

Speaker Redmond: "House will come to order. Members please be in their seats. Be led in prayer by the Reverend Krueger, the House Chaplain."

Reverend Krueger: "In the Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen. O Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. Henry Wadsworth Longfellow wrote in A Psalm for Life: 'Let us be up and doing, with a heart for any fate; still achieving, still pursuing, learn to labour and to wait'. Let us pray; O Lord, God, our Heavenly Father, Eternal and Everlasting Creator, we, Thy children of Grace, do bind ourselves unto Thee for all that we have, all that we are, and all that we shall be or possess. Do Thou endow us with the gift of patience and understanding as we labour to bring into effect such laws that will most adequately serve the peoples of the State of Illinois. As decisions are made, with which we do not agree, may we be strengthened with the power of forbearance in hope that it is Thy will which will be satisfied, if not presently, at a time when all may comprehend that which is compatible for the good of those whom we do serve; through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Pledge of allegiance."

Members: "I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, what have you got? How about those House Bills, Second Reading? Have you got any? They've all been read? 3636 hasn't been, I don't

think. Has it? Doorkeeper advises me that there's some cake on his desk at the back. I guess there was a 'Sweetest Party' at the Sangamo Club last night and they had some cake left over. Anybody in the mood? Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1016, Bowman. 1017, Johnson. 1018, Johnson. 1019, Pechous. 1021, Yourell. 1022, Schneider. 1023, Reed-Deuster-Pierce. 1024, Schlickman. 1025, Doyle-DiPrima-Conti-Madigan. 1026, DiPrima. 1028, Lechowicz. 1029, Emil Jones."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Bowman's 1016 tells of an act of bravery. Johnson's 1017 lauds the Treasurer of a village. 1018 by Johnson extolls the ability of Ralph E. Flexman. 1019 by Pechous notes an anniversary. 1021 by Yourell honors a third place certificate holder. 1022 by Schneider tells of a golden wedding anniversary. 1023 by Reed honors 50 years of service. 1024 by Schlickman records the contribution of the Arlington Heights High School marching band. 1025 by Doyle records an Eagle Scout award. 1026 by DiPrima extolls the virtues of Judge Louie D'Repo. And 1028 by Lechowicz honors Stan Macquitta of the Chicago Black Hawks. Emil Jones talks about a 35 year retirement. And I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. The Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk?"

Okay. Death Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1020, Yourell, with respect to the memory of Dr. David Alexander Johnson and House Resolution 1027, Lechowicz, with respect to the memory of Robert F. Che."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi moves the adoption of the Death Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. The Death Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1014, Farley."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee on Assignment. Just in case there's any misunderstanding it's a full Session tomorrow. Don't know yet. Probably ten, but we don't know for sure. Request for change of votes."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Daniels, requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3622. Are there objections?"

Speaker Redmond: "No objections."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Bell, requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 3622. Are there objections?..."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Hearing none.."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Hudson requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3623."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, request is granted. And request journalized. Representative Donovan, are you seeking recognition? Yes, Sir. On the... Representative Schneider in the chamber? Roll Call for attendance. Take the record. No, open it up. I thought you were Simms. Is Representative Schneider here? Schneider? On page two, House Bills, Second Reading, 3636?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3636, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels, for what purpose do you arise? Daniels? Give the Gentleman your attention."

Daniels: "Have all of the Amendments been distributed on this? We have... Representative Schneider has put an Amendment #5, so I'm going to withdraw Amendment #1 in support of Representative Schneider's Amendment #5."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment...Are there any Amendments from the floor, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Daniels..."

Speaker Redmond: "You withdraw that. Is that correct? Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Giorgi, amends House Bill 3636 on page two, line ten by deleting the words, 'assessed valuation' and inserting in lieu thereof, 'tax extension by fund'."

Speaker Redmond: "Who was the Sponsor of this Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Giorgi."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi on Amendment 2."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, that was withdrawn in favor of Amendment #3."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment 2 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Giorgi, amends House Bill 3636 on page in line ten by deleting 'assessed valuation for real' and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'tax exemption bytaxing districts...'"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move for the adoption of Amendment #3. What it does is it allows the county clerk when he's adjusting the taxes of following year to use the line item rather than the assessed valuations and that's what Amendment #3 does. I move for the adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Schlickman. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Giorgi: "Yes."

Schlickman: "Which line item are you referring to?"

Giorgi: "On page two, lines ten and eleven. On Amendment #3. Do you have Amendment #3 in your hand?"

Schlickman:: "You said assessed valuation was being substituted for by line item?"

Giorgi: "The wording...Scratching out the wording, 'assessed valuation for real property', and including the words, 'decreasing the tax extension by funds for each taxing district'."

Schlickman: "What is the effect as far as the taxpayers are concerned?"

Giorgi: "Well, because, the funds if we don't use the word, 'funds', some of the funds may be statutorily limited and they'll be...not be able to extend that tax. In other words, if the fund is over the limit. You will know that by just using assessed valuation. But you wouldn't know it by using tax fund."

Schlickman: "What effect will this have on the taxpayer?"

Giorgi: "The tax bill will be adjusted. I don't know what the end effect will be, but the county clerk will

adjust each tax bill the following year to correct any inequity."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment 3. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. The motion is adopted. Representative Karpiel, have you discussed this Bill with Representative Giorgi? Representative Karpiel."

Karpiel: "Am I on?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes."

Karpiel: "Yes, I did discuss this Bill with Representative Giorgi. He had told me just right before Session that he probably wasn't going to move the Bill today, but that if he did he would bring it back to Second."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi?"

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, we spoke because her Amendments weren't prepared correctly. She was going to get a new Amendment. We still have to adopt another Amendment by Daniels. But if her Amendment is acceptable, I'll move the Bill back from Third to Second Reading for her Amendment. That's the agreement we have."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. So that's taken care of anyway. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4, McMaster-Giorgi..."

Giorgi: "That's withdrawn. Amendment #4 is withdrawn. Amendment #5 is the only viable Amendment by Daniels."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi withdrew Amendment 4, is that correct?"

Giorgi: "McMaster-Giorgi is withdrawing Amendment #4 and the only Amendment left is Daniels' #5."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's withdrawing #4?"

Giorgi: "McMaster-Giorgi."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Schneider-Daniels, amends House Bill 3636 on page one, line two by deleting the period and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels-Schneider. Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #5 is in reference to a law that we passed last year called the Local Government Finance Study Commission. That law calls for a reporting date which the Finance Study Commission will be unable to meet. This is probably one of the extremely active Commissions in the State of Illinois. They've been meeting weekly for the last several months. They are requesting this Amendment which would set over their reporting date preliminary and fact finding studies to be completed by May 1, 1981, public comment to be submitted by that report up until October 15, 1981 and the final report to be submitted to the General Assembly no later than December 1, 1981. And I don't know of any opposition to this Amendment and I would request a favorable approval."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Representative Getty."

Getty: "Would the Gentleman yield? Representative Daniels, I thought that we would need this information so we could act, you know, early in the next Session. Certainly, hopefully, we would send something to the

Governor by June. But this indicates we wouldn't even have a final report till next December."

Daniels: "That's correct. We would not have a final report from the Commission until next December. However, that does not mean that the Commission would not be in a position to recommend legislation as it would do as soon possible. The Commission intends to do that to have legislation introduced and recommend, butthis time it's going to be impossible to meet the original reporting date that was set at February 1, 1981."

Getty: "Well, do I understand then you're suggesting we ought to enact some interim legislation and then await the final report in December and then maybe go back and correct that interim legislation?"

Daniels: "Absolutely not. We would only, in this Body, through its deliberative process, enact legislation that would be good and lasting. What I'm suggesting to you, is that there may be several additional pieces that will come out as a result of the final report in December of 1981."

Getty:: "Well, then are you suggesting maybe we ought to suspend any legislation in this Spring Session..."

Daniels: "...That may be a good idea.. I'd move for favorable adoption, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question's on Representative Daniels' motion to adopt Amendment 5. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. It's understood that Representative Giorgi, that you bring this back to Second for Representative Karpel in the event she can make an agreement on that Amendment. Is that correct? Okay. Okay. Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have with us today the Queen of Peace High School sitting up in the auditorium, the class that studies practical politics. They're represented by all the southwest side Legislators like Kucharski, Bus Yourell, Huskey, Jane Barnes and all those good Legislators from the southwest side of Chicago. Up in the balcony here, Queen of Peace High School."

Speaker Redmond: "And on House Bills, Second Reading, 3638? Friedrich? I understand the Amendments have not yet been distributed on that so we'll have to pass that for the moment. House Bills, Third Reading, 3626, Representative Peters."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3626, a Bill for an Act amending various public Acts and making new appropriations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave of the House to move House Bill 3626 back to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of two Amendments which were agreed to yesterday. Oh, I'm sorry. Mr. Speaker.."

Speaker Redmond: "The Minority Leader objects.."

Peters: "I would ask..."

Speaker Redmond: "Stop humming.."

Peters: "I would ask leave of the House, Mr. Speaker, to move House Bill 3626 back to the Order of Second

Reading for the purpose of the adoption of two Amendments which have been agreed to."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, 3626 is returned to the Order of Second Reading..."

Peters: "Amendment #7 is being offered by Mr. Mautino. The Amendment provides for supplemental appropriation to the Department of Mental Health. I would move adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters has moved the adoption of Amendment 7. Any discussion? The question's on the motion. Those in favor say 'yes'. 'Yes'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #8, Vinson, amends House Bill 3626 as amended by deleting all of Section VI and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move adoption of the Amendment as it simply discharges a constitutional obligation of the General Assembly."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman?"

Schlickman: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "Would you cite the Article of the Constitution that you're attempting to implement?"

Vinson: "Well, I don't know the Article it's specifically in, but the Federal Constitution requires that electors of the various states meet to.. in the Electoral College to cast their vote for the President. And, under our procedures in Illinois, we have provided the money for them every four years for

them to travel to the Electoral College and that's what this is for."

Schlickman: "This is to reimburse the Illinois electors to come to Springfield?"

Vinson: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear the question."

Schlickman: "Is it to reimburse the electors?"

Vinson: "Yes.."

Schlickman: "To come to Springfield? And to send one of them to Washington?"

Vinson: "To cast their vote in the Electoral College.."

Schlickman: "For whom?"

Vinson: "Governor Reagan, President Elect, Reagan."

Schlickman: "Well, this is getting partisan, Mr. Speaker."

Vinson: "We did it for Jimmy Carter last time."

Schlickman: "Well.."

Vinson: "And we did it for..."

Schlickman: "One mistake doesn't justify a second."

Vinson: "Well, this one won't be a mistake. Not like the other one."

Schlickman: "Would you take an Amendment for Anderson?"

Vinson: "Excuse me?"

Schlickman: "Is this.. Is this the tradition, Sam?"

Vinson: "Yes, it's been a tradition throughout the history."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Vinson: "It's actually authorized by state law."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have the Ox State basketball championship from Maine High School up in the balcony represented by Schlickman, Pullen and Aaron Jaffe. Up in the back.."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I can't see anybody but Gus Benassi up there, who's waving hello to me."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, where are we on Amendment 8 on 3626? Any further discussion on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption? Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, on Amendment #8, Representative Vinson, this \$1500 is for the Electoral people that travel to Springfield, is it not? And you're going to send one on to Washington? Can't it be mailed? I'm asking a question of Mr. Vinson, Mr. Speaker."

Vinson: "It's for them to go to Springfield, not to Washington."

Giorgi: "But you mislead us. I thought you were flying someone to Washington with the good news. They can be mailed right?"

Vinson: "Sure."

Speaker Redmond: "...On the adoption of the Amendment #8. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries and Amendment 8 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #9, Mahar, amends House Bill 3626 as amended by deleting all of Section VIII and inserting in lieu thereof the following; 'Section VIII, the sum of \$20,000 or so much as may be necessary appropriated to the Department of Conservation for the purpose of a boat ramp'."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the Sponsor? Representative Mautino?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Mautino."

Mautino: "Yes, Sir. This ... This Amendment basically.. centers around a grant that was given to a village in

the 37th District for a boat ramp. And the amount was \$71,000. Sixty-eight thousand was already forwarded by the Department of Conservation. The rest, by the village. But what has happened is the..under construction, the Department of Conservation did not allow the ramp to be put in when it was supposed to be put it. It's still not in now because of duck season. So therefore, there's an acceleration provision in that contract that increases ten to fifteen percent with this next year. And so the difference is about \$20,000, and, basically, that's what this Amendment does. It covers that escalation on the grant for the boat ramp. And I move that we adopt.."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, could you tell me whether the Amendment has been distributed please? We don't seem to have it on this side."

Speaker Redmond: "What was the inquiry?"

Pullen: "Whether the Amendment has been printed and distributed."

Speaker Redmond: "Has the Amendment been printed and distributed?"

Pullen: "On both sides?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well...Huh? Not yet. We will have to halt consideration of Amendment 9 and advance until it's distributed. Have you got them? Is that it...Well, let's take this one out of the record. How about 3627? Hold it on Second and take it out of the record until we get the Amendments. Are there any Amendments other than 9, Jerry? Okay. We'll just take it out of the record. Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I have an Amendment #10 to House Bill 3626 which appropriates to the Comptroller the sum of \$4,726,412.16 for the purpose..for the purpose of a cost of living increase for the Members of the General Assembly. I move adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Would you repeat that please? I was interrupted and..."

Peters: "I've got the figure wrong, Mr. Speaker. It's \$4,208,614.18 not 12 cents."

Speaker Redmond: "We're talking on 3627? Is that correct?"

Peters: "Yes, Sir..for the purpose of a cost of living increase for the Members of the General Assembly."

Speaker Redmond: "Have you moved this to the Order of Second Reading?"

Peters: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "I think you did it without my knowledge."

Peters: "I'll withdraw the Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, do you want that returned to the Order of Second Reading, 3627? I was advised there were possibly some additional Amendments to 3627. Am I in error on that?"

Peters: "No. Are there? There are none. We're alright on 3627."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, just leave it the way it is? Nobody wants to bring it back. Am I correct on that?"

Peters: "3627 is fine."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. 3631, Matijevich."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3631, Matijevich,..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, could we have leave of the House to table Committee

Amendments #1 and 2? Floor Amendment #3 is being offered that will take the place of Committee Amendments #1 and 2.."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich have leave to return 3631 to the Order of Second Reading? No objection on the Order of Second Reading. Now he moves to table Amendments 1 and 2, is that correct?"

Matijevich: "Committee Amendments #1 and 2, table.."

Speaker Redmond: "1 and 2. The motion the Clerk is only on 2..."

Matijevich: "No, we want 1 and 2..Leave of the House..."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave to amend the motion on its face? Any objection? Alright, hearing no objection, leave is granted. Well, now the motion is to table Amendments 1 and 2. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 112..13..14..15..16..17 'aye' and 3 'no'. The motion carries. Amendments 1 and 2 are tabled. Now, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, now we have Floor Amendment #3. Correct, Mr. Clerk? Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Amendment #3, Floor Amendment #3, is Committee Amendment #1 which had a technical error in an amount. I move the adoption of Amendment #3."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the motion for the adoption of Amendment 3. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries and the Amendment #3 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, Matijevich..."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, #4 and 5 are repetitious. That should be withdrawn."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendments #4 and 5 are withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3635, Representative Terzich. 3635. Still House Bills, Third Reading. I don't know. Let's find out what he wants. Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3635 makes no substantive changes in the pension laws. It was introduced to correct errors contained in House Bill 2012 which was passed in 1979. It provides for an employer pick up of employee retirement contributions to the Pension Code and that's into the method of sheltering for federal income tax purposes the employee pension contribution. It changes the effective date from January 1, 1981 to January 1, 1982 so that we can get the IRS's approval. And I would urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3635, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I would like to know if the Sponsor is going to accept any Amendments in the Senate whatsoever."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "None, whatsoever. This is the Bill, just corrective action on this particular Bill and I'm not

accepting any Amendments. It's going straight through."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner. The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 155 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Bill, having received the Extraordinary Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page four.. Representative Braun. Representative Braun is 'aye'. On page four, under Total Veto Motions, appears House Bill 3542. Representative Madigan. Representative Madigan? Representative Madigan. 3542. Total Veto Motions."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill will provide a real estate tax increase within the city of Chicago for the benefit of the Chicago Park District and the public museums located on Chicago Park District land. The Governor vetoed the Bill and stated in his veto message that he based his veto upon the fact that the Chicago Park District had not abated any of its tax collections because of the adoption of the corporate personal property tax replacement. Subsequent to that action by the Governor, the Chicago Park District did abate three point one million dollars. This action has been taken within the last three to four weeks. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that this money is needed for both the Park District and the major museums in the city of Chicago which are utilized by people from all over the state. These institutions are affected by the same rise in cost and prices that have affected all aspects of our economy.

The cost of utility, the cost of fuel, the cost of labor impact upon these institutions just as they impact upon any business enterprise in the state. The money is needed for continued operations and I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall House Bill 35..' Pardon me. Representative Braun."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, this is the Chicago Park District tax increase Bill. It calls for a tax increase without a referendum. It calls for a tax increase on behalf of the single, most wasteful tax...wasteful Park District in the entire State of Illinois. In light of the last election results, I would caution any Member of this General Assembly who goes forward to vote for such a tax increase on the people of the city of Chicago without a referendum, particularly in light of the fact that the city of Chicago is going to be taxing its citizens additionally for things like schools, for roads, and the like, this Park District has failed in its responsibility to abate taxes, even though that is not the single issue in this instance. The tax district...the tax increase that is requested goes not only to museums, but goes to the Park Districts generally. And I would encourage as I did in the fall, when this issue came up, a 'no' vote. A tax increase without a referendum is what the people of the State of Illinois clearly sent a message to this Assembly that this did not want it. And I would encourage you to keep faith with the citizens who voted for you and defeat this veto override motion. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Conti."

Conti: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of the override. This is the first time in a good many years that I could remember, the city of Chicago is not coming down here and asking for a subsidy and as Representative Braun stated that the people did send this message loud and clear this last election. If they don't want this tax increase, let them take that decision to the polls when they have an election in the city of Chicago. We, downstaters, we, in the suburbs, have full access to all the Park Districts in the city of Chicago and still we don't pay any extra fees anymore than the people that live in the city of Chicago. Those benefits are for throughout the state. The cultural behind all those museums are for the good of the people of the whole State of Illinois. Now, if the people of the city of Chicago want to pay for this through a tax, let them pay for it through the tax. If the people in the city of Chicago don't like the tax, let them throw the rascals out like they did on November 4th."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "I just wanted to warn the last speaker that he shouldn't get in too deep cause he doesn't swim too well."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think it would be refreshing if someone would suggest that it would be a good idea to let people of the city of Chicago vote on their own fate for a change. If,

indeed, the parks and museums of the city of Chicago are for all the people of the State of Illinois, then maybe we ought to be passing an appropriation to subsidize them instead of socking it to the people of Chicago again. I think the least that those of us in the rest of Illinois who have the opportunity to have referenda in our area can do, is to give the people of the city of Chicago an opportunity to vote when their taxes are going to be increased. We don't just sit back and say, 'Well let's throw the rascals out in our own areas.' We fight tax increases without referendum for our own areas and I don't think that it is at all fair for this Legislature to impose a tax increase on the people of the city of Chicago who do not have an election coming up very soon and who ought to have the opportunity like the rest of us, to vote in referendum on their tax increases. This Bill passed the House last spring with 50 negative votes on it. This is an extraordinary action, voting to override the Governor's veto and I suggest that we put at least 50 negative votes on this motion and defeat it. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise in support of 3542. I understand the Chicago Park District operation. I meet with the Superintendent Kelly. I know some of the problems that he's confronted with. I know the parks in the city of Chicago need to be updated and I know that this particular legislation is going to only help the city of Chicago. We know that it would be very

difficult in other ways to do this. But, I understand the problem that is there, insist I understand those problems. I urge my colleagues to give us this increase."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell. Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen ...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I've been a critic of the Park District. There are a lot of things I didn't like about it. When I didn't like it, I stood up and said so. We had a number of problems with the Chicago Park District. A number of them have not been resolved. But I, too, attempt to be a reasonable person. You cannot ask for all of the improvements that you want. You cannot ask for something and then simply refuse to pay for it. We're at a crossroads and the crossroads is simply this, if we want a better Park District then we're going to have to put the money to match our mouths. It's been said very often in this Body that we ought not dictate to private ...er..we ought not dictate to local units of government and put mandates on them without putting the money with it. In this case, the people of the city of Chicago are paying for their own mandate. If it be their choice, so be it. They ought to at least be allowed to attempt to solve some of their problems. And it distresses me to hear the cries from some Sections of the state talking about the people of Chicago and their tax problems. We, in this case, although we have many problems, are attempting to solve our own problem and if the people of the city of Chicago can vote for this tax, then surely, you and the rest of the Legislature ought not

be able to do less. We are not coming to you with a handout. It's an effort to solve a problem that's critical. There are many problems in the Park District and perhaps all of them will not be solved. But men of reason must sit down and work together and attempt to work out some kind of compromise. If this a compromise, so be it. Please allow us to at least have our own faith and suffer our fate at the polls if we err."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Anybody else? Representative Madigan to close? Representative Beatty?"

Beatty: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to speak in favor of this override. The Park Districts have been providing very necessary services and giving young people opportunities for good wholesome activity in sports. In recent times they've had to close down some facilities in our District, those that were tied in with the schools and due to the efforts of our Majority Leader, we were able to get these reopened. That was based on the promise there would be some help to the Park District. In my community a new field house is being built by the Park District. We have thousands of youngsters and the best place for them when they're not home is to be right there in the parks playing baseball, basketball, football and all these other things. And I don't know of any better use for our money. Now, I don't know what the voters would do on a referendum if it were presented. But I know referendums cost money. The voters have voted us back into office, many of us, and we.. there will be

an election as one of the previous speakers had said in the near future and if they like the course that we're taking, I'm sure they will throw out the rest of the rascals, because as you know there's an awful lot of rascals that are still here and were returned."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3542 pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "I vote 'no' for a simple reason. I cannot understand how anyone would vote for a proposition that does not allow the people to make their own decision. No referendum. To me, this is incredible. It's not American in the slightest degree. You'd better think about it. I suppose it won't do any good."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members, I was going to explain my 'aye' vote, but I don't think it'll be necessary. Thank you."

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

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the override motion on this Bill. In my district, is an historical institution that was named after the founder of the first settlement, which is now called the city of Chicago, Jean Point DuSable. That institution is in dire need of financial support and the Chicago Park District indicated a willingness to help sustain that

very historical institution. Because of that and because of the good faith shown by the commissioners of Chicago's Park District, I rise and cast an 'aye' vote on the override of veto for House Bill 3542."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 110 'aye' and 47 'no'. The motion prevails. And House Bill 3542 is declared passed, the Governor of the... the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. 2847. 2847. Representative Kosinski. Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2847 costs money. What it says is, that up to the first thousand dollars, up to, of interest on your savings in Illinois banks and other institutions will be tax free. This parallels what's being done in Federal Government. Now I heard the Governor's message as well as you did. And I'm sympathetic. At the same time, let's face certain realities. We just in this last General Assembly passed an RTA tax which hit our people. We refused to decrease the five percent on food and medicine in its total. Edison just went up 8.9%. Auto license fees are to go up. There's consideration of a water tax increase in Chicago on top of a sewer tax that we've been hit with. Gasoline tax increase is going to be asked. Cigarette tax increase is going to be asked. Liquor tax increase is going to be asked. The schools want more money. The RTA is wanting more money. And our people, the people in the middle, are in a squeeze. 2847 includes just a miniscule consideration for these people, for the people in fixed income brackets and

senior citizens. We just passed 3542, another tax increase. I voted for it. We voted for a lot of issues that increase taxes. All of us have been responsible and guilty. Now in this situation, can we give our people just a little bit, up to \$25.00 a year? Just a little bit to show them we're... it isn't take, take, take, take, take, when we can give them a little? I ask for an override."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's motion. While I support the idea behind this Bill, I do think that the state should give some incentives to people who are saving money and creating capital. I think that the timing of the Bill is all wrong. We all heard the Governor's message yesterday. The financial condition of the state is in somewhat doubt right now. We passed this Bill last spring when we were just entering into the recession. No one knows at this point how long the recession will continue. And if you will read the Governor's veto message you will note that the estimate is that this Bill, when fully implemented, will cost the state some \$50,000,000 a year in revenues. I suggest to you that the state cannot afford this Bill at this time, that we should allow the Governor's veto to stand. We should vote against this motion to override and at the proper time, when the economy begins to pull out of this recession, then pass this Bill. This is not the right time. I urge you to vote against the override

motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to point out just a couple of things why I'm going to vote 'no' on this. First of all, I think all of us, in this Body, at least partly, consider ourselves politicians. I do in fact. But I look at this and I see how little help this is going to be to any of our citizens. And I think about what the consequences of our overspending or failure to tighten down our spending is going to do in the state. It's going to force us to consider a tax increase. And I can tell you for one, that I'd rather watch how we give our tax relief out; I'd rather watch how we spend our money, than I would rather to vote for an increase in our income tax. And that's really the choice that we're going to have. Now this one Bill won't drive us over the cliff and put us in a position of voting for an increase in the income tax. But it's this Bill along with many other Bills that can put us in that position. I think that's one good reason that we should oppose this override. The other reason is that when we give money or we give tax relief to people in this state for our income tax, this generally adds money to the federal coffers. You say 'Why?'. First of all, Illinois income tax is deductible from your federal return. If you don't have to pay that Illinois income tax, then you lose that deduction and part of that money if you're in the 50% bracket, the 25% bracket, whatever relief we're giving, is just

transferred to the federal coffers. For those two reasons, I suggest that a good vote on this..vote which is good for the people of the State of Illinois, good for our financial management is a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski, to close."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, one of the last speakers indicated an amount almost twice that which my notes indicate. And certainly an amount greater than the Governor indicated in his veto message. But we're neither here nor there. We're takers. Let's give just a little bit. I know we've all been reelected, those of us who will return next Session and maybe we don't need their vote at this time. But that isn't my point. My point is the middle man is in the squeeze and any little bit we can do for him will be thoroughly appreciated. The climate next year in terms of tax increases is going to be deplorable. Let's give them this little bit and override the veto on 2847."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2847 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'nay'. Marco. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 91 'ayes', 50 'nos'. The Gentleman asks leave to poll the absentees. Clerk, poll the absentees. The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Stiehl, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you vote me 'no' "

please? I inadvertantly pressed the wrong button."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mrs. Stiehl as 'no'. Proceed to poll the absentees. Excuse me. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you vote me 'no'? I, too, pressed the wrong button."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Change Mr. Hudson from 'aye' to 'no'. Please proceed to poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees; Burnidge. Casey. Chapman. Epton. Ewell. Dwight Friedrich. Giorgi..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Giorgi as 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Goodwin. Hanahan. Harris. Emil Jones. Kane..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kane 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Kucharski. McBroom. McCourt. McPike. Meyer. Ronan. Sandquist. Schisler. Schlickman. Skinner. Taylor. Totten..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Emil Jones as 'aye'. And Ray Ewell as 'aye'. Please proceed, Tony."

Clerk Leone: "Walsh. Willer. Williams. Conclusion of the poll of the absentees."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Representative Taylor as 'aye'. On this question there are 95 'ayes', 53 'nos'. The motion fails and House Bill 2847 is declared lost, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. House Bill 3166. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3166 increases the minimum salaries

for county officials other than coroners as follows; separated...it only affects the three smallest categories in the state, those with a population of zero to 14,000, from 14,000 to 30,000, from 30,000 to 60,000. That increase in minimums is only \$1500 in each category. Now, these minimums have not been changed since 1974 and obviously no elected official should be expected to work in responsible positions for less than the amounts proposed. These figures do not approach the increases in inflation over the recent years. The elected county officials affected are county recorders, county clerks, county treasurers, sheriffs and auditors. There are only nine counties that are basically affected. And I want to remind you that these people take office next month and unless this Bill passes, they will not have had an increase in their minimum salaries for 14..for a period of 14 years at the end of this next term. And I ask for your favorable support and Mr. Speaker, I move House Bill 3166 do pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if the Gentleman would clarify a comment I believe he made on the size of the counties that are affected by this legislation?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Campbell please."

Campbell: "Okay. Edwards, Franklin, Hardin, Hamilton, Henderson, Jasper, Lawrence, Massac and Wayne."

Bradley: "A population then of less than what?"

Campbell: "This only affects any of those counties of less than 60,000 population."

Bradley: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers?"

Borchers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and fellow Members of the House, I want to point out that these Gentlemen that run for office and were elected knew exactly what their salaries were going to be. And I feel we should never increase any salaries including our own, that we should remember that this is taxpayers' money and if ever there is a time that we begin to have to reserve and protect the taxpayers it's now. So I suggest we vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Vermilion... The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield for a question or two?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Ewing: "Did you say, Chuck, how many counties this affected? Nine counties?"

Campbell: "Nine, yes."

Ewing: "This is an increase in the minimum salary. Is that correct?"

Campbell: "That's correct."

Ewing: "And is it true that these county Boards could pay their county officers if they chose to?"

Campbell: "Yes."

Ewing: "And would you say that this falls into the category of a mandated program?"

Campbell: "Yes, I would. But in answering that question, I would simply say to you that I don't feel that a

county Board, any county Board, is very responsible if they don't increase sometime during 14 years."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I agree with Chuck Campbell that if they don't increase their salaries, they're not being responsible. I disagree with this very good Sponsor in this measure because they should not come to the General Assembly to mandate a program to solve their problem. They should lobby their elected county officials, the elected county Board and get their raises there. It's difficult to go back and I come from a small county and tell those county Board members that we know more than you do what you should be paying your county officials. I really think this is a precedent that we've been following for a long time in this state and it's really time to put it to rest. They can raise their salaries on the local level if they want and if we want to sustain the Governor's veto, we should vote 'no' on this motion and let the local governments handle their own affairs."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to ask Chuck if there really...if he was accurate. In our analysis here it says counties of 14,000 and 30,000 also. Chuck, has the Bill been changed? You said..."

Campbell: "No, there's no change. This is the way it was originally from .."

Van Duyne: "I'm not against it, but you said it was only counties of 60,000 or above didn't you? Or 60..."

Campbell: "Sixty thousand..."

Van Duyne: "Okay..."

Campbell: "It would affect counties up to 60,000."

Van Dyne: "Okay. Alright. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Campbell, to close."

Campbell: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this isn't anything new for the State Legislature. We have set minimum salaries for county officials. We've set maximum salaries for county officials. So this isn't something ..first time that we've ever done. Maybe we should get out of the business of setting salaries at all and just leave them to the county officials. But nevertheless when you have counties that simply will not increase the pay of their elected officials, and I think it's a responsibility of this Legislature to do something about it. And I ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3166 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 86 'ayes', 43 'nos'. The Gentleman asks leave to poll the absentees. Clerk will poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees: Alexander. Anderson. Bullock. Capuzi..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Capuzi, 'aye'. Cullerton, 'aye'. McPike, 'aye'. Mrs. Alexander, 'aye'. Williamson, 'aye'. Just wait a minute. It's too fast for the Clerk. Williams, 'aye'. Emil Jones, 'aye'. Anderson, 'aye'. Mrs. Frederick, 'no'. Change Mrs.

Frederick from 'aye' to 'no'. Mrs. Dyer, 'aye'. Mr. Mahar, 'aye'. Peters, 'aye'. Mrs. Jones, 'aye'. Mr. Robbins from 'no' to 'aye', is that correct? Mr. Hoffman, 'aye'. Mr. Schraeder, 'aye'. Mr. Wolf, Sam Wolf, 'aye'. Wait a minute, Roger. You caught up, Tony? Mahar wanted to be recorded as 'aye'. And put McAuliffe as 'aye'. And, Mrs. Stiehl? She wants to be changed from 'no' to 'aye'. And Mr. Polk, the same request. Mr. Griesheimer wants to be recorded as 'no'. Jake Wolf, 'aye'. Gaines, Charlie Gaines, 'aye'. What's our count? Mr. Huff as 'aye'. Hallock as 'aye'. Tim Simms as 'aye'. Record the Speaker as 'aye'. Mr. Friedrich?"

Friedrich: "Would you change from 'aye' to 'no' please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Change.. Kindly record Mr. Friedrich as 'no'. What's the count? Anyone else want to be recorded? Swanstrom from 'no' to 'aye'? This is Chuck Campbell's Bill. Might as well go with the winner. He's winning. Bullock as 'aye'. That's more than enough. What's the count? Mr. Neff? Chuck Campbell. You want to be recorded in what way? 'Aye'? 'No'. Kindly record Neff as 'no'. What's the count, Tony? On this question there's 109 'ayes', 39 'nos'. And the motion prevails and House Bill 3166 is declared passed, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Message from the Senate."

Clerk Leone: "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 of Representatives in the passage of Bills, the following titles to wit; House Bill 3230,

together with attached Amendments hereto. And the adoption of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House to wit; Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3230, passed by the Senate as amended November 20th, 1980 by a three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Back on the Calendar on page four appears House Bill 3167, Mr. Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I promise you this is my last Bill. House Bill 3167 was introduced at the request of the Illinois Coroners' Association. It was acted upon favorably in Counties and Townships Committee by a vote of 14 to nothing and passed the full House 122 to 22. It proposes that the increase in minimum salaries outside of Cook County for coroners be increased so as to approximate the minimums which have been in effect for other county officials since 1974. In his veto message, Governor Thompson cited his opposition to mandating cost increases for units of local government without providing additional reimbursements from the state. Certainly this theory is commendable in many cases. But where a local unit refuses to accept a responsible position, then it becomes incumbent upon the Legislature to address and correct a totally unfair situation. Coroners enter upon their new term of office in December of 1980 so unless this Bill passes, they will be faced with a period of 14 years without any increase in the minimum. In Illinois, a coroner is on call 24 hours a day, seven days of every week in the year. More than 60% of these men are not

even provided with a full time deputy. This request we believe is necessary, long overdue, and it will assist the coroners in their efforts to professionalize and upgrade their office. A number of counties are already paying as much or more than the proposed minimums and they, of course, will not be affected. And I simply ask for your favorable support and I move, Mr. Speaker, that House Bill 3167 do pass, the Governor's veto notwithstanding."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3167 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'nay'. Representative Farley? Farley. Record me as 'aye' please. Have all voted who wish? This Bill is similar in nature to the one we just passed. Have all voted who wish? Chuck Campbell's last Bill. Have all voted who wish? Kindly record Marco Domico...You are recorded, Marco. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 113 'aye' and 40 'nos', 3 recorded as 'present'. The motion prevails and House Bill 3167 is declared passed, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. House Bill 2860. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise to urge support of the override on the Governor's veto on House Bill 2860. This Bill exempts senior citizens from paying income tax on the first \$1500. Unlike my copartner here, Roman Kosinski's Bill, this Bill cost the state about eight million dollars. We have done nothing for the senior citizens this year and I urge that you will

support this override. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again, we have a Bill that would exempt interest from the Illinois state income tax. The big difference between this Bill and the one that we've already rejected is that this exempts interest up to \$1500. So I think that to a great extent even though this applies only to senior citizens, it may be exempting interest for senior citizens who are in the higher tax brackets as opposed to the Bill that Representative Kosinski was attempting to override a while ago. I think the principle is the same. We rejected the last Bill. We should reject this Bill. I urge a 'no' vote on the motion to override the Governor's veto."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing? Mr. Capparelli, to close."

Capparelli: "As I said, Ladies and Gentlemen, why we can afford this Bill, it's only eight million dollars. It's for the senior citizens. We have done nothing for them. I would urge your support. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2860 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Johnson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think most of us in this House, in the Legislature, like to pride ourselves on votes and programs designed to benefit people in their advanced years. But we've

extended benefits in a wide variety of ways already, circuit breaker, the homestead exemption, the various benefits in our parks and so forth. And what the Sponsor neglected to say, at least according to our analysis, is that for Fiscal Year '82 cost of this is estimated at 82 million dollars. I don't think the benefits are going to be sufficiently great that the bankroll of the state can afford this kind of depredation. And for those reasons, notwithstanding that all of us want to continue to make efforts on behalf of senior citizens, I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Terzich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, again, you know, the seniors are going to come out here with nothing if we don't give them some help and some support. The figure that the previous speaker said is certainly not true. It's only eight million dollars if I recall this Bill, that Representative Capparelli worked very, very closely with the Bureau of the Budget and also took their recommendations to keep the cost down. It's time that we do pay attention to the economic problems of our seniors. This is our chance to give them the support. I think that Representative Capparelli did in good faith work with the Governor's Office and I don't see why the Governor would want to veto such a very, very fine Bill such as this. And I would urge support of House Bill 2876."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, we're not giving any state money to

these senior citizens. What we're saying to them is, 'If you've saved your money, somehow in this inflationary period you're able to save your money, we're going to give you a certain exemption on on the state income tax in having to pay that to the state'. What's wrong with that? These senior citizens have been through the depression. They've been through World War II. They've been through inflation. And they've managed to save up a few dollars when they're over 65 in their old age. Why should the State of Illinois tax them on the income from their savings when they're senior citizens? We're not giving them eight million dollars. What we're doing is saying, 'You can keep the money that you've scraped to save your whole life so that you have a little something to live on when you get old and when inflation, which is the cruelest tax of all, when inflation eats away at your savings'. We at the State of Illinois won't also eat away at it. We're going to have..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Please proceed, Mr. Pierce. I shortchanged you as far as time."

Pierce: "All right. The State of Illinois, according to the figure that got on at the Fiscal Commission, will at the end of this Fiscal Year, have a surplus of close to \$300,000,000. We're not a bank. I don't know why we have to tax the senior citizens on their life savings. Let's pass this Bill. It's the honorable thing to do. It's the decent thing to do and we can afford it, believe me, we can."

Speaker Lechowicz: "There will be no demonstrations from the gallery please. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bradey

(sic)... I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Preston, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this motion to override the Governor's veto. The Governor's veto message says that this Bill will save no more than \$37.50 for the people who benefit from this Bill. The veto message on a previous Bill said that people..we should vote against it because people would only save \$25.00. And on and on and on. If the Governor would stop vetoing these Bills, senior citizens in the State of Illinois would be able to save substantial money to benefit them and to help live on a fixed income. I'd urge all of you to vote 'yes' on this override motion. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 98 'ayes' and 56 'nos'. The Gentleman asks to poll the absentees. Clerk will poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees: Capuzi. Casey. Epton. Ewell. Goodwin. Hanahan. Leon. Mautino. McBroom. McCourt. Meyer. Patrick. Peters..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Kindly record Ewell as 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the poll of the absentees: Peters. Ronan. Sandquist. Schlickman. Totten. And, Walsh."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On this question there are 99 'nos' (sic), 56... I'm sorry. 99 'ayes', 56 'nos', 4 recorded as 'present'. The motion fails and House Bill 2860 is declared lost. On the Calendar on page

six, on the Amendatory Veto Motions appears House Bill 3204. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Sharp."

Sharp: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise to place a motion before this Body today to override the Governor's amendatory veto of House Bill 3204. And I would ask the Membership to take a look at this issue with an open mind to listen to the debate and do what they believe the right and just thing to do. Yesterday we heard the Governor's address concerning the fiscal state of the state budget, the revenue projection for the state, and I think we all realize that we have to approach state finances with a conservative thought in mind. But at the same time, I think we have to look at issues based upon their merit. We have to not turn our heads blindly to any issue or program that would cost the state money because the Governor says we have a financial problem. What we have to do is what we feel is needed for the people in the State of Illinois. House Bill 3204 is legislation that received overwhelming support by both the House and the Senate during the Regular Session of the General Assembly. It's legislation that was designed to provide a comprehensive update to the circuit breaker program in the State of Illinois. Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker? "

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Mr. Sharp. I'm listening."

Sharp: "Yes. Well, I would like a little attention from the House, if I may."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Surely. Please proceed, Sir."

Sharp: "I would hope that the Membership would pay attention

to some of the facts involved with this legislation because it is a vehicle that affects many people in the State of Illinois, many of your constituents and I would hope that you would listen to the facts surrounding it. As I stated, this legislation is designed to upgrade the circuit breaker program in the State of Illinois. And it does several things. It, first of all, increases the maximum allowable income under the circuit breaker program from 10,000 to 12,000. And changes the way the grants are calculated somewhat. Secondly, it states that any senior citizen who is otherwise qualified for circuit breaker, but received some cash assistance under one of the public aid programs, will not be automatically deemed ineligible, but will be allowed up to \$55.00 a month cash assistance before they are held ineligible for circuit breaker. And the third part, for the first time in the State of Illinois, recognizes the needs that senior citizens are having in the area of meeting the increasing cost of utilities to these households. Now, the Governor looked at the Bill and he approved part of it and he vetoed part. He vetoed out the part dealing with the fuel cost relief, the utility relief to the senior citizens in the State of Illinois. And in his veto message, he made two statements. He said that, first of all, the State couldn't afford it. Secondly, it duplicated federal programs. And I say that both of those statements are not correct. First of all, this Bill does not duplicate the federal programs. Under the federal programs, first of all, the people in line first are the public aid

recipients. They receive their payments automatically with their cash assistance from the state. Then, those living on fixed incomes who meet the guidelines-- and listen to the guidelines-- 'an individual can receive an income of up to \$4250 before they're held ineligible for the federal assistance. If you're a couple, you're allowed \$5625 before you're determined ineligible'..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Sharp. Ladies and Gentlemen, please, give the Gentleman your attention. Please proceed."

Sharp: "So to be eligible for the federal assistance you have to be just about at poverty levels of income before you're even determined to be eligible and allowed to make application. And out of those who make application, less than one half receive anything because the assistance is given out on a first come, first serve basis. So, when the Governor says we duplicate federal programs, nothing further from the truth in that statement. It does not duplicate the federal program and where there is any duplication at all, what you might say, that it's a good supplement to the federal program. To say that the state, second of all, cannot afford the program, well, let's look at the facts there. The utility user refund part of the bill will cost in the neighborhood of 18 million dollars additional monies. Illinois has the highest utility tax in the nation. The utility tax receipts have been increasing in the neighborhood of 40 million dollars annually and they're going to increase by even more this Fiscal Year and for the future Fiscal Years.

We're only asking that a part of those revenues be used for relief for the senior citizens. The circuit breaker program has been the most neglected program in the State of Illinois. In 1975 we spent in the neighborhood of \$125,000,000 for a circuit breaker tax relief. This year we can boast that we spent the Fiscal Year just completed 86 million dollars. So the relief under this program has gone down from 125 million dollars from a maximum to 86 million dollars this year. That certainly isn't anything to be proud of. In closing, and I'm afraid that many Members have not paid any attention to this because they really don't care about, you know, the arguments for or against the Bill. They've made up their minds. They really don't care that much. I can only say several things. It would be a sad commentary in my opinion on the State of Illinois if we could implement and continue implementation of phasing out the sales tax on equipment used in manufacturing to the tune of about 200 million dollars. And we could implement, continue to implement and phase out the sales tax on farm implements to the tune of 36 million dollars when it's implemented. And when it comes to relief for senior citizens, against the increasing cost of utilities, that Illinois can sit back and boast of having the highest utility tax in the nation and would turn its back on the senior citizens when we're asking that we give only partial relief against the increasing cost of these utilities. Because these households cannot meet those increased costs and we should use part of the increased revenue from the

increased utility tax to meet and help these senior citizens pay their utility bills. I would ask for an override of the Governor's veto, the amendatory veto, to this Bill because it's the only right and just thing to do."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the guests in the gallery please refrain from either applauding or showing your emotions? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Before beginning, I would like to say that as this motion was being called, I was out in the rotunda and the senior citizens gave me some petitions with a note to Representative Ryan and after I speak I'll go over there and present them to him. These are petitions that have been circulated by seniors all over the state and they wanted me to deliver them to Representative Ryan. Before I do, I wanted to show everybody how many thousands and thousands of names there are right here. Now, what I would like to say is that with the rest of you I sat here on this floor yesterday and listened to the Governor and after I heard his speech I recommend that the Governor get a job on Broadway. Not as an actor, but as stage manager. He has stagemanaged an effort to make us believe that we are on the verge of bankruptcy. There is a recession going on. There's no question about that. But during the recession, our revenue growth has never been higher. We are as economists generally agree, at the bottom of the recession. We are not looking into the abyss. We are looking up the mountain. Besides, the Governor told us that are cash

balance had been drawn down by 100 million dollars this last year. An unexpected decrease of 100 million dollars because we were buffeted by the chill winds of recession. Well let me tell you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Governor stagemanaged that one too. During the last spring as Conference Committees were meeting to consider appropriation Bills, the Governor's minions came to those Conference Committees and asked for 10 thousand dollars here, a million dollars there, and we said, I served on a number of those Committees, we said, you've asked us for fiscal restraint. We're trying to give you a lean budget. The Governor's people said, that's okay. We can afford it and, they produced letters from the budget Director, Dr. Mandeville, to prove that the Governor had signed off on those additional requests. And after the Session was over, we added it all up and we found that the Governor had asked to have over 100 million dollars in extra expenditures added after the budget Bills had been introduced and had gone through both chambers and they were now in Conference, over 100 million dollars at the Governor's request. So that draw down in the cash balance didn't occur because of the chill winds of recession. That was a deliberate decision on the part of the Governor to set us up. Let me tell you something else, and if you hadn't read the papers yet, something the Governor couldn't have known yesterday when he was addressing us, that after his address...excuse me. Mr. Speaker? Could I have a little more order? I have just one more main point to make."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let's give the Gentleman your attention please."

Bowman: "While the Governor was addressing us yesterday, the Commerce Commission awarded Commonwealth Edison an 8.9% interim rate increase. That's exactly what Commonwealth Edison says and they have already asked for another 11.1% and they will probably get a substantial amount of that. That 8.9%, Ladies and Gentleman, will generate revenues to the utilities of 282 million dollars and that will create another 14 million dollars in additional utility tax revenue to the State of Illinois. Fourteen million dollars, Ladies and Gentlemen, that can be used to fund this particular program. The money is there. The money is there because the utilities are raising the rates. They have raised them so high that the money that we get from utility tax receipts will, in this Fiscal Year, exceed the money we get from all the corporate profit taxes levied in this state. For the first time in history, the utility taxes will outstrip the corporate taxes in providing revenue to the state. We can take a portion of that. We can afford to take a portion of that and provide utility tax relief to senior citizens. Not only can we afford it, it's our duty. I urge the override."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jake Wolf."

Wolf: "Well, well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm sure we all enjoyed that last speech. Talk about acting, I witnessed the little performance down in the rotunda of the previous speaker and all I can say is he ought to be on the stage too. I think the next one

leaves in about fifteen minutes. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, you know, we're all impressed with a lot of petitions. We had another demagogue running around the state this year with a lot of petitions too. And we can deal with emotionalism. But those of you who are willing to listen to a few facts, I hope you'll just keep your minds open for about a minute. As you know, we had a 21 million dollar federal program which the Governor based his amendatory veto on, but if you look on your Calendar today, and if you'll look at House Bill 3627, which is on Third Reading today, we have another supplemental Bill of some 86 million dollars which is included in there, 84 million dollars in grants and 1.2 million of that would be operations. So, there's 84 million dollars in grants. That's in addition to 44 million dollars which goes to the Department of Public Aid for expressly this type of a program, low income energy assistance program. And as the... one of the previous speakers said, it was based on those who are just above poverty level and you're correct as far as the Department of Public Aid goes. That is based on the poverty level. This new leap program, which is the low income energy assistance program, which is funded out of the wind fall profit tax of the oil companies, providing us 84 million dollars in addition to the 44 million dollars already given to Public Aid, is based on people.. households of...income of less than 80% of the lower living standard. That is not poverty level. That is, I'll repeat that, the lower living standard. If you want to know how much that is, a family of two

could earn \$6,088, a family of four could earn \$10,312 and still be eligible for these fuel grants of up to \$500. I think it was a perfectly sound veto on the part of the Governor. We have now 80 some million dollars in federal money coming down the pike to be used for people. There is no reason to dip into General Revenue funds of the State of Illinois, duplicate a program that is already in existence, that is being funded with federal dollars. And I would urge that we sustain the Governor's amendatory veto."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "Mr. Speaker and fine Members of the House, House Bill 3204 is the most important Bill in this Session. This is the senior citizens Bill and the senior citizens throughout the state are asking for your help. These are the people that are on fixed income and they need relief. This is the only circuit breaker tax relief Bill that was passed in this Session. We have over 1,000 senior citizens here that came out...have over 1,000 senior citizens that are asking you to support the Bill to override House Bill 3204. In closing I ask you for a favorable vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Rigney."

Rigney: "Mr. Speaker, I think all of us would agree that basically House Bill 3204 is an excellent piece of legislation. The Governor recognized this at the time that he applied his amendatory veto. In fact, there were about five separate provisions in this legislation that he gave his endorsement to. And

collectively they amount to about 16 or 17 million dollars of additional money into the circuit breaker program. Now, let's keep in mind that even senior citizens' legislation at times can have provisions in it that simply are not wise. The Governor recognized this and he pointed it out to the Members of the General Assembly."

Speaker Lechowicz: "May I kindly remind the guests in the gallery please refrain from either applauding or displaying your emotions one way or another. It will not help your cause. Please. Please continue, Sir."

Rigney: "Mr. Speaker, I feel somewhat like a point man in the infantry on this occasion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We always used to call them the forward observer and they're very expendable."

Rigney: "Let me point out the one provision in this Bill that I simply do not understand. The Governor... The Governor amendatorally vetoed this Section out. It's the so-called fuel relief clause that intends to give about 75% relief for any increases in fuel costs. However, there's a second provision in that legislation that says that even if fuel cost don't go up at all, in fact if they were to go down in some year in the future, we're still going to give everybody \$40.00. Now, I do not see how in good conscience we can relate this provision to the theory of relief for the cost of energy. It bears no relationship whatsoever. So I say to my friends on both sides of the aisle, all you have to do is vote this one down. The next Amendment... the next motion is going to take care of this Bill in its proper form."

It's going to do all of those good and necessary things that need to be done for senior citizens and it's going to remove the one bad feature that is found in the present Bill, 3204, as it now stands."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Balanoff."

Balanoff: "The senior citizens in Illinois are victims on two counts; one, they're living on fixed incomes and two, they're subject to the same inflation that we're all subject to. Let's not put them out in the cold also. Let's override the Governor's veto on this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Robbins."

Robbins: "I'm very proud to have to stand here and say that the people in my District are contributing 20 million dollars a month for this federal relief that the senior citizens are getting and the ones that are paying it and paying it the hardest are the senior citizens that are paying the wind fall profits tax. It's nice to know that some good is going to come of it. Now, as far as this one clause here, I think that the amount of fuel adjustment that is being done is very commendable. If the senior citizens are taking advantage of the money that we supply to winterize their homes in the areas in which they can, they will save substantially more than the amount of money we are talking about. So, I suggest they take advantage of the wind fall profits tax, winterize their homes at the cost of the government, use the fuel adjustment and leave the state economy alone."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, a great deal of

debate has taken place on this motion in the last few moments with facts and figures being discussed on both sides of the question. I'd like to remind the Members that this Bill has other fine benefits for senior citizens in Illinois, benefits which they deserve and which all of us have worked hard for so that we can give our constituents who are senior citizens more financial benefits. Let me simply remind you of this, if this motion prevails, and then goes over to the Senate, and the motion in the Senate fails, the entire Bill is lost which includes some of those other benefits. I don't know how many of you are aware of that because sometimes these rules or procedures of Veto Sessions become overlooked. The entire Bill could be in great jeopardy over on the Senate side if this motion prevails."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Well, I guess that just puts a lot more pressure on the Senate to approve this fine Bill and we are all elected as Members of the House of Representatives to do our job here and this is our job, as before us. We've heard a lot of talk in the last several days about fiscal responsibility and tightening of the belt. We've heard that talk from one side of the mouth. But let's also hear some facts from the other side of that same mouth, that same mouth who talks about sales tax relief and fiscal responsibility, sales tax relief of 36 million dollars for the purchase of farm equipment that was signed, sales tax relief of 200 million dollars for machinery

used in manufacturing that was signed. That's 236 million dollars of sales tax relief in a time we need fiscal responsibility. We, here, are asking for 17.8 million dollars in relief that's needed for senior citizens who have worked their entire life productively and now are on fixed incomes. This is the state with the highest utility tax in the country, 539 million dollars. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a pittance, but important to the people throughout the State of Illinois that are on fixed incomes. If we're going to talk about fiscal responsibility, let's be honest. Let's talk about it for everybody, not just for those that have special interest lobbyists down here to pass important legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to touch on this Bill indirectly. Now, I'm a senior citizen and those are my colleagues up there, whether they know it or not. But let me tell you, I'm going to vote to override the Governor's veto. But I think it's wrong for the Speaker to allow more interruptions from that gallery than I've ever heard in ten years. You're wrong in doing that. You're insulting this House. You have no business doing it. You should shut up and listen to people here. Now, I'm voting for you. But you're wrong and I can tell you so, cause I, too, am a senior citizen."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson."

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. The previous speaker from the other side of the aisle alluded to a 17 and a half

million dollars that this fuel program will bring to the senior citizens. Let me remind him that the Federal Government is about to come down with 101 million dollars for this particular need. For the past three years, I've handled this program in my own office. I've seen that the people from my area got relief. It was there. And it will be there again. You can get your house winterized like the fellow from this side of the aisle said, Representative Robbins. That program is still in place with the Federal Government. This is not needed. This is a place where we can save money and I suggest we do not override the Governor's veto."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed? The previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Sharp, to close."

Sharp: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I have a few comments to make in closing. And they're directed to those who have risen in opposition to the Bill and to those who feel that this is not a good concept. Well, if it's so bad now, I wonder why 137 Members of the House voted for it and 44 Members of the Senate voted for it? It seemed to be a good idea in the fall. Now, all of a sudden, it's not so good because the Governor says we have some problems with our state finances. I say that's a bunch of nonsense. There are several things that have to be pointed out. It was mentioned here that another 84 million dollars was

coming to the state. Except that is an appropriation to Public Aid. Now, whether you believe it or not, all senior citizens are not on public aid. And a lot of senior citizens have to make it on a limited income and they don't receive cash assistance from Public Aid. And you don't point out that the income guidelines now for a couple is 6,080. Well, last year it was 5625. So now we're going to allow a couple to have \$455 additional income and still be eligible for the federal assistance. That's the poverty level whether you like it or not. And you don't say that of those senior citizens who apply and qualify, probably less than half again will get any help at all and those that are left out will just have to make out some way, but we can't really help them. Well, I don't think that is correct either. Another speaker said, well, the Governor did you a real favor because he approved several provisions of the Bill and he's going to give you 16 million dollars in tax relief. But you forget to mention that's 19 million dollars lapsed from last year so he's not giving you a thing. This Bill is a meaningful approach to upgrade the circuit breaker program in the state. It's a meaningful approach to provide relief against increasing cost of utilities. And if you're like one of the previous speakers, who somehow believes that utility costs aren't going to continue to go up, well, just take a look at the past three or four years. The costs have gone up on an average of \$100.00 a year. And they're going to continue going up. We're just asking for the State of Illinois, the state with the

highest utility tax in the nation, to provide some type of meaningful relief to recognize the fact that the senior citizens do have a problem in meeting these costs and I'd ask for an override of the Governor's veto."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3204 pass, notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendations for change?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun, to explain her vote. Timer's on."

Braun: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to urge a 'yes' vote on this override motion. The last Bill that came up before this House was a tax increase. Some senior citizens will have to pay for that tax increase. Some senior citizens will have difficulty making the choice between heating and eating. This Bill provides some relief against rising utility bills and I would say that all 110 of you people who voted for that tax increase should vote 'yes' for this override motion. All 40 something of you who are Republicans who voted 'yes' vote that tax increase, should vote 'yes' on this override motion. Otherwise, the message from the Governor and from the Republican party will be, we will pile on the increased taxes, but you'll get no tax relief from us. I encourage a 'yes' vote and additional votes from all the Republicans who are not voting at this time on this good Bill. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in past years we've sponsored legislation calling for life line rates to be established by utility companies. And we hear the cry from the utility companies that we should not meddle in their business and that we should not control their rates. But instead, we should go and get assistance from the Federal and the State Government to help pay the needy and help pay their utility bills. And we have federal legislation and federal programs and we've heard the Republicans praise these federal programs. And I stand here today to tell you that when Ronald Reagan gets into the Presidency, these funds will be eliminated. This will part of the waste and we will hear cries from the other side of the aisle on fiscal responsibility and how these funds were cut in the name of fiscal responsibility. And there will be no, no federal relief for utility bills. The state program will be the only program at that time. And what do we have? Now we have a government.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've heard a lot of rhetoric about helping senior citizens. We've heard a lot of rhetoric about saving tax monies. Well, the bottom line is that there are a lot of senior citizens who have a little bit, but not enough, and as the Gentleman from the other side of the aisle stated, they are not on Public Aid. Some of them are homeowners. Some of them are persons who

have too much pride to ask for public assistance. And this is the kind of relief that they can receive with pride and dignity. And we should not force our senior citizens to grovel. And I also want to re-echo the fact that the Federal Government is cutting everything they can find and if we can't do something to help our senior citizens, how can we expect Washington to do something? So I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, at yesterday's lecture we were told something about cynicism. I would hope that those seniors who have taken this trip down here to Springfield today would understand that it is not those individual Legislators, mostly on the other side of the aisle, who rose and spoke against this measure who are fault. Most of those, even those who have spoken, would like to vote for it. If you're going to vent any of your frustrations, do so against the Governor because that's where the fault really lies. You couldn't get 140 votes for this and then all of a sudden come down to 92 if there's not one fault. And that lies with the Leadership. The Republican has..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Preston. Timer's on."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry. What, John? I use the timer on everyone..."

Preston: "The Governor's veto of House Bill 3204 is the most

recent in a long line of gubernatorial vetos that demonstrates the insensitivity of the Governor to the plight of senior citizens in the State of Illinois. Senior citizens need this form of tax relief. They needed the forms of tax relief that were proposed in previous Bills that the Governor has also vetoed. We, in this House, are going to have to face the voters again, most of us will, and the voters are not going to forget the type of votes that we give here today. If the Governor thinks the people of Illinois don't need this tax relief, let him come here today and speak to a 'Margaret person', to a 'Margaret Hayes', to a 'Bertha Schlon', to these other fine people who have come down here to Springfield from Chicago asking us for this needed tax relief. If the Governor wasn't hiding, let him address the people and see what kind of relief they find necessary with which to function in their lives. We need this relief. Senior citizens need it and I..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. There's been a request to poll the absentees. And there's been a request for a verification. We'll wait till we get the results out of the machine then we will proceed to poll the absentees. Would all unauthorized personnel remove themselves from the floor please? This is a very important issue. Let's poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees: Ralph Dunn. Epton. Ewell. Hanahan. McAuliffe. McBroom. Ronan. Sandquist. Schisler. Schlickman. Stearney..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Ewell: "Record me 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Ewell as 'aye'. And Dawson wants leave to be verified. Leave is granted. Mr. Dunn, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Leave to be verified, John Dunn? All right. Leave. Let's proceed with the verification... Oh, let's proceed with the absentees, first, please."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing with the poll of the absentees: Totten. No further."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the count? On this question there's 107 'ayes' and 55 'nos'. And who wants to have the verification? Mr. Schuneman. Clerk will proceed to verify the affirmative vote. Mr. Rea asks leave to be verified. Leave is granted. Rea, Jim Rea. And Jessie White, same request. Granted."

Clerk O'Brien: "Verification of the Affirmative: Alexander. Balanoff. Barnes. Beatty. Bianco. Birchler. Borchers. Boucek. Bowman. Bradley. Braub. Breslin. Brummer. Bullock. Capparelli. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton. Currie. Darrow. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Dyer. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Gaines. Garnisa. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Hallock. Hannig. Harris. Henry. Huff. Jaffe. Johnson. Margery Jones. Emil Jones. Kane. Katz. Keane. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kucharski. Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz. Madigan. Mahar. Margalus. Marovitz..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Vitek requests leave to be verified."

Leave is granted. Vitek. Please proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Matijevich. Mautino. McClain. McGrew. McPike. Mugalian. Mulcahey. Murphy. Oblinger. O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Rea. Richmond. Satterthwaite. Schneider. Schoeberlein. Schraeder. Sharp. Simms. Slape. Stanley. Steczo. E.G. Steele. Stuffle. Sumner. Taylor..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Jack. Would you please verify the Speaker? Leave is granted. Please proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Terzich. Tuerk. Van Duyne. Vitek. VonBoeckman. White. Wikoff. Willer. Williams. Williamson. Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any questions of the affirmative votes, Mr. Schuneman?"

Schuneman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. What's the count, before we start, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "107."

Schuneman: "I beg your pardon?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "107 affirmative votes.."

Schuneman: "Okay. Representative Barnes?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady is in her chair."

Schuneman: "Representative Bianco."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Bianco? He's in his chair."

Schuneman: "Representative Chapman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Chapman is..."

Schuneman: "Okay. I see her. Representative Boucek?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's in the center aisle."

Schuneman: "Representative Willer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Willer is in her chair."

Schuneman: "Representative Darrow. Representative Mugalian.
Representative Mugalian, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He is in the chamber."

Schuneman: "Representative DiPrima."

Speaker Lechowicz: "DiPrima is in his chair as always."

Schuneman: "Donovan?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Donovan is in his chair."

Schuneman: "Farley?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Farley? Mr. Farley? How is the
Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove Mr. Farley from the Roll Call."

Schuneman: "Representative Flinn."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Monroe Flinn? How is the Gentleman
recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove Mr. Flinn."

Schuneman: "Representative Katz?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Katz? How is Mr. Katz recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly remove Mr. Katz."

Schuneman: "Representative Harris."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mr. Harris in the chamber? How..How
is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Schuneman: "Representative Domico."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Domico? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Schuneman: "Representative Kane."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Kane? He's in the chamber, Sir."

Schuneman: "Let's see. We called Representative Katz, I believe. Didn't we, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "You did call Mr. Katz and Mr. Katz was not in the chamber. And I removed him."

Schuneman: "All right. Representative Leverenz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Leverenz? How is Mr. Leverenz recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Leverenz in the chamber? Here he is. Anyone else?"

Schuneman: "Representative McClain."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's in his chair. McClain is in his chair."

Schuneman: "Representative Richmond?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's in his chair."

Schuneman: "Representative Slape."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman is in his chair."

Schuneman: "Is he here, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes he is, Sir. He's in his chair."

Schuneman: "Representative Stanley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Stanley? How is Mr. Stanley recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mr. Stanley in the chamber? Remove him."

Schuneman: "Representative Tuerk."

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is Mr. Tuerk recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mr. Tuerk in the chamber? Remove

him."

Schuneman: "Representative VonBoeckman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's in his chair."

Schuneman: "Take the record."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Anyone else?"

Schuneman: "That's all, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the count, Jack? On this question there are 100 'ayes', 55 'nos'. This motion, having failed to receive a three-fifths Majority, is hereby declared lost. Back on page four on the Total Veto Motions, appears House Bill 3505. Mr. Ropp. Yes, Sir. The Gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Rigney, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Rigney: "Mr. Speaker, what happened to my motion in regard to House Bill 3204, which was next on the Calendar?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "No one asked me to call it, Sir."

Rigney: "I beg your pardon?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "No one asked me to call it. We'll get back to it."

Rigney: "Now.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ropp.."

Rigney: "Mr. Speaker..."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 3505...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Ropp. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Representative Rigney's motion is the next motion on the Calendar and I would request that you would call that motion on the Bill that we just left and he's got to have the opportunity to call

his motion..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ryan..."

Ryan: "There's no reason for you to jump out of order and I don't know what gives you the authority to do that anyway. His motion is on the Calendar, ready to go..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We've been doing it all afternoon..."

Ryan: "...On the same Bill and I would like to have you call that motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We will."

Ryan: "Now."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Immediately after Mr. Ropp's Bill. We called that Bill. I wasn't aware of ..."

Ryan: "Thank you..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...Mr. Rigney's concern. I stated that earlier. As a matter of protocol, we'll continue with Mr. Ropp..."

Ryan: "Thank you..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...And then we'll get to Mr. Rigney..."

Ryan: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You're welcome. Mr. Ropp."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 3505 is a Bill which deals with inheritance tax. What it's trying to do is to bring into compliance with the federal law, is the exact rules and the exact reading. That is, currently, under Illinois law, when the inheritance tax is paid, you have ten months to pay it without any penalty. If you're one day late in paying that inheritance tax, the penalty goes back to the date of death. This does not comply with federal law, not that it necessarily has to, but I think oftentimes

we have too many laws that are conflicting and oftentimes we are trying to become more efficient and I think this would be an attempt to make this more efficient. Then, I have increased the interest penalty which would have been now 7%, increased that to 10% so that one day after the tenth month, the penalty for delay would be 10% of the tax due. In addition to this, there is one percent of the inheritance tax which would go to Cook County for the operation of the Legal Guardians Office and one percent that would go downstate for the operation of the counties in administering this particular law. We often see a lot of increased inflation in operational expense in these particular offices. There has been no increase for some time. I think this is a piece of legislation which, as the Governor has stated, we need to retain it to encourage people to pay their inheritance tax within the ten months. I'm saying that during that ten month period, this is a time of grief and sorrow and concern and people ought to be given some additional concern for resolving their inheritance and I urge a favorable vote on this override motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I rise in support of the motion to override House Bill 3505. This is a matter of simple fairness. Occasionally a widow, orphans of a decedent's estate, through error, through misadventure fail to pay a tax within the ten months set down under the existing statute. As a result of that a penalty is imposed that goes all the way back

to the date of death. I want you to understand, this does not excuse the payment penalty. What it does is say if you haven't paid it by the date, ten months after the date of death, we will charge interest from that time, but not impose an extra year almost in interest for a simple missing of one day's payment, a simple miscalculation, a simple error. In addition to this, this Bill will provide additional funds for every county in the State of Illinois. It will raise the revenue from four percent to five percent the distributive share which the counties will receive. I think this is fair and in keeping with a very expanding cost that we have. This General Assembly two years ago required that in Cook County certain expenses be borne to finance the Public Guardians Office. In Cook County, those funds would be earmarked to take care of this. In downstate the additional one percent could be used as the downstate counties need it. I think this is a very good Bill and it deserves all of our support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell.
The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen."

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm sure that many Members on this floor share my concern with those who have to pay the awful state inheritance tax. I think before you vote on this motion though, you should be aware that one of the reasons the Governor vetoed House Bill 3505 was that he signed Senate Bill 1497 which already provides for a ten year deferral in payment of the inheritance tax. So most of what the Sponsor is seeking to do in this

Bill has already been done. The tax relief, if you want to call it that, is already there. People have been helped by the Governor having signed Senate Bill 1497 which already provides for a ten year deferral. I see no reason why we should override a veto on a Bill that is largely duplicative of something that has already gone into law. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will. Mr. Ropp, a question."

Leinenweber: "Representative Ropp, what is the interest rate that will be begin to accrue ten percent..or ten months after death of the decedent?"

Ropp: "The amount of interest?"

Leinenweber: "Yes. What is the rate?"

Ropp: "Right now it's seven percent. And I have increased it to ten. One...Beginning one day after the tenth month."

Leinenweber: "So, they pay ten percent for the eleventh month..."

Ropp: "That's correct."

Leinenweber: "All right. Now, what is the justification for the increase of 25% in the rate of money that goes back to the counties for collecting this?"

Ropp: "Apparently, before some of us got to this General Assembly, legislation which was passed that provided for a guardianship operation in Chicago and apparently opportunity was also given for downstate counties and they decided not to go in that direction. Cook County

did receive that office, but along with that, no dollars went to operate that particular facility. This Bill is attempting to provide in part some funds for the operation of that office in Cook County and in addition, now provide the 25% increase for all counties throughout the state."

Leinenweber: "So in other words, it's not necessary under the present cost of collecting inheritance tax that, for example, Cook County receive a 25% increase in rates which of course applied to the base which would be somewhat responsive to inflation would automatically go up. They want the money for another purpose, wholly unrelated to the inheritance tax. Is that correct?"

Ropp: "Well, I think this... Currently there are no dollars that go from the state for the guardianship operation..."

Leinenweber: "No. What I'm talking about is the four percent current rate of reimbursement to the counties for collecting the tax is to go up to five percent. But what you're telling me is Cook County needs this extra percent, this 25% interest...25% increase in rate in order to pay for a guardianship Commission, not because of increased costs in the ...for the local office that collects the inheritance tax. Is that correct?"

Ropp: "Honestly I can't answer this. The Amendment was submitted by people from the northern part of the state, justifying the usage in that Legal Guardian Office and..."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House,

this Bill, although it might appear on the face to be laudable, and...but if people can't pay tax which can be assessed almost immediately within ten months, perhaps there ought to be some kind of penalty assessed. Now, if it's just merely having to pay interest on the sum of... you could put money in a money market certificate and get ten percent. So rather than pay the tax, why pay it at all? The reason for the ten month period is obviously to provide some incentive to get these taxes paid. Now, be that as it may, that might be laudable. I think we could live with that, but there's no reason for this additional raid that I can see on the state monies. We've heard the Governor yesterday talk about the problems we're going to be facing and the question is whether or not we want to provide sales tax relief for people for food and drugs. I think one of the ways we have to stop this type of raid, there's no reason at all to increase the rate by a 25% margin from the four percent to the five percent reimbursement. It's obviously not necessary for.. to reimburse these counties for collecting the taxes because Cook County doesn't even intend to use it for that. They intend to use it for some Guardianship Commission which probably they don't need, but have in order to give some people some jobs. So I think the Governor is absolutely right. We should not override this veto and we ought to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, probably .

part of the justification for this override is the fact that many of the lawyers here in probate work fiddle around with these estates until the last minute. The taxpayer finally wakes up on the last day and finds out how much he owes. Maybe if the lawyers would get on the ball and get these things processed, this would not be necessary. "

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Robbins."

Robbins: "Mr. Leinenweber and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one of the reasons that the downstate counties need this additional increase is to pay for the mandated increases in salaries by the State Legislature."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ropp to close."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a Bill, House Bill 3505. I urge your favorable support in overriding the Governor's veto."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3505 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 95 'ayes' and 52 'nos'. Poll the absentees please. Kindly record Emil Jones as 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees: Barnes. Bowman. Campbell. Casey. Epton. Ewell. Dwight Friedrich. Gaines. Hanahan. Harris. Klosak. Kornowicz. Marovitz. McBroom. Pechous..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Pechous, 'aye', please."

Clerk O'Brien: "Murphy.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Murphy, 'aye'. Bowman, 'aye'."

VonBoeckman, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the poll of the absentees: Ronan. Sandquist. Schlickman. Schraeder. Totten. Wikoff. And, Woodyard."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On this question there are 100 'ayes' and 52 'nos'. The motion fails and House Bill 3505 is declared lost. Back on the Calendar, page six, House Bill 32... under the area of Amendatory Veto Motions, House Bill 3204. Mr. Rigney."

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the amendatory veto motion that I filed is to concur with the Governor's suggested amendatory veto to 3204 that does those good and necessary things that need to be done to the circuit breaker program, namely to increase the maximum income level from ten thousand dollars up to twelve thousand dollars. The maximum grant is increased from \$650 less five percent of household income to \$700 less five percent of household income. In other words, we are increasing that by \$50. Also the provision dealing with excess tax burden is lowered from four percent of our income or from a senior's income down to three and a half percent of household income. It also exempts the first \$55.00 per month for Public Aid assistance from the calculation of the computations made to determine household income. I think all of us agree that these are good and necessary provisions. It will provide about 17 million dollars of additional grant money for senior citizens and I would merely ask that we concur in the Governor's amendatory veto."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, it's a shame the senior citizens have left the gallery because they need to hear what I'm about to tell them. They are receiving benefits now which are totally unjustified in the flat grant ... in what amounts to the flat grant sales tax relief section of this formula. Now, neither the Governor nor the Democrats who drew up this Bill have the courage to take away the money which they do not deserve to get in refund checks this past Session. I hope those of who will be back next year will realize that for every one percent that you take away of the sales tax on food and drugs, you can cut back the sales.. the so-called sales tax relief portion of the circuit breaker formula by one-fifth. The sales tax relief portion is approximately 35 million dollars in this formula. Fourteen million dollars of that should be going to ..for some legitimate need, whether that legitimate need be utility relief, or additional property tax relief. Now, senior citizens are going to have a hard time getting additional grants for anything if they're willing to sit down and accept grants which are not deserved. One cannot get sales tax relief at the cash register and then go around and apply to the state circuit breaker program for a tax rebate on taxes which have never been paid. If we had taken this 14 million dollars, if either the Governor or the General Assembly, I guess we really mean the Democrats in the General Assembly, since the Republicans had no impact or input whatsoever on this Bill, if either had the courage to do what was right, senior citizens could be getting 14 million dollars

worth of additional relief. Either for utility relief or property tax relief. My personal preference would have been for property tax relief because this additional 14 million dollars could virtually solve the problems senior citizens have with property taxes. By agreeing with the Governor's amendatory veto on this Bill, we will not solve the problems seniors and handicapped have with property taxes. Those of you coming back next Session will have another chance to have senior citizens grovel at your feet, asking for more property tax relief and legitimately asking for more property tax relief. This is nothing but another tiny step towards solving the problems and all I wish would be this, that we would finally deliver the package that should.. well, that was really promised by Governor Ogilvie back in 1971 or 19...I guess it was 1972. Why don't we... Why don't we solve the problems senior citizens have with property tax relief and then go forward to what I think is legitimate ... well, legitimate relief that should be given for utilities. But when we go the to the utilities then, let's not go to a flat grant procedure where everybody gets a \$40.00 check. Let's compare the amount of money that senior citizens pay in utilities with the amount of money that they are receiving in income. That makes just one heck of a lot more sense and frankly, I'm surprised that any Democrat could come up with a formula, that the Democratic party could come up with a formula, that is so regressive that does not give the relief in proportion to need. Fortunately the circuit breaker program does give property tax

relief in direct relationship to need. And I'm proud to say that it was a Republican Governor, Governor Ogilvie who initiated the plan and it has traditionally been a program of the Republican party. I'm happy the Democrats have figured out it's a good idea and I hope that everyone will vote for this amendatory veto concurrence."

Speaker Lechowicz: "This Bill will require 107 votes because it has an immediate effective date. Any further discussion? The Gentleman... Mr. Rigney, to close. Rigney, you want to close? The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's amendatory veto on House Bill 3204?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 160 'ayes', no 'nays' and the House does accept the amendatory... the Governor's amendatory veto on House Bill 3204. This Bill is hereby declared passed. On...On the desk is the Concurrence Calendar, appears House Bill 3230. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Laurino."

Laurino: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur with Amendment #1 to House Bill 3230. And what Amendment #1 does is it delays a referendum in DuPage County only until March of 1982 primary."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3230 .. the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3230?' All in favor vote 'aye'. Clear the Board, Jack. All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from

DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's not necessary."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, since this is concurrence, it's final action and I wonder if the Gentleman in explanation of vote might tell us whether it replaces the original Bill or whether there's something else in here."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Laurino."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, it does replace the original Bill. And the Bill is exactly as I explained the Amendment. It just delays the referendum in DuPage County only."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 150 'ayes', no 'nays', three recorded as 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3230. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Back on the Calendar, on page four, on Total Veto Motions, appears House Bill 2845. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Henry. You want to explain your Bill?"

Henry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Excuse me. I move to override the veto of the Governor's notwithstanding with respect to House Bill 2845. As you may recall, this Bill established the Illinois Product Development Corporation, a quasi-public body governed by a Board of seven directors appointed by the Governor. It's purpose is to encourage and stimulate the development of new products, devices, technics or processes by small businesses in Illinois. This would be accomplished

through the infusion of risk capital where such financial assistance is not otherwise available from commercial sources. This reduces or eliminates the contention or conflict or competition with free enterprise lending. In fact, this proposal puts small companies in a position to be more actively ...compete in the free market once the new product and inventors have lifted the company's financial status. One of the major concerns of small business people is capital formation and retention. Here is one chance to help eradicate this problem for at least some promising jobs in innovative product producers. To further assist small businesses this Bill creates the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, a small business division. This division... This new ... This new and required division would have a ten small business advisory council of all Members which would represent small businesses. Governor Thompson in his veto message said that the functions set out in this Bill for a small business division are already being performed by the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, Office of Business Service and other divisions. If this is true, then why are we having 700 small business people in Springfield this week for the Illinois Legislative Small Business Conference? I will tell you why. Because small business people get little attention from the state. They have no central agency division to go to with their problems and DECA has yet to put a complete program together to aid and assist this segment of the business community which provides the vast majority of new jobs in the state

and develops more than half of the new products and inventions. Their developments have improved the economy climate of the state and we must help them to continue. We have no other choice but to give these business people a direct voice in State Government and some financial assistance when it's proved to be required for new products and inventions. We all understand that most states are having trouble. And times are tough. Must we wait until small businesses fail, unemployment continue to rise, welfare payments climb, unemployment insurance debts skyrocket? And high crime usually follows. I think when times are tough, the tough get going to support this motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Hallock."

Hallock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What we have here is an issue we discussed last Session which will, in effect, just create more bureaucracy. The Illinois Product Development Corporation is not the way to solve the problem of the businessman. Rather, I would say to you, the way to do that is to get the government off the back of the businessman. That will do the best, I think, to achieve this goal. With respect to the small business aspect of this Bill, it should be noted that all summer long, the Department of Commerce went around the state hearing testimony from all businessmen from all walks of life as to what they can do to help out the small businessman. From those small conferences and from the one here held this week, you're going to find some good legislation being proposed by the

Department of Commerce trying to address their problems. They do, in fact, have a small business aspect in the Department of Commerce Office. We don't need more bureaucracy, more money to be spent to do that. All we have to do is get the government off the back of the businessman and he, himself, will make it for himself and therefore.. thereby employ more people. I would say to you this Bill is unnecessary and it should be defeated."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Henry to close."

Henry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Recently an organization called 'Trust', an independent research group in Chicago which spent two years studying how to help the economy and create new jobs, made 20 recommendations to the Governor and also to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. These are bankers and corporate leaders, responsible people, and they have recommended a new Product Development Corporation, a matching grant for economic development and technical assistance for small businesses. And they did not know we had already passed this Bill, Mr. Speaker. They could not understand why the Governor would veto it. The point is what they independently came up with, the same idea that this House passed last fall or summer. We lost at the Datsun Plant in Illinois according to a recent article. The reason we lost this plant to another state is that the people who were taking them around did not know what they wanted. If our communities had had an economic development commission, they could have aggressively gone up the plant and sold them the advantages of their area. The

Governor says we have limited money and he wants to hide it away to save for the future. I think that he has forgotten the parable of the talents of the wise and the foolish servant. If you remember, the wise servant used his talents and he prospered. And he was rewarded. But the foolish servant who hide his talents lost even the small amount he had. And I'm afraid that the Governor is so afraid, that he will not make our economy grow. We have a golden opportunity to change the Illinois economic development attitude. And I suggest to you that that golden opportunity is now and I ask for your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2845 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In explaining my 'aye' vote, in good times or bad, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, our quest is the same, the redevelopment of our areas. This Bill is asking for capital investments, something that this State's Body has never done. I ask you, if you're worried about the state expenditures, how can you object to a measure that would reduce that cost? This investment would increase revenues, Ladies and Gentlemen, and the adoption of this Bill would do that. Afterall, who is to say that the state economy recovery can't begin on the west side areas of Chicago? I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 89 'ayes', 65 'nos'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff (sic), for what purpose do you seek recognition? Mr. Henry."

Henry: "Poll the absentees."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees: Capuzi. Casey. Epton. Griesheimer. Hanahan. Johnson. Kane. Katz. Klosak. McBroom. Meyer. Oblinger. Polk. Richmond. Ronan. Sandquist..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Kindly record Doug Kane as 'aye'. Please continue."

Clerk O'Brien: "Schlickman. Stearney. Totten. Wikoff. Willer. And, Winchester."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On this question there are 90 'ayes' and 65 'nos'. And the motion fails and House Bill 2845 is declared lost. House Bill 3153. Mr. Stuffle. The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The veto of House Bill 3153 and the remarks of the Governor I think should be explained. Because the Governor claims that this particular Bill would cost the state some 23 million dollars over a period of five years. However, in checking with the Governor's Office and the Bureau of the Budget, our staff is unable to have the Bureau of the Budget even explain their figures. The State Office of Education indicates that this Bill would cost less than four million dollars and even with that four million dollar figure for five years, the State Board of Education has two assumptions in that figure which make it too

high. Number one, they assume that everyone with a masters degree affected by this minimum salary Bill has 180 hours or 30 more than they need with a masters degree. In fact, in point of fact, only about 15% of the masters degree people do who teach in the public schools in Illinois affected by this Bill. Secondly and importantly, there's an assumption built into that four million dollar figure that the average increase for teachers in downstate Illinois has been ten percent a year. When, in fact, it has been six point four percent a year for the last ten years on an average. So I submit to you that the Governor's arguments are wrong, wrong in their entirety and about six times higher in his cost estimate than is actually in the case. In fact, even more than that. It's ironic that the Governor argues that we really don't do much to erode local control here. Cause much of the argument made against the Bill initially was that it did erode local control. I point out to you that only one percent of the teachers in this state roughly are affected by this particular Bill. Secondly, we cleaned the Bill up and took virtually every Amendment possible in passing it and putting it on the Governor's desk, that not only limited the cost, eliminated the city of Chicago from its consideration in the Bill and the coverage of the Bill, but also we provided that only those people to meet one clear question, who have certification and whose jobs require certification, would be covered by the Bill. I submit to you again that the cost estimate is too high, much, much too high, that those people affected

by the Bill are basically those people who teach in the public schools in Illinois outside of Chicago who now have very low wages. In fact, I submit to you something else of consideration in voting on this particular override motion and that is this, the highest minimum salary set in this Bill is \$12,000. And that is only in the case of those particular people with masters degrees who have masters degrees and 30 hours extra of educational achievement. I submit to you, given that \$12,000 maximum-minimum if you will, that if we look at the other side of the picture, that in Illinois 99.7%, 99.7% of the principals in this state make over \$15,000 a year, as opposed to that \$12,000 minimum for masters degree people. And in fact, nearly 80% make over \$25,000 a year. Clearly and simply, I think this is an issue of addressing the cost analysis of the Governor which is not only wrong, but even his own Bureau of the Budget can't substantiate the arguments for with our own staff. I suggest to you that the cost is not 24 million dollars over five years, but something less than four million dollars over five years. And I submit the Governor's own arguments that we do very little to erode local control, that we affect only some one percent of the teachers in the state, that all we're doing is trying to help the poorest of the poor teachers in the state. And for those reasons I submitted to you, I would urge that you support me in my motion to override the Governor's veto of House Bill 3153."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's motion. I think one of the most disagreeable aspects of this Bill if you will, is the tying of the salary....adjustments of minimum salary levels to reflect statewide average teachers' salary. By doing that, we statistically build in automatic increases by tying them in at the bottom. Those of you who have watched automatic escalator clauses in employee contracts function know the degree to which they have the capacity to hamstring those people who are responsible for providing the services. It seems fairly obvious to me that we can guarantee a built in cost without doing anything other than that. Let me also suggest to you that regardless of what it costs in terms of the numbers, this is going to be money which will have to be drawn off the general distributive money that this General Assembly has the responsibility to appropriate. There's only so much water in the well and as we start to earmark greater and greater amounts of that water, it ties the hands of this General Assembly. The next two years of this Legislature are going to be difficult years financially. Let us not this evening pass a program which will further tie our hands as we move into the next Session of the Legislature. And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion of the Gentleman on House Bill 3153."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle, to close."

Stuffle: "Yes, very briefly. Merely to reiterate, two

things and state one other. First of all, I think the arguments made by the Governor against the Bill are not only erroneous in the degree that they argue the costs as I have pointed out and no one's bothered to refute, including the Governor or the Bureau of the Budget. But secondly, I think the arguments he makes are really arguments that ought to be made in support of the override motion. I would also remind people here that what the Governor has done, and others in opposing the Bill have done, is to effectively not look at the fact that the Bill does not kick in any increases except where their statewide average is not met in the given School District and it affects very, very few people. We don't start from base year. We start from that average increase to come to the level that we have in the Bill. I would add also that we stood here today and passed with my vote and others, increased minimum salaries for local officials, elected officials, if you will. If we can do that for them and for others, we can do that continuously. I think we ought to look to the people who teach our kids. If we really believe in quality education, we ought to believe in a living wage. And to say that \$12,000 is too much of a living wage for a person with the education of a masters degree, and 30 extra hours seems to me to say we really don't care about the quality of education in the state and I think that a 'no' vote, for that reason, if we don't care, ought to be noted by the people in the state. A 'yes' vote ought to be given to this override motion if we're going to be fair to the students because we're not

going to keep people teaching for peanuts in this state. I urge your 'yes' vote. I urge you to remember that the cost that I gave of less than four million dollars is one that the State Board of Education came up with. And as I reiterate, the Governor's people can't substantiate in any way, shape or form their arguments against the Bill or the cost they perceive to associate with the Bill. I urge your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3153 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? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 93 'ayes', 61 'nos', none recorded as 'present'. The motion on House Bill 3153 fails and is hereby declared lost. House Bill 986. The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Rea."

Rea: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 986 would create the State Purchase Human Services Review Board which would set up the standards for grants in aid and service contracts and to set purchase care rates of thirteen different human service agencies. It would codify and reorganize an ad hoc group which was established by a press release in 1977 and it would also incorporate the powers and duties of a separate Board recognized under Senate Bill 395 to set rates for residential, special education schools serving handicapped children. This would bring about an innovative, coordinated approach in terms of establishing rates for the.. for purchase

of human services here in the state, which would be about a fourth of the state budget. Now, there has been in the Governor's veto message indicated somewhat the cost. But the fact is that more than one point three million is currently dedicated to state rate setting activities. \$261,200 was appropriated to the ..to the Statutory Board which is commonly referred to as the '395 Board', reviewing rates of residential handicapped schools and the Office of Health Finance within the Illinois Department of Health..Public Health, was appropriated one point one million for FY '81 for functions related to current rate review activities of the ad hoc Committee. Now, it is not... This does not change the cost because what it changes is really allocation of those resources, the resources already allocated. There's also a claim that this would produce ... that it will produce duplication. But it is either a misinterpretation or some misrepresentation of its provisions. Because this would notAnd instead House Bill 986 would require that the Board oversight of agencies functions rather than direct contract review and monitoring. It would make current rate setting and contract review assistance more efficient and effective. The proposed Board will establish standards and procedures which they do not have now and rates would be set in open meetings and would not be based upon a haphazard manner. I would ask for your support in the override of this House Bill 986 and there are many people that are very interested in seeing some standards established in some orderly fashion to rate review

including the Children's Mental Health Coalition, the Illinois Association of Retarded Citizens, Illinois Association of Rehab Facilities, Illinois Association of School Administrators, Illinois Education Association, Illinois Nurses Association, Illinois Principals Association and many others. I would ask for your favorable vote on this most important piece of legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I suppose after that list of people who are in favor of it, I should be for this Bill. I'm a little bit intimidated by it. But I think that maybe they've been misled a little bit. Representative Chapman and I serve on a Committee to try to bring some sanity into the rate review process for these human service agencies. And, we have succeeded in setting a deadline by which time it's going to be necessary for this General Assembly to completely reform this rate making process, both substantively and procedurally. I think that's the most important thing to do. I have felt for a long time the group... that virtually every provider of human services in this state is woefully shortchanged and in most cases, there is no sanity in terms of who provides a priority service and who should get the most reimbursement for the process. I think the nursing homes, the hospitals, every time they go into the Public Aid Department in recent years, the rates that they have received have been inadequate to cover their costs. And I don't believe that that's primarily because of their inefficiency. I believe

it's because the costs are bad. However, this Bill may be the worst possible way to solve a problem. And the reason that it's the worst possible way to solve the problem is primarily because it continues to have the wolf in the chickens coop. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Director of Public Aid are still the primary people setting the rates for the hospitals and the..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "For what reason does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Wolf, seek recognition?"

Vinson: "Excuse me?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Wolf was seeking recognition? Please proceed, Sir."

Vinson: "They are still the primary people making the decisions and they have an enormous conflict of interest. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget as we've seen in recent weeks is interested in balancing the Governor's budget. He is not interested in ascertaining a fair hospital reimbursement rate. He's not interested in ascertaining a fair reimbursement rate for nursing homes. What we need is truly a public authority, a public authority that has standards, a public authority that is not controlled by a set of people who have vested interests in this process. Now, I believe that we can have legislation to do that next year. The one way to kill a chance to have that kind of reform in legislation is to pass this Bill because if we halfway reform the process, the argument is going to be that there's no need for further reform until we see what this reform reaps. I would strongly urge that we oppose this Bill. Because

we have a chance to do something meaningful next year and because we can do something. And I believe we have the commitment of Representative Chapman. I believe we'll have the commitment of the Republican Leadership next year in the House to do that. And so I would urge that we defeat this override, that we vote 'no' on it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman."

Chapman: "I appreciate very much the additional publicity which Representative Vinson has provided for the Nursing Care Reimbursement Committee. Much of what Mr. Vinson says I would agree with and that is the reason why I would ask you to vote 'yes' to override the Governor's veto of House Bill 986. Mr. Vinson correctly perceives the problem. The present administration is not concerned in equitable rates and fair rates. They do not set priorities, but rather, they identify the amount of money they are willing to spend for certain purposes and then divvy it up. How they divvy it up no one provider or Legislator is able to ascertain because their meetings are private. I agree with Mr. Vinson also that we are making progress as we study nursing home reimbursement rates. But I would point out to you that the Committee which is being set up, the group that is being set up by Mr. Rea's Bill goes far further than nursing care reimbursement. Are you concerned with the way three billion dollars in the state's budget is spent each year? Mr. Rea's Bill is not only going to help to assure fairness in rate setting for nursing homes, but if your concern is child welfare, vote 'aye'. If your

concern is handicapped children and adults vote 'aye'. If your concern is rate setting for the potential three billion dollars that this state disburses to various providers for day care, child care, nursing home facilities, special education facilities, if you want any of these facilities to know what's going on and be involved in setting fair and equitable rates, if you want Legislators to be able to attend a meeting without being tossed out on their ears, the way Representative Macdonald and I were about a year or so ago, vote 'yes' with Mr. Rea to bring some sunshine into these decisions to help to provide for a fair and equitable decisions that are based on need, that are based on costs, that are not based on some secret willy-nilly kind of decision making that apparently now is not even being done in the Commission formed by press statement, but is simply happening to the extent it's happening over a cup of coffee. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. For what purpose does the Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson, see recognition?"

Vinson: "Point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's your point? Your name was mentioned in debate?"

Vinson: "Yes, it was mentioned in debate. And I just want to make it very clear that the gentle Lady is on the opposite side of the issue from me."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Everyone knows that. Thank you."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, I'm glad Mr. Vinson can make the distinction between the two persons who have spoken. One of the opportunities that Mr. Vinson had last spring to solve one of the problems relating to the Purchase Care Review Board's failure was to vote for 1729. That Bill did pass out of here, but not with his support. He agonizes mercilessly apparently and at length about the special interest groups, but on the one opportunity to deal with children who are behaviorally disordered, he voted against that special interest group. I sent you all a very standard letter about 986. I had gotten quite involved in House Bill 1729 and it's apropos that we try to resolve the dilemma of interpretation and misinterpretations by the Purchase Care Review Board. What Representative Chapman pointed out is very important because it ties to the veto message. You notice in the Governor's veto message he says that this proposal duplicates what is already being done. What he doesn't state is that there are two Boards that are duplicating the process currently. One is the .. one that I call the Statutory Board. The other is the one which was formed by press release and we call that the Press Release Board. That is the Board that truly sets the rates and that is the one which is not open to the public. It's the one that ran Representative Chapman and a colleague out of a meeting because they were in a secret meeting dealing with setting rates. It's the same Board, that is the Press Release Board, is the same Board that ran out staff persons from this side

of the aisle because they did not want the staff to participate or at least to sit and listen as we ask them to do for us. What you have in front of you is an opportunity to resolve that dilemma, to set rates openly. I also cited by the way the Illinois State Medical Society's great success in establishing their own account through the Public Aid Department. That is, ISMS, negotiated directly with Public Aid to get the kinds of increases that they felt were necessary for their clients, the doctors. That wasn't done openly. That wasn't done with any Purchase Care Review Board, either the Press Release Board or the open one. So I think what you have before you for once, and I'm glad it's gotten this far, although regrettably it was vetoed on the Governor's desk, what you have in front of you is truly what Chapman is telling you. It's a sunshine provision, the opportunity for services that are going to be given to the citizens of the State of Illinois, are going to have the opportunity to listen to the process of how we determine rates. Possibly the Republican side or I'll say Mr. Vinson, in particular, maybe what he's fearful of is that the special interest groups won't have the input that they have currently when you have a private secret Board, or when you can negotiate with the agency directly. Maybe that's what he's fearful of. And I do use his name in debate because he started out with the comment that the Special Interest Board...groups would like this kind of Board. The truth is quite the opposite. If you want open hearings, if you want honest meaningful rate setting,

if you want to be a monitor of that process as you should be as a Legislator, if you want the staff to monitor that process, then this is the Bill you want to support. It's a golden opportunity. I know we need 107 votes. If you vote against this folks, you vote against openness, you vote against students and children who don't get proper care because we refuse to set the proper rates. Please vote 'aye' on this one. It's an essential piece of legislation, possibly the most important piece before us today."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's very difficult for me to stand up and talk again.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Ma'am. Please proceed."

Hallstrom: "Yes, Sir. It's very difficult for me to stand up and talk against my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have been so helpful in legislation for handicapped children. Those of you who know me, know I have also been very involved and I care what happens to handicapped children. It concerns me that this is being put into this Bill, that that's why you should vote for it. Please listen to me. This is not good for handicapped children. First of all, 395 Board is open, so please don't include that Board with the other Boards that's been discussed. Secondly, the 395 Board is trying to get us together so that handicapped children will receive the necessary money so that they are placed in the appropriate facility. You'll notice that the Illinois administrators of special education who are responsible for administering programs for

handicapped children are not on that list. Also please understand that if you put handicapped children in this large bureaucratic mess, those children are going to suffer. I urge you please to stick with the Governor and to not override his veto on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "I'm waiting for somebody to stand up here and defend the administration's closing of the meetings of the Board that this Board is supposed to replace. I can't think of any real good reason to vote for the veto override except for the fact that the Bureau of the Budget is kicking out Legislators and staff members and press when they hold meetings to decide what the levels of reimbursement should be. Now, I don't know whether Representative Rea has a good Bill here or a bad Bill here, but I know the administration has a very bad practice of keeping things secret that should be public. Now if the administration has nothing to hide, there's no reason not to have those meetings open. So I must assume in lack of having imperfect knowledge on the subject matter, that if there's something to hide, it's better to get it out in the open. And I'm going to vote to override for that reason. Got that, Dr. Bob?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dawson."

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker, I make a motion to move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye',

opposed. The previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Rea, to close."

Rea: "Thank you. In regards to one of the concerns that have been expressed of reform, this is definitely a reform Bill. It will prohibit the closed meetings. I likewise believe that the decisions that are made should be out in the open. People should know what's going on. And, the advisory Board even though they were established by a press release, their recommendations have always been gone along with. The Governor has accepted those recommendations on rates. This will also allow input, which at the present time you do not have input. It will expand the Board to include both consumers and providers and everybody will know what's going on in terms of how rates are being established and for what purpose. In terms of the 395 Board, there was an Amendment that takes care of that, Amendment #2, which provides for an orderly transition and the existing Board will stay together until this is reorganized and the direction has been established. Now, we need this for a number of reasons. We need it to eliminate the confusion of having two Boards which approve rates for similar services, but for different agencies. We need to have one rate review Board which will hold public meetings per the Open Meetings Act. Currently, the Press Release Board refuses to meet in public and you've heard different examples of that cited here today. We need to have the Board approving rates for this state's purchase of human care services to be a more representative Body. And House Bill 986 would

establish a Board with the four public members and Directors of three state agencies, the State Superintendent of Education and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. We need to eliminate the duplication in time and staff costs of the two existing rate approval Boards. This will give us an opportunity because all we do is reallocate those resources. We need to have rates for the state's purchase of all human care services be reviewed and approved by one Board. So, I think you can see the importance of this Bill and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 986 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, for 12 years I've run into the attempt to secrecy in all our agencies, Boards and Commissions. This is a very good Bill. I think if anyone is responsible to the people, this Body is. It's our duty to see that we know what's going on no matter what agency, what Board, or what Commission it may be. Therefore I urge, vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 91 'ayes' and 55 'nos'. The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Rea?"

Rea: "Poll the absentees please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Poll the absentees please. Kindly

record Mr. Hoffman as 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees: Abramson. Barnes. Boucek. Burnidge. Capuzi. Casey. John Dunn. Epton. Griesheimer. Hanahan. Harris. Johnson. Klosak. Mahar..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mahar wants to be recorded as 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "McAuliffe. McBroom.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Jake Wolf, 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Mol..excuse me. Peters. Ronan. Ropp. Sandquist. Schisler. Schlickman. Stanley. Stearney. Totten. And, Woodyard."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Johnson?"

Johnson: "Record me as 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Johnson as 'no'. What's the count? On this question there are 91 'ayes', 51 'nos'. And the motion fails on House Bill 986. The Bill is hereby declared lost. House Bill 2892? Mrs. Sumner."

Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill exempts from Illinois income tax up to \$5,000 interest earned from income from savings institutions. It will make money for the state. It will cost the first year, but in years to come it will return money to the state. It will put people back to work. And we need to start somewhere. We need tax relief for the people. This is a working man's Bill and gives them an incentive to save and helps all people, including the senior citizens. This Bill will, for instance, make money available for construction work. That's making jobs available. We certainly need jobs in Illinois. If people are

working, they are paying taxes and increasing the state's take rather than spending more money on keeping them on welfare. I urge a 'yes' vote to override the Governor's veto."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again I have to rise to oppose the last of the three Bills that would grant income tax exemptions. This particular one I think is even more far reaching than the others that we've considered today in that it would exempt interest on savings accounts up to as much as \$5,000. Now I submit to you that in order to earn \$5,000 in interest one needs to be.. have on deposit a large amount of money and in no way can this Bill be considered to be an aid to low income groups as some of the earlier Bills were. I think this Bill also is too expensive for the state to pass as this particular time and I would therefore ask you to vote against the Lady's motion to override the Governor's veto."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Peoria, Mrs. Sumner, to close."

Sumner: "Thank you. In closing, I would like to remind you that this does not only exempt those who can save large sums of money, as the previous speaker just mentioned. It will allow anyone to be exempt from any interest they earn whether it's for a dollar or five thousand. It helps that young person who is trying to get a start in saving money towards buying a home. It will save all of these young people. It will help the senior in the area of getting money together to help

to pay for any of the other incidentals rather than have to be continually taxed on a tax that has already been taxed. They've already paid the taxes on this when they earned it. Why should they have to pay for it again? I urge a 'yes' vote to override."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2892 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor signify by saying (sic) 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ray. Ray. Mr. Ewell, record me as 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 44 'ayes', 65 'nos', 18 recorded as 'present'. And the motion fails on House Bill 2892 and is hereby declared lost. On page six, Amendatory Veto Motions, appears House Bill 1009. The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill, I'll be very brief because you've been very patient today and we have a lot of other business. This Bill as passed provided a one-time increase of a dollar a month for each year of service for those retiring January 1 of '76. The Governor reduced that to 1971. The Bill as we passed provided a minimum pension of \$10.00 a month for each year of service for downstate teachers. It was ten years, \$300 and we increased it to 45 years or \$450 a month. This Bill provided a one-time increase for survivors in the three system downstate teachers, Chicago teachers and the university teachers. And the Governor deleted that from his Amendment.. (sic)..from his... the Bill by his amendatory veto. But to

remember these..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Give the Gentleman your attention please? Please continue, Sir."

Schraeder: "But remember, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, these annuitants spent their entire productive life in the teaching profession and are deserving of this. It's no reason and no fault of their own that they're suffering from the rampant inflation that we're now facing in the country and in Illinois. In the Governor's veto he says he recognizes the difficult problems of the teachers on long term retirement. And he states that it fails to address the problem of all state employees in this same category and I say to you, yes, it fails to cover all the state employees because the Governor wished that out when the Bill was being drafted and when we passed it out of the House 116 to 12 and out of the Senate 55 to 3. And so what the Governor really is saying, he's using whatever means possible to keep these categories from receiving adequate compensation. And he wants new legislation to cover those employees and I say that's the best statement he made in his veto message. And I promise you now that I will cooperate with the Governor and his leadership in the next General Assembly to assure that those other employees that he wants included will be included in these same kind of benefits. I think it's an absolute necessity that these people be granted these minimal increases if they're going to live in common decency and justice. I think we ought to override and give the vote like we did when we originally passed it, with both sides of the aisle.

And I would certainly ask that you do that. Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like Representative Stuffle to make the closing remarks."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who was that, Representative Schraeder?"

Schraeder: "Representative Stuffle."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Stuffle? Okay. Any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, like the Sponsor of the motion to override, will try to be brief. You'll notice on the Calendar that I have a motion following Representative Schraeder's to move to accept the amendatory veto of the Governor. I feel so strongly about the Bill in terms of addressing those people who had received no changes and were not affected by changes that were made in '73 and '75 in particularly, the downstate teachers pension system. By the Governor's amendatory veto, he addressed those who were in most critical need, recognized that if we were going to do these kinds of things, we had to look at it equitably and provided for an increased cost to the system of \$507,000,000. So if you look at the provisions of the Bill and the changes that the Governor made, you will notice that what he basically did was to move the date back to one-one-71 or a five year move back. This seems to me to be equitable, seems to be fair and it seems to address the people most in need on our pension system, particularly the downstate teachers pension system. And for that reason, I have made the motion to accept the amendatory veto and would suggest to you that you

should do the same.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Sangamon, Mrs. Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to address two points in this which means that I would like you to vote for the override. Number one, is the 1971 versus the 1976 cut off period. The people who retired before 1976 are already 70 years of age. There's going to be a decreasing amount wanted. A lot of these people taught in schools where they didn't get very large salaries before '76 and they have very, very small pensions. But even more important is number five. The people who taught 45 years ago and I'm one of the few who can tell you about it, had to make a lot of sacrifices when we were teaching. I taught in South Cook County where we think the salaries are great. This was 45 years ago. I got \$75 a month which I never got. They gave me a piece of paper which said when and if we ever have any money, we'll pay you. Those people made a lot of sacrifices in those days and we're asking that same group of low paid teachers to make a sacrifice now. I think number five where we recognize those people who taught 45 years ago is a very excellent part of this Bill and I would urge you to override the Governor's veto.

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, one of the aspects of this Bill that I'm concerned about is the section on survivor benefits and I want to point out to you that for those in that category there's not

been a raise in the last 20 years. Now, I don't know what kind of ...what other thing is similar where people are trying to live on what they lived on 20 years ago. This provides for a one percent increase for each year of benefits and that certainly doesn't add up to very much. I will tell you that the teachers are paying in one percent of their salary for survivors benefits. That amount generated has constantly gone up. But the people on the other end of the stick are not getting it. I'm sure you all know what inflation has done to these people on fixed incomes, but just think for a moment on being on a fixed income that was true 20 years ago and trying to live on it now. As pointed out, certainly some of these people have done everything right and are now down below Public Aid benefits and are not eligible for Social Security. So for that reason alone, as reluctant as I am to oppose the Governor on this matter, I'm going to support the override."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I support the override of this legislation where I think we've got to take a look at the many people this does affect. When you get letters and you know of people that retired several years ago and some of these teachers, particularly rural area teachers, worked from \$40 to \$50 a month and they're retired and now getting \$150 to \$200. We have several hundred retired teachers that are now getting from \$150 to \$325 a month and we know this isn't a living wage. When you have letters from school teachers that

retired several years ago, and they had a little savings. They've spent all the savings. They had a home bought and paid for. And they've had to sell this home in order to survive. I talked to a retired school teacher just a short time ago and he showed me where, after he paid his bills, he had around \$30 left for groceries for that month. I asked him how he lived on it. He said, the only way I can live on it is by peanut butter and bread. He says, that's.. I have to eat that to get by. And I think this is a disgrace and a shame for the people of Illinois to let these people down like we have. I think it's very important that at least we help some of these people that have been in dire circumstances for many years and with inflation increasing like it has, it's putting every year they're getting in a little worst financial shape. I don't think any of us want to see these people go on hungry or anybody that has to live on peanut butter in order to survive. These are the teachers that taught way back years ago. Some of them retired 20 years ago at no large salaries and now they're having trouble living. I would hope that we'd all take this into consideration and support this override."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder, to close. The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle, to close."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Let me try to brief, but I would like to speak specifically to what the Governor said in his veto because I think you will see if you read the veto that there are

several clearly inaccurate statements and some contradictions in the veto. First of all, the Governor argues about the cost to the system ..to the state of this particular Bill. And then in turn says we ought to add 15,000 people to the coverage of the Bill. That seems to me to be contradictory. Secondly, he suggests we should have a graduated formula in the Bill. And then this bad public policy is written in the Bill. However, the Public Pension Laws Commission are the ones who proposed the exact policy that we put in the Bill. He argues that it's inequitable to let downstate teachers have the minimum benefits of a pension law for 45 years of service except he fails to point out that's exactly the opposite of the truth because the city of Chicago teachers have, for some seven years, had that exact ability. I point out in Section #5, he says that we fail to recognize in the survivors annuities the length of time the older people have been on survivors benefits and in fact, the exact opposite is clearly true. The Bill deals with the length of time that individuals have been survivors. The Bill provides in contradiction to what he says, the same sort of situation with regard to those people who are now retired and who retired before 1976. Representative Oblinger, Representative Neff, Representative Friedrich, all conservative Members on the other side of the aisle, stood before you to support this Bill for good reasons, because it helps, not the rich, but the very poor, not the younger retirees, but the very old. Not those people who have the financial

wherewithal to make it on their own, but many who fall below the poverty level, many who are or will be on Public Aid if we continue the inflation and the spiral of inflation that we have in this country. This is the last Bill that we have a chance that I know of to help senior citizens on, any senior citizens on. This Bill helps as I said, the poorest of the poor. You have one last chance to help them. And the chance to help them cannot be done by accepting an amendatory veto. The amendatory veto of the Governor not only is illogical, his proposal, as I have pointed out because he is in error in virtually every statement he makes and it's not a question of logic, it's simply a matter that he doesn't state the facts on the Bill. The amendatory veto does nothing to help virtually anyone. And in fact, I point out to you that twelve-thirteenths, twelve-thirteenths, of the cost of this Bill are associated with diminishing costs because we have diminishing groups of people who are helped by the Bill. So for the reasons argued by Republican and Democrat alike here today, by the Sponsor, Representative Schraeder, and myself, the hyphenated Sponsor, by the Republican Members who stood up for the people who are needy. I urge you to vote affirmatively to override the veto of the Governor on House Bill 1009."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1009 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The Lady from Peoria, Mrs. Sumner, to explain her vote. Timer's on."

Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I supported this legislation last spring and I urge a 'yes' vote to override it now. I have been meeting regularly with retired teachers and find that they have worked hard and have earned every bit of this. I urge that you override by voting 'yes'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I support retired teachers and particularly those who have small incomes and I've heard from many of them too. I think the thing we're missing here is all the Governor did was to reduce the years in which this was available. Those who are really in need, those who retired before 1971 are going to be benefitted if we accept the Governor's veto. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as Minority Spokesman on the Pensions Committee, I'd like to remind everybody in the House that the people who brought in legislation, there are many Members who did on addressing this same subject, at least as the General Assembly of the House and the Senate has accepted it and so has the Governor. We know there's a motion filed to accept the reduction. We were only talking with all the Bills we heard on the Pension Committee, addressing to about 10,000 to 11,000 people, within the Governor's veto this legislation addresses those 10 or 11 thousand people. He cut back those five years and in so doing he

reduces the total cost from 15.9 million to 5.7 which, with the acceptance of the amendatory veto, will be saving 10.2 million dollars. In view of the financial situation we face in the months and the years ahead, I would suggest that some of you people that are on green reconsider your position. Vote 'no'..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan. The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think a lot of people are voting for this measure with some mistaken understanding of what this.. of what the Governor's veto does. First of all, the Governor did not cut out increased benefits for people who had been retired for more than 10 years. Those increases are still in the Bill. So, if you're voting for this with the idea you'll help teachers who have been retired a long time, you don't need to vote for it, for that reason. There's a later motion to accept the Governor's amendatory veto which will accomplish that same purpose. The other thing that hasn't been mentioned, if you read the Governor's veto message, you will find by voting for this override, you're actually taking on an unfunded liability debt of 134 million dollars. That's what you're voting for. And I think the right vote on this is 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania, to explain her vote."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I have a conflict, but I'd like to vote the way I think I ought to vote anyway."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Schoeberlein. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti, requests a verification. Clerk will proceed to poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees: Abramson. Burnidge. Campbell. Casey. Dyer. Epton. Grossi. Hanahan. Harris. Klosak. Kucharski. Laurino. Madigan. McBroom. McCourt. Reed. Ronan. Sandquist. Schlickman. Stanley. Stearney. Totten. And, J.J. Wolf."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Clerk will proceed to verify the affirmative vote. Mr. Getty, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Getty: "I'd like to ask leave to be verified."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leave? Leave is granted..."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Leon has leave to be recorded... Leave is granted. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative: Alexander. Balanoff. Barnes. Beatty. Bell. Bianco. Birchler. Borchers. Bower. Bowman. Bradley. Braun. Breslin. Brummer. Bullock. Capparelli. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton. Currie. Daniels. Darrow. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Ralph Dunn. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Dwight Friedrich. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi Goodwin. Greiman. Griesheimer. Hallock. Hallstrom. Hannig. Henry. Hoxsey. Huff. Jaffe. Johnson. Margery Jones. Emil Jones. Kane. Katz. Keane. Kelly. Kent. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kulas.

Lechowicz. Leinenweber. Leon. Leverenz. Margalus.
 Marovitz. Matijevich. Matula. Mautino. McAuliffe.
 McClain. McGrew. McMaster. McPike. Mugalian.
 Mulcahey. Murphy. Neff. Oblinger. O'Brien.
 Patrick. Pechous. Pierce. Polk. Pouncey..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Mrs. Braun asks leave to be verified. Leave is granted. Please proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Preston. Rea. Reilly. Richmond. Rigney. Robbins. Ropp. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schneider. Schraeder. Sharp. Simms. Skinner. Slape. Steczo. E.G. Steele. C.M. Stiehl. Stuffle. Sumner. Swanstrom. Taylor. Terzich. Tuerk. Van Duyne. Vinson. Vitek. VonBoeckman. Watson. White. Wikoff. Williams. Williamson. Winchester. Sam Wolf. Woodyard. Younge. Yourell and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Grossi as 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti, any question of the affirmative vote?"

Conti: "Yeah. Jane Barnes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Jane Barnes? The Lady's in her chair."

Conti: "Bell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's here."

Conti: "Bianco."

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Conti: "Take him off, will you please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Bianco? Remove him."

Conti: "Bower?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Bower's still here."

Conti: "Brummer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Brummer's here."

Conti: "I see him. Capparelli."

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Conti: "I saw Chapman here. She's not here now. Chapman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Chapman on the floor? Yes, she is."

Conti: "Mugalian."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mugalian? How is he recorded?"

Mugalian. He's recorded as 'aye'."

Conti: "Dawson?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Wait a minute."

Conti: "Oh, I'm sorry."

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is... Is Mr. Mugalian on the floor?"

Conti: "No."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Conti: "Dawson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is Dawson recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Conti: "Domico."

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is Domico recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Conti: "Farley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is Mr. Farley recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Conti: "Garmisa. Oh, I'm sorry. He's here.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...He's here."

Conti: "Getty's been verified. Griesheimer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Griesheimer? How is he recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Conti: "Hallock. Okay. I see him."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's on the floor."

Conti: "Jaffe."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Jaffe? How is Mr. Jaffe recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Conti: "Emil Jones. Emil Jones."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's in the back of the chamber."

Conti: "Where's Emil Jones at?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's in the back of the chamber."

Conti: "All right, Sir. Thank you. Rea?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Rea's in the back of the chamber. Jimmy Rea? In the back of the chamber, talking to Ralph Dunn."

Conti: "Matula."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Matula's in his chair."

Conti: "Leon's been verified."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, he has."

Conti: "Satterthwaite?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Satterthwaite's in the chamber."

Conti: "Sharp."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Sharp? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Conti: "Taylor?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Taylor?"

Conti: "He's here."

Speaker Lechowicz: "There he is."

Conti: "Terzich?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Terzich? How is Terzich recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Conti: "Sam Vinson?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Sam Vinson? How is he recorded? Oh, there you are."

Conti: "Mr. Wikoff?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. McAuliffe, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Change Mr. McAuliffe to 'no'. Mr. Stearney? To 'no'. I'm sorry. Who did you ask for, Mr. Conti?"

Conti: "Wikoff."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Wikoff. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove Mr. Wikoff and put Mr. Jaffe back on."

Conti: "Williams."

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is Mr. Williams recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Williams? Remove him."

Conti: "Watson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Watson? How is Mr. Watson recorded?"

Conti: "That's all right. He's here. Younge?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady's in her chair."

Conti: "Younge."

Speaker Lechowicz: "She's in her chair."

Conti: "Steczo?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's in his chair."

Conti: "Margalus."

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is Mr. Margalus recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Conti: "Did you take off Satterthwaite?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, she was in the chamber. She still is."

Conti: "I see. McClain. He's in his chair.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...He's in the chair."

Conti: "No further questions. Hold it. Hold it. Hold it a minute.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Hoxsey, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Kindly record.. change the Lady from 'aye' to 'no'."

Conti: "Mr. Ronan, Al Ronan?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I don't... I don't believe he is recorded. How is the Gentleman recorded? Ronan."

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is not recorded as voting."

Conti: "Rigney."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who?"

Conti: "Rigney. Harlan Rigney."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Rigney? He's there. And the Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Stiehl, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Stiehl: "Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, change me to 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Change her from 'aye' to 'no'."

Conti: "You took Margalus off didn't you?"

Speaker Lechowicz: " I did."

Conti: "Neff?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Neff was not questioned before. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Didn't we just... Clarence? Come back too soon, Clarence."

Conti: "Polk."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's here. Clarence Neff is here. He's verified."

Conti: "Ben Polk."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ben Polk is in the back of the chamber."

Conti: "Lee Daniels?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Daniels? He's conferring with Pate Phillips now. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him. What's our count, Tony?"

Conti: "...turned me off.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, I never turned you off..."

Conti: "Mr. Woodyard.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You just ran out of steam.."

Conti: "Mr. Woodyard."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Woodyard? I thought we questioned him before. Was Mr. Woodyard questioned before?"

Conti: "No."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He was not. Okay. Is Mr. Woodyard in the woodwork...in the chamber? Conti wants to know."

Conti: "Swanstrom? Did you take him off?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, not yet.."

Conti: "Please do.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We're checking the woodwork. Remove him."

Conti: "Swanstrom."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We're getting close aren't we?"

Conti: "Swanstrom."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Swanstrom? He was here."

Conti: "I know it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He must be at choir practice. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, that's a proper vote.."

Conti: "What's the count?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Wait a minute. How is... Is Mr. Swanstrom in the chamber? Remove him. Are you concluded now, Mr. Conti? You're off.."

Conti: "Vitek."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Vitek had leave."

Conti: "One more here. What's the count please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Are you through?"

Conti: "No. What's the count?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I believe we're on 106. Freddy? Fred."

Conti: "Goodwin?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Goodwin? Quentin Goodwin? There he is."

Conti: "VonBoeckman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's always here in the building. He's in the chair."

Conti: "Bullock."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Put Mr. Daniels back on. You've waited too long. Bullock is here."

Conti: "Thank you for your patience. Ropp. Gordon Ropp."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ropp? How is Mr. Ropp recorded? Mr. Ropp is in the chamber."

Conti: "Johnson?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Tim Johnson? He's over here at this side of the chamber. Gaines? Have you concluded, Mr. Conti?"

Conti: "No, just one more."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who is it?"

Conti: "Char..John..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Make sure you've got the right one."

Conti: "Gaines wants to be recognized I think."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I called on Mr. Gaines. He didn't make one move."

Conti: "He's moving now."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He wants to make sure he's recorded as 'aye'. I'm sure."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "In the proper way. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Gaines: "Change me to 'present'."

Conti: "That's it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is that it? No, Mr. Mulcahey wants to be recorded in what way?"

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, record me as 'aye'."

Conti: "Well, I think I missed somebody here.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Conti: "He was already 'aye' on that. He's already recorded 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I don't know. I've got to check with the Clerk. You're recorded as 'aye', Mr. Mulcahey."

Conti: "You can only vote once."

Speaker Lechowicz: "No. He just wants to make sure he's

recorded the right way."

Conti: "That's it, Mr. Speaker.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Anyone else?"

Conti: "No, that's it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. On this question there's 106 'ayes', 28 'no', and the motion fails. House Bill 1009 is declared lost. House Bill 1009, Mr. Hoffman, a motion to accept."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move we accept the Governor's amendatory veto on House Bill 1009."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House accept the amendatory veto on House Bill 1009?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'nay'. Danny? Jerry, give me a... Jerry? Give me an 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 144 'ayes', no 'nays', and the House does accept the Governor's amendatory veto on House Bill 1009 and the Bill is declared passed. House Bill 1522."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Yes. This is also to accept the Governor's amendatory veto on House Bill 1522. The Governor's changes exclude any collective bargaining agreements between state employees and the state when the Department of Labor determines locally prevalent wage rates and I urge the support of the Governor's amendatory veto."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill

1522 by the adoption of the Amendment? Those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 133 'aye' and 12 'no'. The motion carries and the House does accept the specific recommendations for change by the adoption of the Amendment. 2227. Representative Reilly?"

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On House Bill 2227, one of things we did was create a council to oversee the provision of emergency medical services. Director Kempiners requested some changes clarifying that that council was advisory and not controlling. In that request he was strongly seconded by the then Chairman of the Human Resources Committee. And on reflection I think the changes reflect wisdom. I would move to accept the amendatory veto."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, could I learn from the Sponsor whether this Bill still licenses ambulances?"

Reilly: "Yes. It has a very modified provision on that if you recall. It grandfathers in all the existing ambulances. It has a lot of other provisions that I believe are acceptable at least to the members of the industry I've spoken to. But it does, yes, do that."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, if I might address the issue.."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Skinner: "This state is not content to license more people than any other state in the country. Now we're going to license vehicles, not just that they're on the road, but they've got all the proper equipment, all

that sort of good stuff. I have a theory as to why this Bill was introduced. I mean, I know why it was introduced. It's because we beat it two years ago in the Human Resources Committee and they brought it back and they sort of hid it in another Bill and the excuse came from Jacksonville, where, apparently somebody was using a Gremlin for an ambulance. Well, you know, I don't care if they use a Gremlin for an ambulance or not. It doesn't make much difference to me. If anybody's dumb enough to want to take an ambulance that looks like a Gremlin to a hospital, you know, such is life or death. But what I don't understand is why we have to find work for Public Health Department employees that wouldn't have to do anything. They've accomplished their goal. Two years ago in the Human Resources Committee, the Public Health Department employees came up to me and asked me why I voted against their dumb Bill. They said, 'Representative Skinner, all of the ambulances in your district already meet our qualifications.' And they didn't seem to understand my answer when I said, 'Well, if they already meet my qualifications, why do you have to go out and check them again?' I just don't see a reason in the world to license ambulances by the State Department of Public Health. I haven't found any agency that runs an ambulance that is so..so incapable of figuring out what is good and what is bad about ambulances that they cannot purchase an ambulance without having oversight from the state. This part of the Bill just doesn't make any sense to me whatsoever. And I really the only reason it was introduced by the

Department of Public Health was to give people something to do who, otherwise, could have been fired. Now if the Governor wants to find ways to save money, if he wants to find ways to save money to pay for some of these overrides that we're passing over his approval, I would suggest for the first time in his administration he start squeezing the bureaucracy. I'll bet you you could save a hundred million dollars in this state if you would fire 5,000 state employees. Now, on the state payroll in the university system and within the Governor's control.. I would contend the State University System is at least somewhat under the control of the Governor, there are about 120,000 employees. Five thousand employees is less than, you know, it's less than ten percent. Would anybody here stand and contend that you couldn't cut the state bureaucracy by five percent and not increase efficiency? Rather than decrease efficiency? This is going to create work for state employees that will justify their jobs. And I just don't think we need that justification."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Simms: "Representative Reilly, does this grandfather in some of those that are now in existence, ambulances?"

Reilly: "It grandfathers in all of the ...every vehicle that's now in use as an ambulance. Furthermore, as to the problem you and I had discussed before with the nonemergency vehicles..."

Simms: "...Yeah, in other words..."

Reilly: "They're not regulated at all..."

Simms: "In other words, it's not going to run the downstate funeral director out of the ambulance business with the equipment they have now. But when a time to replace, they would have to go under the standards. Fine. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rigney."

Rigney: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Rigney: "Is there any provision in your Bill dealing with EMT's and specifically about having two EMT's on every ambulance run?"

Reilly: "No. I think what you're referring to and I concur with what I think you're getting at. The Department distributed some proposed regulations which they could issue either under the present law or under this, talking about that. I object to that and told the Department that and they've withdrawn those regulations. It may be that we will have to come back whether we pass this or not and forbid them from requiring two EMT's just as we previously forbidden (sic) them from requiring two paramedics. But it's... there's nothing in this Bill that affects that."

Rigney: "And you feel you have assurance then from the Department that they are going to drop that regulation."

Reilly: "I feel that I do and if they don't I'll personally introduce the Bill to forbid that. Because that... There's nothing wrong with that idea. I guess there are a lot of rural areas that just can't afford to do that.."

Rigney: "Yeah, they don't have the two EMT's."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Reilly to close."

Reilly: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've debated these other issues before. The primary thrust of the Bill is to try to bring together the law in this area and to help with the ambulance service, particularly in rural areas. All we're really talking about now, having passed the Bill before, is the amendatory veto. All that did is put in some changes recommended by Director Kempiners and I would ask a favorable Roll Call on my motion to accept the amendatory veto."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 2227 by adoption of the Amendment?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Hoffman, please be in your seat. Representative Hoffman, 'aye'. Now please be in your seat. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the ...The Clerk will take...How many do you need? Okay. Take the record. Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Wait a minute. There's a difference of opinion here, Mr. Reilly. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. Representative Reilly. Poll the absentees."

Reilly: "Why... I thought in accepting an amendatory veto it just needed a Constitutional Majority."

Speaker Redmond: "Immediate effective date."

Reilly: "Does the Bill by its terms have an immediate effective date?"

Speaker Redmond: "That's what the Clerk advises me. The Bill itself provides for..."

Reilly: "Would you poll the absentees please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bell. Burnidge. Casey. Dawson. Domico. Epton. Flinn. Griesheimer. Hanahan. Harris. Huff. Klosak. Laurino. Lechowicz. McBroom. McPike. Meyer. Molloy. Oblinger. Ronan. Sandquist. Schlickman. Totten. And, Woodyard."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz, 'aye'. Representative McPike, 'aye'. Representative .. that a new Member back there? Representative Huskey, 'aye'. Representative Burnidge, 'aye'. Stearney, 'aye'. Watson, 'aye'. What's the count? On this question there's 109 'aye' and 43 'no'. The motion, having received the Extraordinary Majority, prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 2227. 3007. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "I just wonder and it may be that I have no expertise in this, but I just wonder if the comment that you made at the end of the Bill in declaring what was done, the action of the House, was appropriate? I thought that you said that it failed."

Speaker Redmond: "No. Accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 2227 by adoption of the Amendment. Out of the record. 3070, Anderson."

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3070, which I have filed a motion to accept the Governor's veto, started out to be a technical Bill to make very small

technical changes to move out-moded language. However, this Bill was amended in the Senate. Two Amendments were added. One, to continue the use of state aid anticipation certificates and two, to make them repayable beyond the fiscal year in which they were issued. Now, the Governor has concurred with the continued use of the state anti..state aid anticipation certificates, but he has vetoed out the part where they could be repaid in longer than the fiscal year in which they were issued. I think what he has done is proper because it arms the school people with an additional way of raising money for the short term. We now have the anticipation that.. the tax anticipation warrants and the tax anticipation notes. This third way that we will continue to use will be the state aid anticipation certificates. Since state aid is paid twice a month, it will be a way that the School Boards may be able to raise money at a lesser rate of interest. I move to accept the Governor's amendatory veto. I know of no opposition."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 3070 by adoption of the Amendment?' All in favor vote 'aye'; 'opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 147 'aye' and 2 'no'. The motion, having received an Extraordinary Majority, prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 3070 by adoption of the

Amendment. 3271, Marovitz. Representative Marovitz.
The Calendar doesn't say what your motion is."

Marovitz: "The motion is to accept the Governor's..."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay.."

Marovitz: "...Amendatory veto of..."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Proceed.."

Marovitz: "...House Bill 3271. I would move that the House do accept the Governor's amendatory veto on House Bill 3271. This is the .. one of the anti-arson Bills and the section that the Governor amended out was not in the original Bill, but was an accommodation for another Member of the House, which we put in because her Bill was ..got caught in a crunch. We put that section in which eliminated the required payment of excess monies in the Fire Prevention Fund from being put into the General Revenue Fund and we allowed that money to stay into the Fire Prevention Fund, any excess money that lapsed. The Governor took that out. It was not in the original Bill. I agree with the Governor and would recommend that we accept the amendatory veto."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 3271 by adoption of the Amendment?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 146 'aye' and no 'nay'. The motion, having received the Extraordinary Majority, prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change,

regarding House Bill 3271 by adoption of the Amendment. 3614. Representative Christensen. Christensen, 3614."

Christensen "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. When the Governor vetoed the Amendment on 3614, he said that this Amendment might be unconstitutional. I think it's the duty of the courts to decide whether it's unconstitutional or not. All this Amendment does is state... that we will take their out of state waste if they'll take ours. This has nothing to do with the intrastate. So those that were worried about dump sites within the state have nothing to worry about and there's no dollars amount in this. Some states have laws prohibiting dumping, some have import quotas. We don't have that. This override should be done to give Illinois some bargaining power when the Federal Government goes about the duty of locating a permanent dump site. We need something to bargain with. And for that reason, it's one of the reasons we should override this. I feel that we, as State Representatives, owe this to the people of Illinois to give them the protection they need. This will probably be our last chance to stop this out of state waste from filling up our local dump. When that was filled, we would have no place for our own. Trucks hauling spent fuel rods go through 17 Legislative Districts in the State of Illinois, 17 Districts. And out of those 17 Districts, ten Representatives voted against this Amendment last time. I think the people of Illinois deserve better representation than that and I think we should override the Governor on this

veto."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti. Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've heard so many times say that a Bill never dies, it just keeps reappearing and appearing and appearing. The veto that the Governor directed and this is only the Senate Amendment, which was tacked on by Senator Joyce. The House, both in Committee and in full Session, defeated three other identical measures during the Eighty-First General Assembly. On its face the Joyce Amendment does appear to be unconstitutional. It is unlawful because they violate both the commerce and the contract clauses of the Constitution. While this material is much lower in radioactive..in spent fuel, it's greater in volume. Now, I've been told that they're trying to send a message to Washington. Well, I've got the Sun-Times in front of me here and it says that the Senate Finance Committee on Tuesday, which was yesterday, day before yesterday, voted unanimously Tuesday to send four and two-tenths billions for a clean-up of toxic chemical waste on the Senate Floor. The Congressman from that area is now working on it and they said that he's been dragging his feet on nuclear waste management. Here are the facts regarding the management of spent nuclear; legislation is moving through Congress at the present time appropriating some four and two-tenths billion dollars for an away from the reactor storage program. Our own Illinois Congressman, Tom Corcoran, that comes from Morris, is a Member of the House Energy and Power Subcommittee

with jurisdiction over nuclear energy policy. He's right on top of this. The Department of Energy envisions three or four away from reactor storage facilities in the United States to establish a regional storage program. This is a federal program. We should corollate all these programs for nuclear waste through the Federal Government and not have each and every state come up with their own rules and regulations. It's not fair in the Reciprocity Act that we have that we are allowing other companies to spend and waste.. bring their waste into Morris while we are prohibiting our own companies from doing so in Illinois. I urge you to sustain the Governor's veto on this particular Bill because, as I said before this Bill has been killed by this House at least three times. And it's just the Amendment on the Bill that the Governor has vetoed."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Article II of this Bill, which the Governor is seeking to strike, is a resurrected version of Senate Bill 1581. And 1581 did pass the Senate, came over to the House but was never discharged from our Rules Committee. What Representative Conti has already said is very true as to the history of this Bill. It seeks to prohibit the disposal and storage or acceptance of spent nuclear fuel in Illinois from another state unless that state has a storage or disposal facility substantially like that of Illinois and that state has a reciprocity agreement approved by the General Assembly and the Governor. Well, these are long and

tortuous routes, my friends, to do. Let us all agree that the proper safe and prudent storage of spent fuel is of utmost importance, but let us at the same time recognize that Illinois has been and is a leader in the development and use of nuclear as a source of power for our citizens. And it should also be a leader in the resolution of the storage and disposal problems. But this proposal tacked onto House Bill 3614 is not the responsible way and I believe the Governor's veto should be sustained. Article II does violate the supremacy ...supremacy and commerce clause of the U.S. Constitution, which gives the U.S. Government jurisdiction over the handling of this type of spent fuel. And it seems to be at the same time unconstitutional in that it impedes the flow of commerce across our state lines, and will, in effect, close our borders to highly valuable spent fuel, which at some future date, and I think this is important, can be a rich source of power supply for our people when reprocessing of spent fuel is permitted and I believe that in the future this will be permitted. I repeat, we are not speaking of radioactive trash material, but of partially spent fuel rods in which there is a tremendous amount of residual energy to be used at a future date. Out of this we can get uranium and to some extent plutonium. The vetoed Article would require not only that shipments be stopped, but that all spent fuel previously shipped to and stored here in Illinois be removed if reciprocity agreements are not arrived at. Now, where would we send it? Where would it go to? In conclusion, this is not the

time, it seems to me, in our nation's history to be tampering with a reasonable and safe storage of spent fuel in cooperation as we are with other states. Remember, more than ten million tons of nuclear waste are stored in other states which are a result of producing the energy that comes in here in the first place. These are ..take the form of spent fuel discharge, uranium mining wastes, uranium mill tailings, enrichment tailings, all of which are a spin-off in producing the rods we use in Illinois for energy. Now they're storing those for us. Why is it so wrong for us to reciprocate by storing some of our own spent fuel rods here? Finally, the Department of Nuclear Safety is charged by statute to study these problems, to study the problems of storage and report to the General Assembly. Let's let this Department address itself to the problem before closing our borders to this form of interstate commerce. This seems to me to be bad policy. Illinois is a leader in the peaceful use of nuclear energy. Let's keep it that way. And I recommend supporting the Governor's veto, amendatory veto, of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'm not deeply interested in the legal arguments on this Bill because they're undoubtedly true and if the Bill should pass, it'll be struck down by the courts. I am interested in the emotion of the issue. I'm interested in the emotion of the issue because I can understand why people are nervous about nuclear power. But, we've got a situation in this country where, if

we're going to have energy, we're going to have to live with nuclear power. It's a safe process for storing it at Morris. I look out my front door at a similar storage site, not a similar storage site, but another storage site, that's being built at Clinton. I don't believe that you can have nuclear power unless you have places to store the fuel. I don't believe that it's possible to have nuclear power at this point at least, unless you have some waste. I believe that what we have to do... I think the worst thing that we've got going in this country right now is this attitude that my ox can't be gored. Well, if we're going to solve the energy problem, each of us are going to have to have our oxen gored a little bit. And what that means is that somebody's going to have to store energy and even though I sympathize very greatly with the problem that Mr. Christensen has in terms of the people in his District, writing him letters and so forth, I believe that this rises above that to a national challenge. I believe that we have to defeat this override motion and I feel so concerned about it that I want to request a verification in the event that it gets enough votes."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was provided with a... and I haven't seen him arise in debate yet, neither of these two Gentleman, but I was provided with a press release by the Minority Leader and Ed McBroom and since neither one of them are speaking on the issue, I'd like to share

with the Members of the House some of what they say about this issue in their press release. 'Illinois presently is the only state in the Union to accept spent nuclear fuel rods from other states. A number of states have already adopted legislation to ban acceptance of waste from outside their borders. The Governor's veto is particularly significant because the Federal Government has expressed an interest in the making the General Electric Dresden facility in the well populated vicinity of Morris, a nation dumping site for the nation's high level nuclear waste. Without a waste transportation ban, that location would not only bring new dangers to the Morris community, it would endanger every community near roads leading to the dumpsite. Waste could be transported down interstates 80 or 55 or along any road throughout our Legislative District, or indeed, anywhere in northern Illinois.' And they also say and I want to emphasize this, we, we will work for an override of Thompson's veto during the fall Veto Session of the Legislature. The Governor may well be correct in his estimation that the ban could be unconstitutional, but that is an issue for the court to decide. I want to commend the Minority Leader for that statement and I would urge that he try to work his side the aisle to the best of his ability so we can override this. I think the matter of nuclear waste very well could be a time bomb that is ticking. We really don't know, but if a time bomb is going to tick, I don't want all of the ticking being done here in the State of Illinois. I think if there's anything

noble that any of us can ever say that we're going to do, the noble thing that we can say is that we are going to protect future generations. The matter of nuclear power believe me is ..is one that is very questionable about safety. In the minds of many who, at one time were the strongest advocates, there are many now who are taking a second look and at this very critical juncture, I don't think that any of us here, in Illinois, ought to say that we are going to be the dumping ground of the whole country on a matter that at one day could take our children away from us. I want everybody, everybody, I'm not going to be here many, many years. But I've got a boy ten years old and I don't want myself and my vote to say that my vote could have taken my boy's life away or the lives of children now who are going to be with us for a long time. This is something very serious. This is not a matter of public utilities, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is not a matter of vote that we've got to protect big business. This is a matter of life and death. And all we're saying is, that we don't think Illinois should be treated any different than every state of the Union. And I would urge, I would urge all of you, let me tell you that in the State of Washington, many times on many issues I've heard people get up on the floor of the House and they say, we ought to bring this matter to the vote of the people. Do you know what the people of the State of Illinois would vote on this very issue? I believe it would be about 98%. In the State of Washington in this past election they voted on the matter of banning nuclear waste in the

State of Washington. It was a 70% vote. Now, George, I commend you and after this Bill comes up I want to see you walk up and down that aisle like you do and get those votes and get them up there because really, seriously, though, it is a matter of life and death."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "I didn't hear."

Speaker Redmond: "Borchers.."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of the House.."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers. What's the matter down there?"

Borchers: "...Environmental Protection Agency... Environmental Protection Committee for nuclear power. I have visited every one of these nuclear plants we have in Illinois. I estimate that the storage space at Morris is a third of this room and the storage space is not even full. The situation in the other areas are, I would say, even less. Now, I feel that from my observation and from listening and looking into the situation on nuclear power, we cannot afford not to continue in this direction. It not only is one of the cheapest powers we have, but on top of that, I feel that it's necessary for the future safety of our country that we continue to develop and maintain nuclear power. No one is stopping the Russians, for example, the eastern bloc from developing nuclear power. The French are on our side, but they have some of the finest and largest nuclear power plants in the world in France. Other nations are developing them. If we are backward in this, the children and the son

that one of my colleagues over here speaks about could well be destroyed by the Russians' super power that they may have in the future. We've got to maintain ourselves with the nuclear power. I feel from what I have listened at these various nuclear power plants that it is safe. I think one of the greatest effects and one of the greatest efforts have been made to decry and tear down and make the people of this country afraid of nuclear power. I'm not afraid of it. I think it can be contained. It can be handled. I think we would be blind to the best interests of our country if we stop and go backward. So I suggest we support the Governor in his action here. Now, you must think beyond right here in Illinois. You must think of the future. You must think of the fact that this world is divided into two great power structures. We cannot allow ourselves to be overridden in nuclear power anymore than we can allow ourselves to be overridden as we are right now by the armed forces of the Russians. Now, this is slightly off the subject, but the Russians at this minute have 335 divisions. We have 18. I don't want to see this continue in nuclear power as it is in the armed forces."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would hope that each of the 177 Members on this House Floor has read this one page article. It's very short and if you're listening to the rhetoric on the floor here, you're not going to know what this is about. This is not about the question of whether or not we are going to continue to

remain the leading state with regard to the development of nuclear power. It is very simply a question of whether we're going to continue to remain the leading state as the national dump of nuclear waste. It has nothing to do with whether we can continue to develop. It has nothing to do with the development of power in Illinois. It is simply a question of whether we have to accept the spent wastes and become the dumping grounds of the nation for all the other states which do not accept our waste. I would submit that the answer is very simple. We ought to resoundingly vote to override the Governor's veto."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to urge an override of the Governor's veto. When we are dealing with the problem of nuclear waste, we really fail to appreciate the dimensions of the problem. Illinois has been a state for 162 years. Do you realize that there are nuclear wastes whose toxic life is twice or three times the entire history of Illinois, that when you are talking about some of the radioactive materials given off in the nuclear contamination process, that these toxic wastes will go on into the year 2000 and into the year 3000? Their toxicity will continue. Is it unreasonable in that circumstance to say that Illinois despite the fact that we are centrally located, and hence other states would like to ship their toxic wastes here, was it unreasonable of the Senate to say that Illinois will not accept toxic wastes from other states that will not accept the same wastes from Illinois? It is a

reciprocity provision. The Senate was not seeking to kill off Illinois' burgeoning nuclear power system. They were simply seeking to prevent Illinois from becoming the nation's dumping ground with regard to nuclear waste. That is a fair and reasonable proposal. It is a sensible proposition when you consider as I indicated to you that nuclear waste, the half life of those wastes, extend to hundreds and hundreds of years that far eclipse the Illinois history of 162 years. I would urge you to be true to the next 162 years and to be true to the next 324 years because these toxic wastes will last that long once they are here. Let us have fairness between Illinois and other states. If it is a national problem, let there be a national solution. It should not be Illinois' problem alone. I would urge a vote to override the veto."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First off, I'd like to thank the Gentleman from Lake for reading my press release. I thought that was magnanimous and maybe in the future we can use him in the office downstairs someplace, the press office. And I hope that he does watch me as I try and get the votes to override this Bill because I'm sincere and serious in an attempt to override it. The Governor knows that. I've talked to the Governor and I would hope that my colleagues on this side of the aisle would join with me to override this Bill. Representative... One of the Representatives spoke about the future of the children. Let me tell you,

there may not be any future for the children who live in that area. I think Representative Katz pointed that out. And how would you like to live in constant fear like those people in the Three Mile Island area where they're going to have to tear their families up and move their houses and leave the area after they've been there for a whole lifetime? And that's the fear that the people in our district are concerned about and that's the fear that I'm concerned. And I would encourage an override on this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Representative Brummer did indeed bring the debate full circle, when he indicated as the previous speaker indicated that this Bill has nothing to do with the great debate as to whether or not you favor or oppose nuclear power but it does have something to do with whether or not those of us who live outside of Morris, Illinois or that part of the State, or those 17 districts that receive at least as transported nuclear wastes transported through their districts. Whether those citizens of our State deserve protection and whether we should stand with the Representatives of that area in trying to afford them piece of mind. I dare say that Morris, Illinois and those other sites are not the only places within in our State our United States that can receive our nuclear waste. As most of you know or may not know we could very well send it to outer space or we could store it in Canada in some vault. I think what we have here is that Illinois stores its own nuclear wastes but we have indeed become

a dropping point or a dumping ground for other states. I think one statistic that is most glaring if there's any doubt as to why we are designated the dumping ground, it's that in that one area that Representative Ryan spoke about we receive approximately 370 metric tons of waste that are stored at that site and none of that waste, Ladies and Gentlemen, come within the State of Illinois. Those 370 metric tons are imported from out of state. I think that's a glaring statistic and I think that's reason enough for us to join with Representative Ryan and McBroom and Christensen and all of the other fair-minded individuals who are for once looking toward the future and certainly we don't want a repeat of Three Mile Island or any of the other type of misfortunes that have occurred with the use of nuclear waste. I rise in support of the motion to override the Governor's veto on House Bill 3614, and I urge all of you to stand with these Representatives and vote likewise."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "In deference to my good friend, Elmer Conti, I move the previous question."

Speaker Remond: "Question is shall the main question be put, those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried. Representative Christensen to close. Christensen."

Christensen: "Yes, I would like to correct Representative Conti, he said that Corcoran was from Morris, if Corcoran was from Morris we probably wouldn't be doing this here today. We'd have our support, he's not from Morris, I wish he was so he could really represent us

like he should. The statement was made that we're one of the leading states in nuclear plants, we are and I hope we stay that way. All this...all this Amendment does is say that...that we don't want our dump filled up with outside waste. Now, if you don't think it's serious in Grundy County, somebody made the...the point that we should be glad to have this stored, well maybe we ought to take it to DuPage County and store it up there if they'd think they'd like to have it. Grundy County, the county itself has thrown in \$25,000 to try to defeat this. The city of Morris, where I live has thrown in \$15,000 trying to defeat this. Am I...Representative Ryan said every day you're getting phone calls from people that are afraid to live in the area because of the...the huge amount waste being stored and there's going to be many, many, many times over if we don't put a stop to it and this is what we're asking let's once and for all truly represent the people and put a stop to outside waste coming to Morris, Illinois. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall House Bill 3614 pass, notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendations for change? All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all vote...Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to explain my 'yes' vote on overriding the veto. I think the intent is clear for the State of Illinois and that's what this Amendment addresses. The statement that we're making with this Amendment an override is a statement of state's

rights. A Gentleman was elected President of the United States on November 4, under the auspices of state's rights. One of the previous speakers said that the Federal Government has a program, that program has been in effect for 39 years, they've done nothing..."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to save the time of the House and...and I see some people voting up there that are not here and I don't want to verify this Roll call, so while they are explaining their votes, I see some buttons being pushed that aren't here today and I don't want to verify the Roll Call again."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson has requested a verification in the event that it passes, so I would suggest that you consider that when you're casting your vote. Proceed, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "That question of federal action on repositories is moot this time and that is because they have not taken action in 39 years but most importantly when the atom was first split in the State of Illinois at the Argonne National Laboratory they've used on site facilities, that is all this legislation is asking for, is that the State of Illinois have a disposal for those energies that are produced here in the State of Illinois and if other states want to bring there energy repositories into our State we must have that same provision to transport ours out. I think it's only fair state's rights are here, this is what you're voting on and if you believe in your own State of

Illinois you should be voting 'yes' on this override question."

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

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the best thing to do is burn Illinois coal and let a little smoke go up in the air and it won't cause any problems. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 106 'aye' and 35 'no'. Representative Christensen. Representative Christensen has requested a Poll of the Absentees. Representative Wolf. J. J. Wolf, 'aye'. Representative Simms 'aye'. Will you put that in the record, for Representative Ryan, Representative Simms votes 'aye'. Representative Campbell, 'aye'. Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Change me to 'aye', please, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "'Aye', Representative Mahar, 'aye'. Stearney, 'aye'. Representative Karpel 'aye'. McAuliffe, 'aye'. Representative Marovitz.."

Marovitz: "Leave to be verified, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "May Mr. Marovitz be verified, Mr. Vinson? He indicates yes. Representative Cissy Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "'Aye', Representative Winchester, 'aye'. Ralph Dunn, 'aye'. Polk, Polk 'aye'. Representative Rigney, 'aye'. Leon 'aye'. Swanstrom 'aye'. Representative MacDonald 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all indicated their desire, what is the count Mr. Clerk? 122 'aye' and how many 'no'? 23

'no'. Representative Vinson is requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call, please be in your seats, Hanahan's Rules. He's making more rules. Did you request a Poll of the Absentees, Mr. Christensen? Poll the Absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bell. Bluthardt. Burnidge. Capuzi. Casey. Dawson. Domico. John Dunn. Dyer. Epton. Ewell. Hanahan. Harris. Klosak. Laurino. Lechowicz. McBroom. McCourt. Oblinger. Richmond. Ronan. Sandquist. Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Sharp. Stanley. Totten. Wikoff. No further."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson. Mr. Clerk will you proceed with the verification of the Affirmative Roll Call?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Ackerman. Alexander. Anderson. Balanoff. Barnes. Beatty. Birchler. Boucek. Bower. Bowman. Bradley. Braun. Breslin."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Braun, she's here is that alright? Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Brummer. Bullock. Campbell. Capparelli. Chapman. Christensen. Collins. Cullerton. Daniels. Darrell. Davis. Deuster. DiPrima. Donovan. Doyle. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Ewing. Farley. Flinn. Virginia Frederick. Gaines. Garmisa. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Grossi. Hallock. Hannig. Henry. Hoxsey. Huff. Jaffe. Johnson. Marjorie Jones. Emil Jones. Kane. Karpiel. Katz. Keane. Kelly. Kent. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kucharski. Kulas. Leinenweber. Leon. Leverenz. MacDonald. Madigan. Mahar. Marovitz. Matijevich. Matula. Mautino. McAuliffe. McClain. McGrew. McMaster.

Meyer. Mulcahey. Murphy. Neff. O'Brien. Patrick.
 Pechous. Peters. Polk. Pouncey. Preston. Rea.
 Reed. Rigney. Robbins. Ryan. Satterthwaite.
 Schisler. Schneider. Schraeder. Schuneman. Sims.
 Skinner. Slape. Stearney. Steczo. E. G. Steele.
 C. M. Stiehl. Stuffle. Sumner. Swanstrom. Taylor.
 Telcser. Terzich. Tuerk. Van Duyne. Vitek.
 VonBoeckman. Watson. White. Williamson.
 Winchester. J. J. Wolf. Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell.
 Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson, any questions of
 the Affirmative Roll Call?"

Vinson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Please be in your seats now."

Vinson: "Representative Alexander."

Speaker Redmond: "She's in the aisle."

Vinson: "They should be in their seats, Mr. Speaker, as you
 indicated. Representative Balanoff."

Speaker Redmond: "She's in her seat."

Vinson: "Representative Beatty."

Speaker Redmond: "Beatty, he's there."

Vinson: "Representative Bowman."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Vinson: "Representative Bradley."

Speaker Redmond: "He's back there in his seat."

Vinson: "Wrong seat, Mr. Speaker but...."

Speaker Redmond: "He got lost November 4th."

Vinson: "Representative Breslin."

Speaker Redmond: "She's here."

Vinson: "Representative Brummer."

Speaker Redmond: "He's back there."

Vinson: "Representative Capparelli."
Speaker Redmond: "Is Capparelli here? Capparelli, how's he recorded?"
Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."
Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."
Vinson: "Representative Chapman. Chapman."
Speaker Redmond: "She's over here."
Vinson: "She's what?"
Speaker Redmond: "Here."
Vinson: "Cullerton."
Speaker Redmond: "He's here."
Vinson: "Representative Darrow."
Speaker Redmond: "He's down here. The fellow with the whiskers. Attorney General."
Vinson: "Representative Doyle."
Speaker Redmond: "He's...he's in his seat."
Vinson: "Where's his seat? I've never figured that out."
Speaker Redmond: "Where he is."
Vinson: "Farley."
Speaker Redmond: "Is Farley back there? Representative Farley. I can't see, Representative Wolf will you sit down. Is Farley back there? How's he recorded?"
Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."
Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."
Vinson: "Representative Flinn."
Speaker Redmond: "Monroe Flinn..."
Vinson: "Yes, that's the one."
Speaker Redmond: "...how's he recorded? Is he back there?"
Vinson: "I certainly don't see him."
Speaker Redmond: "How's he recorded?"
Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Garmisa."

Speaker Redmond: "Garmisa, how's he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Giorgi."

Speaker Redmond: "He's down here."

Vinson: "I hear a voice, but I sure don't see him."

Speaker Redmond: "Stand up, face East Representative Giorgi. He's getting his instructions from former House Member Vadalabene."

Vinson: "Representative Greiman."

Speaker Redmond: "Greiman, Flinn... Monroe Flinn has returned, put him back on the Roll Call. Greiman here? Remove him from the Roll Call."

Vinson: "Representative Hannig. Alright, I see him."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Vinson: "Henry."

Speaker Redmond: "Henry back there? Yeah."

Vinson: "Mr. Huff. No, now wait a minute, I... I have got a right to see their faces not just the hands."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here. Representative Huff will you come from out from behind that post?"

Vinson: "Representative Ja... I see him."

Speaker Redmond: "Now remove the post. Who you on now?"

Vinson: "Nothing. Representative Katz."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Vinson: "Keane."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Vinson: "Keane."

Speaker Redmond: "Keane's back there."

Vinson: "Kelly."

Speaker Redmond: "Kelly, he's here."

Vinson: "Kosinski."

Speaker Redmond: "How is Representative Kosinski recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Madigan."

Speaker Redmond: "Madigan."

Vinson: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "How's Madigan reported."

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him but I predict he'll be produced
in three seconds."

Vinson: "Mr. McGrew."

Speaker Redmond: "McGrew. He's back there. Representative
Madigan has returned put him back on the Roll Call."

Vinson: "Representative Murphy."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Murphy there? He's back there in his
seat."

Vinson: "Representative O'Brien."

Speaker Redmond: "Is O'Brien here? How's he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Voting 'aye'?"

Clerk O'Brien: "'Aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Here's O'Brien."

Vinson: "Representative Patrick."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Patrick. Is he back there?
Patrick. How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "He is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Wikoff."

Speaker Redmond: "Wikoff, how's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him (sic)."

Vinson: "Representative Kent."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kent, she's here."

Vinson: "Representative Campbell."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell, is Campbell here?
How's he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Vinson: : "Representative...."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove...remove Campbell."

Vinson: "Representative Pouncey."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pouncey back there?"

Vinson: "We won't assume Cullerton's substitute either."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Pouncey there? How's he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Mr. Preston."

Speaker Redmond: "Preston. Is Preston here? How's he
recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Karpel."

Speaker Redmond: "Karpel, how's she recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Lady's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove her."

Vinson: "Representative Satterthwaite. I...sorry, I see
her, she's not in her seat but I see her.
Representative Schisler."

Speaker Redmond: "Schisler, is he back there? How's he
recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Taylor."

Speaker Redmond: "Taylor, how's he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative VonBoeckman."

Speaker Redmond: "VonBoeckman back there? He's down front here, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Representative Sharp."

Speaker Redmond: "Sharp here? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him (sic)."

Vinson: "Representative White?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's here?"

Vinson: "Representative William...I..sorry, I see him. Mrs. Younge."

Speaker Redmond: "She's...she's here. She's here."

Vinson: "Representative Watson."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Watson here? How's Watson recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Schneider."

Speaker Redmond: "Schneider here. How's he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Abramson."

Speaker Redmond: "Is he here? Abramson here? How's he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Representative Polk."

Speaker Redmond: "Polk, is Polk here? How's he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him. Anything further?"

Vinson: "No further questions."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? 106 'aye', Representative McPike, 'aye'. Representative Mugalian, with McPike it's 107 'aye'. Representative McAuliffe...McAuliffe 'no'. Does that change the count, Mr. Clerk? It's 106 'aye'. Representative Mugalian 'aye'. That's 107 'aye'. How many 'no'? 24 'no' and the motion having received three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails and House Bill 3614 is declared passed notwithstanding the specific recommendations of the Governor for change. It's the intention of the Chair to give every Member an opportunity to have his matters heard today. Although we will be in full Session tomorrow probably have 176 Members tomorrow, but just to make sure why I think everybody who has something on the Calendar today should be given the opportunity. Now there's some matters here that the Governor's Office has requested that we call. On page two, under the order of Third Reading, 3626. I think that was returned to Second Reading, was it not Mr. Peters? 3626, okay. Any action on 3626? Just...is that on Third, it's on Second, then."

Clerk O'Brien: "It's on Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "You want to leave it there? Didn't...did we not return that today, to Second? Then we're waiting for Amendment nine to be printed so we'll just

hold that one their. Is that right? Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker that's on 3629."

Speaker Redmond: "Well I called 3626, will you please advise me of the status of 3626?"

Peters: "My understanding, Mr. Speaker is that is in the right...."

Speaker Redmond: "Well let's have the Clerk tell us what the posture is. Where is 3626? It is on Second Reading. It is being held there for what reason? Amendment number nine has not yet been printed or distributed so...it is now?"

Peters: "It...it has been distributed, Mr. Speaker. I...I'm sorry, it is my error, I had the numbers mixed. This is an Amendment which is sponsored by Representative Mautino which he explained earlier, we held it because there was objections to the fact the Amendment was not distributed. I would join Representative Mautino now in moving adoption of Amendment number nine."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion. Question is on the motion to adopt Amendment number nine to House Bill 3626. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried. Amendment number nine is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Another one we have to take is 3638, Representative Friedrich. It's now on Second Reading on page two."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, this is a revisionary Bill to one that Representative Yourell introduced last year. It

has to do with the mandate of duties to units of local government. The Reference Bureau found problems with it so...Repre...with Representative Yourell the Illinois Information Service, your Parliamentarian and other we have worked up some Amendments. Now, Representative Yourell has already introduced Amendment but I'm going to yield to him because I think he wants to withdraw his Amendments and I move to adopt Amendment number three. Representative Yourell."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House I ask leave to withdraw Amendment number One and Amendment number Two, to House Bill 3638."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Yourell, amends House Bill 3638 on page four by deleting line eight and nine and so forth."

Yourell: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #3 incorporates both Amendments #1 and Amendments #2 and another Amendment that the Reference Bureau found would be better suited to the provisions of the Mandated Acts Program that as you know takes affect January 1st, 1981. These are merely technical Amendments for the most part and I move the adoption of Amendment #3 to House Bill 3638."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Yourell moved the adoption of Amendment 3. All in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried, Amendment's adopted. Any further

Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "If you leave me alone, I'll get them."

Matijevich: "...Speaker and Members of the House, if that's all the Bills that have been moved from...returned to Second and moved to Third, there has been an agreement on both sides of the aisle that we suspend Rule 35C so that these Bills on Third Reading can be passed today. I...do we have leave and use the Attendance Roll Call for that purpose?"

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

Bowman: "Well, Speaker there's another Bill on Third Reading 3633 by Representative Catania and myself. We have an Amendment that we'd like to offer on Second and like to have that considered...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania has indicated that and if everybody will be quiet and sit down and take their turn we will get to everybody."

Bowman: "Well, we can still have leave at this time so that all of those Bills that were returned to Second and moved to Third can be heard on Third Reading today. That agreement has been reached on both sides of the aisle."

Speaker Redmond: "Would repeat that please?"

Peters: "All of the Bills that were returned to Second for the purpose of an Amendment and moved to Third Reading today can be passed on Third Reading today in suspension of Rule 35C."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Does that include House Bill 3628?"

Speaker Redmond: "No, that wasn't returned to Second Reading."

Vinson: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on Representative Matijevich's motion that...that the Bills amended today on Second Reading be moved to Third and voted on today. Yeah...will you read the Bill numbers, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Bills involved are House Bill 3627, no excuse me 3626, which was amended today. House Bill 3631 and House Bill 3638."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the motion, those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Piel."

Piel: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, where are these three Bills that he's talking about up here on the Calendar?"

Speaker Redmond: "Page two, I believe are they not, Mr. Clerk? On page two under the order of House Bills, Third Reading."

Piel: "3638. Okay, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 113 'aye' and 4 'no' and the motion carried. Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I hate to bring up the subject of House Bill 3633 again."

Speaker Redmond: "I was going to go to that."

Bowman: "Okay, but...but my...staff just informs me that Bill was not included in the list of Bills that...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker if we allow Representative Bowman to bring his Bill back to Second Reading, add the Amendment he wants and then pass the motion that Representative Matijevich suggested for your Bill, we will be in the proper posture, okay? It was...Woody it was not included because we didn't get your Amendment on it."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, it hadn't been returned to the order of Second Reading...."

Peters: "It hadn't...right..."

Speaker Redmond: "...so it wasn't encompassed in the Amendment..."

Bowman: "...okay, I'm glad we clarified this because when I got up to query the Chair earlier, I thought...the response I got was that 3633 was on the list. Okay, it is not. We have to do it again?"

Speaker Redmond: "You have to return it to the order of Second Reading, on the order of House Bills, Third Reading appears 3633, Representative Bowman is recognized. Representative Bowman requests that it be returned to the order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. 3633 on the order of Second Reading, are there any Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment number Two, Bowman, amends House Bill 3633 on page one, line 16 by deleting, '76-CC, 15-85 and so forth'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think....the Board shows Amendment number One, that was adopted in Committee."

Now, Amendment number Two, which has my name on it, was...is not necessary and I ask leave to withdraw because it is the same as number One."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment number Two is withdrawn, any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment number Three, Bowman, amends House Bill 3633 on page one, line 6 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment number Three is an Amendment that adds \$20,000 to the original \$69,000, requested because the...and we'll get to the substance of the Bill later but the basic Bill provides for personal service reimbursement for certain people who have received FEPC awards and the Bill as originally introduced did not have monies in there for retirement, social security and attorney's fees which...to which they're entitled. When the Bill came out of Committee yesterday I...I told the Committee Members that I'd be offering an Amendment like this on the floor and...and so this simply adds in the fringes and the attorney's fees to go along with the personal services. It expands the Bill by about \$20,000 and I ask it's...move it's adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment Three. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it, the motion carried, Amendment is adopted, any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Peters."

Peters: "Speaker, now...now I would move with your permission that House Bill 3633...that the appropriate rule 35C be suspended so that Bill can be heard today if that becomes the Speaker's intention."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. 89 votes. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record, on this question there is 90...118 'aye' and 13 'no'. The motion carries. Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker on a parliamentary inquiry. On the previous motion, the Clerk read that the Bills affected were House Bill 3626, 3631 and 3638."

Speaker Redmond: "Correct."

Pullen: "The Calendar shows 3638 on Second Reading today not on Third Reading, it seems to me that it could not have been brought back from Third Reading to Second for Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "It was read a second time. We moved that to the order of Third Reading not too long ago. It was...well that's right, you don't have to but it can be...it can be voted on today."

Pullen: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills, Third Reading, 3625. It's the intention of the Chair to call everyone's Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3625, a Bill for an Act to appropriate certain monies to the Department of Public Health, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 3625 appropriates \$17,500 to the Department

of Public Health for 3,500 rape evidence collection kits to be distributed to hospitals all over the State of Illinois. The money that is now available to them came from the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission and will run out at the end of December. This money is necessary now, so that there can be uninterrupted distribution of these kits. The Bill came out of the Appropriations Committee unanimously and I ask for your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House I would urge that the Members of the House support Representative Catania in this measure."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Dunn, do you seek recognition? When you're from Notre Dame, you're faced the wrong way. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 124 'aye' and 7 'no' having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 3626, Representative Peters."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3626, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act...provide appropriations to certain agencies..."

Speaker Redmond: "Quinn is looking..."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr....Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3626 provides supplemental monies to

the Department of Public Health in the sum of \$11,812,000 all of which is federal money for the women and children's programs, to the Department of Ageing as discussed earlier on the adoption of the Amendment in the amount of roughly \$9,000,000 for their special and nutritional services programs, to the Department of Mental Health in the sum of \$525,000 supplemental to individual schools and institutions. To the Comptroller \$1,500 in mileage expenses, to the Department of Conservation, \$20,000 for the construction of boat ramp and immersion control in Lake Depue and makes other transfers in the budget of the Department of Public Health in order to provide some \$25,000 for the purchase of additional formula used...used for PKU screening and such other Amendments as were discussed when the measure was first brought before the Committee and before the House. I would respectfully request the approval of the House of House Bill 3626."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 128 'aye' and 8 'no', the Bill having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 3631...Matijevich."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3631, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Capital Development Board for certain permanent improvements, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3631 as amended is an appropriation to the Capital Development Board for the Illinois Community College Board for the correction of construction defects at certain community colleges in Illinois. The Danville Area Community College, Illinois Eastern Community College, Rend Lake College and Triton College. This is an agreement that is finally been reached with the Illinois Community College Board, CDB and the Governor's Office through the Bureau of the Budget. This is very, very necessary and if there were a further delay in the construction it would lead to a 13% increase due to inflation. So I would urge the Membership to vote...support House Bill 3631 as amended."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Would the Sponsor please tell us what action the Capital Development Board has taken against the contractors who apparently did not build these projects adequately."

Matijevich: "They're dragging their feet."

Skinner: "And we're bailing them out?"

Matijevich: "There's...no, there's been...been one lawsuit but that has not been at the instigation of the CDB but I believe the Triton College did institute a lawsuit. There will be further lawsuits, I might say that the present Capital Development Board has done a much better job than the prior administration and I think we've done a much...much better job in averting this type of situation and I'm sure we won't have

these problems in the future. "

Skinner: "Well, I'm not as worried about the future as I am about the past. Do you have any reason to believe that the Capital Development Board is going to take legal action against contractors which built faulty projects for junior colleges?"

Matijevich: "There...I am told that there...they are reviewing it and there are pending court actions that will result."

Skinner: "They've been reviewing it three or four or five years, to the best of my knowledge."

Matijevich: "But we...we are certain that there will be court actions very soon, from my staff support."

Skinner: "Hope springs eternal, I guess."

Matijevich: "It sure does, Cal."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is shall this Bill...Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just a point of clarification and frankly to say that Representative Skinner is correct. Legislation I passed two years ago said the State would indeed pay for 100% of the cost of reconstruction in cases such as we're now talking about. However, part of that legislation told the Capital Development Board to look into the possibilities of the contractors errors and to bring suit when necessary. That has not happened, the only case that is now pending is Carl Sandburg Junior College in Galesburg has filed suit that...that is in court and frankly so is their reconstruction cost of that particular program, however it has not happened

and we need to do something to tell them that those....these suits should be brought forward, they need investigating, we've set on them long enough and it's about time that we've got some kind of action out of the legal department of the Capital Development Board."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 110 'aye' and 26 'no' and having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 20...3629. Representative Peters."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3629, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act making appropriations to ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Children and Family Services, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's supplemental appropriation to the Department of Children and Family Services. It makes changes in various a...line items with a net reduction of \$12,800 in GRF funds, a reduction in GRF funds and it appropriates new federal monies which are presently here in the amount of approximately \$700,000 and approximately two and a half million which are anticipated should the Federal Government pass or the...Federal Congress pass its total budget as well as \$70,000 which the Department has received from a private...private foundation for the purposes of

looking into the problems of foster care and adoption care. The total measure as I indicated is 12....a minus twelve thousand eight hundred dollars in GRF, a plus three million and two in Federal funds should all of that money arrive and 70,000 in special...those special purpose funds for the study which was given by the Connel Foundation. The monies from the Federal Government that will be used by the Department to develop a program for adoptions and the hiring of attorneys, the hiring of counselors and others that may be needed in order to establish a full and complete and comprehensive adoption program for the State of Illinois. I would respectfully request the support of both sides of the aisle as you have for this department these last couple years and continue give it the assistance it needs to provide the kinds of services it should be providing to needy children throughout the state. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield? Representative Peters, the I...I think the department has been suffering seriously from a lack of cooperation in times from the existing State's Attorneys and some of the 102 counties of the State of Illinois. The director had indicated some desire to hire their own attorneys, I heard you say something about some funds. Was this fund for a study to establish a program or was it for the purpose of actually hiring legal counsel in some of the severe child abuse cases so that the department can proceed even without the assistance of the State's Attorneys?"

Peters: "Representative, the answer to your question really is...is yes to both parts. There is \$70,000 here of private monies which were received by the department from the Atta...Edna McDonald Foundation to study the entire area of child abuse and child adoption and foster care. Now we can't spend that until we get the appropriation through here. The monies that are coming from the Federal Government to implement the adoption program do in fact provide for the hiring of eleven attorneys in the department in order to assist them with the adoption problems and to assist them in...in whatever problems there may be with the State's Attorneys throughout the various counties."

Brummer: "Thank you, I think that's very necessary and I urge support."

Peters: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Question is shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 139 'aye' and 2 'no' and the Bill having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. 3628, Representative Chapman."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3628, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Board of Education, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, this is a supplemental appropriation to the State Board of Education..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson for what purpose do

you rise?"

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker I believe the rules provide a precedent, provided that when a motion to recommit on a Bill that is filed, that that has precedence over the Bill and has to be debated first. I filed that motion, it's on the Supplemental Calendar and I would like that motion to be called and debated at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Parliamentarian come here. Vinson we'll take this out of the record until the Parliamentarian gets here. 3633, Representative Bowman."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3633, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the state Comptroller to pay the claims of victims of unfair employment practices committed by state agencies, Third Reading of the Bill."

Bowman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I refer the Membership to Amendment number Three which spells everything out in detail basically this is an appropriation of \$89,000 to six....I believe it's six individuals who have received awards by the Fair Employment Practices Commission, the State Court of Claims dismissed them on the grounds of a change in Attorney General's policy which has now been reversed so this...these people got caught in the switches if their cases would come up in another few months they probably would have gone sailing through so that's why this Bill is introduced, the \$89,000. I ask approval of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Question is shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote

'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 96 'aye', 36 'no'. Representative Bowman. Representative Catania."

Catania: "Is it still on?"

Speaker Redmond: "What did you say?"

Catania: "Can people still vote? No, it's locked in. I'd like to explain my vote, if I may."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Catania: "The reason for this Bill is that eight people were told by the Fair Employment Practices Commission acting under the statutes that they were entitled to awards but when they went to the Court of Claims they were not given the awards because the Attorney's General office reversing an earlier policy came in and said they couldn't have the awards. These are now all in various stages of litigation which would end up costing the state a great deal more money to fight rather than to just permit these awards to be made. Attorney General Fahner and the director of the Department of Human Rights have agreed to work this out so that we will not have any of these kinds of problems in the future but in the meantime these eight people have been waiting for their awards. Some for a number of years and this is to simply clean up that problem and I ask for your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rea."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How's Representative Rea recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting

'present'."

Rea: "Please vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the Gentleman 'aye'. Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Well I'd like to Poll the Absentees if doesn't get up...107...there's other people like Representative Rea being so good to me."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hallstrom.....Representative Hallstrom, 'aye'. Representative Frederick 'aye'. Anyone else desire to vote? Request has been made for a Poll of the Absentees, Mr. Clerk poll the Absentees. Frederick voted 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the Absentees, Abramson. Bell. Bluthardt. Borchers. Burnidge. Capuzi. Casey. Davis. Dawson. Domico. Ralph Dunn. Epton. Flinn. Hanahan. Harris. Henry. Huff. Johnson. Karpziel. Klosak. Kosinski. Laurino. McBroom. McCourt. McMaster. Neff. Oblinger. Polk. Reed. Robbins. Ronan. Sandquist. Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Schraeder. Stanley. Stearney. E. G. Steele. C. M. Stiehl. Totten. Wikoff. And Yourell."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "First I'd like to know like to know what the count is at this point and then I have parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the count? 99 'aye'."

Bowman: "My inquiry Mr. Speaker, is...if this were to receive 89 votes as...as it has...then and it were passed by the Senate and the Governor were to sign it by the end of this year, could it not become law?"

Speaker Redmond: "I'm waiting for the Parliamentarian, he's...somebody stole him. Representative Yourell 'aye'. Representative Walsh 'no'. Parliamentarian has returned. Okay, this...this number has...this Bill has 99 votes. 3633 and the question is does it need 107 or will 89 do. 107 votes. Representative Deuster 'no'. Polk 'aye'. Representative Huskey...Representative Bowman. Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "I'd like to have this placed on the order of Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Consideration. 3640...3634. David I got another question for you, don't run away."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3634, a Bill for an Act to making appropriations for certain claims against the State of Illinois, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 3634 makes a supplemental appropriation for our payments of award made by the Court of Claims for FY'81. The total of \$643,000 to the Court of Claim for payment of claims which was not made prior to FY'81 appropriation. The appropr....appropriation is composed of \$571,000 of GRF funds, \$29,000 of Road funds, \$5,000 Working Capital Revolving fund, \$30,000 from the Statistical Service Revolving fund and \$36,000...Federal Trust fund. Mr. Speaker and there's nothing in there for 'Medley Movers'. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move for the adoption of the passage of 3634."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I would join with Representative Taylor in asking for approval of the House of the awards that he indicates here. All of them, all 82 of the awards have been approved by the Court of Claims and staff has checked all of them out with the Auditor General. Medley Movers is not in here, the Conti construction company however is. It's a little new...a little new wrinkle. I would join with Represent...Representative Taylor in asking for passage of this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 128 'aye' and 4 'no'. The Bill having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On Supplemental Calendar number Two appears House Bill, Third Reading, 3638, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Well, Mr. Speaker I'll yield to Representative Yourell, if he's on the floor."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3638, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the State Mandates Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3638 with the Amendment #3 now is the revisory Bill to the Mandated Acts legislation that will go into effect on January 1st, 1981. All of the...all...the Amendment...all the Amendment did was

to make the change...suggested by the Reference Bureau, the Comptroller and the Administrative Rules Committee and I move for a favorable vote on House Bill 3638."

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

Pullen: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell, will you yield? Indicates he will."

Pullen: "Would you please describe the provision of the Bill concerning the opting in by home rule units and reimbursement for that."

Yourell: "Yes, the...the Comptroller indicated through conversations with Representative Friedrich and myself that they will a portion the claims into three equal installments and...and direct the Comptroller to pay the installments at equal intervals....intervals throughout the remainder of the fiscal year. Is that what you were referring to?"

Pullen: "No, I'm referring to home rule units."

Yourell: "That's on page eleven, and line nine and they shall notify the agency responsible for distributing the funds and that agency shall direct the Comptroller and the...requires the statement of statewide policy objections shall be published in the Illinois Register at the same time at the first notice under Section 5.1 is established."

Pullen: "Is it not that the case that when the Bill was introduced there was a provision in the Bill permitting home rule units to opt in to the mandated."

Yourell: "No."

Pullen: "Why is that in the synopsis?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich for purpose do you rise?"

Friedrich: "I believe in fairness Representative Younge...Yourell made the wrong answer, it was in the Bill it was amended out. There is no provision now for the home rule units to opt in or out."

Pullen: "I hope you're right."

Friedrich: "...as amended."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Question is shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Schneider will you stay in your seat? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 120 'aye' and 1 'no' and the Bill having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. Supplemental Calendar number One on the Order of Motions, House Joint Resolution 111, Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker...what's the number? House Joint Resolution 111 is request by the Committee which was investigating the Chicago ...which is investigating the Chicago school crisis. Our original reporting date was December the first, we have completed all the hearings, we have gathered all the testimony, we are in the process of writing the report after spending the last two days or so as a commission trying to put it all together. We decided we probably need a little bit more time. So it's the request of the Committee and of this Resolution to extend that reporting date from December the one to

January 13, 1981 and I would ask support for that motion. I'm sorry the motion in proper language, I understand is for immediate consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Question is on the Gentleman's motion that House Joint Resolution number 111 be placed on the Speaker's Table for immediate consideration. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all reported who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 122 'aye' and no 'nay' and the motion prevails. Representative Schneider on the adoption of the Resolution. Representative Ewing 'aye'."

Schneider: "Now, Mr. Speaker and Members I'd like to after my explanation I just gave you about the need for the extension to adopt the Resolution on the basis of that...those notions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 111. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried and the Resolution's adopted. Representative Ryan here? On the Supplemental Calendar #1, House Joint Resolution 112, Representative Pechous."

Pechous: "Yes Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, HJR 112 is filed pursuant to Rule 41A and therein I move to place that same matter on the Speaker's Table for Immediate Consideration. It relates to the extension of time for the Special Legislative Committee convened under HJR 72 for the purpose of evaluating the Illinois National Guard. And so I would first ask that the HJR 112 be place on

the Speaker's Table for Immediate Consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the motion. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 127 'aye' and no 'nay'. The motion carries. Representative Pechous on the motion for the adoption of the Resolution."

Pechous: "Yes, I move now, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 112 which will extend the reporting date of the Special Joint Legislative Committee on the Illinois National Guard as formulated under HJR 72, that same be extended...the reporting date be extended from September 30th, 1980 to January 14th, 1981. All hearings have been concluded. A report was determined to be made this morning at a meeting, the Committee is jointly chaired by our colleague, Representative Mahar and in the Senate by Senator George Sangmeister and I would ask for your favorable consideration at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the House Joint Resolution 112. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carried, the Resolution's adopted. On page eight, under the Order of Motions appears motion...House Resolution 1005, Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Rule 41A, I move to place on the Speaker's Table for Immediate Consideration, House Resolution 1005 in order to

implement the Resolution we would need to have action so that a Committee could be set up to report before the end of the Session."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question's on the Lady's motion. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Would the Spons...will the Sponsor tell us the nature of the Resolution?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Yes, Representative Madigan what I'm asking is that a Committee of six Members of the House be set up to compare the method by which the Department of Insurance and the Department of Personnel deal with rate increases for group health insurance policies. As you're probably aware the state employee policies come under one and other policies under the other."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is...this Committee would be dup...duplicative of an Advisory Committee that I serve on that already exists in our government. We...Representative Vinson is a member of this Committee as is myself and we very carefully went over Blue Cross Blue Shield's bid and we even as a matter of fact were able to get them to return over \$200,000 to the State as part of the re....allowing them to rebid. I...I just don't...really don't see the need for a special committee to consider this when there is already a commission which is...which has considered it. And therefore I would oppose the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "In response to that, this really is not

duplicative. What you say is true, that in fact there is a commission that deals with the process under the Department of Personnel. There is a different process for other policies under the Department of Insurance. What I would simply like is to have a committee of a few Members of the House, who can sit down together and delineate the differences in responsibility of the two departments and the differences in the mechanism because a number of constituents in my district look at the two systems and try to compare them and they find that it is not easy to make comparison. I think if we put some of these differences into a report it will be more obvious to them why one department may make one conclusion and another department another."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I....I rise in opposition to the Lady's motion. I think Representative Cullerton is exactly right. This House in its wisdom has agreed that the State Employee's Group Insurance Advisory Commission have jurisdiction over matters of this kind and I really think appointing another committee of Legislators to look over the shoulder of that Commission is duplicative and I...I think that we should defeat the...the Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite to close."

Satterthwaite: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House as I tried to indicate I do not feel that this Committee that I'm asking for would be duplicative of what is done under the Department of Personnel. What I would like is a group that could sit down together and delineate the differences or the similarities in

the way the issues are handled for various kinds of group policies. I can understand that the people who serve on the Commission that operates under the Department of Personnel feel that they have done a good job and I do not really know that they have not done a good job. I assume that they have done but I am saying that that is a different process than the one under the Department of Insurance. It is confusing to the constituents, it is confusing to me and I would find it very helpful if I could have some Members of the House help to sort through these procedures and come up with documentation about why decisions can be made to go for an increase in one department and against an increase in another department. I'm sure the responsibilities are different and I would just like to delineate those. I would ask your support for the passage of my motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question. The question's on the Lady's motion , that pursuant to Rule 41A that House Resolution 1005 be placed on the Speaker's Table for Immediate Consideration. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. 107 votes required. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 74 'aye' and 45 'no', the motion fails. Revert back to page two, 3628, Representative Chapman. The Bill was called for passage, Representative Vinson raised a point of order and his point is well taken. On Calen...Supplemental Calendar #1 appears a motion with respect to House Bill 3628 by Representative Vinson. Representative Vinson is recognized."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Yesterday we had a meeting of the Appropriations II Committee. A meeting that we hope could be quickly dispensed with. This particular Bill came up in that meeting. It was a...Bill of some importance because it's a Bill that appropriates some 13.3 million dollars. Beyond that it's a Bill totally occasioned by a bureaucratic mistake. Now, the problem with the Bill when we may have to eventually pass the Bill, the problem with the Bill and the problem with the deliberations in Committee are...that Representative Bower was cut off in his questioning. I was cut off in my questioning of the witnesses and we eventually had a process that virtually amounted to the proxy voting of one member of the Committee. The problem with the...with that whole thing is that we can get to the point where we have a 13.3 million dollar Bill. We can get to the point where a bureaucrat can make an error, we can't find out why and the taxpayers suffer. There's no reason to think that won't happen next year. I think there was a message sent in this election. I think there is a message sent that we should control State spending. I think there is a message sent that we should control the bureaucrats. The worst thing we could do would be to try to pass this Bill in its form with inadequate deliberation. Now, many of you and I think probably myself are going to eventually be compelled to vote for this Bill because of that bureaucrats error but I think before we do that we ought to make very certain that that bureaucrat doesn't make the error again and

I think we ought to make very certain that that process is not repeated. I don't believe that we should ratify that error, that mistake by simply appropriating that 13.3 million dollars. Representative Bower and I simply wanted to pursue the details of why the error was made so that it would not be repeated. I would ask people to vote yes on this motion. We can come back to Committee with the Bill we can consider the Bill, have adequate deliberation on the Bill, make sure that the prophylactic changes that are necessary are taken and come back with the Bill on the floor. This is not a vote against the Bill this is simply a vote to have adequate deliberation in Committee to not have proxy voting to not have Members cut off and I would ask that virtually everybody on both sides of the aisle do this because these kinds of processes could be continued in the future and I would hope that we'd have a spirit of fairness and that we would discourage those sorts of things in the next two years. So I would urge a yes vote on the motion. A motion to simply reconsider the Bill in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, I am just so concerned that Mr. Vinson has the perception he has of what occurred in the Committee yesterday. Let me refresh him in terms of his memory. Mr. Vinson talked at length and Mr. Bower both of them talked at length, I'm sure that the fact that the Revenue Committee was meeting and one of our Members is also on that Committee and was eager to leave and requested permission to vote since there was

a motion before us and we had had a full presentation of the Bill. I'm sure that...that his...his memory has failed and he doesn't remember that there was no attempt to cut the Gentleman off but rather a simple request that after a full presentation of the Bill that a...that a Member who was on another Committee with a...a double responsibility, one to each Committee wished to vote since the motion, do pass motion had already been made and Mr. Vinson objected to letting the Member vote since she had another Committee to attend. That another Member moved the previous question, there was a vote on the issue, the motion to go to the previous question prevailed. It was clear that the Committee agreed with me, that the questioning really wasn't for the purpose of getting at the fact but was simply dilatory to keep us from coming to a vote and it might be that Mr. Vinson might still be talking and we might still be waiting to vote on this Bill which is urgently needed for local school districts, local school districts by law have spent these dollars for school bus transportation, for our students, we have committed ourselves to a statutory requirement of 80% of the funding and I guess maybe Mr. Vinson wants to avoid saying that he doesn't want to meet this statutory commitment, that he wants local school boards that are financially pressed to have to reach down in their pockets, reach down into the local taxpayer's pockets and come up with the dollars that we have committed ourselves to, to our local school districts through our statutes. I ask that you vote 'no' on Mr. Vinson's motion so that we can do what's

right for the school children of this state, for the taxpayers of this state, for the...for the mothers and fathers of school boards of this state and that we insist that Mr. Vinson, if he's opposed to the Bill at least have the courage to vote 'no' on the Bill and let his local school districts know where he stands. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer, you seeking recognition?"

Brummer: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman's moved the previous question. The question is shall the main question be put. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move that Mr. Vinson's motion lie on the table. And I would like to address my motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "I believe that if you read the contents of Rule 34, that that's an improper motion. I believe that the debate must be on this motion. It can be on nothing else until this motion is laid to rest."

Speaker Redmond: "What subsection? Representative Vinson?"

Vinson: "Just to give the Parliamentarian a couple of other things to think about... I think that Mr. Madigan's attempt to try to address his motion, even if his motion were permissible would be entirely out of order. The motion to table is never debatable and that's what he's trying to do. And I think that in addition to that, it's certainly dilatory because of the effect of his motion is exactly the same as the vote on my motion... Got down to 107 too."

Speaker Redmond: "The motion to table is in order. It's

higher priority than the motion to recommit under Rule 61-A. What did you say?"

Vinson: "He can't debate the motion though, can he?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, it's in order..."

Vinson: "Debating the motion's in order?"

Speaker Redmond: "It's not debatable. The motion is in order, but it's not debatable. Representative Van Dwyne."

Van Dwyne: "What happened to Representative Brummer's motion to move the previous question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we're on that I guess. In a different way. Different way, different way. The question now is on Representative Madigan's motion to table Representative Vinson's motion to recommit. Those in favor of the motion to table vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 79 'aye' and 52 'no'. The motion carries. Representative Ewell, 'aye'. We go back to the main motion which is Representative Chapman's Bill, 3628. Representative Chapman."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3628, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Board of Education for Fiscal Year 1981. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, this is supplemental appropriation to the State Board of Education. It provides for an additional nine million, six hundred and twenty-eight thousand for transportation for regular and vocational education pupils and three million, seven hundred ten thousand for transportation for special education

pupils. These funds will reimburse local School Districts in Fiscal '81. I think what's important to recognize is that the expenditures have all been made by the local School Districts because they submit their bills for last year in this year. Our present formula calls which is statutory, for what is roughly an 80% funding of the costs of school bus transportation. So, if we do not provide these dollars, not only will we not be funding their expenses 100%, but what we actually will be doing is paying out to them 93% of 80% or, in the case of the regular transportation claims, 87.4% of 80%. The School Districts have been required to make these expenditures by law. By law we have stated that we would reimburse them under a particular formula. We will only be able to provide 100% of the allowable costs if this appropriation does pass. The issue here is whether we will fund the transportation claims at 100% of the formula. Failure to provide the supplemental appropriation will impact directly on the individual School Districts, your School Districts and my School Districts, which will have to absorb the portion of the claims not met by the state. This will accentuate financial hardships for our School Districts. I urge you to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "Any... Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would urge a 'no' or at least a 'present' vote on this and I would urge that because what we're really dealing with here given the machinations of Representative Madigan and Chairman Chapman, is the

complete abrogation of minority rights. Now, I'm learning to be less and less concerned with that as I come through the General Assembly and I suspect that I'll be far less concerned with it next month. But at this point, I think it's still an appropriate thing. I think we ought to defeat the Bill because it was not considered in Committee. I think we ought to defeat the Bill because we don't know that the same process will not be repeated again next year. And I think we ought to defeat the Bill most of all because of the kind of process by which the survey was taken, by which the error was made. The State Board of Education only surveyed ten districts in arriving at the figure that was in error. I think that's totally inappropriate and I think we have to send a message to them on that. I would urge a 'no' vote and again, Mr. Speaker, I would request a verification if it gets the sufficient number."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As Cosponsor of this piece of legislation, I was in the Appropriations Committee yesterday. I think the issue has to remain that we fully intended to fully fund the 100% of the 80% for the transportation and so did the Governor. Now, there's been discussion about the fact that the State Board of Education made the error and that's absolutely right. But I do agree with my colleague on this side of the aisle when he says that we have no indication of what's going to happen to not allow this to happen again. The State Superintendent of Schools

came to that meeting and testified. He said we made the error. It is not the fault of the local public School Districts. He did admit as to the system that they were using. He also admitted that's the wrong system. They are things going on right now as far as the way they're handling it. It's already in operation. Please don't let whether it's party problems, whatever, don't let that come in-between the facts, that you, as a State Legislature, we, said we were going to fully fund this. The Governor said we were going to fully fund it. The schools counted on that. The State Board made the error. Please don't penalize our local School Districts for that. And know that that's going to be changed. That the system now will not allow this to happen again. I urge you to vote for this piece of legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "If anyone wants to take this out, this mistake out on the State Board of Education, there's way to do it, but defeating this Bill is not that way. The way to do it is to take it out of the State Board Education's administrative budget. And that could be done merely by amending the appropriations Bill that we passed last year. I would suggest that what we're doing if we defeat this Bill is sending a message to local School Districts that we are not to be counted upon when we say we're going to fully fund the state formulas. And I personally resent my local districts having to cough up extra money out of local property tax dollars to have to bail out a mistake of the State Board of Education. And that's the reason I'm going

to vote for this Bill because I don't want them to have to bail.. to have to increase property taxes or to have to spend our property taxes on this when the state's supposed to come up with the money."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bower."

Bower: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I intend to support this Bill because to vote against it would be penalizing the School Districts of this state who in good faith relied upon the bureaucratic error and upon a commitment made by the General Assembly. But I think the record should be made clear as Representative Vinson attempted to. That a full hearing was not held on this Bill yesterday. The Chairman of the Appropriations Committee tried to cut off the questions I had which was very merely to find out what the problem was that created a more than 13 million dollar error in this formula. Representative Vinson tried to further explore that area and was cut off. I have served the last two years on two different Committees chaired by the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee and it's been characterized by any time the testimony was going in a way that she liked, it could go on for hours. But if it went in such a way she did not like, she attempted to cut it off. I think that all we were trying to do yesterday was to find out why an error was made that now the General Assembly has to correct, which School Districts relied upon in good faith. I say again, I will vote for the Bill because it would be to penalize the School Districts that relied upon in good faith, but a full hearing was not held."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Chapman to close."

Chapman: "Your vote shows simply this, will you keep your promise to local School Districts to fund 100% of allowable costs under the laws which the State of Illinois has on their books? Or will you make them dig down in their pockets, showing them one more time that we do not keep our word. We do not keep our promises. If this is your decision, then certainly there may be some added reluctance on the part of some folk to believe us when we say that we are going to fund 100% of all busing, whether we're talking about ...that the state statute provides and that would include the public school busing. I'm voting for 1812 when it comes up because I had hoped that we meant what we said that 100% of the costs would be borne by the state. The way to show that we keep our promises is to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Peters to explain his vote."

Peters: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask the Members on our side of the aisle certainly, and hopefully the Members on the other side of the aisle to consider very carefully what we are doing and the postures we may be getting

ourselves into. It was not long that we constantly had supplemental budgets because of the fact departments purposely came in and underestimated what they would need. They looked good and the General Assembly ended up looking bad. We have that same kind of problem here. We have it with the Scholarship Commission. We have it in a number of other kinds of agencies. I think it's a very bad kind of situation where we end up passing supplemental appropriations because the initial agency did not end up figuring up whatever they say they figured wrong. We are in a sense left at a disadvantage. We are left only taking their word as to what really happened. It puts us in a bad spot. It puts us in a bad spot with our School Boards, with our local taxpayers, with everybody else. This may be for some people a tough pill to swallow in terms of voting 'present' or 'no' on this one. But I assure you if we end up setting the example to the Office of Education and the bureaucrats and other agencies of government that we are not going to end up responding every time they cry wolf, they are going to keep a lot better figures and do a lot better job of presenting their testimony and their information for us and we won't have the hassle with our local people because of the mistakes the other agencies made. I would ask that you join with us in either voting 'no' or voting 'present' on this issue."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 90 'aye' and 18 'no'. Having failed to receive the necessary three-fifths Constitutional

Majority, the Bill is hereby declared lost. Anybody have anything on the Calendar that has to go tonight? Representative Barnes. Representative Barnes. Anybody... Don't yell at me now. Anybody have anything that has to go tonight? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "No. Only I see everybody rustling. I wanted to announce the Appropriations I Committee, there is not a hearing tomorrow morning. There is not a meeting..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative... Representative Chapman, an announcement?"

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, there will be a meeting of Appropriations II tomorrow morning at nine a.m. We will be considering the substance of those Senate appropriations Bills that are on the Senate Calendar now in the hopes of providing an opportunity an in-depth consideration so that we may be able to give a speedier consideration to them next week."

Speaker Redmond: "How long will it take?"

Chapman: "We estimate that we will be completed by 11:00 a.m."

Speaker Redmond: "Eleven o'clock. So you're in at nine, is that correct?"

Chapman: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wyvetter Younge."

Younge: "I'd like 3027 called."

Speaker Redmond: "Where is it?"

Younge: "It's on page five at the bottom of the page. It's a motion to override a veto."

Speaker Redmond: "You want to go with that now? We're in

Session again tomorrow. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, while she's making up her mind, I'm told by Bruce Richmond also that green sheet that tells about schedule of Committees, somehow said the Appropriations I Committee is meeting Monday. I don't where they got that. That's a misprint from somebody. We are surely not meeting Monday."

Speaker Redmond: "It's on the schedule. That's in Las Vegas."

Matijevich: "Well, I'll be there."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge?"

Younge: "I'll wait till tomorrow."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Representative Ryan, Death Resolution. Death Resolution, former Member. Please."

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 1015, Ryan. Whereas, our esteemed colleague, Vincent E. Molloy passed away November 16th of cancer, and whereas he had just been elected to his fifth term in the Illinois House, and whereas his years in the Legislature were marked with the dedication to serving his constituents that is a model to all of us, and whereas he served on the Financial Institutions and Public Utilities Committee in the House, and whereas he was former supervisor at the Credit Union Division at the Illinois Department of Financial Institutions and a member of the real estate profession, and whereas his service to this community also included membership in the Oak Park Regular Republican Organization since 1951, serving as Republican township committeeman since 1973, and holding many township offices, including auditor and

clerk, and whereas he has served as secretary and financial secretary of the Illinois Young Republican Organization and President of the Oak Park Young Republican Organization and as a member of the Board of Directors of the Family Service Association of Oak Park and River Forest, as treasurer of Cub Scout Pack 23, as area Chairman of the Community Chest and Red Cross funds, as Board Member of both fellowships and PTA and Boy Scout Troop 23, as Director and Treasurer of the Oak Park's Boys's Football Club, and where as he was a member of the Ascension Catholic Church in Oak Park and whereas he was preceded by death by his wife, Carla Jane and is survived by five children and his sister. Therefore, be it Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eighty-First General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that we offer our deepest sympathy to Representative Molloy's family and friends and be it further resolved that we acknowledge the loss of such a fine community servant who will be sadly missed by the residents of Oak Park, members of the real estate profession, his colleagues in the Illinois General Assembly, and all the organizations and groups to which he belonged. And be it further resolved that suitable copies of this Resolution and Preamble be presented to his daughter, Kathy, and to his sons Michael, Kevin, John and Tim, and to his sister, Mary, and be it further resolved that as a token of our grief that the House now stands adjourned."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I'd ask leave that the entire Membership

be added as Cosponsors."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Leave is granted."

Ryan: "Representative Molloy's death was somewhat of a surprise to me and I think to most of us on this side of the aisle. He became sick very fast and passed away very fast. But I think that the contributions that Vince made to his community and as was pointed out in the Resolution, to the young people of this state...there are many young folks, especially in his District, that are going to benefit from his actions and his community dedication and public service dedication. And, certainly the State of Illinois and this Body is going to miss Vince Molloy. And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to Representative Ted Meyer, if I may, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Vince Molloy was a Gentleman who loved his wife and family, liked his work and was proud to be a Member of this General Assembly. I'm sure that all of us will sorely miss him."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "Having been a Member of the Young Republicans with Vince, he was specially close to me and I campaigned for him when he first ran. And he's been a fine, warm Gentleman with a concern for all humanity over the years. It was nothing new with Vince. So with me, it's a special sorrow."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, as a Democrat, I would like to say that the Gentleman was really a Gentleman and we, on our

side, do mourn his absence and will miss him."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "I would ask for passage of the Resolution, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Peters?"

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, if I would, having served with Representative Molloy, not only here, but on the Republican Central Committee in Cook County, just say I think on behalf of all of us, eternal rest grant unto him, Oh, Lord. And may a perpetual light shine upon him. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on Representative Ryan's.. on the adoption of the Death Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. And the House will stand adjourned until eleven o'clock tomorrow morning."

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
NOVEMBER 20, 1980

PAGE 1

HB-0986	VETO	PAGE	85
HB-1009	VETO	PAGE	99
HB-1522	VETO	PAGE	118
HB-2227	VETO	PAGE	119
HB-2845	VETO	PAGE	75
HB-2847	VETO	PAGE	24
HB-2860	VETO	PAGE	35
HB-2892	VETO	PAGE	97
HB-3070	VETO	PAGE	124
HB-3153	VETO	PAGE	80
HB-3166	VETO	PAGE	28
HB-3167	VETO	PAGE	34
HB-3204	VETO	PAGE	40
	VETO	PAGE	71
HB-3230	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	74
HB-3271	VETO	PAGE	126
HB-3505	VETO	PAGE	64
HB-3542	VETO	PAGE	17
HB-3614	VETO	PAGE	127
HB-3625	3RD READING	PAGE	158
HB-3626	2ND READING	PAGE	9
	2ND READING	PAGE	152
	3RD READING	PAGE	159
HB-3628	3RD READING	PAGE	165
	3RD READING	PAGE	182
	MOTIONS	PAGE	177
HB-3629	3RD READING	PAGE	163
HB-3631	2ND READING	PAGE	15
	3RD READING	PAGE	160
HB-3633	2ND READING	PAGE	156
	3RD READING	PAGE	166
	MOTIONS	PAGE	158
HB-3634	3RD READING	PAGE	169
HB-3635	3RD READING	PAGE	16
HB-3636	2ND READING	PAGE	3
HB-3638	2ND READING	PAGE	152
	3RD READING	PAGE	170
HR-1005	MOTIONS	PAGE	174
HR-1014	1ST READING	PAGE	3
HR-1015	3RD READING	PAGE	190
HR-1020	3RD READING	PAGE	3
HR-1027	3RD READING	PAGE	3
HJR-0111	3RD READING	PAGE	173

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
NOVEMBER 20, 1980

PAGE 2

	MOTIONS	PAGE	172
HJR-0112	3RD READING	PAGE	174
	MOTIONS	PAGE	173

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
NOVEMBER 20, 1980

PAGE 3

SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REV. KRUEGER - PRAYER	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	2
CHANGE OF VOTES	PAGE	3
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	33
MOTION TO SUSPEND RULE 35C	PAGE	154
ANNOUNCEMENTS	PAGE	189
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	193

