

Speaker Telcser: "The House will come to order. The prayer this morning by Dr. Johnson."

Dr. Johnson: "We pray. Gracious Father we have invoked Your blessings upon this House of Representatives so very often during the days and the months of the 78th Assembly. We pray because You promised to hear us and because You tell us that blessed is that Nation whose God is the Lord. In the midst of our final deliberation we pause to thank and praise You because You have been in our midst. And we thank You for the strength of mind and body with which You have endowed us. We thank You for our labors and ask You to be with all of the Members of this House individually as they return to their respective homes or labors following this Session. We commend them, as all of our people, to Your continuing care and goodness, asking that Your benediction will rest upon them and upon us and upon the work of our hands done in this place. Bless them Lord and keep them and give them Your peace both now and forevermore. Amen."

Speaker Telcser: "Roll Call for attendance. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk Selcke: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of the Governor's Amendment to the Bill of the following title, House Bill #1133, concurred in by the Senate December 4th, 1974, Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of the Bill of the following title, the veto of the Governor, to the contrary, notwithstanding. House Bill 2769 passed the Senate December 4th, 1974, by a three-fifths vote, veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding, Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representa-



tives the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of the Bill with the following title, the Amendatory Veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. House Bill 2851 passed the Senate December 4th, 1974, by a three-fifths vote, the Amendatory Veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding, Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of the Bill with the following title, House Bill 2518, passed the Senate December 4th, 1974, Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of an item veto in a Bill of the following title. The item veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. House Bill 2416 passed the Senate December 4th, 1974, by a three-fifths vote. The item veto of the Governor, to the contrary, notwithstanding, Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the illustration of an item reduced by the Governor, in a Bill with the following title, House Bill 2264, concurred in by the Senate, December 4th, 1974, Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. No further messages."

Speaker Telcser: "...Calendar, on the order of amendatory veto motions. Representative Calvo on the floor?.. Collins? Geo-Karis? Want....Senate Bill 1452 called, Representative? Okay. On the order of amendatory veto motions appears Senate Bill 1527, for which purpose the Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Hirschfeld is recognized."

Hirschfeld: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, - I move that we accept the Governor's amendatory veto on Senate Bill 1527. All this did was delete



.....a clause from the Bill that would have grandfathered somebody into a job and we thought this was,.....the Governor's veto was proper and it should be deleted and therefore I would move to concur with the Governor's veto."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman has moved that the House do accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with regard to Senate Bill 1527. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "....Will the Gentleman yield.....to a question?"

Speaker Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Shea: "Is this one of the preemption Bills, Mr. Hirschfeld?"

Hirschfeld: "Right."

Shea: "Would you explain what the specific language of the amendatory veto did?"

Hirschfeld: "It deleted.....This was the sanitary engineers preemption Bill, Representative and it deleted the partit only deleted that part of the Bill that would have grandfathered a person into his job in Senator Moore's district.....and the Governor felt that was inappropriate and I agree with the Governor's stand on that point. The rest of the Bill was left exactly the way it is."

Shea: "This is those bad Bills you handled right....."

Hirschfeld: "This is the ones that we discuss with great specificity over a fifteen hour period."

Shea: "Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay. The Gentleman has moved the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for a change with respect to Senate Bill 1452. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. This will take 89 affirmative votes:.....This will take 89 affirmative votes.

A little short? Okay, have all voted who wish? Let's



get on there John. I'm dragging it out for you.

.....Senate Bill 1538, Representative Lechowicz on the floor? Collins?.....Representative Gibbs?.....John?.... Okay, in the order of the minutes.....Motions....appears Senate Bill 1676, for which purpose the Gentleman from Kane, Representative Friedland is recognized."

Friedland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that the House concur with the Senate in the adoption of the amendatory veto with respect to Senate Bill 1676. The Governor's action replaced the immunity for doctors and nurses and physician paramedic personnel back to the original form of the law in that the Amendment was supported by the Illinois Nurses Association and the Medical Society and I would appreciate your support."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman moves that the House do adopt the Governor's specific recommendations for a change with respect to Senate Bill 1676. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. This will take 89 votes. Hart 'aye'. Merlo 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Merlo, Peters and Hart..... and Peters....Grotberg 'aye'....On this question there are 119 'ayes', one 'nay', none answering 'present'.... and the House adopts the Governor's specific recommendations for a change with respect to Senate Bill 1676. Calvo here. Geo.....do you want to go with yours now? In the order of minutes.....veto motionsappears Senate Bill 1452, for which purpose the Lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis is recognized."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1452 was the Bill Sponsored by Senator Nimrod, in the Senate. It cleared the Senate. I'm asking to move to concur in the amendatory veto. The Governor replaced six words in this Bill in which the



DEC 05 1974

5.

local area, in order to apply for Federal grants, would have to get the okay from the RTA. I have no objection to the Amendment and I move to concur in the amendatory veto on Senate Bill 1452."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Lady moves that the House adopt the Governor's specific recommendations for a change with respect to Senate Bill 1452. All in favor of the Lady's motion signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Giddy?.....Your switch is open Jenny. Macdonald 'aye'. Jenny Macdonald 'aye'.... Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question 110 'ayes'. No 'nays', 5 answering 'present' and the House adopts the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to Senate Bill 1452. Palmer 'aye' on the last Roll Call. Palmer 'aye'.....Gibbs,..... Collins, Calvo, Lechowicz.... Representative Calvo on the Floor? Horace Calvo? On the order of amendatory veto motions appears Senate Bill 166, for which purpose the Gentleman from Madison, Representative Calvo is recognized."

Calvo: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I filed a motionwould move to accept the amendatory veto of the Governor as to Senate Bill 166. This is the Bill that creates thecivic center authority through-out theIllinois, Southern Illinois and the Amendments by the Governor were merely to put the Bill in the proper form as it was originally amended many times and it was necessary to make some changes to make the Amendments coincide with the proper meaning in the Bill and there was some change in the financing structure as to one of the authorities as they said they didn't need quite as much money as we had originally put in the Bill. I would move for the approval of the Governor's amendatory veto."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh."

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS



Walsh, Wm.: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the last chance we'll have to knock-out this thoroughly bad Bill. There have been many efforts on the part of some of these cities to have referenda where the people in the district would pay for the exposition hall that this Bill proposes to build for them. What this says is that the State will provide the funds and if the revenues from the halls do not pay for the bonds then the State will pay them. This is ridiculous. If we do this then every city in the State ought to have an exposition hall....notably La Grange Park....because La Grange Park is just about as big as some of the towns that are mentioned in here....and I suggest to you that this is a rip-off in the purer sense. One that is fairly unjustified and should be defeated....And I ask you in the interest of saving taxpayer's dollars for far more worthy needs than we're going to be confronted in the next two years with some staggering....staggering obligations. We ought to start now and start looking to the future so that we can avoid possibly a tax increase. So I ask you to vote 'no' on the Gentleman's motion and hope that the Governor will act responsibly and veto this Bill outright."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Palmer."

Palmer: ".....The Sponsor will yield for a question?"

Speaker Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Palmer: "Representative Calvo, is there any home rule authority here where the people themselves can do it without having to come to the Legislature?.....I see that it authorizes additional bond issues for all of Peoria, Rockford and Springfield. Do they have that authority now, without asking for the 'implementer' of this Legislature?"

Calvo: "Yeah. If I understand your question correctly, they



do. I think it's under the home rule powers that any municipality over 40,000 people would have the opportunity tosell bonds and perhaps erect a civic center. But that, however, is not the point. We have in Chicago, as you know, McCormick Place, which is financed exactly as it is supposed to finance these civic centers. I sincerely feel that what is good for McCormick Place is good for the rest of Illinois and there is no problem. We went through this, you know, in June and I don't know how many times in the last two years. There is no problem with the financial structure. There is plenty of money,.. in the same fund that McCormick Place was supported by, to take care of these exposition centers."

Palmer: "Well, McCormick Place, I believe, wasthe authority for that was prior to the time of the present Constitution. It's vindictive..."

Calvo: "So what?.... Well, you know, all you're asking me is 'Do they have home rule powers?' Yes, they probably do. And this Bill is something to help them in the financing in the event they need it and I think they are certainly entitled to it."

Palmer: "All right. Okay....They could do it themselves though, couldn't they?"

Calvo: "Sure. They could do it themselves. So could McCormick Place."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, our distinguished Majority Leader mentioned a moment ago that this was the last time we're going to have a chance to vote for this Bill and he is correct, except he characterized it wrongly when he said it was a bad Bill. Actually it's the last time we have a chance to vote for a good Bill and I wish he'd get off the phone so he could hear that. But, actually, this is a Bill which gives several cities



throughout the State an opportunity to provide a civic auditorium, civic center complex, and I know in my City of Peoria, where we have some downtown redevelopment going on, that this is going to provide the catalyst for tremendous growth in the inner city. Now, without this type of financing, we're just not going to be able to get the job done. We're not going to be able to build the civic center which is going to provide that impetus for growth, downtown redevelopment, etc. Now, the concept of this particular Bill and the amendatory veto, which raised the amounts for our fine city to where it's an equitable arrangement is no different than what has been done in the past where \$60,000,000 of bond authorizationas amended by the Governor, parallel those of the Fair and Exposition Authority Reconstruction Act, which authorized somewhere in the vicinity of \$40,000,000 in bonds for the reconstruction of McCormick Place. So, I say to you as Members of the House, what's fair for Chicago is fair for downstate and this is not going to cost the taxpayers any funds. It comes out of race track revenue, it goes into a separate fund and it is used for that purpose of retiring those bonds if need be. I would urge your support of this sustaining amendatory veto on this particular Act."

Speaker Telcser: "Further discussion? If not, the Gentleman from Madison, Representative Calvo, to close."

Calvo: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Gentleman from Peoria has very correctly stated the..... in a very concise and proper way, the entire summary of this Bill and the concept. In closing all I'd say is, I'd appreciate your favorable vote to accept the Governor's amendatory veto which does in no way change or substantially change the Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman moves the House do accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 166. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion



signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. This will take at least 89 affirmative votes. Do you want to hit Shea's switch?.....Have all voted who wish? Representative Ebbesen, did you want to....Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 113 'ayes', 8 'nays', 6 answering 'present' and the House adopts the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to Senate Bill 166. On the order of amendatory veto motions appears Senate Bill 1674, for which purpose the Gentleman from Christian, Representative Tipsword is recognized."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is the Bill I'm handling on motion because Representative Gibbs is not here. This Bill relates to the establishment of Alcoholic Rehabilitation Centers through the Department of Mental Health and they provided in it that it went into effect on October 1st of 1974. Due to the lateness of the Bill in being passed, the Department was unable to gear up with the hospitals throughout the State of Illinois to establish these programs and the amendatory veto merely delays the effective date of it until July 1, 1975, to let the Department make contracts and contacts with the various hospitals throughout the State to provide this alcoholic rehabilitation service. I would move that we accept the amendatory language of the Governor's veto motion."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman has moved the House do adopt the Governor's specific recommendations for a change with respect to Senate Bill 1674. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. This will take 89 affirmative votes. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 112 'ayes', 1 'nay', none answering 'present'. Borchers 'aye'.....Waddell 'aye'. D'Arco 'aye'. Lemke 'aye'. Kozubowski 'aye'.



Catania and Yourell 'aye'. Oh boy!.....Shea 'aye'.
 Brandt 'aye'. Laurino 'aye'. Thompson 'aye'. Krause
 'aye'. Stiehl 'aye'. R. Hoffman 'aye'. Harold Katz
 'aye'. Ben Polk 'aye'. Molloy 'aye'. Schoeberlein 'aye'.
 I'll come back up in a second. Von Boeckman 'aye'.
 Leon 'aye'. DiPrima 'aye'. Okay. And, the House adopts
 the Governor's specific recommendations for change with
 respect to Senate Bill 1674. Is there a second motion
 you got here? With respect to motion number two.....
 Wait a second. Okay, on the order of minutes for veto
 motions appears Senate Bill 1291....for which purpose
 the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins is
 recognized."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
 Senate Bill 1291 was a clarifying Bill pertaining to
 the term of office of the Chairman of the State Board of
 Elections. In one part of the Bill it referred to the
 term as one year and the other it referred to it as a
 two year term. The Chairman of course was appointed in
actually it would be midyear, so this would clear up
 an inconsistency in the Bill and give the present chair-
 man a full term before he is required by statute to
 to relinquish his title. The other language in the Bill
 which I would have wished had been left in was an Amend-
 ment offered by Representative Philip that would have
 clarified the language pertaining to the appointment of
 election judges in precincts other than Cook County, which
 would have made it a three-two division depending on which
 is the majority party. The Governor chose to strike this
 without giving any real reason for doing so and the Senate
 voted to accept this amendatory veto. Since any initiative
 was denied me I have no choice other than to go along
 with the amendatory veto in light of the importance of
 the other positions of the Bill. So, I would move at
 this time that we accept the amendatory veto of the



Governor."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman moves that the House do adopt the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to Senate Bill 1291. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. 89 affirmative votes. Let's try and get on these switches. Phil, do you want to hit Harry Leinenweber's switch? Okay, now, have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question 121 'ayes', and one 'nay', 4 answering 'present' and the House adopts the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to Senate Bill 1291. On the order of minutes for veto motions appears Senate Bill 1641, for which purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins is recognized."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1641 is a very important Bill again in regard to the State Board of Elections. When the State Board was created, I am sure, and I think we all share the belief, that it was meant to be a completely autonomous body.....free of interference from other branches of government and certainly not subject to the one of the Executive. Senate Bill 1641 would remove the employees from.....of the State Board of Elections, from the provisions of the Personnel Code, but at the same time would mandate that the State Board of Elections set up their own, very stringent, hiring and firing practices.... and in effect create their own merit system. There are other provisions of the Bill that are, while not as important, are important to our election code..... Number one, the roll would permit the employees of County Clerks and State Boards of Elections and State's Attorneys, who have duties on election day, to vote by absentee ballot. It would exclude the population of penitentiaries from the computation of the 40,000 population requirement, which



mandates to have voting machines when they exceed that population. It merely removes that provision of the penitentiary population. I believe that this only effects one county which would be Livingston County and I this Amendment was added at the request of the Senate President, Senator Harris. There is another provision in there which we adopted. I think at the request of Representative Redmond, which would specify that a County Board of Election's Commissioners had jurisdiction only with respect to county wide elections. This stipulation, I am sure, wouldapply only to DuPage County which is the only county, I believe, that has a County Board of Elections Commissioners. There is further provisions which is merely removing obsolete language with reference to the Secretary of State when it should be now with reference to the State Board of Elections..... This language is merely cleanup. This Bill is an important Bill and I would move that the Senate Bill 1641 pass, the veto of the Governor to the contrary is notwithstanding."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from LaSalle, Representative Fennessey."

Fennessey: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm going to oppose this motion to override.....primarily because of this portion of the Bill removing the population of inmatesin prison from the census. I've talked to people in Livingston County, I've talked to ^{the} Democratic County Chairman there and he informed me that there is a great need for voting machines in Livingston County. This last election they had precincts that were out from 3 o'clock to 6 o'clock the next morning. Also he said that the canvasin talking to the Republican County Chairman, he agreed to the need for voting machines in this county. Also, I have a letter from the Mayor of the City of Pontiac pointing out the amount of money that the



City of Pontiac had received by having the population of the census included. I don't think any county can have it both ways. They can't include these census of these persons when they want funds from the State and then take them out when it's to their benefit. So, for this motion, for this reason, I would ask the Members of this Body to ...not to vote to override the Governor's veto."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the Sponsor of this override motion. The previous speaker has mentioned that in Livingston County there were some precincts that were out until three or four in the morning and I would remind that same speaker that in Kane County, who has sophisticated electric voting devices, we have a couple of precincts that are still out. There is not necessarily a correlation between speed based on the paper ballot function in Livingston County with a rather small population and in the high cost of the purchase of such electronic voting devices....Let's not be carried away, for one minute, by what's behind all this.. I do urge your support of this veto override that Representative Collins is Sponsoring."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Hunsicker."

Hunsicker: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wholeheartedly agree with the previous speaker and the Sponsor of this Bill. This veto, if not overridden, is going to cost the people of Livingston County somewhere in the neighborhood of \$237,000 for voting machines that we should be exempt from. Taxes are taxes my friend, regardless of where they are paid, if it's at the local, State, or Federal level, it doesn't make any difference. And \$237of additional expense on the county is not



exactly peanuts in my book. Especially when over a thousand of these persons are incarcerated within two penitentiaries within Livingston County and cannot vote to begin with. I think this veto smells just a little bit and I'm wondering if it wasn't done to spite the President of the Senate, the Sponsor of the Bill. In the special messages that were left on our desk....by the Governor, this Session of the General Assembly, he mentioned the fact that if his vetoes are overridden it will have far reaching consequences in ensuing years. This I subscribe to but when he vetoes a Bill forcing the people of Livingston County to spend an additional \$237,000 for voting machines by including over a thousand felons who are disfranchised from voting in the first place, this is also going to have far reaching consequences in ensuing years. Livingston County has a population of 40,580 people which include 1,031 felons,.... 705 of these felons are from Cook County and the rest are from other counties in the State and only two of this 1,019 are from Livingston County. So, even if there were not.....(tape failure...approx. two minutes.)

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise?"

Shea: "I've got a parliamentary inquiry, please."

Speaker Telcser: "State your point, Sir."

Shea: "This Bill is an amendatorily...vetoed Bill. Is that correct?"

Speaker Telcser: "That's correct, Sir."

Shea: "My inquiry is, on a Bill that comes over from the Senate that was an amendatory veto, if that Bill is overridden by the Senate we only have one of two choices, is that correct? We either sustain a complete veto or override?"

Speaker Telcser: "That's correct, Sir."

Shea: "All right. Is that becauseI just want to make sure where we stand with this, not so much on this Bill



but in other Bills, because both Houses must take the exact same action with regard to vetoes?"

Speaker Telcser: "Sure, to have final action, of course."

Shea: "But even though this is an amendatory veto, you could not move to accept the specific language of the Governor?"

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Shea, the point you make is germane but really only in respect to a Senate Bill that is now over in the House, because we're acting on a message from the Senate."

Shea: "But, my inquiry was, that this Bill was amendatorily vetoed by the Governor. Then action, as I understand it, in the Senate was to total override. Is that correct?"

Speaker Telcser: "That's correct, Sir."

Shea: "So that the action in the House must be either to sustain a total veto, in other words we can do one of two things. By tryingwe either override or the Bill dies, is that right?"

Speaker Telcser: "That's correct."

Shea: "Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Collins, with respect to Representative Palmer's inquiry."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, in looking at the Governor's message on the Bill, I think that Representative Palmer is absolutely correct. What the message does, is not only remove the new language that we wish to employ concerning the exemption from the personnel code but it goes beyond that and strikes all language dealing with employment of personnel of the State Board of Elections and therefore would remove the board from the personnel code without adding any new language for an alternative method of selection. So, the Governor's message went much further, I am sure, than he had intended it to go."

Speaker Telcser: "You want to take it out of the record?"

Collins: "No...No....I want to move to override."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, you want to move to override?.. The



Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins with respect to a motion."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I'll be very brief in closing but I'd like to emphasize the importance of this Bill and I don't think that we should get lost in thein some of the other moresome of the other minor provisions of the Bill. The importance of this Bill is the independence and the autonomy of the State Board of Elections which has been created pursuant to the provisions of the new Constitution of 1970. This Board is a result of a mandate of that Constitutionto create this Board to have general supervision and....over the elections of the State of Illinois.... And we went through much debate as to the composition of this Board and to the equal representation on this Board and now we're going right to the heart of the powers of this Board. This Bill had the unanimous support of the State Board of Elections, which as we know is exactly bipartisan. It has the support of the Election Laws Commission and this motion to override has the overwhelming support of the Senate. I think this is a very important Bill and I would urge every Member to join us in this motion."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman moves to override the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to Senate Bill 1641. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. This motion will require 107 affirmative votes. Okay. Have all voted who wish?.." (Approximately one minute skip in tape.)

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2715 is a Bill that passed out of this House that will grant relief to senior citizens for the sales tax paid on food, drug and medicine and necessities. The Bill had two Amendments in the Senate. The First Amend-



ment struck some language that changed almost nothing in the Bill. The Second Amendment restructured the restructured the method of payment and broke it down into ten categories and reduced the actual amount of expendituresfrom my figuresfrom about \$600,000. The second part of the Amendment, in effect, amended a part of the Bill that J. David Jones hadand increased in the circuit breaker what a runner can take from 25 to 30 percent. I think this is a meaningful Bill and I would ask for the concurrence of the House."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce. No? Is there any discussion? The Gentleman moves the House concur with Senate Amendments #2 and 4 to House Bill 2715. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. It takes 107 affirmative votes. It'll become effective immediately. Giddy?.....The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, it's quite obvious that this Bill is going to pass and yet it doesn't deserve to pass. If you will look at the new schedule you'll see that someone who earns \$1000 will be getting a rebate of approximately \$50. Someone who earns \$10,000 on the other hand, will be getting a rebate of \$100. Now the problem senior citizens have is money. It doesn't matter whether we call it sales tax relief or property tax relief or welfare or supplemental Social Security...it's money. Now, if indeed the Democratic Party, which is supposedly traditionally in favor of helping those who are least able to help themselves, are now marketing a plan which guarantees everyone who earns under \$10,000 that the higher the income the more money they will get from the State of Illinois. I'm amazed. During this last election I very actively supported the elimination of the amendatory veto. Yet I have never seen a Bill that needs an amendatory veto more



than this one. I am reluctantly going to vote 'yes' because money is money and these senior citizens need as much as they can get. But, I surely hope that Governor Walker can come up with a more rational formula than the one enclosed in this Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to rebut the comments of the previous speaker with whom I served on a subcommittee of the House Revenue Committee that studied quite extensively the modification of the circuit breaker Bill. I would simply point out that it is not correct, it is misleading to use the percentages without pointing out that the benefits under this addition to the circuit breaker are subject to the five percent reduction for each thousand dollars..... of income ...which applies to the original circuit breakers, so that there is a graduated effect. As income goes up the amount of actual benefits received will be diminished by five percent for each thousand dollars.....of income. It would be misleading to let the remarks of the previous speaker stand without that correction. Let me say that this is a valuable addition to the circuit breaker. It will mean several million dollars of additional benefit to low income senior citizens in Illinois. I think it's an absolutely crucial Bill that we ought to pass and I urge an 'aye' vote for it."

Speaker Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question, 123 'ayes', 3 'nays', 11 answering 'present'. And, the House concurs with Senate Amendments #2 and 4. McAuliffe 'aye'. House Bill 2715. LaFleur 'aye'. Okay, we'll go now to the item of total veto motion. Total veto motion. On the order ofon this order of business appears Senate Bill 89. For which purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins:"



is recognized. Do you want yours called now, Representative Collins?"

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 89 is a simple Bill. It would allow a person who worked on contractual basis for a Legislative Committee or Commission to receive service credit for pension purposes.....upon making their contribution to the State Employee's Retirement System. This only effects a certain number of people. The Bill was amended at the demand of the Pension Laws Commission.....to limit the application of the Bill to July 1, 1975. In all candor this would only effect two people that I know of who are secretaries in the Senate, who have worked for Committees over there and this would allow those Ladies to apply their contractual service time to their pension credit. Of course, making the necessary contribution to the fund, that they would be required to make. I would solicit the support of the House in the motion to override this veto."

Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? The Gentleman moves that the House override the Governor's veto with respect to Senate Bill 89. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. It will take 107 affirmative votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Want to make a stab at it?"

Collins: "Well, you're looking at me, Mr. Speaker and I'm looking at you and I'm looking at the Floor and it appears that we're quite a bit short. This Bill is a Bill that was introduced by Senator Jack Walker in the Senate. It would permit two secretaries over there..... his own being one of them to apply the time that they've worked on contractual services for the General Assembly... to count this time for pension purposes. It really is it's really a simple Bill. It's not going to cost



a lot of money. These girls would have to make their own contribution to the Pension System to make this time applicable. And I would appreciate any affirmative support that we can get, which seems to be quite difficult at this time."

Speaker Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, ordinarily with that kind of a vote on the board, ah.... I would ask for a postponed consideration, but in deference to Senator Walker, I would ask that this Bill be postponed."

Speaker Telcser: "All right, the Gentleman has asked for postponed consideration with respect to his motion. That order of business will be put on postponed consideration. On the order of Total Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 328 for which purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ron Hoffman is recognized."

R. Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 328 amends the Park District Code to add Article 9.3 which provides for the issuance of revenue bonds for the construction of revenue producing recreational facilities. Senate Bill 328 was passed overwhelmingly in both the House and the Senate. And the override in the Senate was done with a substantial margin. The reason for the override pursuant to the Governor's message was that no explanation had been furnished by the Sponsor of this legislation to indicate that it had substance..... consequently, it was vetoed. Now it appeared at the time that it was discussed in both the Senate and the House that it had substance and many many people supported the concept. And therefore, I ask for your green light to override the Governor's Veto on Senate Bill 328:"

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? Any discussion?"



The question is shall Senate Bill 328.... question?

The question is shall Senate Bill 328 pass, the Governor's Veto notwithstanding. All in favor indicate by voting 'aye' and the opposed by voting 'no'. This will take 107 affirmative votes. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative R. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This happens to be one of those unique Bills where there is no large fiscal impact. I find that there's no objection from the Governor's Office on this. It was just a misunderstanding where the staff in their analysis to the Governor.... inappropriately informed him that there was no emphasis and no need for it. I think that.... ah.. speaking for the Park Association, that there is a great need for it. We had a lot of dialogue on this and we find that it is something that the Park Association does want and does need. It's supported by the Illinois Park Association and the Illinois Park and Recreation Society. There is no appropriation to this. And I repeat the Governor's Office, at this point, does not oppose this Bill. And I would ask for quite a few more green lights on there. Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't know how many of you pulled out the Veto Sheet on Senate Bill 328, but I think that you should. And this applies to Senate Bill 329, which we will be addressing ourselves to also. Here is the reason for vetoing Senate Bill 328. Since no explanation has been furnished by the supporters of this legislation, I am vetoing and returning this Bill as unnecessary. Now let me tell you what this Bill tries to do. At the present time, a park district can sell revenue bonds to finance something like a skating rink or a golf course, but you have to



sell separate bonds for separate facilities. All this Bill says is that you can sell one set of bonds for several facilities. So if you have a skating rink and it's an extremely poor winter and you don't get much use out of it; or maybe it's an extremely cold winter and the people don't have to come to the skating rink, they can go to their local pond, maybe the skating rink won't make so much money, but the next summer there may be a land office business at the golf course. And so what this says is that you can merge these two flows of income into one set of bonds. And I have talked with bond people in Chicago. I've put Amendments on it. I've Ron and I both have been handling this in the House on various years and the thing will fly. As soon as Chapman and Cutler takes a look at it..... and there's a sample suit that's ah... you know, it's going to be a good way to finance park improvement without having to use property taxes. We'll be able to use user fees on it. And if we're in an age where we don't want to go after the property tax, by God, ... who do you want to pay for it? Who is fairer to have pay for it than the person that's using the facility?"

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a Bill that actually should get 107 votes because parks have had the opportunity in the past and this General Assembly has authorized them to do so, to issue revenue bonds for a specific purpose such as has been enumerated in the discussion here this morning. Now what this Bill does is allow the park districts to further the extent of extending revenue bonds for the purposes of providing recreational facilities for the people within the district. It's a good concept. There's nothing..... there is nothing that's going to cost the taxpayers an inordinate



amount of money. It is a needed thing among the park districts within the state. And I would urge your support of this override of this particular veto."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Palmer to explain his vote. Representative Palmer..... Romie Palmer."

Palmer: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is a much needed Bill to clarify some of the problems that park districts have now. And on the question as the purposes for which bonds might be issued.....and it clarifies that to some great extent... to all extents and purposes. Now it's a realy problem if the park district wants to finance by bond issues certain facilities.... recreational facilities, because of the language used in the Act. The Bill itself would make it without doubt as to their authority to do so. The park district needs this Bill and needs it badly. If we're going to... and we're in the 70's now, if we're going to talk about recreation and all of us pay lip-service to it, at least to our constituents and to the members of the boards of the park districts, we ought to do something here on it. And I would encourage everybody to give this Bill an 'aye' vote because it's an actually needed Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Hunsicker, Representative..... The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Hunsicker."

Hunsicker: "A question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker. Who pays for the bonds in case the facility is not self-supporting? A question of the Sponsor. Who pays for the bonds in case the facilities are not self-supporting?"

Speaker Telcser: "Well, do you want to answer that, Representative Hoffman,... we'll go around on the explanation of votes? Turn on Representative Ron Hoffman."

Hoffman: "No one."

Hunsicker: "No one?"



Speaker Telcser: "Does anyone else wish to explain their vote? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Day to explain his vote."

Day: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this seems a little bit inconsistent to have a law on the books which would authorize park districts to issue revenue bonds to construct handball courts, racketball courts, squash courts and zoos and not give them authority to issue bonds, revenue bonds, if you will, for skating rinks and swimming pools and gymnasiums. This is a matter that should be left up to the local park district. There isn't any really change in... in underlying philosophy here, they're still limited to revenue bonds, they're not general obligation bonds. And it simply broadens the use for which they can issue these bonds for the purpose of constructing these facilities. And it really doesn't make very much sense for the Legislature to take the stand that they can issue bonds for a handball court, but they can't for a skating rink. So I think that we ought to get back of this. I think it was an oversight on the part of the Governor's Office in vetoing this Bill. And as the Sponsor has mentioned, he has since discussed it with the Governor's Office and they are now in favor of the Bill. I think that you would be doing a real injustice if we didn't vote in favor of the override on this Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Will the Sponsor yield for one question?"

Speaker Telcser: "He indicates that he will, although it's unusual."

Shea: "Ron, am I to understand that these bonds will be paid, like if they build a handball court.... what would pay off these bonds would be just the revenue from the people that use it?"

R. Hoffman: "That's correct."



Shea: "And they are not full faith and credit bonds of the
.... of the park district? They are just general revenue
bonds of the object they build?"

R. Hoffman: "That's correct. Just skating rinks and hand-
ball courts."

Shea: "Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, have all voted who wish? Okay, you've
really worked that one out. Have all voted who wish?
Take the record. On this question there are 119 'ayes'
and 3 'nays' and 4 answering 'present' and Senate Bill
328 having received the constitutional three-fifths
majority is hereby declared passed, the Governor's
Veto notwithstanding. On the order of Total Veto Motions
appears Senate Bill 32.... ah... Senate Bill 329, for
which purpose the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative
Skinner is recognized."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker..... Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentle-
men of the House, the veto message on this is exactly
the same as the veto message on the previous one. 'Since
no explanation has been furnished by the supporters of
this legislation, I am vetoing and returning this Bill
as unnecessary.' Well, at least when I read Governor
Ogilvie's vetos, I could understand the reason for the
veto. This is about a six line Bill that said that if
you're a Park District Commissioner and you get elected
and you resign, the Park Board.... you know you have a
six year term, the Park Board can't appoint someone.....
let's say that you resign a week after you're sworn in
for a five year and fifty-one week term, that you have
to run for election if you want to stay on the Park
Board at the next election. Now all sorts of local
government do this and I see no reason whatsoever why
Park Districts can't become more democratic. And I just
do not understand if our Governor wishes to return things
to the people, why he wishes the people to be denied a



vote on Park District Commissioners for as much as five years and fifty-one weeks. And I, ah.. you know, I don't know whether we're going to get 107 votes on it, but it surely is a logical Bill and it surely is a illogical veto and I would certainly solicit your support."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think what we're doing here is discussing an issue that became law about four years ago. I Co-sponsored a Bill with.... I don't recall who it was, that accomplished this purpose. If they..... if a Park District Commissioner was appointed to fill a vacancy caused by the resignation or the death or the failure to serve of that position, that position had to be filled at the next regular election of the Park District, whether the term be two, four or six years. We had a situation in the Oak Lawn Park District which prompted this kind of legislation. And if I'm not mistaken, that statute is already and I think it was Representative Juckett, if I'm not mistaken, who sponsored that Bill three or four years ago. So, Cal, can you.... are you aware of this?"

Speaker Telcser: "Does Representative Hoffman care to respond?"

Skinner: "He can probably do it better than I."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ron Hoffman will respond."

R. Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, this is exactly what you say, but the Association felt that there was clarification language needed and that's exactly what this Bill does. It indicates and inserts in the statute that if there's not sufficient time to meet the requirements for nomination at the next election, the person so pointed shall hold office until the next



subsequent election, at which such requirements for nomination can be met. And that's clarifying language."

Yourell: "Well, how does that differ in the statute as it's presently constituted?"

R. Hoffman: "The Section that you allude to, I do not have here, but this is a product of the Association because they felt that they needed the clarification on that point, as far as whether there was sufficient time to meet the requirement. So that's all this particular Bill does."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion?"

Yourell: "May I respond, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Telcser: "Proceed, Sir."

Yourell: "Reading from Senate Bill 329 on line 19, 'at such election a person shall be elected to fill the vacancy' and then they've deleted parts of line 20, 21, 22 and 23, but the language is quite clear. It says, 'Any person so appointed shall hold his office until the next election, at which a member of the Governing Board of any Park District is elected.' Now I don't see where the language has to be clarified. It's very clear, it's very concise. It mentions a member and mentions the election and it mentions which election. So I have no objection to the Bill only I think that we're duplicating our efforts."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ron Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Representative. Going back to it, as the language reads, it says; 'if there's sufficient time'. It doesn't use the proviso as to if there is not sufficient time. So this is what we're inserting as to... in addition.... if there is not sufficient time and what the qualifications and actions would be. We are inserting the explanation as to the alternative if there is not sufficient time."



Speaker Telcser: "The question is shall Senate Bill 329 pass, the Governor's Veto notwithstanding? All in favor of the Gentleman's motion indicate by voting 'aye' and the opposed by voting 'no'. This will require 107 votes. Now there's a motion just before this, Motion #1 with respect to Senate Bill 329. It's an identical motion to...Representative Skinner's. So this will be action with respect to both motions actually. This will take 107 affirmative votes. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ron Hoffman to explain his vote."

R. Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This again, as Representative Skinner has eluded to, is one of those unfortunate circumstances where the Bill was vetoed based upon the reason that no one had contacted him indicating the significance of this legislation. It has no other impact other than clarifying language. As Representative Yourell had eluded to, it narrows it down, but this goes one step further indicating what the proviso would be if there is not sufficient time. It's important to the Park District to clarify something so that we do not have problems in the districts.... and that's all it does. And I would solicit a few more green lights on this so we don't end up with a couple of park districts in a quandary when the situation arises when there is not sufficient time. And I would ask for a few more green lights."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I agree with the Sponsor of the... of this motion. I think that it's probably not necessary, but in order to clarify the language in the existing statute, as he attempts to do with the additional language; I



would suggest that we give the authority to do this and I know where many instances where they have problems with park boards where an individual has been appointed. It could happen perhaps that a dynasty be created where a majority of one party can be continuallyin the majority.....(Skip in the tape....)...."

Clerk Selcke: "Alsup, Arnell, Barnes, Barry, Borchers, Boyle, Brandt, Brummet, Caldwell, Calvo, Capparelli, Capuzi, Carter, Chapman, Collins, Craig, Dee, DiPrima, Douglas, Epton, ..."

Speaker Telcser: "Epton, 'aye'."

Clerk Selcke: "...Farley, Fary, Fennessey, Flinn, Garmisa, Getty, Gibbs, Giglio, Giorgi, Grieman, Hanahan, Hill, Jimmy Holloway, Robert Holloway, ..."

Speaker Telcser: "Bob Holloway, 'aye'...."

Clerk Selcke: "...J. Houlihan, Hyde, Emil Jones, Juckett, ... Katz, 'aye'..."

Speaker Telcser: "Katz, 'aye'..."

Clerk Selcke: "Kennedy, Klosak, Krause, Kucharski, Laurino, Lechowicz, Lemke, Leon, Londrigan...(Skip in tape....)... McLendon, McPartlin, Merlo, Mugalian, Murphy, Nardulli, Neff, North, Pappas, Patrick, Porter, ..."

Speaker Telcser: "Mugalian, 'aye'.....Jack Hill, 'aye'..... Hill, 'aye'...."

Clerk Selcke: "Randolph, Sangmeister, (Skip in tape...)"

Rayson: ".....when there should be more credit available and in the Installment Loan Act and other acts, we have increased in the authorized amount of credit, however, I was hung-up on the Bill originally due to the fact that there was some other language with reference to the interest rate schedules which suggest that those who would get the majority of these loans would in effect have higher interest costs. So, I for one, Mr. Speaker, am



going to vote 'present' on this Bill but the Legislature, in its wisdom, might think it's condoning the override due to the fact that you should go up to 10,000 or may not go with the motion on the basis that we can come back and give them the 10,000 and adjust this interest rate factor which bothers me. So I vote 'present', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor of the Bill please read me the override message.....or the veto message of the Governor.....to see what his rationale is?"

Speaker Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Randolph: "The Governor, in his message, states that this Bill amends the Consumer Installment Loan Act by doubling both the maximum loan and maximum maturity. The annual percentage rate would remain approximately the same as under the current law. He states that other major industrial and commercial states and he namesabout six or eightdo not permit consumer loans which involves much money borrowed at this high rate as long period as this. This is where the error in the Governor's Veto Message is, it was, I'm sure, a misunderstanding. The information given to him was not correct because in the states that he mentions, Massachusettsthe increase in the Massachusetts, the Governor (unintelligible)..... is in error, Massachusetts law provides for loan with an unlimited ceiling, with no restriction on the maturity. California regulates loans at ten thousand of eighteen percent and does not limit maturity and ...but does limit maturity to eighty-four months. New York, the Superintendent of the Banking State of New York has completed a study and is recommending a second mortgage loan law with an unlimited ceiling rateand Ohio and so on...."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman wish to close the debate? No? Do you wish to close the



debate, Representative Randolph?"

Randolph: "The consumer finance companies provide a needed alternate source of credit for those people who do not qualify at a bank or other lending institution. People who lack substantial security but may qualifymay not qualify at a bank or credit union because they must protect thesums of money with the land. Senate Bill 408 will allow people of Illinois to have an adequate legal source for their needs and I urge a full support of this measure."

Speaker Telcser: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 408 pass, the Governor's Veto notwithstanding? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. This will take 107 affirmative votes. Oh! Sure, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Beatty to explain his vote."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on this particular issue, since I own some stock in.... Consumer Finance Company, I'm going to vote 'present'." However, I have in the past been employed in this particular industry and I do have some knowledge of the need. With the rapid inflation and with the high cost of money, these companies are having trouble remaining competitive. Their earnings are declining, they're paying substantial sums, 12----13 percent a year. They borrow money themselves and now they are loaning it out at..... 17 and 19 percent. What the Sponsor of this Bill is asking you is a reasonable request. Companies are in business, they are allowingextending credit....now credit will be available to people. People do not have to borrow these funds, however, if a person wishes to there will be a source for him to borrow and he will be aware of what his interest rate is. This Bill, I don't believe, really increases the rates....it merely allows them to run ten thousand instead of five and increases the term of the deposits of the banks...."



and it allows the consumer finance business to be competitive in the State of Illinois and continue to be in business because if we don't allow corporations some leeway we're going to find out these companies are going to be going out of business and there will be less credit. So I think the Bill is substantially a good one. Although I'm just voting 'present'."

Speaker Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question 115 'ayes', 12 'nays', 7 answering 'present', and Senate Bill 408 having received the Constitutional Three-fifths Majority is hereby declared passed, the Governor's Veto notwithstanding. On the order of Total Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 876, for which purpose the Lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis is recognized. Representative Geo-Karis....Representative Geo-Karis.....876?....Senate Bill 876.....Total Veto Motion..."

Geo-Karis: ".....I wonder if I could wait? I...I..."

Speaker Telcser: "Do you want me to come back to it?"

Geo-Karis: "Yes, if I may, please?"

Speaker Telcser: "On the order of Total Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 1212, for which purpose the Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Day is recognized."

Day: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1212 is the usual, simple, vacation of the Highway Easement Bill. It only involves 1614 square feet and it is a Bill that was agreed to by the Highway Department. That is, the Highway Department has declared this little piece of land as excess land and one of the adjoining owners would like to acquire it and they have gotten together and have agreed on a price consideration and the whole thing was worked out with the agreement of the Highway Department. The Governor's Message indicating a veto on it stated that no explanation had been furnished by the supporters of the legislation. I understand that



that explanation has been furnished and of course the reasonthe real value for a Bill like this is that it.....the Highway Department has a number of small pieces of land throughout the State which they acquired for highway purposes but which they do not need and if they can turn it back to the adjoining owner at a fair price why we can get that little piece of land back on the tax rolls and it will be paying some local taxes. So I would appreciate your support of this motion to override the veto on this Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Will the Sponsor yield for a couple of questions?"

Speaker Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Schlickman: "Who owns the land.....upon which the easement exists?"

Day: "I'm sorry, Gene, I didn't hear you."

Schlickman: "Who owns the land upon which the easement exists?"

Day: "In this particular case I think the land is owned by a man who has a ...either a doctor or dentist office and it's only eight a strip eighteen inches wide that he wants to acquire there, primarily for the purpose of extending an air conditioner over.....for his building.....eighteen inches...over."

Schlickman: "Who made the appraisal, or was there an appraisal made?"

Day: "I assume that the Highway Department made the appraisal, I don't know in this particular case."

Schlickman: "I understand that the Department of Transportation has stated affirmatively that it has no need, either immediately or in the future, for this easement?"

Day: "That is correct."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Day: "It's a usual case."

Speaker Telcser: "Further discussion? The question is shall



Senate Bill 1212 pass, the Governor's Veto notwithstanding? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. 107 Affirmative votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Okay, the Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Sponsor of this Legislation has clearly indicated that this land is no longer needed by the State for highway purposes and is willing to sell back this little strip of land to the original owner for a fair market price and since it isn't needed by the State and as he quite aptly pointed out, this would get this piece of land back on the tax rolls and I think would be to the benefit of the people to do this. Now, it's money to the State also to the extent of the price of the property and I think the Governor when he vetoed this Bill said that he was vetoing it strictly on the basis that there was no explanation furnished for this particular Bill. I submit that that's not a very good explanation of his veto and it would seem to me logically that we do override this so that we can get this land back on the rolls and I would urge another forty votes or so in order to get this overridden."

Speaker Telcser: "Anyone else wish to explain their votes?
The Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I don't know if anybody is confused theirselves, but it seems like it's a fairly good price, three dollars a square foot, which works out to about one hundred and thirty thousand dollars an acre. Now, I would say that this seems like a reasonably good bargain for the State of Illinois.....and I certainly don't see any reason why we can't give the Gentleman the votes to override the veto. That is a good price."

Speaker Telcser: "Anyone else wish to explain their vote?
Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Peoria,



Representative Day."

Day: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to poll the absentees."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, first, let's get the Roll Call. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Okay, and then when we have the record from the machine will the Clerk please poll the absentees?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Alsup, Arnell, Barnes, Barry, Beatty, Beaupre, Berman, Boyle, Bradley, Brandt, Brummet, Caldwell, Calvo, Capparelli, Capuzi, Carter, Chapman, Choate, Craig, D'Arco, Davis, Deavers, DiPrima, Douglas, Ralph Dunn, Ewell, Farley, Fary, Fennessey, Fleck, Flinn, Garmisa, ...Kick me when I get there, will you? Gibbs, Giglio, Giorgi, Hanahan, Hill, ..."

Speaker Telcser: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'present'... Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise?"

Shea: "Vote me 'aye', please."

Speaker Telcser: "Record Representative Shea as voting 'aye'. Representative Ralph Dunn, 'aye'.....Let the Clerk catch up now, Beaupre 'aye'.....Rayson 'aye'...Kelly 'aye'..... Do you want to take a new Roll Call? Will that help you, Mr. Clerk? Let's take a new Roll Call. The question is shall Senate Bill 1212 pass, the Governor's Veto notwithstanding? All those in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. 107 votes....If we can get on these switches faster we might be able to get out of here at a reasonable hour today. There is an awful lot of work to do. Jerry you vote early Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? What? Let's get on this, John....Have all voted who wish? Take the record. John Brandt, 'aye'. On this question 113 'ayes', 2 'nays', 12 answering 'present', and Senate Bill 1212 having received the Constitutional Three-fifths Majority is hereby declared passed....The Governor's Veto notwithstanding. Laurino 'aye'.....On the Order of Total Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 876, for which purpose



the Lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis is recognized."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 876 would permit the Northshore Sanitary District to raise its tax levy if it did so by referendum. When the Bill was vetoed I think there was an error made by one of the Staff of the Governor because I think he thought there wasn't a clear referendum provision. I invite your attention to inspection of the Bill. The referendum provision is thereon which has to be solved if there is any raise in the tax rate. The North Shore Sanitary District of Lake County has been mandated by the EPA to update its operations completely in line with the EPA and although we have the equipment we don't have the necessary funds for the operational costs. This will allow the North Shore Sanitary District to put on a referendum to ask for the additional cost of the tax levy. I am joined here by both the Democrats and the Republicans of Lake County, on this floor and I would especially ask mycorunners to verify what I am saying. And, I especially ask for an override of the veto because it is a necessity for my County."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, excuse my voice but I do wish to stand up and add my support to the override on this particular Bill. We're at a point in Lake County, with the North Shore Sanitary Districtdoes not have some opportunity to get operating funds. It will literally be at a point of almost ready to close down and all we're asking is the opportunity to present this issue to the citizens and the residents of the North Shore Sanitary District to vote on this matter. This concept of referendum was added to this Bill by an Amendment in order to make it palatable to



two of the other Representatives in the 31st District and somehow or another that point was overlooked when the Bill was vetoed. So all we're asking is the opportunity to our voters in our District to vote on this matter. Whether they vote in favor or against it is a completely other issue. All we need is this opportunity to get these operating funds and I urge you to support this override."

Speaker Telcser: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rayson."

Rayson: "A question of Representative Geo-Karis and that addresses itself to the referendum. Now, the Governor's Message raises a point and a referendum besides that is an ambiguity. I want to know from you is, is it an ambiguity or is it in fact.....the referendum is a...is a... a prerequisite?"

Speaker Telcser: "Turn on Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Rayson, I believe that there was a staff error because right in the Bill I was the one who put the Amendment on for a referendum....and it's right in the Bill that says if there is any raise they shall order an election to be held within the district. It's right in the Bill."

Rayson: "Right in the Bill?"

Geo-Karis: "Right in the Bill. There is no ambiguity."

Speaker Telcser: "Further discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 876 pass, the Governor's Veto notwithstanding? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. 107 votes. Let's get on these switches now. Eddy? Let's get on these switches if we're going to vote. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, some of you may recall, I really opposed this Bill last year.... and....I'm not sure why the Governor vetoed it, we've all got our own opinions about what happened. Frankly, in my own mind, I thought it was a political veto and it that

were true, the Governor did disservice to this State and my District the greatest service any man could have done because we got rid of that State Senator over there. If that was the purpose that's all right, but having done that now I think really that Adeline Geo-Karis is right, that a referendum is required.....under the Bill....and now I'm going to vote for it."

Speaker Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? I'm doing my best for you, 'Geo'.More! Anyone else?....Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question 114 'ayes', no 'nays', 5 answering 'present' and Senate Bill 876 having received the Constitutional Three-fifths Majority is hereby declared passed....The Governor's Veto notwithstanding. On the order of Total Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 1218 for which purpose the Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Day is recognized."

Day: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is another very small tract of land, 1.6 acres in Stark and Grundy Counties, which has been declared excess by the Highway Department. They do not need it for highway purposes and they have agreed to a price with the adjoining landowner of \$1000, as set forth in the Bill. It's another case of a typical highway vacation easement and I would appreciate your support. Again reminding you that it's just good policy to get this land back upon the tax rolls. If there is any questions I'd be happy to answer them."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Beatty.....Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Day, could you tell me what the price of the land was when the State acquired it?"

Day: "I'm sorry, I do not have thosethose figures at this time."

Beatty: "Don't you think that would be a significant matter to



bring forth to the Legislature, if you're going to return the land back for a certain figure? Don't you think we should know what it is going to cost the State of Illinois?"

Day: "The only thing I can say to you is that the price here has been set here by agreement between the Highway Department and the owner. We're talking about 1.6 acres of land in Stark and Grundy County and the usual practice is for the Highway Department to have an appraisal made so that they know what the value of the land is that they're giving up. At least that particular small piece....and of course at the time they acquire the land I suppose they acquired a much larger tract of land for this highway and the price at that time wouldn't necessarily be indicative of the value of this little piece at this time."

Beatty: "Is this property farm land or is it in an industrial area or"

Day: "As I understand it it is in a rural area....in the rural area..."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Ryan: "Representative Day, did you say that the money included here is forhow many acres, in which county?"

Day: "One point six acres."

Ryan: "In both counties?"

Day: "A little over an acre and a half...and the land is located in Stark and Grundy Counties."

Ryan: "I see. Was this Bill.....maybe Representative Beaupre can answer this, was this part of a Bill that he had earlier in the Session, do you know?"

Day: "I wouldn't know about."

Ryan: "Thank you."



Speaker Telcser: "Further discussion?....The question is, shall Senate Bill 1218 pass, the Governor's Veto notwithstanding? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Requires 107 affirmative votes. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman to explain his vote."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in explaining my vote I'm looking at the Governor's Veto and the explanation he gives for this veto is 'Since no explanation has been furnished by the supporters of this legislation, I am vetoing and returning this Bill as unnecessary.' This is his only justification for vetoing this Bill. Now I think the Governorthe Governor of this State, after a couple of years, should know something about the legislative process in Illinois.....and despite some well-founded criticism, this is a deliberative Body. This Bill was introduced, it was referred to Committee, and it was considered in Committee, it was reported out of Committee, it was presented on the floor, at Third Reading it was discussed, and by the time a Bill in Illinois reaches the Governor's Desk there is a presumption and there has to be a presumption that the Bill was considered in a deliberative fashion. And, when a Bill reaches the Governor's Office, I don't care who that Governor is, he has the burden of stating to us why he is vetoing it and in this case all he said was 'The burden is yours to tell me why.'In fact the presumption is when a Bill is passed by the Illinois General Assembly, it has been discussed in a deliberative Body. I'm voting 'aye' and I would urge everybody to vote 'aye', not only to secure the passage of a Bill which has been justified, but also to give a message to the Governor of this State that when we do pass a Bill we have done it in a deliberative fashion and if he wants to veto it then let him tell us what's wrong about the Bill."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Day."

Day: "To explain my vote, Mr. Speaker; this land was acquired by the people of this State to be used for State highways. I don't know whether it was condemned or not, but you and I know that the Highway Department has for many years and for many years in the future will continue to take land from property owners to be used for a highway purpose. If you've ever gotten involved in one of these things and I'm sure everyone has, where they come to you and they say 'Why don't they build it somewhere else? This is our land, this is valuable, we don't want to sell it.' You always have to tell them, 'Well, we need it for highway purposes for all of the people in the State.' So, the Highway Department takes the land away from the people. Now when the Highway Department itself says 'This is now excess land, we don't need it for a highway, we don't need it for State purposes anymore.' The smart thing to do is to let it go back to the person from whom it was taken, at a fair price at that time. And this Bill, as Representative Schlickman says, went through the legislative process, the Highway Department was represented at the hearing and I'm certain that if they had not been there and testified in favor of this Bill, the Bill never would have passed through Committee, so all we're doing is trying to recompense to a ... a small degree, to extend a little favor that isn't costing the taxpayers anything, in fact, in this case they are getting a thousand dollars for about an acre and a half. Get that land back on the tax rolls where somebody will pay taxes on it and can use it and as I have mentioned before there are a number of tracts of land throughout the State, little pieces like this and the Highway Department should be out soliciting people to buy this land and to take it over and to put it to use and to pay taxes on



it. That's all this Bill does. We've passed hundreds of these Bills like this out of here during my Session here in the General Assembly and they have always been handled in the same way. Is it agreeable with the Highway Department? Do they need it anymore? Is the price fair? Ask the Highway Department if the price is fair. They have agreed to this just as they have agreed to all of the others and I would certainly appreciate it if you would give your vote of support in favor of this motion to override and I'd like to mention one other thing to you that this is one of Senator Sours' Bills and I'm sure we'd all like to retire him with a smile on his face. So I would urge your support."

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question ...115 'ayes', 3 'nays', 6 answering 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Three-fifths Majority is hereby declared passed, the Governor's Veto notwithstanding. On the Order of Total Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 1244, for which purpose the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Campbell is recognized."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this too is a Highway vacation easement in Clark County, for two and a half acres and a price was established at \$11,750. This is in the City of Marshall. I don't have the plat or the detailed information but I know the Governor used the same reasoning. that the Senate Sponsor did not explain to him the necessity for the Bill previously. He has been given that explanation since. I certainly ask for your favorable vote on the override."

Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1244 pass, the Governor's Veto notwithstanding? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."



DEC 05 1974

43.

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield for one question?"

Speaker Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Schlickman: "Do you have an affirmative statement from the Department of Transportation that the State has no present or future need for this highway easement?"

Campbell: "I don't have it on me but I did have it when I had the detailed informationwhen the Bill passed out of the House the other time."

Schlickman: "In other words the Department of Transportation affirmatively said to you that the State has no present or future need for this easement?"

Campbell: "Had no use for it at the time and also that the District 5, were the ones who established the price, the engineers there so far as the appraisal...."

Schlickman: "And the State has no future need for this?"

Campbell: "No highway need whatsoever."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1244 pass, the Governor's Veto notwithstanding? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. It takes 107 affirmative votes. Now, let's try and get them as quickly asIt's taking an awful lot of time to vote this morning. Have all voted who wish? Get on.

Thompson 'aye'. Thompson.....'aye'..... Ralph Dunn 'aye', if he is not already on? Have all voted who wish?

Walters 'aye'.Walters 'aye'....Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 108

'ayes', 4 'nays', 9 answering 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Three-fifths Majority is

hereby declared passed, the Governor's Veto notwithstanding. On the Order of Total Veto Motions appears Senate

Bill 1248, for which purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kozubowski is recognized."

Kozubowski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1248 would allow the Forest



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Preserve District of Cook County to increase its working tax fund from one point five million dollars to three million dollars. It would also allow the district to sell its bonds at a rate up to seven percent interest from four present which it is presently at now. This would mean that the bonds would become more attractive to the market investors. This request is made because there has not been a change in the working tax fund in the past eleven years. The Governor's Veto Message was very similar to that of Representative Day's in that he said because the Sponsors and the people in favor of this Legislation did not come to him with their recommendations he found the Bill unnecessary. But, we in Cook County feel that it is necessary and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1248 pass, the Governor's Veto notwithstanding? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Takes 107 affirmative votes. Giddy?.....Kenny Boyle 'aye'...Thompson 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Moving along. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question 115 'ayes', and no 'nays', 6 answering 'present', this Bill having received the Constitutional Three-fifths Majority is hereby declared passed, the Governor's Veto notwithstanding. On the Order of Total Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 1296, for which purpose the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Campbell is recognized."

Campbell: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is another highway vacation easement and it consists of 836 square feet in Vermilion County and the price was established at \$500. It went through the Code Department. There is no further need for the land and the price was established. I'd appreciate your favorable support."



Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1296 pass, the Governor's Veto notwithstanding? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Takes 107 affirmative votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Kempiners 'aye'. Kempiners 'aye'....Have all voted who wish? Dave Jones 'aye'. Everybody on who wants to get on? The switches are still open. Have all voted who wish? LaFleur 'aye'.LaFleur 'aye'.....Have all voted who wish? We are going to save an awful lot of time if those who want to vote get on now. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. McAuliffe 'aye'..... Jenison 'aye'...Peters 'aye'. On this question 110 'ayes', 5 'nays', 11 answering 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Three-fifths Majority is hereby declared passed, the Governor's Veto notwithstanding. On the order of Total Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 1635, for which purpose the Gentleman from Henry, Representative Neff is recognized. Representative Neff on the floor? Neff? Neff?.....No?...Okay. On the order of Total Veto MotionsOkay, Clarence. Turn on Neff. You got Neff on?....You're on, Clarence."

Neff: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 16....Senate Bill 1635, which was vetoed by the Governor. It was a Bill that would require the Illinois Department of Transportation to adopt as public this year long plan, for each 'physical' year road program,....by the first Wednesday in April of the previous 'physical' year. Now, at the present time the Department is required to publish its stand by the day the new 'physical' year begins. This year the Governor withheld his highway plans until the very end of the Session. Without this type of important information it was difficult for us in the General Assembly to consider appropriations for the Department. This Bill would make the Department more



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

accountable to the Legislators and would permit the Appropriations Committee to have the road programs long before the DOT appropriation was to be made. I think this is very important to each and everyone of the Legislators sitting on this floor to know what the Governorwhat the Transportation plans are. The Governor stated that accurate Federal revenue estimates for the coming year are not available in time to allow the program to be ready by the first of April. He's certainly wrong on this because the estimate is still only an estimate no matter when it is made and an estimate can be made at any time. At one time from 1959 to 1972 DOT submitted its road program by December 31st of the year previous to when the budget was actually adopted and so by asking this to be issued on the first Wednesday in April we're not doing anythingwe're giving the Department of Transportation a much better brake than they have had in the past. Iat the time this Bill was presented I talked to the Department of Transportation, they had no objection to it and I had no objections at all over in the House in any of the Committees it went through and I am surprised that the Governor vetoed it. I think maybe somehow or other his advisors gave him the wrong information, but I think this is something that's very important to each and everyone of us on this floor of this House to know before the appropriations is taken up by the Appropriation Committee.....we know what the estimated plans are and these are only estimated which they can have easily at this time. Therefore, I would recommend that we vote and would ask for your vote to override the Governor's veto on this particular instance."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is shall Senate Bill 1635 pass, the Governor's Veto notwithstanding? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. Takes 107 votes. Have all voted



who wish? ... Have all voted who wish? Kempiners 'aye'.
The Gentleman from Henderson, Representative Neff to
explain your vote, Sir."

Neff: "I.....For the life of me, I can't understand why any
Legislator wouldn't vote for this. As I say, the
Department of Transportation has no objection to it and
it certainly would be an advantage when we're handling
the appropriations....Appropriations Committee to know
what the estimated plans are and this isn't unusual to
have it at this time because a few years ago they had to
have it December the firstahead....before. And, so
I don't see why anyone wouldn't vote for this."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative
Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I
concur with Representative Neff, it's rather difficult
for me to understand why there are not more green lights
on this Bill. The difficulty that the present June 30th
date provides this House,....and the Appropriations
Committee with, is one I think most of you realize but
maybe not enough to provide the votes needed.....here.
When almost 25 percent of our State expenditures are tied
up in one Department's budget and this General Assembly
cannot see those finite plans on Bills the last week of
the Legislature. It seems to me we're doing the people of
this State a disservice by not having more time to work
on that appropriation. This Bill, Senate Bill 1635, would
provide that time and apparently not to the detriment of
the Department as they are quite willing to do this. So,
I think that there should be more green lights up there
and I urge you to support Representative Neff's motion."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Anyone else
wish to explain their vote? Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? ...Take the record. On this
question there are 78 'ayes', 7 'nays', 40 answering



DEC 05 1974

48.

'present' and the Gentleman's motion fails. On the Order of Total Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 1296..... Representative Campbell on the floor?Tom you are next. Where is Representative Hanahan? Tom you are next. On the order of Items....or Vetoes appears Senate Bill 1324....for which purpose...Oh!...I'm sorry, Tom... Tom....Representative Hanahan, I had promised Representative Miller I would go back to his item. On the order of Total Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 265, for which purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Tom Miller is recognized."

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



Speaker Telcser: "On the order of Total Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 265 for which purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Tom Miller is recognized."

T.H. Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House and thank you to Representative Hanahan for yielding for the moment. Senate Bill 265, if you recall, reduces the administrative fee charged by the State of Illinois in rebating ah... sales tax municipalities and counties. Presently the fee is 4% and the Bill calls for lowering it to 2%. In studying the Department of Revenue operations, we find that their actual cost is no where near the 4% they are presently charging. As a matter of fact, as near as we can determine, it's something less than 1% today. When we look at other states and how they ah... handle their administrative fees, we find several states that do not charge a fee at all and by and large, the vast majority of states that do have a fee ranging anywhere from, in New York, for example, nine tenths of one percent; California-1.1%. There isn't any other state to my knowledge that has a 4% administrative fee. Now if we override the Governor ah... the Governor's veto of this Bill, what will it do to our municipalities and counties throughout the state? It will return an additional \$6,000,000 to the 1,191 municipalities and 102 counties throughout the state. To give you an example of what it might mean to a town in your area, the City of Chicago, for example, will gain anywhere from one and one-half million to one and three-quarter million dollars if we override the Governor's veto. To a town like Alton, Illinois, it'll mean 20,000, Belleville 29,000, Waukegan 45,000, Peoria \$93,000, Rockford 92,000, and so on. It will help each and every municipality throughout our state and the counties to better serve the people that we represent as well. The Governor has indicated well, we don't like to lose that revenue to the State of Illinois, but there is no justification at all for the State of Illinois to charge that 4% fee. When we look at the revenue coming into the State of Illinois from sales tax, we find over the past few years that it has been increasing every year to the point where returning this \$6,000,000 to our municipalities will not in any event, lower the net revenue that the state is picking up. The sales tax revenue has continued to escalate



and we are not financially hurting the operation in the State of Illinois and I would ask that you continue to support this Bill as you have in the past. In our House Revenue Committee, it came out with a 23 to 1 vote. When it passed on the floor on Third Reading, we had in excess of the three-fifths votes needed and I ask you again to get behind your initial vote and vote again to help the towns and counties in your district. I ask you to support to override the Governor's veto of Senate Bill 265."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any discussion? The question is shall Senate Bill 265 pass, the Governor's veto notwithstanding. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. It takes 107 affirmative votes. Have all voted who wished? Anyone wish to explain their vote? Th Gentleman from Franklin, Representative Hart."

Hart: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this a ah... an excellent piece of legislation. Several years ago, we passed this Bill for the cities and ah... failed to pass it for the counties and Governor Ogilvie then vetoed it; but at that time, I was a Member of the Appropriations Committee and we asked Willard Ice in the Department of Revenue how much it cost the state to collect the ah... tax and ah... refund it to the cities and counties and at that time, it was much less than ah... the state was collecting. I think it was even less than 2% which ah... this provides, but ah... I have received a lot of ah... requests from the people in the local districts asking us to pass this Bill over the Governor's veto. Now the 1970 Illinois Constitution abolished the practice of onetaxing district making money off another taxing district. That is an abominable situation, but under the present law as it exists today, the State of Illinois actually makes money on the collection of taxes for cities and counties and I do not think that that's a situation which we should allow to continue and if we pass this Bill over the Governor's veto, then the counties and the cities will benefit from receiving as much of their revenues which they're legally entitled to as is possible without jeopardizing the state's situation because the state will then be more in a ah... in a condition of a break-even proposition rather than to make money on the cities and counties. I would urge all the Members of the House



to take a look at what this Bill does, to look at your mail and see if you haven't received requests from cities and counties to support this legislation and pass it over the Governor's veto so that the cities and counties can be treated fairly by the state as they should be."

Speaker Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman, to explain his vote."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I accept the logic in this Bill that the cost of collection that's passed on or charged to the units of local government in municipalities and counties should be no greater than the actual cost. In theory, that's fine, but let's be realistic and practical about the state's financial situation. We've heard from both the Comptroller of this State and the Governor of this State that if we engage in substantial appropriations by overrides this Fall, that in the not too distant future, we're going to be subject to the need for tax increase. I don't know how we can rationalize on one hand or justify on one hand overriding certain appropriation vetoes and on the other hand, reduce the revenue of this state. You just can't do it mathematically. While there's logic in terms of charging no more than what it costs, realistically and practically, we have to consider matching our appropriations with our revenue. And, therefore, I would urge a 'no' vote on this override."

Speaker Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I think that we should not only be realistic about state revenues, but we should also be realistic about local revenues and know that if this doesn't pass, local property taxes are going to have to go up. And I really think that we ought to sustain this veto, er... excuse me, override."

Speaker Telcser: "Have... have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question there are 117 'ayes', 14 'nays', 11 answering 'present' and this Bill having received the Constitutional 3/5 Majority is hereby declared passed, the Governor's veto notwithstanding."



DEC 05 1974.

1.

52.

Arthur Telcser: "Okay, ...on the Order of Item Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 1324, for which purpose the gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan is recognized."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is one of three item vetoes..ah or three vetoes that the Governor had in the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction's Total Budget. This is on the learning disability line item that would restore \$611,000 for the continuation of the program that was started three years ago, ah... 'The Discovery of Learning Disabled.' Every Member of the House has received mail from the Council on Learning Disabilities and the various organizations ah.... concerning this override. The original veto by the Governor stated that the Superintendent of Public Instruction ah... recommended this veto, which was in error. There was a recommendation since then by the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to override. It passed on an override motion in the Senate by 48 to 0. There was no significant opposition for the override and for this item I move to override the veto of the Governor."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Okay, the gentleman moves that the House restore the Governor's item of veto reduction. All in favor of the gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye' and the opposed by voting 'nay'. This will take 107 affirmative votes. Have all voted who wished? Do you wish to explain your vote,



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DEC 05 1974

2.

53.

Representative Hanahan? The gentleman from McHenry,
Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, this is a motion that would restore the Learning Disabilities ah... Program that the state has involved itself in for the last three years. If they do not restore the money the program ends and it has helped significantly in the areas of epilepsy and the areas of the learning disabled to discover this type of program. It is competitively bid. It's ah.... the organizations are bidding on this thing and it has to be within this school year if used throughout the state and I would appreciate an affirmative vote on this."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? The gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Ya, ah.... I'm sorry that I was off the floor. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Arthur Telcser: "He indicates that he will."

Shea: "Tom, ah.. I ah...I didn't understand when you talked ah... This Bill...it's for what ah... learning disabilities?"

Hanahan: "Right."

Shea: "Alright, now to discover learning disabilities ah.... how much is involved?"

Hanahan: "\$611,000."

Shea: "Okay, now and what's that the ah... dispersed to local school districts?"

Hanahan: "Yes, ah... the money note is ah... let by contract where a firm or firms to bid on, ah... various firms that



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DEC 05 1974

3.

54.

are in this business, to discover L.D. children through this Gestalt testing process. It's ah... a very cheap way of discovering or at least the ah.... way that the organizations have put down in their big books on learning disabilities. It's a very inexpensive way of discovering L.D. children through this screen processing programs that they have been developing."

Shea: "Alright, now if we do not return this money, what happens?"

Hanahan: "That program ceases and the children in Illinois that would have been tested in the next school year, the 90,000 kids or, however many in first grade or second grade will not be tested and all over the state, whether in Chicago or Cook County or downstate, will not be tested and therefore the program would end."

Shea: "Well, you're telling me then that it costs about \$8.00 a child for this test?"

Hanahan: "\$3.00. Less than \$3.00 a child and my own experience has been that to have a Gestalt test ah... costs an excess of \$75.00 a child to have ah... psychologist do it. Ah..... the state has been ah... through its bidding procedures has got it down to less than \$3.00 a child for the screening of these ah.... L.D. children."

Shea: "Thank you."

Arthur Telcser: "Have all voted..... the gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider."

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



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DEC 05 1974

55.

4.

Let me just stand ah... very briefly in support of the legis.... override that Representative Hanahan refers to. Ah.... when we talk about learning disabilities we are indeed in a new field and one of the important aspects of learning disabled children that probably we aren't aware of is that the kinds of children that are not identified early as learning disability children who are perceptually, auditorily .. handicapped, ah... find that these children eventually grow to be ah... disciplinary in learning problems despite the fact that learning disability children on an average have I.Q.'s that are above average. They are children that have handicaps that cannot be corrected as readily as ah... we would like because they ah... appear to be on first surface a reading problem or an underachiever problem. The reality is that these are minimal brain disfunction children who have to learn differently than the traditional classroom allows. We are now finding in current research that learning disabled children appear as often as 20% of the classroom and again despite the fact that they tend to be above average in traditional I.Q. tests. So any program that can early in the ah... career of a child, detect the fact that he has a learning disabled child, advances not only the educational program of ah... the society, but basically ah... the education possibility in achievements of that child. The learning disabilities is a relatively new problem, yet we need to find out more



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DEC 05 1974

5.

about it and we can do that by detecting that early in their lives, so I support Representative Hanahan's motion."

Arthur Telcser: "Is there further discussion? Does anyone else wish to explain his vote? Have all voted who wished? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question there are 112 'ayes' and no 'nays', 10 answering 'present' and this motion having received the required 3/5 th's majority is hereby declared passed and the item reduction veto is restored."

56.



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Speaker Telcser: "Okay, I want to go over to Resolutions, Consideration Postponed. The Sponsor has to attend a funeral in a little while. Senate Joint Resolution 87, for which purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brandt is recognized."

Brandt: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, copies of Senate Joint Resolution 87 was distributed to each and every Member of the House. It says these Commissions has an appropriation of two and a half million dollars for the development of the Capitol Complex. The Commission is ready to conduct the negotiations for the purchase of land by the Capitol Complex and the Commission feels that these negotiations should be conducted in a closed meeting to the public. Gentlemen, the State of Illinois leases about 96 $\frac{1}{2}$ square feet of space at an annual rental of about \$4,600,000 a year. The Commission feels that we should start to do something about the Capitol Complex which has been processed for the last twenty years and the thing that the Commission needs at the present time are the tools to bring this long developed dream into a reality. We in the Commission feel that we need this Joint Resolution to pass today so that we can start doing our work....and to build this Capitol Complex. The Senate passed this Resolution by a vote of 40 to 3. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would appreciate an 'aye' vote. We need about 2/3 of the affirmative vote to pass this Resolution."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Jones."

Jones, J.D.: "As a Member of the Space Needs Commission, this is the Legislative Space Needs Commission, your agency to acquire and to allocate space needed by the Legislature and the government and the ...this is an omission in the Space Needs Act to allow the agency to perform in this manner and we appreciate your vote so that we can go about



these matters in a legal manner."

Speaker Telcser: "The question is, shall Senate Joint Resolution 87 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. This will require 107 votes. Okay, I'm sorry I stated the number of required votes wrong, it takes 2/3 voting on the question, since it is stated in the Resolution. Is that correct? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this question111 'ayes', 5 'nays', 4 answering 'present'. This Bill having received the required 2/3 majority is hereby declared passed. 118?.....All right now. We've had a little confusion up here. We have a little confusion on this Resolution. This Resolution provides for thethe closing of open meetings and would require 2/3 of the elected Membership. Not 2/3 voting on the question. So, therefore this would need 118 votes. So, let's take this question again. The question is, shall Senate Joint Resolution 87 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', the opposed by voting 'no'. This will require 118 votes. Have all voted who wish? It takes 118 votes if we're going to pass this. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I want to explain my vote.....Mr. Speaker, am I correct that this takeswhat, 118 votes?"

Speaker Telcser: "That's correct."

Shea: "All right, now, as I understand this Resolution, the Space Needs Commission is going to talk about acquiring land within the Capitol Complex and all this is going to do is going to safeguard that those discussions so that they aren't public and have the price of land and speculators soar. Is that correct? And, is this limited to land acquisition?....."

Brandt: "Mr. Shea?"

Shea: "Is this limited to land acquisition?"



Brandt: "Land acquisition, yes."

Shea: "All right."

Brandt: ".....in the Capitol Complex."

Shea: "Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record.

On this question there are 118 'ayes', and 17 'nays', 8 answering 'present' and this Resolution having received the Constitutional 2/3 Majority is hereby declared passed....and adopted. Okay, on the item of the Order of Reduction Veto Motions



Speaker Telcser: "Okay ah... on the item of... on the order of Reduction Veto Motions... on the order of Reduction Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 1276 for which purpose, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative D'Arco, is recognized. John, 1276."

D'Arco: "Mr. Speaker, this is the Motion to restore the Governor's reduction of \$1,493 as a state contribution to the State Employees Retirement Fund and I would appreciate a favorable vote on this matter. It's only a question of \$1,493 and please vote affirmatively on this."

Speaker Telcser: "Any discussion? The question is shall the item be restored to Senate Bill 1276. All in favor of the Gentleman's Motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. This will take 89 affirmative votes. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative D'Arco."

D'Arco: "Speaker, I rise to explain my vote. This... we're really only talking about \$1,493. I don't really think that would affect the Governor's budget that drastically and I really appreciate... this Bill did ah... was, the measure was restored in the Senate and ah... I would really appreciate an affirmative vote on this and if you find it in the, your own conscience to vote affirmatively, ah... that's fine. So please do so. Someone else rise and explain their vote, do something."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, ah... I would like to reiterate that ah... John really needs the \$1,400 and I think this his first Bill and the least we can do is give John the necessary votes to give this tremendous amount of \$1,493 ah... to the Retirement Fund. This, I believe, is one half of one half of one percent of the total allocation and I, I think that ah... John really couldn't afford to pay it out of his own pocket, otherwise, he said he would. So I think we have enough Members here that ah... could give ah..., Representative D'Arco the additional ah... 40 votes to ah... to bring this ah... Bill. So ah... let's get on there. This is the Legislative Pay Raise Bill and ah... and I think we should all get together and give John some support. He said that he would vote for anybody else's Bill ah... that came up. So ah... he's checking the list."



He's sending out Chirstmas presents. So if you want Santa Claus and John D'Arco to be good to you, you'd better put an 'aye' vote up on there."

Speaker Telcser: "Anyone else wish to vote? Have all voted who wished? John, I'm trying for you. This takes 89 votes. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as the Sponsor pointed out, this is a restoration of approximately \$1,400 in the area of retirement contributions and this was a, out of the \$2,000,000 budget. I would imagine for the Medical Commission this is a, justifies a restoration and I thank the Members of the House."

Speaker Telcser: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question there are 92 'ayes', no 'nays', 24 answering 'present' and this Motion having received the required 89 votes is hereby declared passed and the item is restored."



Speaker Telcser: "On the order of Reduction of Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 1324. For which purpose the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan is recognized. Tom?"

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is on the line item reduction veto and the line item....which line item is it...because there is a few of them in this Bill...on motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion 1, page 17, line 15 and 16."

Hanahan: "This is a Chicago teacher's restoration for the amount that the Governor had vetoed and it passed in the Senate for the amount enacted would have been \$36,890,000 and it was reduced to \$34,464,600. This money is needed to fund the Pension Fund of the Chicago Teacher's Pension Fund. Now, there will be another one.....Yeah. This one \$2,425,400. This one is needed to adequately fund the Chicago Teacher's Pension. There will be another motion coming up on the downstate teachers and I move to concur with the Senate action in overriding the veto of the Governor on the Chicago Teacher's Pension Funding."

Blair in Chair.....

Speaker Blair: "Discussion? All right, the question is, shall the appropriation for the item reduced be restored to its original amount over the reduction of the Governor? All those in favor will vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. Mr. Hanahan?"

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I know many Members may not realize that this is what the teachers who are writing us letters about all of the time on their adequate pension funding. This is just an amount of money to adequatelymake the fund operate. We're not talking about full funding or anything like that. It's a couple of million dollars but it's what our commitment, under law, is to the teachers and I know the downstaters will be next and they'll



certainly want the Chicago Representatives voting for the downstate teachers funding and I know each of us receive a lot of mail on it. Now the Senate did their thing and I just suggest that the Members of the House should consider adequately funding these pension funds or we should change the law."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd like to point out that on the Bill preceeding this has made Legislative history whether you realize it or not....by making an attempt to get the State of Illinois on the accrual method of funding the State employees or teachers or whatever system happens to be on a basis other than a pay as you go, appropriating only enough to meet the immediate cash payouts for the coming year. What this is is a slight percentage of grade-in to put us on a track that ultimately we will reach not full funding as the court decision has had, but a full level funding which would supply enough money that if the system were stopped tomorrow, those employees with ten years service would have enough to get what they would be entitled to with ten years service in...those with twelve, fourteen, twenty and so forth. It's a very sound concept. This should be continued. I heard there were a few politicians and nonpoliticians who have toured the State and campaigned not only on this type of an operation but on complete full funding. Now if we're going to vote employee salary increases and to pass statutory obligations to fund these then I say it's about time that you showed some statesmanship and were honest with yourself and vote to put the money in the till. I would urge some more green lights on the board. It is a sound concept and it is a good concept and it is one that we really ought to be doing or else we ought to change the law and say 'to hell with the State employees and the teachers, don't give them



DEC 05 1974

64.

anything'."

Speaker Blair: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. What's the Gentleman's pleasure?.....Mr. Hanahan?....."

Hanahan: "Is this the second motion now?"

Speaker Blair: "No....What do you want...."

Hanahan: "I have an announce...."

Speaker Blair: "I'm going to have to leave it die....and Members are voting and how they vote is recorded they explain to the teachers back in their district..."

Hanahan: ".....get down..."

Speaker Blair: "All right. On this question there is 73 'ayes', one 'nay' and the Gentleman's motion failed. That's motion one. Motion two."

Hanahan: "Motion two, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House is a similar motion to override the Governor's reduction veto on the amount that was appropriated by the General Assembly for the downstate teachers fund. Now, with the last vote I feel very chagrined about the fact that I know there is going to be a lot of downstaters who appear before local IEA meeting and local educational type meetings and they have key meetings explaining to those teachers that they did not feel that their pension should even come close to a sound funding and this amount of money would restore \$3,973,000 to the amount of money that is necessaryjust to get even. Like Representative Wolf pointed out...this is something that is drawn for by law. This is not some magic formula that is called up. We should be meeting these obligations. I know many candidates for the Legislature speak about their sympathy toward what is equitable and right for the pension fund. Now here is a chance again to prove it and this is for the downstate teachers program for \$3,973,000 and I urge an vote."

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF

Speaker Blair: "All right. Discussion? The question is, shall the appropriation for the item be restored to its original amount...over the reduction of the Governor.... with respect to Senate Bill 1324. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Boyle 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. We're actually at 85..... Ebbesen 'aye'. The Gentleman desire to....Okay, on this question there are 85....86 'aye', 3 'nays', and the Gentleman's motion ...Catania 'aye'. 87 'aye'.....3 'nay'...and the Gentleman's motion fails. Senate Bill 1345, Ebbesen. Wait a minute. Yeah. Before you do that let's read some messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary, Mr. Speaker, I regret to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill with the Bill with the following title, to wit: House Bill 1114, a Bill for an Act in relation to reclamation of abandoned land mines, together with Amendments, passed the Senate, as amended, December 5th, 1974, Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives ...the Senate concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of the Bill with the following title, to wit: House Bill 1277, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Land Surf.....Surface-Mined Land Conservation and Reclamation Act, together with Amendments, passed the Senate, as amended, December 5th, 1974, Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 2480. A Bill for an



Act to amend Sections of the Unemployment Compensation Act, together with Amendments. Passed the Senate, as amended, December 5th, 1974 by a 3/5 vote. Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, 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 the Bill with the following title, to wit: House Bill 2815, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to compensation to members of the General Assembly, together with Amendments, passed the Senate as amended, December 5th, 1974, by a 3/5 vote, Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary."

Speaker Blair: "Yeah. Further messages. Go ahead."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendment to a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 2897, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Action taken by the Senate, December 5th, 1974, Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary, Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of the Bill with the following title, to wit: House Bill 2909, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for certain ordinary and contingent expenses of the State government, together with Amendments, passed the Senate as amended, December 5th, 1974, by a 3/5 vote, Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. "

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Ebbesen, you are ready with Senate Bill 1345?"

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, first of all I'd like to ask for leave of the House to consider both Motions 1 and 2, in one Roll Call since



they are related. Well, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Blair: "Does the Gentleman have leave to
Mr. Choate.."

Choate: "If I understood the Gentleman's request correctly,
it was only to hear Motions 1 and 2....as a combined vote
rather than 1, 2 and 3. Was that not correct?.....I
have no objections to hearing 1 and 2 together."

Ebbesen: "Yes, I only have two motions, 1 and 2."
Speaker Blair: "Yes, Mr. Ebbesen has 1 and 2 and then there
is a third.....And, he is asking that he be allowed to
discuss Motions 1 and 2."

Choate: "It's certainly agreeable with me, Mr. Speaker, and
I am the Sponsor of this Bill and I might say to the
House that the two motions are interrelated so I have no
objections to hearing them together."

Speaker Blair: "All right. The Gentleman will proceed."
Ebbesen: "I thank you, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Blair: "Did you read them both?.....Wait until he
reads them both."

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion 1 to Senate Bill 1345, I move that the
item on page 15, line 1 thru 4, Senate Bill 1345 be re-
stored. The item reduction of the Governor to the con-
trary notwithstanding. Representative Ebbesen. I move
that item on page 15, line 15 thru 17, Senate Bill 1345 be
restored. The item reduction of the Governor to the con-
trary notwithstanding. Joseph B. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
this subject matter deals with the Department of Trans-
portation appropriation a sum of \$424,000 was appropriated
within the Department of Transportation and the Governor
vetoed....reduced the item from 424 down to 24,000. I'll
read what he had to say here. 'The reduction provides
funds for a study to determine the feasibility of the
proposed train over the Chicago Northwestern, Chicago-
Rochelle-Fulton Route'. Now, I would like to point out



to you that a feasibility study was conducted in 1972, by the present Governor's Department of Transportation, and I have here, over the signature of Langhorne Bond, the Director, and I'll read from this, it does say that on pages 78 through 80 of that particular report, it is stated that the service would be feasible. Now I just, for the life of me, can't understand why we should have \$24,000 to conduct a study which was done in '72. The ridership was feasible at that time and certainly in view of the energy crisis and so forth as exist today.....I would think that it would even be more so in view of the circumstances. Now this has hadthis particular AMTRAK route has had overwhelming support from a surprising number of people who desire this service, passenger service. There is no passenger service whatsoever going through Northern Illinois on these Northwestern tracks. Now, there was also, at the time, within the appropriation \$100,000 for track renovation that was badly needed. Since that time the Chicago and Northwestern Railway has committed themselves to \$7,000,000 in improvements. It's to run from West Chicago, 100 miles west to roughly Sterling, Illinois and 55 percent or 55 miles of this is to be completed by the end of the construction season in '74 and phase two of course, assuming the seal is what it should be, will be completed in 1975. It only seems to me that it's inevitable that this service is going to take place. Here we are right on the threshold of this and to give you one illustration, when the Greyhound Bus Line went on strike, the City of DeKalb has 22,000 students unable to move as the result of no passenger service and the Governor himself, through the Department of Transportation, did get a train out and get these students home during the Thanksgiving Holiday. Now, the 22,000 students, roughly 65 percent of them come from the valley of this State since April 30th of '74. The East, which is the Suburban Chicago-Cook County area, and the potential of this route has been I would appreciate your consideration in voting favorably



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

for this override to establish this very much needed service across the top of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Choate.....Turn Mr. Choate on."

Choate: "Sometimes I wonder how long it takes those guys to push those buttons down there, Mr. Speaker, after you do recognize one of the Members of the House floor."

Speaker Blair: "Hopefully you'll be able to ...ah...you know, at some point in the near future, be a little more emphatic with regard to the operator."

Choate: "Thank you for your hope.... Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, these are what I consider very important, very important, reductions as far as the Department of Transportation's Budget is concerned. I would hope that you Members would bear with me for just one second because I know that you all realize the importance of this budget, that you all realize that it is one of the largest budgets that has and will confront this present Session of the General Assembly and future Sessions of the General Assembly, that you all realize that in the closing days of the last Session, this budget was screened thoroughly by the Legislative Branch of government to the extent that the Director was here practically day and night answering questions of the Membership. But it only points out, after all of this screening, and all of the thorough study, that the Legislative Branch of government can make, that sometimes we act a wee bit hasty because in this particular instance I think that we acted a wee bit hastily and granted monies that are totally not needed at the present time. Because the Department of Transportation and officials of AMTRAK have not had an opportunity to bring about a complete evaluation of the questions before us today.

AMTRAK, as an example, has not serviced this particular railline or this route since April 30th of '74. The ridership potential of this particular route has not been



determined either by the Department or by AMTRAK. An accurate estimation of the cost has not been made and this is probably where we made our mistake because we don't know. We do not know 'bona fidedly' that this is the amount of money that will be needed if this route is restored as far as the AMTRAK service is concerned. I point out to you that the Governor has and advisedly so, upon the recommendation of all parties concerned, left \$24,000 in in order that a feasibility study can be conducted and to determine the ridership and the true and actual and factual cost of this project. I personally feel I personally feel that we would be premature today if we overrode the Governor's Veto and sustained the motion made by my good friend and colleague Representative Ebbesen. I would therefore advise the Members of the House that there is only a month's time that we are talking about. A month's time until we come back in January, a month's time until the new General Assembly can have a feasibility report, an actual figure dollar amount if you please, that this route will cost, if the ridership determines that it should be serviced. I would therefore, Mr. Speaker, request the majority of the Members of this House to join with me in opposing the motion made by Representative Ebbesen."

Speaker Kempiners: "Is there further discussion? Mr. Ebbesen would you like to close? Pardon me, Representative Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Some of the things that our distinguished Gentleman across the street brought out, I don't think is fact....as he made the statement that the cost was not accurately made. There was an accurate check in cost made on this in 1972. On these figures the Bill that Mr. Ebbesen has, 30 percent was added for inflation, which I think is adequate. Now, establishing more AMTRAKS is probably one of the most important things that we have



in this State of Illinois....on account of environmental and also the energy crisis; it's very important that we start establishing more of these AMTRAK trains. This would serve a large area there and as been brought out, the Northern Universitywhere 60 percent of their students are from the Chicago area, would give them transportation and if we're going to take automobiles off of the highways, it's a must that we give the people some form of transportation. Trains will do it. This passenger train. I think it would be a shame, I think the Governor was ill-advised on this when he vetoed it. The original Bill that I had simi.....exactly like this, was passed the House, it went through two Committees without any dissenting votes and as I recall it there was no dissenting votes on the House floor last spring when that Bill was passed which was exactly the same as this Bill that was in the appropriations....transportation, so therefore.....all of us voted on this in the past and it's only a small amount of money for what it will do. I think it's important that we get these trains establish at once.....not put them off. If we're going to help on energy, which is very important and also on the environmental. Therefore, I would hope that we would give a yes vote on overriding this veto."

Speaker Kempiners: "Is there any further discussion? If not, Mr. Ebbesen to close."

Ebbesen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, contrary to what has been said previously by the distinguished Minority Leader, I have in front of me here some very accurate estimated fixed expenses that are dated March 11, 1974, addressed to Senator Shapiro, who handled this particular piece of Legislation in the Senate. For your information, it gives the estimated fixed expense at \$105,000. Labor expense at \$175,000 and operating expense at 120.....which totals 400,000 and as far as the



service expense is concerned the station expense is estimated at 78,000 and food service at 11,800...The total expense would be \$490,000. I'm giving you a lot of figures here but the loss that they project here would be \$342,000 and of course of the total of \$424,000...is to pick up two-thirds of the operating deficit as has been true in all of these AMTRAK cases here...would be \$227,000. There would be one \$100,000 contribution by the State for the improvement of those tracks and \$70,000 for the renovation of seven probable stations on the route. I would just appeal to you in closing that there is absolutely no passenger service whatsoever between Chicago, going straight West through such communities as DeKalb, Dixon, Sterling, Rock Falls,clear up to the Iowa line and this is an opportunity and I see no reason to wait another 30 or 60 days and reintroduce identical legislation with the same numbers and I would encourage a 'yes' vote.....on this proposed override."

Speaker Kempiners: "With regard to Motion #1 of Senate Bill 1345, the question is, shall the appropriation for the item reducedah...The Speaker indicated that there would have to be a separate Roll Call or the person putting the Motion may request that the same Roll Call be printed twice. So, on Motion #1, Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "I thought I made it clear that I would consider Motions 1 and 2 on the same Roll Call because they are related and I think we had concurrence from the other side."

Speaker Kempiners: "Mr. Ebbesen is requesting that on this Roll Call that the Roll Call be printed twice.....for Motion 1 and Motion 2....to Senate Bill 1345 and the question is, shall the appropriations for the item reduced be restored to its original amount over the reduction of the Governor? Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. Representative Grotberg to explain his vote."

Grotberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would certainly encourage everybody present in the House today to get on this vote. I see some red ones up there that probably are following their distinguished leader, who, with his kind remarks regarding this Bill, left out the main thing and that is, once again we're trying to move some people through the City of Geneva, through the City of DeKalb, through the City of Sterling, Dixon, et cetera.....on up to Fulton and Clinton, Illinois. There are thousands upon thousands upon thousands of students all along that road that have been frustrated now since the 1971 closing of what we call the Kate-Shelly..... This is a Bill and an override motion that is very essential to Northern Illinois. If you'll try to get a ride out of Chicago, anywhere across Northern Illinois, you'll find yourself in nothing but trouble on everything including the airlines. This is our last and only hope to move some people and I would urge.....please...please...recognize the problem of the thousands upon thousands particularly of students, who need your help with this small amount to keep an AMTRAK train going on this experimental basis for one year. Help us to try. Thank you."

Speaker Kempiners: "Representative Ebbesen to explain his vote."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote I would just like to remind you once again, as the distinguished Minority Leader did suggest that the \$24,000 is for a feasibility study that has already been conducted. I would like to read for you what was stated in a letter to the Mayor of the City of DeKalb, from Langhorne Bond, the Director of the Department of Transportation....and it's dated April 1974. I quote; It says; 'The State's innercity rail



program is based upon a report prepared by the Department, with the help of a consultant, in June of '72..... a copy of which is inclosed'. On pages 78 through 80 of that report it is stated that service would be feasible if crew arrangements could be established and equipment could be located to operate three round trips daily. Now this is the '72 report, certainly the circumstances lend themselves toward this type of service across the geographical area in the northern part of our State. I quote further, it says 'at that time our detailed investigation of this service revealed that the Chicago-Sterling has the ridership potential to be viable but the track conditions would require a three hour schedule'. That's what I want to elaborate. The point is that the railroad itself has a \$7,000,000 track renovation program going on right now and will be continued in the second phase next year.....and I just would plead with you the distinguished Minority Leader has said that perhaps within 30 to 60 days.....in 69 we can come up with more accurate figures. These figures we have in estimate are very accurate, very recent and I see no reason to have to go through this ritual of reintroducing the legislation in procrastinating on this much needed service and I would appreciate it if some of you people that are not voting to push those green lights and give us a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Kempiners: "Is there anyone else who wishes to explain his or her vote? Have all voted who.....Ah..... Tuerk 'aye'...The Chair recognizes Representative Kenneth Miller to explain his vote."

Miller, K.: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think everyone on this floor knows that this is probably going to be the last speech that I make on this House floor.

Now, I'm up here with the idea that I'd like to plead with you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, with you, I'd like to plead with you to give some green..



lights on this particular issue. I've lived along the railroad lines where the Kate-Shelly has run for many years. Actually more than 60 years. This area has no passenger train service at all....from the City of Chicago west to Clinton, Iowa and if we can get this train going again you'll do a great service for everythingah... Northern, Illinois. I noticed by looking at the board there are several Members who are not voting on this issue. I noticed many of those are some of my good friends from downstate. We are all interested in transportation in Illinois. This is only \$400,000. We talk about 4 million and 40 million and so on. This will do a great service to those people in Northern Illinois. Both....in from Chicago, on the train going west and from the west, going east. I understand this only takes 89 votes, Mr. Speaker and I'd surely like to see 22 more votes up there on the board and I would surely urge all of my friends on the House to give us a green vote on this particular issue. Thank you very....very much."

Speaker Kempiners: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Roll. Motion #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1345, there are 71 'yeas', 39 'nays', 8 voting 'present', and the Motions fail. Motion #3 to Senate Bill 1345, the Chair recognizes Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, will we have the Motion read first?"

Clerk Selcke: "Motions. I move that the House concur with the Senate in the restoration of the reduced items of appropriation in Senate Bill 1345 to the original amount over the reduction of the Governor, as follows: Page 13, lines 30 and 31, Amount Enacted, \$78,000,000; Amount Reduced, \$73,000,000. Page 13, line 32, Amount Enacted, \$106,100,000; Reduced Amount, \$101,600,000. Page 13, lines 33 and 34, Amount Enacted, \$37,200,000; Reduced Amount, \$31,700,000."

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen



of the House, I move that these item reductions be restored. These items represent the appropriation for House Bill 2792. As I'm sure you'll recall that Bill is the Bill which increased the percentage share of motor fuel tax revenue for fiscal 1975, which will be apportioned to municipalities, counties and road districts throughout the State of Illinois. The Governor's veto of these items....or....excuse me, the Governor's veto of House Bill 2792 was overridden in this Chamber some two weeks ago and was overridden in the Senate yesterday. Since these item reductions, which we are addressing, were based upon the veto of House Bill 2792 and since that veto has been overridden now, in both the House and the Senate, these items must now be restored. I so move that we concur with the Senate in restoring these items to Senate Bill 1345."

Speaker Kempiners: "Is there any discussion on this Bill....er..on this Motion? The Chair recognizes Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Certainly I hate to disagree with one of the nicest and quietest Members of this Legislature and one of the most attentive ...both in body and voting. However, what we're really talking about in this particular Motion of my friend Representative Houlihan, is the difference between repairing some streets in the City of Chicago and the County of Cook, and the resurfacing of some down-state farm to market roads.....so that we cut the issue clearly and put it where it is. Because the reduction of the \$15,000,000 is included in the 'State only works'.... this would result in 100 miles of farm to market roads that will not be widened or will not be resurfaced in the fiscal year '75. Or, that 220 miles of these roads will not be put under the contract for resurfacing in fiscal year '75. I don't know whether many of you know this or not, but when we talk about the distribution of the Motor Fuel Tax, that the Highway Study Transportation Commission



is at the present time making a study regarding the re-distribution of the Motor Fuel Tax and the impact that it would have for the entire road construction programs throughout the entire State of Illinois. The Department of Transportation is cooperating in this study so that they can bring about, if possible, a more feasible construction program as far as our road systems are concerned. Therefore, I think it would be a wee bit premature, a month or two premature, if we attempted to reallocate funds such as we would be doing with the motion of my distinguished colleague, Representative Houlihan, and that I think that we would not have the knowledge of the total impact that would be brought about. So I would suggest that we leave this alone for the present time, wait for the Highway Study Commission's report and the next Session of the General Assembly, before we bring about the reallocation of the Motor Fuel Tax Fund."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dunne."

Dunne: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is an extremely important issue we're about to address ourselves to. Both the Senate and the House have seen fit, by overwhelming vote, to override the veto of the substantive Bill and the Senate, by an overwhelming vote, has overridden this particular veto that we're addressing ourselves to now. Now the hope that people all over the State are riding on this vote, people from all areas of this State, from my area, those people that have suffered unjustly and unmercifully from the WPA street system situation in Chicago, their hopes are riding on this vote. So I alert you all, those of you who are concerned in the township, downstate, the people all over this State are aware of this vote and are looking for you to give this an 'aye' vote. It's extremely important. We cannot wait for anymore studies. This issue has been studied to death. This is a critical issue. It's not a permanent thing



you're doing here, it's only for one year.....but it's absolutely necessary to so many of our constituents and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, it is indeed a rare occasion that I would rise to disagree with our beloved and esteemed Majority Leader and it pains me grievously to do so. However, I would like to point out that the streets that we're talking about were paved back in the 30's, under the WPA. We have suffered....and these streets in the City of Chicago....longer than many of the Members of this present Body have been on this good earth. Now, when we get to the roads in Southern Illinois, we hear the pleas of the people and we understand, we respond with money, with kindness, and ever increasing shares of the motor revenue....er....the Motor Fuel Tax Fund. I don't want to point out that the people who live on all of these little broken up streets, that were paved by the WPA, ..are paying all of the tax bills for the Motor Fuel Tax Fund. They're not asking for something that's unjust or inequitable, they're simply asking for basic fairness. Just a little bit, we're not asking for too much. We're not asking for a ten year program or a study that might last us longer than the street. All we want is a little tar and a little asphalt to spread on our little street that probably carries more passengers in a day than many of the highway or many of the market roads carry in a week. Now, when we ask this for ourselves remember we of the Chicago area pay a tremendous portion of the Motor Fuel Tax Funds and we respond with kindness, with love and with affection to every single request that comes out here to help the downstate roads, whether it's in '54, or my friend on the other side of the aisle, or whether it's down close to St. Louis, or in the Northern part of the State, we hear your pleas, we understand, and



remember, your roads are going to be washed away in the spring again when the rains come and you're going to need some more help. Please help us do something about our little WPA streets and surely we will respond to your needs in the spring. Thank you.."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that the Minority Leader and the previous spokesman...or the previous speaker has somewhat underestimated the impact of this Bill and for that reason I am very thankful that the Legislative Service Unit has finally gotten this sheet of information telling how much is going to whom all over the State. Now....let's start with cities and villages. In the City of Chicago only, the amount of money which will amountwere down to half the amount of money we started with because this is only for fiscal year '75 and the Governor's Officeer..... the Department of Transportation says that they've already figured out how they are going to distribute December's.. but....December's money....but if enough Democrats get through to him, maybe he would be willing to change his mind and give us seven months worth out of this year. You'll notice in the City of Chicago, according to the Bill, that the money has to be spent on nonarterial streets. Now that's the street right in front of your constituent's home. In the case of the WPA streets, those are the streets with the potholes.....I mean they may not even exist as streets as far as I know....We found when we were drawing this Bill up, which was the Republican Leadership's answer to RTA for the township government downstate and in the metropolitan area, that the WPA streets and streets in our unincorporated subdivisions that are nondedicated had a lot in common, that is they were really falling apart. In fact, many of them did not exist. So, in the House what happened was, we cut



down what was going to the townships a little bit and added money for the cities. When it went to the Senate the Senate added the counties. Now, if the Minority Leader would like to talk about farm to market roads, I would suggest he refer to the two charts labeled Townships and Counties. The chart labeled Townships shows the approximate amount of moneyand here we have figured it out in the third column, I apologize for not not getting the subtraction done in the other two charts, we figured out how much is going to go to each county. You can figure it out for any county in the State. You can figure it out for all of the cities that are relatively large. This is a Bill that'll help every person in this State, and I definately urge you to vote in favor of it."

Speaker Kempiners: "Is there any further discussion on the Motion? If not, the Chair recognizes Representative Houlihan to close."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Membership to the Governor's Veto Message which states in fact that the reduction of these items was necessary to conform to existing law regarding distribution of Motor Fuel Tax receipts. That justification for these reductions no longer exist in view of the action of this Legislature in changing the distribution formula for Motor Fuel Tax receipts. I submit to my colleagues that we have a legislative obligation here. Having passed the substantive legislation, we have an obligation to fulfil what has been our commitment with the appropriate funding. This will not be a tax increase. It is simply a redistribution of existing Motor Fuel Tax revenue. As far as State only work from the Road Fund or revenues from the Road Fund for State only work, the net effect of this would be to leave for such works, in the road fund, some seventy-one and a half million dollars. That equates with what happened in fiscal '75 of seventy-two million



dollars which was actually expended; in fiscal year of '73, seventy-two million; and in fiscal year '72, seventy-two million. This is a very reasonable Bill. This Legislature by overwhelming majority has addressed itself to what it feels should be a new legislative priority in the distribution of the Motor Fuel Tax Funds. I earnestly solicit your support."

Speaker Kempiners: "The question on Motion 3 to Senate Bill 1345 is, shall the appropriations for the item reduced be restored to its original amount over the reduction of the Governor? Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The Gentleman from Lawrence, Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am voting for this Bill with a good deal of fear and trepidation less the people back in my District ever learn that I had done so. I'm voting for it for the future. I want the Sponsors to know that I share their frustration and hope in the matter of getting anything out of this administration for streets and highways. But...I want the Gentleman from Crystal Fork or Lake or wherever it's from to realize that the figures that he sent out here are sheer ...utter nonsense. When you multiply an inequity, as presently exists, between Cook County and downstate, you merely exaggerate the inequity that results to all the people throughout the State. Those of us who are downstate now voting for the Bill are expressing the hope that sometime...somewhere our turn will come, and we want you to write down, Ben, on your cuff that you owe us one."

Speaker Kempiners: "Does anyone else wish to explain their vote? The Clerk will take the Roll. Representative Dunne?....There are 98 'yeas', 16 'nays', 13 voting 'present'. The Motion passes. For what purpose does Representative Kalvo rise?"



Kalvo: "Was this Motion to override the veto?....Or, to accept...."

Speaker Kempiners: "To restore the reduced item....Takes 89 votes."

Kalvo: "All right."

Speaker Kempiners:

Faint, illegible text at the bottom of the page, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side.



Speaker Kempiners: "On the order of Reduction Veto Motions...ah...lies Senate Bill 1559 and the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Campbell is recognized."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies, and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1559, as you know, is the appropriation to the Department of Public Aid for the fiscal year of 1975. These motions address themselves to the reduction that was made by the Governor of twenty one million, three hundred and thirty-nine dollars and eight hundred and sixty eight cents (correctly transcribed as was spoken), representing the cost of living for the public aid recipients; and, Mr. Speaker, since there are 8 motions here, in order to save time, I wondered if I could have unanimous consent to consider all of those motions together at one time."

Speaker Kempiners: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Ah...The Gentleman from Union, Representative Choate."

Choate: "If I understand it correctly,...ah...I don't think it'd be advisable to take all of the motions to...in one package because...ah...there is a difference in feeling on some of the motions. Ah...You know they...as an example, this Body has been pretty consistent on the retirement portion of the...of all of these budget Bills...ah...Representative Campbell. I...I would suggest that you don't tie the retirement in with some of the other things."

Campbell: "All right, we'll consider them separately then."

Speaker Kempiners: "With respect to Motion 1, the Chair recognizes Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies, and Gentlemen of the House, it should be clear to anyone who shops in a food market, or buys clothes for his children, or fuel for his automobile the inflationary spiral of the past several years has seriously impaired the buying power of all the American families. People on fixed or regulated incomes have been hit the hardest. The aged, and the disabled, and the truly needy on welfare cannot adequately feed nor house their families at today's prices. From June 1972 to July 1974, the Bureau of Labor Consumer Price Index rose 20 percent, food prices in that same period rose 35 percent. Although it was basically



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

understood the aged, blind, and disabled would receive a 5 percent cost-of-living increase, that increase as of last October was 1 percent. The Department of Public Aid failed to notify the Legislative Advisory Committee on Public Aid of its plans to give the aged, blind, and disabled, and those on general assistance only a 1 percent increase amounting to approximately \$1.16 per month in increased benefits. In its November meeting, the Legislative Advisory Committee directed the department to increase those benefits to 5 percent to partially satisfy the intent of Senate Bill 1559. The 5 percent is not enough because of today's ever increasing cost of living. On the average, 5 percent results in an increase of only \$14 a month for a family of 4 living on the A.D.C. Program and only an average of \$8 a month to the aged, blind, and disabled. The state last gave a cost-of-living increase in September of 1972. Last year in October some grants under the A.D.C. Program were increased as a consequent of the change to the flat-grant program; but many families suffered a reduction in ^{their} grants at the same time. The average increases last year brought the standard of living for our state aid, aged, and needy population only to a level comparable to the consumer price index indicators for January 1973. All of us know how far behind we are now in our purchasing powers just two years later. I think you can all agree that the need is clear, that the Governor's reduction veto represents a lack of concern for the less fortunate people of this state and that this motion to restore the reduced amount over the Governor's veto deserves your support, and I respectfully ask your support in that behalf."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman from Union, Representative Choate."

Choate: "First, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to...ah...ask a question of the... Representative Campbell, who just...ah...just finished speaking, if he will yield?"

Speaker Keminpers: "Representative Campbell?"

Choate: "Ah...Representative Campbell, you were speaking, I assume, on Motion 1, was you not?"

Campbell: "Yes."

Choate: "Well, actually your remark was not directed at Motion 1, your..."



DEC 05 1974

remark was directed to Motion 3, which is the cost-of-living increase that you're talking about..."

Campbell: "My..."

Choate: "...As I understand it, Motion 1 has to do with retirement."

Campbell: "...Motion 1 is the total amount, page 1, line 6, of the total appropriation of twenty one million, three hundred and thirty-nine dollars and eight hundred and sixty eight cents...eight hundred and sixty eight dollars."

Choate: "Well, my memoranda shows me that Motion 1, page...line 1, I mean, page 1, line 6, and it has to do with retiring...retirement in the amount of \$800,030,000...ah...\$830,368."

Campbell: "What about it? What does he have? What does the Clerk have on that motion?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Page 1, line 6, amount enacted, \$1,000,000... \$1,520,748,000, reduced amount, \$1,499,408,132."

Campbell: "What was that last figure?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Reduced amount, \$1,499..."

Campbell: "Yes, that's what I have."

Speaker Kempiners: "For what reason does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea, arise?"

Shea: "I would like to inquire either of your Parliamentarian or the Clerk that the amount on line 1 or page 1, line 6 where it reduced the amount from \$1,520,000,000 to \$1,499,000,000. Does that not include the reduction of all items contained within the Bill?"

Unknown: "Yes."

Speaker Kempiners: "Ah...Representative Shea...ah...we have the motion and the Bill here. Would you restate the question please?"

Shea: "Well, as I read Motion 1, it deals with page 1, line 6, which is a reduction of some \$21,000,000. That is the reduced total of the line item reductions as it...we go through the Bill, is that correct?"

Speaker Kempiners: "That is correct."

Shea: "So that actually...ah...I would imagine that Motion 1 should not be put until we find out how Motions 2 through 6 go."

Speaker Kempiners: "Representative Campbell, what would you like to do on this? Would you like to hold this motion until the others are heard?"



Campbell: "Well, I think we may as well have a Roll Call on the...ah... on this motion."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Campbell, might I explain to you that what you're doing is changing the totals on the items we are going to vote through 2 through 6. Perhaps...wouldn't it be better to see if the motions on the specifics carry first before we change the total? That's all I'm asking you."

Campbell: "All right, I'll go along with that. I...I agree to...ah... take them separately."

Speaker Kempiners: "You...you wish to hold Motion #1 until the others are heard then? Okay, we'll proceed with Motion 2 to Senate Bill 1559, Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "I wonder if in that instance that I might have unanimous consent to consider 2 through 6."

Speaker Kempiners: "Does the Gentleman have leave..."

Campbell: "All right."

Speaker Kempiners: "...to consider Motions 2 through 6 together? There is objection. Ah...Motion 2, Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Yes, and this deals with the retirement system and it was reduced, as you know, there has been...ah...some question about...ah...the pension funds of being actuarily sound; and this merely effects...ah...I believe it's...ah...\$800,000 pertaining to that...ah...retirement fund in restoring it back to what would be considered actuarily sound; and I would move for the...ah...adopt the motion."

Speaker Kempiners: "Is there any discussion? Ah...Representative Choate."

Choate: "Ah...Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is the motion that I was referring to primarily that if the House want...wishes to stay consistent that it will defeat this motion simply because the House by it...in its wisdom has refused the same request from various other state agencies and governmental bodies throughout the State of Illinois such as your institutions of higher education and etcetera. This has to do with the retirement; so I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that...ah...this motion...ah...by Representative Campbell do not pass."

Speaker Kempiners: "There are several Members who were on this previous motion who asked to be recognized...ah...one has said that he does not



want to be recognized on this other motion. Representative Rayson, do you wish to speak on Motion #2?"

Rayson: "The matter on which I wish to speak on does refer primarily to the cost of living, although it's germane to other things, and I... I would vie to speak at that motion at that time."

Speaker Kempiners: "Thank you, is there any other discussion on Motion #2 to Senate Bill 1559? Ah...The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Davis."

Davis: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, and Ladies, and Gentlemen of the House...ah... this has to do with the reduction in the retirement contribution, and it reflects the Governor's position of not funding retirement above the 6.4 percent level, and this is what they've done to all agencies; and I don't...I...I don't know, there's no fight as far as I'm concerned over the retirement because this is what they've done to all...to other agencies; but after that, this is what they're gonna' do to poor people. This is what they're doing to working people who've got jobs...ah...but these aged and blind, so I...I don't want to fight over this because they've done this to all agencies and it reflects his position on the 6.4 percent."

Speaker Kempiners: "Is...is there no further discussion? Okay, on Motion #2 to Senate Bill 1559, the question is, shall the appropriation for the item reduced be restored to the original amount over the reduction of the Governor? Those in favor vote 'yes', those opposed vote 'no'. Collins 'aye'. Mahar 'aye'. Waddell 'no'. The switch is still open for those who...ah...okay, Waddell 'no'. Representative Macdonald 'aye'. Does anyone wish to explain his vote? Ah...The Clerk will take the Roll. On this question there are 48 'ayes', 16 'nays', 44 voting 'present'; and the motion fails. With...with regard to Motion #3 on Senate Bill 1559, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Now...now, Mr. Speaker, we get into an item which is considerably more important and we do certainly request your support to ...on this motion, and this is for the aid to the aged, blind, and disabled; and certainly if there is any group of people in this State of Illinois that do need help, and particularly during an



inflationary period, it is this group; and I ask for your favorable support on this motion."

Speaker Kempiners: "Ah...For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian, arise?"

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, would the...would the Sponsor yield to a question? Would he yield to a question?"

Speaker Kempiners: "Would...would the Gentleman yield?"

Mugalian: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, and Ladies, and Gentlemen of the House, I have the veto message before me; and I'm puzzled by the arithmetic. The item on page 1, line 6, which is the total sum, shows a difference of approximately \$21,000,000. I would assume that that figure would be a total of...of the reductions in the following specific items; and yet when I take the total of the specific items following, the total is much larger than \$21,000,000. For example, the reduction for aid...aid to families with dependent children under Article 4, there's a reduction in the veto of about \$19,000,000; but then there's another figure, the next to the last item on the...on the first page, where the reduction is about \$22,000,000, which far exceeds the total on page 1, line 6; and I'm just asking for an explanation."

Campbell: "You'll...you'll find that in Section 3 of...ah...Senate Bill 1559...ah...that in regard to these motions that...ah...particularly Motions 3, 4, 5, and 6 that that expresses the dollar amount. Now, you get into the last three motions and that simply earmarks the amount of money for the cost of living to be taken out of the dollar amounts in the...ah...in Section 3."

Mugalian: "Then...then those are duplicated and that's that?"

Campbell: "Well, it just earmarks it."

Mugalian: "Thank you."

Speaker Kempiners: "Thank you. The Gentleman from Cook...ah...Mr. Shea."

Shea: "No, I just wanted...on that that 31 was a duplication of the amounts already appropriated in 3, but for this specific purpose of a 10 percent increase. That's all, is that right, Chuck?"

Campbell: "Right."

Speaker Kempiners: "Is there any further discussion? 3? All right, if there is no further discussion...ah...Representative Campbell to close."



Campbell: "I simply ask for your favorable support for these real needy people."

Speaker Kempiners: "On Motion 3 to Senate Bill 1559, the question is, shall the appropriation for the item of this be restored to its original amount or the reduction of the Governors'. Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Lawrence, Representative...ah...Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies, and Gentlemen of the House, no one wishes to be thought insensitive to the needs of the poor, especially this season of the year, but I would caution my brethren on this side of the aisle and the other legislative persons here, too, that we should pause a moment before we rush in here to rescue this Governor from the dilemma created by his irresistible desire to be everything to everyone every opportunity. Obviously, this is a case of the winner walking home over the backs and stomachs of the poor, the very groups that were so decisive in his election; but it isn't our responsibility to rescue them from their mistake in putting him in that particular office. It was he and not we that promised so much to the poor. It was he and not we who promised the rich and those in between a \$500,000,000 reduction of the taxes; but, unfortunately, alas for us, the public holds us and not him responsible for his failure to perform. The Governor's position is cynical, but from a political point of view, it's impeccable. He might be able to parley it into a Washington, D.C. address. He knows full well that his defection will be forgiven very soon and go unpunished, and that the poor will continue to vote unanimously for his ticket come what may. So I say to those of you on this side that have the temptation always to furnish an excuse to this Governor for his nonperformance, you have a splendid opportunity to get the monkey off of your back. I, for one, am weary of being a political patsy for his nonperformance. That's the reason that I'm voting 'no'; and I suggest to the rest of you that it would be a good move to make."

Speaker Kempiners: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the

Roll: On this question there are 116 'yeas', 2 'nays', 14 voting

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



'present'; and the motion is adopted. With regard to Motion #4 to Senate Bill 1559, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman for...from Vermilion, Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Now, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies, and Gentlemen of the House, I've previously addressed some remarks to this particular question and this is the cost-of-living increase for the aid families with dependent children. Now, I know that this Body a number of times and over the years has done some mighty responsible things, although, they were not popular; but I want to remind everybody in this House floor, and I know that the A.D.C. Program has not been a popular... with your constituents in many instances, but I can't see how anybody can sit on this House floor knowing that 3/4 of those people are children. The other 1/4, of course, are the mothers. So I would simply ask you for your favorable support on this motion."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies, and Gentlemen of the House, I join with my distinguished colleague on the other side of the aisle. I plead with you to vote along with him in this override. I might say to you in passing that these little children didn't ask to come into this world, they found themselves here. As my distinguished Leader in the Advisory Committee, Senator Moore, 'That reminds me', he says, 'Preacher, you'd better get ready now 'cause now they're gonna' take off after this'; and well, I am ready. One of the greatest ceremonies in the Christian Church is the baptism of little children. I'm sure all of you have experienced it; and I don't know anything that I enjoy better than to participate in that service. Just Sunday they brought little children up to the alter and I was asked to baptize them; and you don't know what a thrill it was. When I said to the parents, to the Godparents and all of those who are responsible, when I said to them, 'Name this child'. I'm saying this to you because there have been much debate in this House about A B C and little children, and when I say of the parents and the godparents, 'Name this child', and they named the child, I always before I baptize try to emulate the Master, and I put my hands on their heads and I begin to say that I wish that his hands, meaning the Master's hand, had been laid on my head and



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

that his arms had been thrown around me, that I might have seen his kind lips when he said, 'Let these little ones come unto me'. Do you recall when the Disciples wanted to keep him away? Do you recall the great rebuke, he said to them, 'Tell the little children to come unto me and forbid them not of else such is the Kingdom of Heaven'. Do you understand 'of such is the Kingdom on Heaven', and then he gave another sacred admonition and you subscribed to the Christian principles, that 'unless you become as one of these little ones, you shall not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven'. You've heard that. This is written in my Bible, 'unless you become as one of these little ones...', these are live children, these are children who have been born. I've heard the great fights on this floor about abortions and children who have not been born and that they are entitled, and I've heard it many, many times, that the unborn little children are entitled to life. Then let me remind you they didn't have to come into this world, they find themselves here and it's the duty and responsibility, I don't believe the people all over this state will criticize us because we are going to give a cost-of-living increase to these little babies who cannot work, to these little babies who must be educated, to these little babies who must be given a chance, I don't believe the people all over this state will criticize us. In fact, I believe that those who subscribe to the human principles, Christian issues, will congratulate us; and more than that, let me give you this solemn and sacred warning, 'It is better to have a millstone tied around your neck and cast into the sea than to harm or stand in the way of one of these little ones'. I plead with you now to vote with my distinguished colleague, vote with the distinguished Chairman of the Legislative Advisory Committee on Public Assistance, Senator Moore, and override this veto."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies, and Gentlemen of this House, it's always a difficult act to follow after Representative Davis has spoken so eloquently, and as any Member to this House knows, seldom if ever had I stood up here and supported any public aid appropriations;



but I had the opportunity, thank God, of going to church with my family on Thanksgiving Day, you've had your chance, and I couldn't help and he will...the deacon will correct me, but I couldn't help as the priest read the gospel about the rich man who had so much he didn't know what to do with it, so what he did he stored it in grain bins and the Lord said, 'You fool because this day I'm removing you from this life and you had so much you could've done for so many, because of what you do for the least of these, my brother, you do for me'; and it seems to me that's what we're saying in this Bill. There's not a Lady or Gentlemen on the floor of this House, and I dare say in the balcony, that didn't have the opportunity on Thanksgiving Day of sitting down and enjoying a sumptuous feast of one kind or another and being truly thankful for what the good Lord had given them; but what about the people that are the subject matter of this particular legislation? I would venture to say that every one of them sat down and thanked God for what they had and it's very, very miniscule. We have this very day overridden the Governor's veto and poured more and more thousands of dollars into roads and concrete; but what about the poor that are among us, what about the people? We're down here to represent the people, not the concrete industry, not the road industry, we're here to represent the people. They're not asking for wealth, they're not asking for help, they're not even asking us for happiness. All that we are doing with this piece of legislation is giving them an existence; and if we cannot pass this over the Governor's veto and let these people exist as decent human beings with a little bit of dignity for a change, then there is not one Member of this House of Representatives that has the right to say that he truly represents the people of this state because when we represent the people, we represent the poor as well as the rich, we present the indigent as well as the wealthy; and it's time, particularly we Republicans, particularly we Republicans, it's time we tell the people of this state we are not insensitive to the needs to the poor, we are not the party of the rich; we are the party of the people, and we're going to override this veto and give these poor people what they truly deserve.



Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rayson."

Rayson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The two Speakers before me have certainly impressed me and normally I would say that they have said what needs to be said to this particular motion, and I commend the last Speaker in particular for his sincere way of which he feels that we must, out of responsibility, act in support of this motion and to override this line veto; but I have another reason in addition to what has been said. I've been here 10 years now and my advisors in public aid have been the great deacon that always speaks on these matters and another colleague of ours, Representative Robert Mann, and he's not here today, and I know he would speak most vehemently and persuasively on this matter today, and I feel somewhat of a legacy to speak in his behalf while he recuperates and gets back here and does his thing for public aid and the poor as he always has and always will. So I say to each of you, I'm a little uneasy as I speak here, notwithstanding what's been said, because all the...the similar atmosphere suggests that we're going to support this motion, but I'm...am a little unsettled as to whether or not in fact we will. To me this is one of the most important symbolic acts we can do right now at this time to close out these waning days of this Session; and particularly when it's accompanied by other things, such as the legislative pay raise, which I think from what I hear is...is...ah...kind of a compromise that I don't even like, but this 10 percent, this increase from 5 to 10 really is a nothing, it's really tokenism, it's really just...ah... a psychological feeling as how we treat the poor because it doesn't go to the question of their needs. When the Chicago Welfare Council was down here last Spring and when we reviewed their problems and their needs in light of the inflation that's taken place, we realized even at that time that the matters of their limited check go...go to the things which are the hard-core elements of un...inflation. At that time, it was about a 36 percent...ah...inflationary rate to them on their items that they need for their limited budget. Now, with the increase of at least of 1 or 2 percent a month of inflation and inflation has been going on for a long time...ah... since, I dare say that they're really swarmed under a 40 percent...ah



...factor so that this 5 percent is hardly to...to give the cost-of-living increase from even last Spring; but more than that, at this time if we don't recognize that the poor are people that we must humanize and protect, and we must also do it with respect to them, these items really go to those who are disabled, those who are sick, the aged, and blind. We're not talking about welfare cheaters or whatever that means, we're talking about human beings who can't make it; and I'd like to make another point to back up the Representative who made this motion, a pragmatic point to the people who are here, there may be some of us who are looking at dollars alone and that is pennywise to deny proper...ah...dollars to the aged and disabled. These people are the heaviest users of the expenses, medicaid program, now to the extent that we can keep our Senior Citizens, our disabled, and our poor, who live in deprived and in inadequate conditions, healthy; we can spare costly hospital and doctor services and perhaps slow down the tremendous outlay of welfare dollars for the welfare program. Bear that in mind, by giving them cost of living, by giving them an adequate share to live on, we can, in effect, perhaps save the state further funds at a costly hospital and medicaid programs. So in closing, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say this that I'm uneasy now, I hope we carry this motion very resoundingly. I'm uneasy in light of the fact that I've heard some talk that there may be a deal with some people to uphold the Governor here so he can go through with that pay raise Bill for us at 20, and I think that this...think that this is involved, I hope it isn't involved, but I'm saying to each and every one to vote for this motion on this particular line item, to support this knowing that it's tokenism; but it's all we have to offer now so that we can come back later and do justice to the poor. Thank you."

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

Borchers: "Well, Mr. Chairman and fellow Members of the House, now everyone here knows that I am a consistent opponent of welfare and the things that have been going on in the welfare in this state, the inefficiencies, the graft, the...the improper handling, the thousands of individuals who are illegally taking money from our state. I



know...and I remind you that 6...as of 1973, 62.3 percent of all children born on welfare are illegitimate. Around 30 percent of the ...the recipients on welfare are either...to a certain degree or a greater...great degree receiving money illegally from the people. I remind you that there are nearly 2,500 births a month that we're paying for and that at least costs us nearly \$4...around \$400 a birth; but let me point out to you something, those children didn't ask to be born, those children...that are illegitimate didn't ask to be born. The children that belong to these families are the ones that are helpless and so I have to take the position with my friend, Representative Davis, that our responsibility is to the children and the families that we should go and do what we can to hunt out the grafters, we should hunt out the grafters, but we shouldn't harm the 60 some percent of the people that need help at the expense of the 30 percent that are cheating us. I have no intentions to...to vote in a way that would encourage and support starvation, so I intend to vote for this override."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor 'aye', those opposed 'nay'; the 'ayes' have it. Ah... Representative Campbell to close."

Campbell: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies, and Gentlemen of the House, I simply say to you that these people are not ripping off the State of Illinois, they are victims of the system, and they do need your help; and what higher priority can we place on government spending than for human needs, and human qualities, and human necessity? I ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Kempiners: "On Motion 4 to Senate Bill...Senate Bill 1159, the question is, shall the appropriation for the item reduced be restored to its original amount over the reduction of the Governor? All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The Chair recognizes Representative Waddell to explain his vote."

Waddell: "Inasmuch as my recorder won't work, would you cast me as 'no', please?"



Speaker Kempiners: "Representative Lauer."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies, and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote, I'd like to quote just a few statistics. 75 percent of... of the people on the A.D.C. Program are kids, I defy you not to feed a hungry child. Of the 25 percent that are left, that are adult, 63 percent are nonwhite, 78 percent have no high school diploma, 32 percent have no high school education at all, 38 percent are women deserted by their husbands. These women have 8 percent of them... an act...exactly 8 percent of the total public aid budget. These are women with children that are school age. You have 13 percent that are women who have children below school age and they have the problems of no day care centers. These are not the groups that cheat on public aid, these are not the groups that cheat on public aid, these are the groups that are in need of the help of all of the people of this state. I probably have in my district fewer people on public aid than any other district in the state. However, I'm sure that my district can afford to help those in other districts who are less fortunate than we are. I strongly solicit an 'aye' vote for this restoration."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I sit here quietly trying to refrain from saying anything on this particular issue. I think that...ah...we all realize what's involved here. I think that we also all realize on what our responsibilities are and where they lie. We read everyday in all of the newspapers across the state and all of the various cities and towns concerning the problems that we have in terms of inflation, in terms of the problems that people on fixed incomes have, in terms of the anti-social problems that we have. We spend hundreds of thousands of dollars in our penal institutions, on corrections, on police, on fire protection, and what do you have? But here what we're talking about, I think, is the crux of where many of our problems lie, because here we are talking about the kids. We're talking about a group of people that whether any of us here like it or not is a part of our society. We will do one of two things, we will either attempt to try to work toward a positive solution in



terms of their upbringing and one of the basic things is for them to have a sufficient assistance to be able to ah.. compete in our society or we will pay for them at the other end of the spear where we will have to pay for them in the manner of corrections and all of the anti-social problems that go along with that. I think that we can make a positive choice here. I think that in many respects we have an opportunity to not only exercise a responsibility, but to show that we have the courage of our convictions and to show that we have not only sympathy, but to show that we have in ourselves the statement like being to really get to the heart or the guts of what the problem is. We will either set our priorities in such a fashion that we will deal with the basic needs of people in terms of hunger or we will continue to set our priorities in the fashion that we will deal with things that are concrete. We can deal with things that are tangible, but these are things that you cannot put your finger on. I think that we have a responsibility here and I would plead that ah.. we need about seven more votes there and I would hope that in this time of year especially that we could get those votes to allow at least in a small measure, some few kids to have a better way of life. Thank you."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Holloway."

Holloway: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ah.. I rise to explain my vote and ah... this probably will be the last time I have the the pleasure and the honor of addressing this House. And I think that it is appropriate that ah... my last speech comes on an issue such as this. I've heard ah... the speeches or ah.. the explanations of other Representatives and all of the ah.... talks in regards to the little children. Most assuredly the observations made in regards to ah.. the faith of the little children is well taken, but as I sit here recognizing my responsibility and equating ah.. I hope, equally the responsibility of each Member of this House, ah.. I think that what's here is ah... not so much the welfare of the children because I'm sure by hook or crook the children will survive. I wonder how we as a society will survive? I remember on one occasion at my church I was asked to make an appeal for the collection. And ah.. in searching around for an issue which hopefully would reach the hearts



and minds and pocketbooks of the ah... parishioners, I spoke of conscience time. And I think that this particular moment is conscience time for each of us as a State Representative representing the interests of all of the people of the State of Illinois, not just the people of our particular district. Now I know that this ah.... this distinguished Body is seldom persuaded by emotional appeal. For the most part ah... we're professional people, business individuals and we deal in facts and figures, but I suggest to you, that ah... let's not worry about the little children, let's worry about ourselves and whether or not we can in good conscience let that board close up there without 89 votes on the board. And I suggest to you that for you and me that this is conscience time and let's listen to our conscience that says that the needs of the people are superior to the needs of the Governor for political purposes. I urge you.... those of you who have not voted.... those of you who are voting 'present', vote 'green'."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rayson."

Rayson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I feel impelled again to say a few more words. We need a few more green lights up there. I can't understand it. You know the U.S. Bureau of Labor statistics show the cost of living has gone up more than 1% a month. The Consumer Price Index is more than 20% in the last two years. The Bureau of Labor statistics estimates that the low income standards of need now is \$6200 for a family of four. I just don't understand this. You know, it seems like the highest priority ah.. if there is ever going to be anything to anybody ah... it should be to the poor, to the unspoken, to the people who have no power base, to the people who really are in fact the invisible constituency. And it seems like this is the highest priority of all. And to us to suggest that we should give them 10% instead of 5% for cost of living only is a niggardly approach to this problem, but still it's something so that we can do better next trip. So let's get those green lights and get this thing on the way so we can go home and feel responsible. Thank you."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Thompson."

Thompson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've listened to the eloquent speeches of those who are speaking in favor of this



motion and I'm not able to express my appreciation for their action. I think of the people.... ah.. sometimes we have a \$1.25 in our pockets and a full stomach ah.. we forget about the world and those who are less fortunate and say, 'Let the world go by'. Pay raises for the Legislators, 'yes'. Pay raises for the Judges, 'yes'. But pay raises for the poor people, for the children that can't help themselves, ah.. we sit here and vote 'present' or not vote at all. I hear them talk about the cheating. There are no perfect organizations There are no perfect groups and there never will be because there are no perfect people to form these groups and organizations. You have cheats every place and yes, in the Legislature. And you're going to find them everywhere in this world as long as mankind is an occupant and inhabitats the world here. The children need help. If my constituents want to condemn me for voting for something that's going to help the poor people to eat, they will just have to condemn me. This will probably be my last speech on the floor, but I have always voted my conscience and I don't care how my constituents feel. There are no one group of people on the Public Aid Rolls..... ah... if you notice the statistics in the Times ah.. not too long ago, how many people that dominate the ah.... ah.... that are on the Public Aid Rolls. I would urge you to give it a thought... to think about it seriously how you can help. And think about the ah... some of the ah... what I call useless things that we have voted to pass and made appropriations for and think of these young children and the poor people who are unable to protect themselves. Let's help them now. Thank you very much."

Speaker Kempiners: "Before we recognize ah... and there are several others who want to speak; ah.. I just want to make this statement. We are using the time clock in an effort to speed things up here and ah... if the mike goes off ah... we'll turn it back on, but please observe the time limit. Ah... the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, in eight years ah.. I have never once ridden on the issue of Public Aid, but I want to say that in simple fairness and justice, I think that we oughta take a look at it. Public Aid recipients receive perhaps \$.26 a meal, which we in



this state say is enough. But I think we have to balance that against the amount of money which we call enough for Legislators and other people who do the state business. We do not cry that \$.56 would be enough or double the amount per meal. We do not calculate that \$.26 a meal is \$.75 or \$.78 a day. We don't say that Legislators ought to spend perhaps no more than \$2.00 a day for a meal. We don't ask the other bodies in this Assembly to take just \$5.00 for a meal. When we ask how much is enough, let's look at the records. Is \$20.00 a day enough for us as Legislators and the answer that we get back is, 'It is not'. We have to live a little, we have to sleep a little and above all we've got to eat pretty damn good. Is \$30.00 enough for us and the people who do the business of the Legislators? And I say again, the answer comes back, 'It is not enough'. Is \$32.00 a day enough for us to take care of the Legislative business? Is that enough to feed us for one day? And the answer comes back a resounding 'No, it is not'. And we will look again.....(microphone turned off during speech).... where we will ask ourselves, 'Is \$36.00 a day enough?' And the answer from most quarters will come back, 'It is not.' I suggest that we take simple elementary fairness and when you take a look at that check that you receive from the Doorkeeper today that pays you \$32.00 for one day, I suggest that you compare that against the \$.78 for all three meals that people on welfare have to receive and remember you are talking about the children. And if there is any asset in this society that ought to be saved... if there is any crop that should be saved from the storm, it ought to be the children. For the children are indeed, our only true asset. And I ask only again when you look at your check and you check that \$32.00 a day; you once again reconsider as to whether or not people on welfare ought to receive a measly \$.07 1/2 per day, per child. Consider it in your interests of fairness and justice. And if you can still vote 'no' and vote 'present' than I ask you to take that into consideration when these other raises come around. You can't save it all on welfare and the children. Thank you."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Douglas."

Douglas: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't like



belaboring a point and certainly wouldn't if we didn't need a few more votes to get this ah... this issue passed. However, it's a coincidence at this moment ah.. as Representative Ewell just alluded to the matter of our per diem expenses, that our checks are being handed out to us by members of the staff of this House. I just received two checks amounting to \$92.00. And as I stand here looking at 83 votes up on that board, my tendency at this moment is be deeply concerned about the fact that those two checks were put on my desk just now and moments from now we're going to have to vote on the issue of our own pay raises, which I have always supported. But I'll say right now that if I don't see the 89 votes up there as a man who is not coming back next Session, I'll be damned if I'm going to vote to give you a pay raise next Session."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't think that we can minimize in explaining my vote... we cannot minimize the terrible and dire effect that inflation has cost us. It's true that some of the people on welfare are greedy and not needy, but we should not penalize the needy. I do feel that it's necessary that we try and get 89 votes and personally ah..... a prior Representatives comments are very true. If we can afford to eat and eat fairly well ah.. I think it's only fair to pass this. Can't we get six more votes up there? We've got to show our humane Christmas spirit now."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, along with many other Legislators, I attended the conference held by Comptroller Lindburg two or three weeks ago involving the budget and the budgetary process and we looked at some of the current projections that ah... he has been able to devise in order to take a look at what's going to happen to the budget of the State of Illinois in the future. There were many of us who were quite concerned about what we saw... about what the budgetary picture of this state will look like in a year and a half from now. And many of us made a firm commitment and a firm resolution to ourselves, I think, that as a result of that and other fiscal data that we have received in the last few months, that we



were going to hold the line on spending. And I've heard all of the speeches on the other side of the aisle talking about how we ought to do things for the little children and for the poor people and so forth. It kind of alarms me because most of those green lights that I see up there now aren't green lights that we've seen in the past for social issues and social programs. I wrestled with this question a great deal. It has concerned me ah... to the point where I was really undecided up to the point of this vote. I think many of the speeches that have been made and points that we have heard certainly are indeed true. While I think that the Legislature has to take an approach for fiscal responsibility, but we must indeed take an approach that we are indeed going to hold the line on spending. If we're going to spend it for public employees pay raises, if we're going to spend it for other matters that we have overridden Gubernatorial vetoes on in the past two days, then I think we have to do it for the poor. I hoped that I wouldn't have to make this decision ah... that my vote wouldn't really count on this issue, but unfortunately, with 82 votes up on the board, my vote will count.... (microphone turned off).... the decision that I make will be important. There are probably four or five other people out there who have to search their conscience and say, 'If we're going to do it for public employees and if we're going to do for other things, if we're going to put more money into concrete and building... we'd better do it for people'. So I'm going to be one of those five or six votes that needs to go up there ah... fully realizing that one hour ago ah.. it was my intention to vote otherwise. I think we have to do it. We have to do it for the people and ah.. I would request that others join me in putting up the necessary votes to do it."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm voting 'present' on this because I really believe that we are in financial strain and I'm not going to be threatened into a pay hike. And the thing that bothers me more than anything.... and I don't understand Jimmy Taylor voting for this, is that all this department is going to do is hire more G.O.R. employees. Thank you."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DEC 05 1974

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "In explaining my vote ah.. I just have one thing to say. I know some families in my community that are on welfare. One woman in particular, that I'm speaking of ah.. actually ah... I have not a whole lot of sympathy for her. She has eight illegitimate children and has never been married, but that has nothing to do with the fact that these children are existing on practically no food. They did not ask to be born. They are innocent of the whole situation and I would like to have some of my conservative friends, and God knows that I'm conservative; stop and think ah.. that we're not talking about people ah.. as relation to those that are doing wrong, we're talking about children. And I think that anyone who would go into such a home, as I have done, and can see how they are living with the reduced money that they have to purchase food, could not do anything but vote 'yes' on this. Again, think of the children."

Speaker Kempiners: "Representative Taylor, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, my name was used in debate. I had not planned to speak on this measure. I do understand the poor. I do think that I represent if not the poorest.... one of the poorest districts in this state. I've heard other Legislators speak about not coming back here again. I'm one of those few that are here that's coming back and this is an important issue to my district. There have been many Bills that I have supported for you across the state and I want to see your name written there on this particular issue."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just want to call your attention ah... in explaining my vote, to an article that appears in the Sun Times, which said ah... that the Department of Agriculture announced proposals and new regulations that will require poor people to spend more for food stamps and will save the taxpayers. Officials said that the proposal was drawn up under an executive order and will not require Congressional approval. And President Ford has announced the food stamps last week in his Economic Plan. As of March 1st, families will begin paying 30% of their monthly income to



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

get stamps. Now I want to say to you, they're going to pay 30% more of that monthly income to get stamps. You mean to tell me..... and I think I know this House, the Senate overrode on this House and I know the record of this House from the first day I came in here and I'm going to move the previous question. I think this has had enough debate on it and I would be willing to stake my very life that this House will pass this Bill."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it goes from 88 to 89 so if it hits above there, I'll stop. I just counted a few minutes ago and there were 27 Republican votes on there and 60 plus Democrats. And it seems to me, as I said earlier, that the Republican Party should not continue to be accused of being insensitive to the poor. This is not a black issue. I respect the right of the black Members to talk on this Bill, but it's not a black issue or a white issue, it's an issue for the people. And it's time that the Republican Party return to the grass roots where it was born, which was with the people. And the people include the poor people of this state. And I think that we need to have more than 91 votes. I think we oughta have more than 100 votes on this Bill to show that both sides of this aisle, black and white, male and female, are supporting the right of the people of this state to at least have a decent life. And I would like to say somewhat in jest; it seems to me that if my distinguished colleague from Macon County can see the light on this, anybody should be able to."

Speaker Kempiners: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the roll. On this motion there are 95 'ayes' and 16 'nays' and 22 voting 'present' and the motion is adopted. With respect to Motion #5, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "I thank the Members of the House on the last motion. This particular motion deals with the 5% pertaining to those that are on general assistance and I ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Kempiners: "Is there any discussion? - With regard to Motion #5 of Senate Bill 1559; the question is shall the appropriation for the item



reduced be restored to its original amount over the reduction of the Governor. Those in favor vote 'aye' and those opposed 'nay'.

Waddell, 'no'. Representative Ralph Dunn, 'no'.... I'm sorry, 'aye'.

The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rayson to explain his vote."

Rayson: "Ah.. to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker, ah.. we had a long and argumentative debate on the last line item and I think what was said then is applicable now and I see no reason why we just let up because the reduction is a mere ah.. you know, a small item. I suggest that we follow ah.. if we really mean what we say and say what we mean and that is to give some token support to the poor. I think we should exercise ah... what I think is our legislative duty in all of these reduction vetoes."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that you oughta know that what we're asking for here is \$869,000. You know that ah.. who ah.. what ah... the people that are on general assistance. Some of them are able bodied men who are out of work. A lot of them are veterens who are looking for work. You've seen the ah.. statistics on ah... the unemployment situation. It's going up ah.. I think I saw where it is probably in the neighborhood of 6% of our folks are unemployed. Certainly we can't go back ah.. nor do we want to go back to the old days where we'd see a veteren walking the streets and in that old familier ah... 'Brother Can You Spare A Dime' we ah.. we've gone too far now.. we've progressed to far. This is general assistance. There are some able bodied people who are ah... because of circumstances over which they have no control... (microphone turned off).... There are some people who must ask for it, but remember that a lot of those people who are on general assistance are returning veterens and the others are people who cannot find jobs. I ah.. on the ah... on the Advisory Committee on Public Aid ah.. Senator Moore on that Committee is doing a great job in trying to stamp out ah.. if there are cheats ah... in trying to stamp out these cheats. We're getting rid of them. I'm not up here to plead for them. In fact, I would rather give them a job and a chance then to give them charity... able bodied men. But if you don't give them a job and don't give them a chance, what is

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



there for you to do? Now we're concerned with people in other countries all over this nation. We're concerned with poverty in all of the other nations, but let me tell you something; charity begins at home. And this is home and if we're only asking for 869,000 which is comparatively a small amount; I ask you in the name of good government, this is ah.. a good government... good government, I ask you to support this motion to override."

Speaker Kempiners: "Representative Campbell to explain his vote."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we just had 95 votes up there for a roughly \$20,000,000 override to help the people that are on A.D.C. We now are approached with this idea of \$868,000 for those are general assistance. So it just doesn't make sense to me and I'm sure that it doesn't make sense to you that we argue over the \$868,000. So let's get on with it and get this job done and get out of here. Let's get those votes on the board and go."

Speaker Kempiners: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the roll. The Lady from Cook, Representative Catania."

Catania: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I just wanted to explain my vote. Something that we're hearing more and more on the south side of Chicago, which I represent a part of, is that the only thing that stands between most of us and welfare is our jobs. This category is where many of us would go if we didn't have the job that we have now... general assistance. With the unemployment rate rising, we're going to have more and more people in this category, not the people that are thought of as the stereotypes in the welfare systems, but the people who need the general assistance for a short time so that they can sustain their hope. So that they don't give up and go over the edge. This is the category that really is general, that takes up all of the people that don't quite qualify for Aid to the Disabled, who aren't quite aged, who are blind.. the people who don't have dependent children. This is a very important category as my colleagues from the 22nd District pointed out. This is extremely important and now that we've helped the others, I think that we should not turn our back on these. And I hope that we can get this over 89 votes."



Speaker Kempiners: "Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Yes, I would like to have the absentees polled, please."

Speaker Kempiners: "Will the Clerk please poll the absentees?"

Clerk Selcke: "Anderson, Arnell, Barry, Boyle, Bradley, Brummet, Calvo, Capparelli, Capuzi, Carter, Clabaugh, Cunningham, Ralph Dunn, R.L. Dunn, Ebbesen, Fennessey, Fleck, Gibbs, Grotberg, Harpstrite, Hill, Jimmy Holloway, Huskey, Hyde, Juckett, Katz, Kennedy, Kent, Klosak, Krause, LaFleur, Mann, Martin, Matijevich, Katz, 'aye'."

Speaker Kempiners: "Katz, 'aye'."

Clerk Selcke: "McAvoy, McCormick, McGrew,"

Speaker Kempiners: "Representative McAvoy, did you seek recognition?"

McAvoy: "Aye."

Speaker Kempiners: "Aye. Ah... Representative Ralph Dunn, 'aye'. Ah... Representative Palmer, 'aye'. Does anyone else seek recognition that the Chair has not yet recognized? Continue with the poll of the absentees, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Selcke: "McGrew, McMaster, Kenny Miller, Neff, North, Pappas, Philip, Pierce, Porter, Redmond, Rigney, Rose, Ryan, Sangmeister, Schisler, Schoeberlein, Sevcik, Shurtz, Soderstrom, Stedelin, Stone, Terzich, Tipsword, Wall, Richard Walsh."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Record me as 'aye', please."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Huskey."

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

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as being 'absent'."

Huskey: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Kempiners: "I can't see. Ah... Representative Schisler."

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

Speaker Kempiners: "How is Representative Schisler recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as being 'absent'."

Schisler: "Please record me as 'present'."

Speaker Kempiners: "Krause, 'aye'. James Holloway, 'aye'. Ah.... Representative Kenny Miller, 'aye'. Is there anyone else that would like to be put on this Roll Call? Representative Alsup, 'aye'. This motion having received 93 'ayes' and 13 'nays' and 19 voting 'present'.



is hereby adopted. With regards to Motion #6 of Senate Bill 1559, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "I wonder now, Mr. Speaker, in the interests of time and so forth and since these next three motions only effect Section 3.1 of 1559 and we've already voted on the other three items separately, that we couldn't consider these three motions together?"

Speaker Kempiners: "Does the Gentleman have leave to consider the next three motions together? Hearing no objection, we will hear the Motions #6, #7 and #8 to Senate Bill 1559 together."

Campbell: "Well, these three motions simply state the total amounts ah... in Section 3.1 of the Bill earmarking the amounts that we just passed for ah... for those ah... those particular items. And I ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Kempiners: "Is there any discussion? The question is on Motions #6, #7 and #8 of Senate Bill 1559. Shall the appropriation for the item reduced be restored to its original amount over the reduction of the Governor? We will take one Roll Call and it will be printed three times. All those in favor vote 'aye' and those opposed 'nay'. Representative Waddell, 'no'. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the House, this just merely earmarks exactly what we've done on the last three motions and I don't see any reason why we don't have the necessary votes up there because we've already voted on them. This just simply earmarks. These are not dollar amounts. The others were dollar amounts, but this is not. It simply sets forth and earmarks that money for that purpose... for the cost of living in the three areas; Aid for the Blind and Disabled, Aid for the Dependent Children and General Assistance that we've just previously voted upon."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question? As I understand 3.1 ah... we've already appropriated the money in Section 3. Those were the three vetoes we just had; This insures that that money will be used



Campbell: "For that purpose, yes."

Shea: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Kempiners: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the roll. Ah... Representative Leon, 'aye'. On this Roll Call there are 90 'ayes' and 8 'nays' and 18 voting 'present'. The Roll Call will be printed three times for Motions #6, #7 and #8 to Senate Bill 1559 and they are hereby adopted. Now with regard to Motion #1 to Senate Bill 1559, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this simply reflects the totals of what we did and I would like to have unanimous consent to change the total amount line item to reflect that \$800,000 that was not passed ah...; pertaining to the retirement."

Speaker Kempiners: "Ah.. there's apparent.... ah.. Representative Shea."

Shea: "Ya, I'd like to find out from your Parliamentarian if we can do that. It's my understanding ah.. that if we pass it ah.. although it's larger than the total items within the appropriations, that the item that was specifically reduced, the pensions cannot be spent and the item as it appears is a sufficient number."

Campbell: "The only... the only reason for my making the motion is to just to clean up the Bill, Jerry."

Shea: "But I don't think that you can do it. That's my question. You can't change it."

Speaker Kempiners: "It is the ruling of the Chair that he can ah.. amend the motion upward to the amount in the original appropriation."

Shea: "Would it then require to go back to the Senate?"

Campbell: "All right, then let's pass the motion as is. And I would so move."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman has moved that Motion #1 be ah.. adopted as is. Is there any discussion?"

Campbell: "This simply reflects the total dollars involved in what we did here today. And I ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Kempiners: "O'kay, the question with regard to Motion #1 to Senate Bill 1559 is, shall the appropriation for the item reduced be restored to its original amount over the reduction of the Governor."

Those in favor vote 'aye' and those opposed 'nay'. Representative Waddell did you ah.... record Representative Waddell as voting 'no', please. Have all voted who wish? To repeat the question, have all voted who wish? Representative Maragos, 'aye'. Is there anybody else that wishes to be recorded? The Clerk will take the roll. Representative McLendon, 'aye'. Is there anyone seeking recognition that the Chair has not yet recognized? Representative Murphy, 'aye'. On Motion #1 to Senate Bill 1559 there are 90 'ayes' and 8 'nays' and 14 voting 'present' and the motion is adopted. Ah.. Representative Campbell is recognized."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker, I simply want to thank the Membership for their support and their patience."



Speaker Kempiners: "Is Representative Williams on the floor? On Supplemental Calendar 1 is a Reduction Veto Motion on Senate Bill 1348. Would you like to call that at this time? Okay, the Chair recognizes Representative Williams for Senate Bill 1348."

Williams: "Is this thing on? Okay. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that the House concur with the Senate in the restoration of the reduced item of appropriation in the Senate Bill 1348 to the original amount over the reduction of the other Governor. The only item that is being restored is \$180,000 which is for the continued program of channel improvement and bank stabilization in the area of the North Branch of the Chicago River.....downstream from Foster Avenue and this restores that item and I move that wethat we do vote here for the restoration."

Speaker Kempiners: "Is there any further discussion? If not, the question is on Senate Bill 1348....in...shall the appropriation for the item reduced be restored to its original amount over the reduction of the Governor. Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed 'nay'....The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Grieman."

Grieman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, obviously the Public Aid Bill is tough act to follow and I would hope that the thinking of this Assembly isn't affected by that. This is a very critical ...this critical matter ...along the North River Banks there are hundreds and hundreds of feet of land which are sinking into the river. There are houses there. This program has been an ongoing one for many..many...well, for several years and this is the final stage. This will conclude this particular section of the river. It's not 180,000 by the way because the Governor did leave him \$50,000. It's \$130,000. I would normally suggest that we leave it and we'd consider it next time...But it is



not a static matter. It's a matter of continuing disintegration along the river bank.....and we would appreciate.....it's an important matter for the people who live along this area. It's a substantially long area in the City of Chicago and we'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Mr. Speaker..... the amount of money we're talking about here is \$130,000 to continue on a program which effects the North Branch of the Chicago River. This has been an ongoing program for a little bit of time....which is aimed at the conservation, the restoration of the River Banks and the protection of the homes and property along this River, which because of the erosion and the flood are finding ... er....we are finding that the backyards of the homes of some of these people are actually sinking into the Rivers. This is also a program which our Congressman, Frank Annunzio, has been extremely interested in in terms of seeking legislation and receiving some funds from the Federal Government to help in this particular project. It is an extremely worthwhile project for, not only the River as it goes through our District, but goes through the entire North Branch of the City of Chicago and takes in the entire North Branch of the Chicago River. I ask my Republican Colleagues here, on this side of the aisle, who have enjoyed the support of many people here in regard to Legislation which was of particular interest to them in their District, to give us the added votes here to bring this up to 89 so that we might have given to the Department of Waterways, the extra \$100,000 to prevent this continued erosion of the river banks and to complete the project and to complete the job as has been originally proposed. This project has been going on since the first



year of Governor Ogilvie's term. It's really one in which the people of the community are extremely interested in.....which is beneficial to the area....which is a protection for the homeowners and has as I repeat once again...has, as one of its purposes, not only the restoration of this bank but also the protection of the environment in the area, the development, the parks along the river banks...to be enjoyed.....by the people there. We're not talking really about that much money and I sincerely ask my good friends on this side of the aisle, including Representatives Ryan and Washburn, et cetera, and Harlan Rigney and Don Deuster, Representative Borchers and Cunningham and the others whose lights I do not see on....to please give a green light on this so that the work in our area might be continued. Thank you."

Speaker Kempiners: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Roll. Representative Ryan...'aye'. Representative Washburn 'aye'. Representative Deuster 'aye'. Representative Borchers 'aye'. Are there any more who want to get on this Roll Call? Blair 'aye'. On this Motion there are 55 'ayes', 3 'nays', 15 voting 'present' and the Motion fails. Appearing on the Calendar in the Order of Amendatory Veto Motions is Senate Bill 1538. The Chair recognizes Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1538 was the Bill that created the Commission to prepare and make the report to this General Assembly for the model school for the deaf and hard of hearing....and I move to accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change to Senate Bill 1538. Basically what he did, he deleted the words on page 1, line 24 and 25, eliminating the Northeastern area section of the State and encompassing the commission, scope and purpose for the entire State of Illinois. He also changed the lines ...lines 27 and 28 and provided the eligibility



criteria for students and the administration of this Commission and the school that they are going to be recommending. The Senate Sponsor agreed with the veto and I would move to concur with the specific recommendations held in the Governor's veto message to Senate Bill 1538. I would ask for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Kempiners: "Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the House adopt the specific recommendations for change? All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. To explain his vote....er...The Chair recognizes Representative Lechowicz to explain his vote."

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur in the Governor's specific recommendation. All he did was to encompass the scope of the Commissions study for the entire State for a very worthwhile purpose and I would hope that the Members would take cognizance of that fact and vote 'aye'."

Speaker Kempiners: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will please take the Roll. On this.....Peters 'aye'. Grieman 'aye'. Anderson 'aye'. Rayson 'aye'. On this Motion there are 100 'aye', no 'nay', no voting 'present', the Motion is adopted. For the information of the House we will have some messages from the Senate and then we will go to the Calendar to the Order of Motions. So the Clerk will read the Messages form the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of the Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 2898, a Bill for an Act to revise compensation of certain State officers by amending certain Acts, together with Amendments, passed the Senate, as amended, December 5, 1974, by a three-fifths vote, Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes,"



Secretary, Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of the Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill 2910, a Bill for an Act in relation to State finance, together with Amendments, passed the Senate as amended, December 5, 1974, by a three-fifths vote, Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of the Bill with the following title, House Bill 2908, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of certain agencies of State government, passed by the Senate December 5, 1974, by a three-fifths vote, Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of the Bill with the following title, House Bill 2912, 2915, 2916, passed by the Senate December 5, 1974, by a three-fifths vote, Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of the Bill with the following title, to wit: House Bill 1115, House Bill 2212, House Bill 2572, passed by the Senate December 5, 1974, Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. That's all the messages."

Speaker Kempiners: "Okay. There are no more messages from the Senate. We'll go to the Calendar to the Order of Motions. On the Calendar is Motion on Senate Bill 416. Is Representative Dunne....in the House...?....Representative Robert Dunne?...Next order on the Calendar is...on the Order of Motions is Senate Bill 430; for which purpose



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's my motion to take Senate Bill 430 from the Rules Committee, return it to the Calendar on the order of Third Reading. If I accomplish that, then to take it back to the order of Second Reading and amend it and I think there is a copy of the Amendment on your desk. Now this was Senator Bell's Bill dealing with bail....and he has given me permission to take this Bill and use it for a vehiclefor a bail Bill that Superintendent Rochford of the Chicago Police Department and I, Vic Witt, from the Police Association and the Sheriff's Association...backed. The purpose of the Bill is that in certain crimes the old capital crimes of murder, aggravated kidnapping and treason and other offenses. When a person who has committed an offense and is out on bail that it would apply to those persons. It says that those persons will be allowed the ten percent provision only after a hearing of the bail...er...after a hearing by the court. I think that many of you have heard from your local police departments, from your local law enforcement agencies, with regard to this Bill and I would appreciate it if you would let me bring it out and put it on the Calendar. I have found out that we tried...er...I wanted to do this and I introduced a Bill ...House Bill 2907, which many of you are Co-sponsors of, but in order to expedite it and not take up the time of the House and the Senate, I discussed it with Senator Bell and he was in favor and so am I, of doing it this way. It will allow us to get this law passed and on the books in this Session of the General Assembly."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."



Walsh, Wm.: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to oppose the Gentleman's motion and suggest that this is a far reaching subject that is deserving of considerable Committee consideration. We're talking about undoing something that this Legislature did and generally for the good...some years ago by putting the bondsmen out of business. This would suggest that the bondsmen ought to go back into business in certain cases and I think we ought to look the matter over very very carefully and not just because police Superintendent Rochford says it's a good idea.....go helter skelter in the direction that we're not too sure of. So I suggest to you that this matter should be considered by a Committee and that the Gentleman can even now prefile this Amendment in the form of a Bill for the next General Assembly to consider and I would urge you to vote 'no' on the Gentleman's motion."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this motion. The crime situation in Chicago has gotto the point where this is an emergency. We're having.....setting a record in Chicago with people being murdered.....four or five people a day. Many of these crimes are committed by people who are out on bond for previous crimes of armed violence. We have a situation in Chicago that hascompounded itself... we're short of policemen due to Federal Legislation, Federal Laws, we can't hire any policemen. We have to do something to cut down on the amount of offenders that are out on the streets. There are people in Chicago who are out on bond for six and seven and eight crimes of armed violence. These are the type of people who constantly go back out onto the streets and make more money to keep paying their lawyers so they can keep operating.



This is one good way of stopping them. Let's not let these people go out and prey upon the public, shooting people and robbing people and hitting them over the head and many ..in many cases murdering them. And,when they are finally caught you find out that they are already out on bond....that they have been charged before...and it's a joke to them. They just keep going back and forth putting up their ten percent bond. This is a step in the right direction.....The police department certainly supports it. I have about fifteen hundred to two thousand policemen that live in my district and they are all in favor of this. I'm a policeman and I'm proud to be a policeman and we want this and we need some help in this and this is one way we can get some help. Thank you."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, because I think Roger McAuliffe was absolutely correct as far as the definite need and I would hope that the Majority Leader would just kindly reconsider and remember the fact that the entire Chicago new media ... both the press and the TV and radio stations came out and editorially endorsed this concept. I would hope that the people, when they were out campaigning and heard the people talking to them, in fact, I was at a meeting Tuesday night and probably one of the most critical issues that was constantly brought up was the safety factor of the residents when commuting to work and for the children and for the elderly people when they were walking through the neighborhood during the evening hours. I think that this proposal will help not only the law enforcement officials in providing the necessary type of service but it will also promote a safety factor to the residents within our respective communities. There is quite a bit of fear



presently residing in your large metropolitan areas as far as safety on the streets is concerned. The people are very upset with the fact that a person who is charged with a misdemeanor or crime is provided bail and in turn unfortunately the person goes out and commits another crime while he is still on bail. This proposal would still have the leniency, in fact, as far as the person that is charged with the first offense, in giving him a ten percent factor as far as his bail bond procedure is concerned. But, in turn would require a full bond if that person is picked up during that intervening period while he is on bail and while he is awaiting trial. I would hope that this House would listen to the constituents that they represent and in turn put this Amendment on the Bill....Now....The people want action ...NOW....Thank you."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rayson."

Rayson: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I know that the Gentleman that's making this motion is trying to do and I certainly think he has a good point and there's much to be done in this area to look into but I'm with the Majority Leader. I.....his point is well taken, that's why we need studies. There's many problems here. The problem is with the facts and whether or not we'll resurrect the old system of bondsmen. ..The matter of preventive detention is somewhat germane to this issue. I think it requires considerable study. The Gentlemen who talk about high crime, and there is...it's terrible, might address themselves to more important things. Perhaps, you know, speedier trials and less continuances, banning of handguns and all of these important matters that count. There is something in the Daily News last night that just happens to be quite cryptic at the moment and I'd like to just say this:



This gentleman says 'requiring those who are arrested for a second offense while out on bail for previous offense, to deposit more than ten percent of the bail, will not keep many criminals off the streets. As a matter of fact the more expert the robber, burgler or thief, the better his credit rating will be and the juicewith the juice loan racketeers and bondsmen. The professional criminals will be back on the streets quickly, whether you make them post one hundred percent or ten percent.' All that such a change in the law would do is to give juice loan racketeers some new clients and revitalize the bail bonding racket. This may not be so. He may have something to it. Another reason to delay and be deliberative and let's see what's then."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz.....Is Representative Merlo's microphone on? Try Representative Leon's microphone."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, it is very appropriate that I am using the microphone of the distinguished Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leon. Representative Leon was a delegate to a Constitutional Convention that put a provision in the Legislative Article which provision says that there must be public notice of Bills that come before Committee. Well, I don't know what puts us above the Constitution. We believe in the Constitution. I think that this Bill may be a good Bill but there are lots of people in Illinois who are entitled to be heard on this subject. I appreciate the interest of the distinguished associate and Minority Leader in this matter. I read about this matter in the Chicago newspapers,..in a press conference that went on, it must have been a month ago. Why did not the Assistant Minority Leader proceed ahead and schedule this matter for hearing. It is the very last day of the Session. It may very well be that this is



a proposal that has merit but it needs some change. It may be that there is language here that will do more harm than good. There is an obligation for due process. People are entitled to be heard....And this procedure offends the Constitution ...offends any sense of fairness and due process and I assure you that if we do it people are still going to be murdered on the streets of Chicago for the next month. I give you that guarantee. I'll regret it but it is unhappily the case that what we do does not stop that taking place. All that needs to be done is that we will be back in one month, proceed ahead immediately with committee hearings, which committee hearings could have taken place in this past month but did not. Then we can act quickly, if it is a good Bill, if we hear witnesses, and those witnesses lead us to believe it is as good Bill as many think it is. Then we will go ahead very early next Session and enact it. We have no right under the Illinois Constitution to proceed in this way. If we do it we are violating the Illinois Constitution. We are violating the fundamental right of people to be heard and I would suggest that the Majority Leader is correct in opposing this procedure and I would respectfully urge that we adopt a procedure of fairness, that we proceed early next Session, that we let people testify and be heard and that in the orderly administration of the proceedings of this House we will be following the Constitution and adding credit to the way in which we discharge our duties here."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have three brief things to say about this proposal and I think they are important. First, the Sponsor of the Bill has clearly recognized that a problem



exists. The problem of crime committed by defendants or accused relief prior to trial. He's certainly right, there is a problem. I think he is very wrong in his proposed solution. This Bill in its present form is purely and simply a proposal for preventive detention. It is almost precisely the kind of thing which was proposed at the Federal level under the administration of John Mitchell and his Justice Department. I happened to be in Washington at the time that was considered. It was not passed by the Congress. It shouldn't be adopted by this General Assembly. Second, the point that needs to be made is that judges already have virtually unlimited discretion to set bond. Bail can only be used to assure appearance at trial. Much as many of us would like to use the bail bond system to keep off the streets defendants that we may consider dangerous, the U. S. Constitution and the decisions under that Constitution, make clear that that is not a proper use of bail. That is precisely what this Bill contemplates....using bail and high bail to keep dangerous defendants off the streets. Now, if we don't consider this Bill today, we have other alternatives, the real solution to the problem of pre-trial crime is to reduce the excessive delay between arraignment and trial. The courts in Cook County already have underway a program which will within the next three years reduce that time to sixty days..... projected. My preference would be that we as the General Assembly set statutory deadlines....with some flexibility for judges but we mandate a maximum period of time between arraignment and trial. In addition we have the alternative of giving judges the power to subject defendants to the same kind of supervision prior to trial that they now have after trial and conviction, when they are on probation. That's an alternative that has never been considered in the State or in most states.



and it's one that I think that we owe it to our constituents to consider before we depart as radically as this Bill proposes to do, from our Constitutional traditions of the presumption of innocence. Finally, the point has been made previously, this is an area which is fought with very substantial Constitutional difficulty. It is a perfect example of the sort of proposal which shouldn't come before this Body, before it has had the benefit of consideration by the Judiciary Committee of the House. I would say that I would be happy to have the Bill introduced at the first opportunity next year or even prefiled now. But, I think it would be doing a disservice to the Members of this Legislature to ask us to consider the Bill before it had even before the Members of the Judiciary Committee and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Mr. Speaker, I very seldom interrupt the proceedings of this House for the purpose of an introduction and for as far as I can remember this is certainly the first time that I have ever interrupted the debate on a piece of Legislation to make an introduction, however, I did ask the Chief Sponsor if he'd mind, Representative Shea, and he said he did not. So, consequently, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like for you to meet and to greet one of the outstanding families of the State of Illinois who are here today observing their husband, their father and their father-in-law in action on the floor of this House, probably for the last full day of a Session that he shall serve and I'm speaking of our distinguished colleague and loved Member, John Alsup. I would like to have the Members of this House great his lovely wife, his six daughters, his son and sons-in-law, sitting in the Speaker's balcony to my immediate left...right..."



Speaker Kempiners: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Christian, Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise on Senate Bill 430, on the Amendment to Senate Bill 430, although I would like to say I'd like to echo the remarks that was just made by the Minority Leader, on this side of the aisle. But in speaking to Senate Bill 430, it has been suggested on the floor of this House, in opposition to this Amendment, that we might....we would be bringing back the old bail bondsmen procedures if this Amendment is premitted to pass. I would suggest to you that that could not be possible. In my experience in the criminal courts in the State of Illinois, back when we had the old bail bondsman procedure, I don't recall a single instance of a bail bondsman coming in and putting up one hundred percent of a bail bond in cash....In any possible situation that was before the court where the man was accused of a crime. The bail bond situation was one wherein a person purchased a bond from a licensed bail bondsman and he submitted his bond. Then if that person didn't show up for trial, then the bail bondsman was then liable for that sum of money to the courts and then there was a long period of time over which the bail bondsman could come up with the defendant before he had to come up with the money. This Bill would require that if the court so decides, not this Statute but if the court so decides that the bail of the offense for which the man was presently charged is insufficient for the new charge that is now levied against him, that he can then require one hundred percent bail in cash by this accused individual. It will certainly go a long way to meeting the objections we find from the law-abiding general public in the State of Illinois. They are very disturbed by our bail procedure. Where an individual is charged with an offense, out on bail, on a

ten percent bail, is charged with another offense and then gets out on another ten percent bail...or the same bail is allowed to apply in the same situation and is repeated over and over again....while the person continues to go out and repeat crimes whereby he may raise money for his defense or money for additional bails or continue in his illicit activities. Certainly this Amendment applies only to those limited number of felony cases that described in this Amendment that are very dangerous to the safety and the health of the people of the State of Illinois. It is suggested that perhaps there is some Constitutional objections or problems with this Amendment. Well, I would say, let's find out if there is a Constitutional objection to this Amendment to this Bill. We know what the last guessers have said on some of the other occasions that they've had occasion to delve into the criminal law, of the Federal laws, and of the State of Illinois. So, let's let them have another last guess on this bail procedure and this Amendment to see if....whether or not this may be a kind of a procedure that would be Constitutional and that would serve the interests of the law-abiding public of the State of Illinois and perhaps maybe if copied elsewhere the other states of this Union. So, I would urge that this Amendment be adopted. We're not violating our own State Constitutional procedures. This is an Amendment to a Bill. There have been Amendments presented on the floor of this House many...many...many times that have never been before a Committee and does not violate the provisions of the current Illinois Constitution. So, I would urge that we would give our favorable consideration to this Amendment."

Speaker Kempiners: "Representative Maragos from Cook."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, this matter having been fully debated, I move the previous question."



The Chair ruled in the belief that the motion had been filed to have the Rules Committee hear the Bill...and it made its ruling on that representation under Rule 31.1, but if such had not been the case, it would take 107 votes to discharge the Rule Committee....Representative Shea."

Shea: "I would ask that I get 107 votes and would appreciate the votes of my colleagues so I could get it out on the floor and we could debate the Bill."

Speaker Kempiners: "The motion is to discharge the Rules Committee of Senate Bill 430 and to put it on the order of Third Reading on the Calendar. Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? 107 votes will be needed to discharge the Rules Committee. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Roll. Representative Wolf?.....J. J. Wolf, 'aye'. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea....seek recognition?"

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues that supported me on this and say that I certainly will not try to poll the absentees. I know the situation we're in. I want to thank those people and will tell you that I will today prefile this Bill and would ask anybody that would like to join me....to join me in Cosponsoring it. Thank you. Thank you very much."

Speaker Kempiners: "On this motion there are 91 'ayes', 25 'nays', one voting 'present' and the motion fails. There will be a conference at this point and the Republicans will meet in Room 212 and the Democrats in Room M-5. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, arise?"

Walsh, Wm.: "Well, just to reiterate what the Speaker said.

There will be a Republican conference in Room 212 for thirty minutes. We'd appreciate it very much if all Republicans would attend and if they would come down



Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, it's a pretty important move that we're being asked to make here and it seems to me that it would be reasonable to have some discussion on it and I would object to moving the previous question. I think we.....no we haven't...."

Speaker Kempiners: "For what purpose does the Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis, arise?"

Geo-Karis: "I had my hand up earlier. I was going to ask, Mr. Speaker, the Sponsor of this Amendment, whether this Amendment includes such kind of crimes as rape?"

Speaker Kempiners: "Representative Shea, if you would like to answer that question?....It appears we're going to have to take a vote on Mr. Maragos's Motion, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well, I'm wondering if Mr. Duff might withdraw his objection if we could get the Bill out on the floor. It's still in Rules Committee. If I can get it out on the floor, then I would like to talk about the Amendment, but it's not going to do very much good to talk about the Amendment until the Bill is out on the floor. 'Geo', I would like to say to you that rape, although I think it's probably as bad as treason, as aggravated kidnapping and in some cases worse than murder, but it is not one of those offenses treated under our Constitution as a nonbailable offense under the old Constitution. What I have tried to do to keep this in line as Constitutionally as I can, I have separated those two offenses, but I assure you that the second part of the Bill, where it is up to a court ...and that's one of the things I want to stress...that we are not taking a right from any defendant, but we are letting a judge



decide. Those judges that we pay so much money to. I wish, Mr. Speaker, I would get the 107 votes to take and put it out on the floor and then I'll discuss the Amendment."

Speaker Kempiners: "Okay. Let's get the parliamentary thing straightened out. Mr. Maragos moved the previous question. Are there any objections? Hearing no objections, I return to Mr. Shea to close. I would assume that Mr. Shea has just made a closing statement, so the motion, if I understand it correctly, is to take Senate Bill 430 from the Rules Committee and place it on the order of Third Reading on the Calendar...."

Shea: "I think I need 107 votes, don't I? Or, do I need 89? Madam Parliamentarian?"

Speaker Kempiners: "The Chair would like to ask you a question, Representative Shea. Before it was in the Rules Committee, what was its status? Was it on Third Reading?"

Shea: "This Bill was on Third Reading and that's where I'm asking it to be returned to."

Speaker Kempiners: "Then the vote will require 89 votes. So, the question on Senate Bill 430.....The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh, Wm.: "Would you cite the Rule, Mr. Speaker, that ..."

Speaker Kempiners: "In response to your question, Representative Walsh, it's Rule 31.1, Subparagraph E. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman arise?"

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, did I understand the Assistant Minority Leader to say that Senate Bill 430 was at the order of Third Reading, prior to its referral to the Committee on Rules?"

Speaker Kempiners: "That is what he stated, yes, Sir."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I refer you to the Digest of the Rules of the House of Representatives, page 107, which states that the House has no record of his saying."



which indicates that this Bill was at the order of Second Reading on June 28, that on July 2 it was on the Spring Calendar and that on April 17, 1974, it was re-referred to Committee on Rules."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Chair recognizes Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well,.....Mr. Speaker, I inquired of the Clerk, yesterday, with the Speaker, and I was informed, by the Clerk, that this Bill was on Third Reading at the time it was returned to Rules Committee."

Speaker Kempiners: "Perhaps we could just stand at ease for a minute and I'll check this out with the Clerk.....
..... According to the Clerk it was read a second time on June 28th and advanced to Third Reading. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh, Wm.: "Will the Sponsor respond to a question?.....
Could you tell me when you filed your request with the Rules Committee, with the Clerk, asking that the Rules Committee hear this Bill?"

Shea: "I think it was in November, Mr. Walsh.....er....No, not that the Rules Committee hear this?....No. I filed.."

Walsh, Wm.: "That it be considered by the Rules Committee.."

Shea: "No..... I didn't file that motion, I filed the motion to take it from the Rules Committee."

Walsh, Wm.: "Well, then I submit to you Mr. Speaker that the matter does not come under Rule 31.1, Paragraph E., and this instead does instead require 107 votes."

Shea: "Well, he has already ruled, Mr. Walsh, that it needs 89, and you've full well..."

Walsh, Wm.: "He has not ruled that it takes 89..."

Shea: "Oh, yes he did..."

Walsh, Wm.: "Well, then he ruled in error and I would ask him to reconsider..."

Shea: "...You know how to appeal the ruling of your Speaker."

Walsh, Wm.: "I would ask him to reconsider his ruling."

Speaker Kempiners: "Could the Chair defend itself in this?"



promptly so that we can get up on the floor and complete our business. Room 212, immediately, for the Republicans."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Yes, in case the Democratic Members were not listening closely to my distinguished Republican Leader, the Democrats will meet immediately, in conference, in Room M-5, we shouldn't be there over five or ten minutes. How long did you ask for, Representative Walsh?"

Walsh, Wm.: "Half an hour."

Choate: "Well, I don't anticipate us being there that long, but we'll be back when you get here. Okay? Democrats come to Room M-5, please."

Speaker Kempiners: "On the order of Concurrences, on Supplemental Calendar #2, there appears House Bill 2897. For which purpose the Chair recognizes the Gentleman, Representative Stone."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is aI want to move to adopt Conference Committee Report....the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2897. As most of you know this is....the Bill as originally introduced by Representative McCormick was a Bill amending the General Assembly Retirement System, which permitted people to file a recision of their election to participate in the system. It extended the time in which they could file this election. There were several Amendments offered in the Senate which were.....and one of them was not acceptable to the Members of the House. The Senate adopted the Conference Committee Report by more than..... at leastforty...at least forty-three affirmative votes and I move the adoption of Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2897."

Speaker Kempiners: "Is there any discussion? If not, Representative Stone has moved House Concurrence on House Bill 2897. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk



Due to the fact that the effective date of this piece of Legislation is January 8, 1975, this Bill, on Concurrence will take 107 votes for passage....So, accordingly I move that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 and 3 to House Bill 2815."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 3 to House Bill 2815. Is there any discussion? If there is no discussion, those in favor to the motion will vote 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster to explain his vote."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there are many full-time Legislators in this Body and there are many new people who have been elected to this Body that don't know they are going to be full time Legislators yet. In my own personal case, I happen...to have resigned a job that payed more money to come back to run for this office expecting I might practice law on the side. I must say that I think for all of you who are conscientious about your duties you'll discover that this job is demanding and that it is becoming..... and for many people it is a full-time job. I've found I've not been able to practice law and really not been able to supplement my income and I'm devoting all of my time to the service of the people in my District. I've found that both the office allowance has run out and the salary is kinda difficult too. I think that the people only get what they pay for and if they want integrity and they want qualified people and I think we have a lot of wonderful, new faces that will be coming in here....realizing that they were going to give full-time service to their people....that you only.... that you must pay them and that's the way that we get quality service out of our public servants. So I urge



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

an 'aye' vote and I'm very proud, not only to vote 'yes', but to speak for this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Henry, Mr. McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. When I was first elected here I suffered under an illusion. I had taught Social Studies and had been told that we have two equal Legislative Bodies. I'd like to congratulate the 'boss' Senate. One of the first things I've found here is that the Senate, in its innate wisdom tables many Bills, considers fewer, tells us when we shall meet and when we shall not and now finally they have decided what we'll earn for doing it. Thank you and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Kempiners: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Roll. On this question there are 110 'ayes', 30 'nays', 4 voting 'present' and the House concurs in Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 2815.....by a three-fifths vote....Also, on the order of concurrences is House Bill 2898 and for this purpose the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Fleck."

Fleck: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2898 was the proposal to increase the salary of the State Officers. These are the Director's heads and the members of the Cabinet. It seemed at the time that the various salary increase proposals were brought to the House and the Senate that if the Judiciary, as one branch of government, was to receive a pay raise and if the Legislative branch was also to receive a pay raise, it was only fair and equitable that the Executive Branch the Directors and the people who work in the management capacities there should have a pay raise. Back in the Spring the State Chamber of Commerce came out with the proposals as to what the various directors and department heads should make. That Bill was presented to this



Body and passed the House. It went to the Senate where the Senate made a number of cuts in the various salaries. Now, if I were to take up the time of this House as to tell you what the salaries were cut, we'd be here for a week. Just take my word and I'll tell you that no salary was increased as it passed this House and approximately 80 percent of the salaries were cut in the range of 43 percent to approximately 3.6 percent. Most of the salary cuts were in the range of 10 percent to 12 percent of the salary as it left the House. I ask that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2898."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. James Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Will the Sponsor of this Bill yield for a question? Charlie, you talked about the action that was taken in the Senate. I noticed in going over the proposed Bill, as Amended, that there was a fluctuation in some of the increases. As you said, there is a range of from about 40 percent to somewhere around 6 percent. Can you give me any reason why they vary. Or, can you give me any explanation as to the differences in why some agencies were cut more than other agencies? Was there any uniform method used to arrive at this reduction? Or, in face, was it a case of politics in reducing some directors and agency heads because of political reasons?"

Fleck: "All right. The Bill, as it came out of the House, did not set, uniformly, any particular salaries. We took the figures of the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce as a base, and a guide. Since we didn't have the time to get that adjusted in the House as to what director is really worth his salt and how much he is worth, from the Legislative perspective and not a State Chamber perspective. Then it went to the Senate. Now, they worked on it and they had the Bill all summer and I was aware that . . . these



changes back in June when they were sitting on the proposal. You'll note that a lot of the cuts are where there were great increases in the salaries. Now, for example the Court of Claims, they were cut 33 percent. But they had an increase of over a 100 percent in the proposed salary....so they cut them back, they thought a 100 percent increase, although I still think the Court of Claims, under this Bill was underpaid for the work they have been doing lately. Still the fact is that they just couldn't justify in their own mind a 100 percent increase and I think that is the judgment they used all the way along. I know of no reasons or political reasons or vindictiveness for some of these cuts and adjustments....which vary. I think they took the importance of the agency and the importance of the director and the amount of work he has and the responsibilities of the particular department and tried to make an assessment based on that."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's my feeling that some of these cuts were suggested by politics and some of them were proposed, not on the merits of what a particular director or a chairman of a commission was doing but rather on the political feelings of the Senate and I again don't think that we should be dictated to by the Senate and that we should merely accept their Amendment without any explanation. I attempted, in talking to the Leadership on our side of the aisle, to determine to get their input as to just what approach was used to arrive at these reductions and I was not given any satisfactory answer and I don't believe that we should vote on this Bill until....or....concur with this Amendment until we know just why some of these directors were reduced and know the supporting arguments for that because we are going to be involved with the Senate in acting very politically on a Bill that

was not supposed to be political and that, I believe, is why we used the Chamber of Commerce recommendations..... as a base. If we're going to change them I think we ought to debate them in both Houses and not just let the Senate do the political hatchet job."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a question? Could I ask you....I'm sorry, I don't....I apologize, for not having my Bill here to compare this with. I would like to know to what depths the salary of the Director of the Department of Local Government Affairs has plunged?"

Fleck: "The Director of Local Government Affairs is cut \$3,000."

Skinner: "What is it at the present time?"

".....Making \$30,000."

Skinner: "And...."

Fleck: "This Amendment proposes to give him a \$2,000 a year raise. It was suggested by the State Chamber of Commerce that..."

Skinner: "The State Chamber of Commerce doesn't know 'diddley poo' about assessments."

Fleck: "I'm aware of that. If you'll let me finish. I'm telling you that's the Bill you probably voted for back in the Spring though. The State Chamber which we passed out of here was \$35,000. The Senate cut the salary \$3,000 so it's \$32,000."

Skinner: "I'm sorry, Representative, I did not mean to interrupt you. I would like to correct your 'misimpression', however, I certainly did not vote in favor of this Bill before because the salary that was proposed in the original Bill was acceptable, to say the least, this is still acceptable. If we are to grant salary raises based on performance, with salaries based on performance, the salary of this Director should be cut probably to \$10,000 and then maybe he'd go back to the University and we



could clean up the assessment mess."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "I would like to ask the Sponsor of this Bill two questions.....if he'd like to answer it.....Chuck, if we do not concur with the Amendment and the Senate does not recede from the Amendment, what transpires as far as the salaries as effective as of January 1975? Will we have another chance to change them before...in January?"

Fleck: "In these men's salaries?"

Maragos: "Yes."

Fleck: "Well, if we go into Conference Committee, if we come back into Session, on January 8th, before the swearing in for the 79th General Assembly, we could. Otherwise, we're going to have to be dealing with the 79th General Assembly."

Maragos: "The....That's what I'm concerned about...The 79th General Assembly does propose a different approach to this salary question of the State officers. Will the State officers who are then in effect be denied anything for a two year period or will they lose out for two years or will they effective immediately?"

Fleck: "Well, they will receive it whenever that Bill becomes law, but I hate to pass judgment with this General Assembly, as to what a future General Assembly is going to do..."

Maragos: "I didn't ask you to pass judgment. All I asked was what the effect would be if the ...if the...in other words the 79th General Assembly could address itself to these salary increases without jeopardizingassuming that they did increase them at that time, without jeopardizing any salaries of those officers at that time. Is that correct?"

Fleck: "Well, if we vote to increase the salaries now, you



can do whatever you want in the 79th General Assembly. If we don't approve these salaries now, you can do whatever you want in the 79th General Assembly. It's going to be at a lower salary for yourself."

Maragos: "No....All I'm bringing out is this, Mr. Fleck, is what.....are the State officers in the same position as we are? In other words will we have to wait two years again....or not?"

Fleck: "Yes.....You talking about elected officials now or.."

Maragos: "No, I'm not talking about elected officials, I'm talking about the appointed cabinet members whose salaries are effected by this Bill."

Fleck: "Whatever answer you want, Sam, I'll be glad to give you."

Maragos: "Well, I'm trying to get from you, Charlie, is if... assuming this is....there's no concurrence and assuming that the Senate refuses to recede in the 78th General Assembly, could the 79th General Assembly address itself and give immediate raises or non-raises to these officers? That's what I'm asking."

Fleck: "No."

Speaker Kempiners: "Is the Gentleman from Cook all through with his questioning?"

Maragos: "I still haven't got aspecific answer to this, that's why I'm still in doubt."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lawerence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Kempiners: "Mr. Fleck will you yield for a question? Mr. Fleck, will you yield for a question?"

Cunningham: "Is the ultimate fate of House Bill 2815 in any way tied with the results of this particular Bill? Is there any understanding with the Second Floor, in that regard?"

Fleck: "Well, I don't know about that but I would guess that



if the judges, the Executive Branch and the Legislative Branch and the Judicial Branch of government are all going to receive pay increases, it would be only fair that they all receive a fair increase. We shouldn't be selective with the branches of government. We should all pay them....if we are going to pay one we should pay them all or pay none of them.

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker.....Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd like to comment on this just a moment. A comparison of the various increases that are involved shows a rather wide range. Some of the department heads are getting as much as \$9,000, several are getting only \$2,000 increases. I noticed the Department of Conservation was only getting a \$2,000. Be that as it may, I think that this is a good opportunity to reaffirm the public's concern with the necessity to spend their money a little less recklessly. I think that this is an occasion where we have an obligation to vote 'no' on any increase whatever. Now, I have voted 'no' here todayagainst the aged, the blind, the disabled, the ADC claims, all of which are meritorious and I suppose conscience should have dictated otherwise. I voted 'no' on the Legislative pay raise and I want you to know whybecause appearance to the contrary notwithstanding I'm desparately anxious that all of you love me. But, a question of pride is involved here. In my district we have twenty judges. The Senate in its limited wisdom gave each of those judges a raise of \$12,500 over a period of twenty judges and yet the pay raise that you propose to give yourself is only \$2500. So, I must say that in all sense of modesty that there should be more of a ratio favorable to the servants. I felt you....you should have been worth more. I think that we have a duty there to express the general frustration that's involved in this pointless effort to buck the tide by



voting 'no' on these. When they reach the Governor's Desk it would be the hope of all the taxpayers in the State of Illinois that he would pair them back and we would have a chance to look at them again when we come back here on the 9th of January. But for now we ought to vote 'no' and let's see if reason can't prevail."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm going to vote for this measure....and do so feeling that, as Mr. Fleck indicated, it is indeed fair that the executive branch should share with the pay increases in the Legislative and the Judicial. But I am very concerned as I look at the increases for the various department levels and I want to register that concern. I want to reiterate some of the things that have been said by my colleagues previous hereto in regard to the vindictive spirit that appears to prevail in the amounts that are appropriated for the various departments. If you look for instance at the true person of the FEPC there is no salary increase scheduled for that person. If you'll look for instance at the line item in regard to the Liquor Control Commission chairman you'll notice that there is indeed no increase scheduled for that person. I don't quite understand the kind of spirit that prevails over there in the Senate which would bring about such a Bill which would bring about such a result. The only thing that I can see is that we may indeed be playing politics, as usual, doing the kind of things over there in the Senate Appropriations Committee that prevail throughout this entire Session. I want to register my concern for the lack of fairness involved in this Bill and I want the Members of this House to know that I intend, in the next Session, to introduce a measure which would bring about increases across the board and deal with those specific line items where we play politics"



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

as usual in the Senate. For instance I handled the Liquor Control Commission Budget, the Chairman of this Commission did the kind of thing during this last period that we admire in public officials, that budget was decreased by some 49 percent during a period of high inflation. It seems to me that we ought to recognize the merit in those kinds of public officials and rather than playing vindictive politics and playing games with pay increases that we ought to indeed reward that kind of conduct. I object very much to Mr. Byrd, for instance, the Chairman of the Liquor Control Commission, not getting a pay increase along with the rest in the Executive Branch. I want you to know that I know him, Bill, and I know he's the kind of man who would not want me to do anything which would cause his colleagues in the Executive Branch to suffer. Therefore, I am going to vote to concur in this but I want to register my objection for the lack of fairness that prevailed in the Senate Amendments that came over here."

Speaker Kempiners: "If there is no further discussion the Chair recognizes Mr. Fleck to close."

Fleck: "I must agree wholeheartedly with the last speaker and I think you fellows can rectify that in the next Session. But I want to say as far as the figures that the Senate came up with, I am not at all pleased with the Senate. The way they handled these pay raise measures, I think it was a rather gutless fashion that they did it in. The logic they might have used for what salary levels baffles me also if you want to get into it. Reminds me of the logic of little Johnny in the classroom and the teacher asked him what was more important, the moon or the sun. Johnny said, 'well the moon is, because the sun shines in the daytime when you don't need it and moon shines at night when you do'. As far as I'm concerned the Senate only shines at night because they certainly don't stand-up



in the daylight and do things when they should do it. We're sitting here at the midnight hour again, after they have been playing games for the last four months. I'm not at all happy with them and I know a lot of you fellows aren't happy with them and the 'Gals' I know aren't happy with them. So, let's just call this vote and take the 107, as the other measure, and see if we can pass it out so that all branches of government receive salary increases as they should."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, and 3 and 4, to House Bill 2898, all those in favor will vote 'aye', all those opposed 'nay'. Representative Waddell votes 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Roll. On this question there are 113 'ayes', 30 'nays', 3 voting 'present', and the House concurs in Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3 and 4, to House Bill 2898. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh arise?"

Walsh, Wm.: "I rise, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of an introduction. It's my pleasure to introduce the son, John, and nephew, Phil, both Kriegsman, as our distinguished colleague, John Kriegsman. They are in the balcony, on the Democratic side. I don't know what they are doing there."

Speaker Kempiners: "We are going to return to the Order of Motions on the Calendar. On the Calendar on the Order of Motions, appears House Resolution 1231. For this purpose the Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is a very simple little Resolution which I have distributed to all of you. It simply says that this Body wishes that the supermarkets and unions in the Chicago area would reopen their contract negotiations on the



matter of selling meat after six o'clock. We do not want to interfere with collective bargaining and this Resolution says that. The Motion is to remove that Resolution from the Executive Committee for immediate consideration."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of House Resolution 1231. If there is no discussion,..... Okay, the Motion is to discharge the Executive Committee for immediate consideration. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "How many votes does the young Lady need to do this?"

Speaker Kempiners: ".....To discharge Committee and put on the Speaker's Table, it will take 89 votes. You shake your head 'no'. What do you want to do with it? Representative Shea?.....The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Union, Representative Choate."

Choate: "I believe that Representative Shea made an identical motion not over a couple of hours ago and his motion took 107 votes. "

Speaker Kempiners: "This is a motion to discharge the Executive Committee, not the Rules Committee. Okay, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Aren't the rulesthat it takes 107 before it is heard and a majority after it is heard. 107 before it is heard.....by the Committee and 89 after it is heard. I wish the Parliamentarian would look at the rules..... because once the Committee rejects it or hears it it takes only a majority. That was Representative Davis's Amendment to our rules. But, as I remember the rules it takes 107 prior to the time it is heard."

Speaker Kempiners: "Representative Catania has informed the Chair that she is requesting immediate consideration of this Resolution. If that is the case, it will take her 107 votes."

Shea: "All right. Now, I would ask the Lady if she would hold



it until Representative Hanahan gets on the floor. I think that he has some interest in this Resolution and I'd like him here if she would exceed to that request."

Speaker Kempiners: "All right. Representative Catania?....."

Catania: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, I believe that Representative Hanahan is in the room right now and if he wouldn't mind staying maybe we could do this?"

Unknown: "Hanahan is on the floor.....Hanahan.....Here comes Pop...."

Speaker Kempiners: "Does the Lady wish to call the Resolution for a vote?.....It will take 107 votes to do as she wishes."

Catania: "Well, yes. I was under the impression it was going to take 89, but I will have to abide by the ruling of the Chair, obviously."

Speaker Kempiners: "You would like to follow through with your motion to discharge the Executive Committee for immediate consideration?"

Catania: "Yes, Sir.....the Motion I filed..."

Speaker Kempiners: "Those who are in favor vote 'aye', those who are opposed vote 'nay'. Is there any discussion before we go on with the Roll Call? Okay. This vote will take 107 votes....er...Pardon me, before we vote the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, is the...is it within the rules to discuss the Bill. Is that where we are at right now? She wants to move....make a motion to allow a Bill to be heard immediately?.....I would like to remind the Members that this motion on this Resolution, even though it seemingly sounds nice, and it has a lot of merit, I think her point has been well taken in bringing it to the attention of the House of Representatives, but certainly it is deficient in calling to the attention of a lot more than just the meatcutters and the Employers Association



of Chicago for some general good to reopen contract negotiations. We could even go a step further and say that and possibly banking, banking laws and possibly doctor's offices and certainly lawyer's offices should be open at hours more convenient to the working persons.men and women that need their services. If this Resolution were amended to include that all types of services and all types of contracts for services and all types of quasi public organizations that seemingly are in business to perform a service for the public, are open at hours most convenient to the public, then I would join with her but to pick out one organization that, and it's very true that I sympathize with those who would like to purchase meat after six o'clock, but to say that this is the only one that needs to be resolved in this plight about when they are performing their services for the general public, I think it is in error. I think we have to broaden the intent and say ...insurance companies, and....if you get in a car accident, that the adjustors must be open at night. I think that law firms should have their hours adjusted for the general public ... to get to them. I think that certainly drug stores and certainly banks and savings and loan and dentist's officesshould be open at night. So, if we were to pass a Resolution and adopt this Motion, you know, move in an extra ordinary manner, I think that we should call to the attention of the general public that we, the General Assembly, are concerned....are concerned about general public services. Not just in one area that we really can't do very much about. We all recognize that the contract is valid, that we have received mail from the Meat Cutter's Union citing the Supreme Court decision allowing this provision to be held in sanctity by the court. We can't pass a law saying that they must reopen, so I think if we're going to point out anything to the general public maybe we should broaden the



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Resolution and until then I would oppose this Motion to allow this Resolution be heard at this time."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of the Lady's Motion. As the Chairman of the Committee in question, obviously there are no Committee meetings scheduled, it would be impossible to give it full consideration at this present time. We would not be able to comply with any of the posting or notice rules and so to defer consideration of this Resolution at this time, by referring it to Committee, would bein effect....killing it. Now, whether you favor the Resolution or not, there has been a great deal of debate upon this subject and is a subject that I think is important to everyone of us. So, I would urge that everyone do support the Motion to discharge the Executive Committee, whether you intend to support the Resolution ultimately or not, I think that we do owe her the service and the courtesy of hearing this Resolution. It's obvious, from our Rules, that we cannot debate the issues on the Resolution, on this Motion but are restricted to questions on the Motion. So, therefore, if we would discharge the Committee, then we could get to the heart of thematter, discuss the Resolution and for....and successfully vote it up or down, whatever the outcome may be. But, I think, in all fairness we should support the Motion to discharge the Committee."

Speaker Kempiners: "If there is no further question, Representative Catania is recognized to close."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to point out for anyone who is concerned about my interest in all services being available at convenient times, that I am the Sponsor of the House Bill that would, ask the State of Illinois to set up flexible scheduling so that State services can be provided for the



convenience of consumers. This is certainly a concept that I think is coming with the times and I think flexible scheduling is indeed an excellent idea. I would be happy to join with anyone who wants to sponsor such a Resolution asking others to consider flexible scheduling and if the Gentleman who made reference to that sort of situation wants to put in that kind of Resolution, I'll be happy to sponsor it with him. This one does not address itself to all types of occupations it goes into one area and I am asking that it can come out of the Executive Committee for immediate consideration by this Body. As I said earlier, I was under the impression that it was going to take only 89 votes. I certainly don't want to beleaguer the point, but I do think that it is an extremely important issue for many people and I hope that you will let it out of Committee with 107 votes."

Speaker Kempiners: "The Lady has moved to discharge House Resolution 1231 from the Executive Committee for immediate consideration. It will take 107 votes. Those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, to explain his vote."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think everyone got a letter from Mr. Emmett Kelly of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butchers Workmen of America. All he said really was that there was a Supreme Court decision which he suggested prevented the Illinois General Assembly from doing anything and I think he is wrong. The decision is here if there is anybody interested in it. All it says is what we know. . . . that hours of work is something you can collective bargain about and as the Jewell case in 1964, that has nothing to do with this Resolution. . . . bringing it out. . . The Resolution is just a matter of this



General Assembly expressing a little freedom of speech. It's very innocuous and it simply will resolve this problem and get it out of our hair. It simply urges the party to go back and reconsider the public interest and to think it over and I don't think even theany of the parties would mind if the General Assembly would say to them, ...'this is the problem that's nagging us, won't you please go back and talk about it again?' That's all we are doing and I urge you to put a vote up there so can bring this out and vote it up or down. If you want to express the will of the General Assembly to urge the parties to resolve privatelya public problem so we don't have to pass laws about it and load up the statute books needlessly with lawswell then let's bring this out, give it 107 votes, and then we can vote it up or down and the problem is over with. I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Kempiners: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Roll. Washburn 'aye'.....Madigan....Mike Madigan 'no'. Jones 'aye'....Deavers 'aye'....D'Arco 'no'..... Brandt 'no'....Lemke 'no'....Is there anybody else who wants to be recorded? On this question there are 88 'ayes', 20 'nays',21 'nays'.....Maragos 'no'..... 7 'present', and the Motion fails....."

Cunningham in Chair.....

Speaker Cunningham: "Thank you for the rousing vote of confidence. The parade of would be or quasi Speakers is encased and..irresolvable deadlock arises on January 8, on this side of the aisle and you'll have a choice. Under motions we find Senate Bill 416. The Chair recognizes the distinguished Representative from Cook, R. L. Dunne. State your point. Representative Hart, I've already promised you that you will be on the list. Representative fromHerrin.....The mike is dead. If you'll slide



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

over there Representative Hart, we'll hear your point."

Hart: "I only agreed to clap for you because you were going to call my Bill next....."

Cunningham: "Your wish will be grantedvery shortly.

Are there further points? Representative Mugalian?"

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, the last matter of call was on the Supplemental Calendar, under Motions and the very next item under that is a matter that I have, HR 1239. I believe that I am entitled to be called next.....under the rules of this House."

Cunningham: "Representative Mugalian, we're merely following the commitments of the prior Speaker and your Bill will be reached and we would be very grateful if you would indulge us so we might proceed and get out at an early hour. Would you withdraw your request on our assurance that the Chair will recognize you timely?"

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, with all respects to the Chair, I knew of no prior commitments, I don't understand how our rules can be avoided by referring to some prior commitment.....that no one knows about? If such prior commitments are to be kept within the bosom of the Speaker, ... our rules are meaningless."

Cunningham: "In response to the question raised by the honorable Representative from Cook, we are assured by the Parliamentarian that the Speaker has wide discretion in going from one order of business to another and for that reason....we must stand on the ruling that's been made and the Chair recognizes the Representative from Cook, Mr. R. L. Dunne, on Senate Bill 413..... Representative Hanahan.....er....that was Houlihan..... Forgive me.....I apologize to both of you for the mistake."

Houlihan: "Apologize.....yes...Thank you. As I understand it, to change the order of business, you have to have leave of the House?...."



Speaker Cunningham: "Your understanding is faulty on that point. Are there further questions? The Chair recognizesthe Representative from.....Representative Kempiners, please."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Maybe I can clear up a possible misunderstanding. When I was in the Chair and went to the order of Motions I did call Senate Bill 416 prior to another Motion that was called and discussed before we went into conference. At that time Representative Dunne was not on the floor and asked if we go back to the order of Motions that we could go back to Senate Bill 416. It was my understanding that unless there were significant objections that the Chair usually gave a Sponsor this courtesy and I,..have...the option of the Chair at that time, said that I would do this....We did hit Senate Bill 416, he wasn't on the floor and we are going back to that order of business.....and then it would be up to the rules of the House to determine if there would be objections to that."

Speaker Cunningham: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I want to make it clear that I speak, not because it's my Resolution, I speak in defense of the rights of all Members of this Assembly. I do not know under what basis he went to the Supplemental Calendar. I do know that my seatmate, Representative Matijevich had a matter on Motions, that was to be called just before we had the caucus. Now, if we are to skip from one Calendar to the other and from one order of business to the other, I see all our rights are threatened and we are all degraded."

Speaker Cunningham: "The Chair would speak to allay your fears, Representative Mugalian, by assuring you that we'll try not to be arbitrary and you will be reached....Representative Maragos:"



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Maragos: "...What order of business are we at the present time, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Cunningham: "We're under motions."

Maragos: "And what Motion are we considering at the present time, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Cunnihgham: "Senate Bill 416, Representative Dunne... has been recognized."

Maragos: "I would like to ask at this time, Mr. Speaker, if Representative Dunne would withdraw his Motion, as a matter of courtesy to the Members of the House because we had an understanding as of last....June 30th....that before any other motions would be put on the Calendar there would be consideration of another Bill being put on at the same time....and at this time I would ask ... as a courtesy....that he withdraw his motion and not proceed with Senate Bill 416."

Speaker Cunningham: "Representative Dunne?"

Dunne: "Well, I plan to speak on that very issue, Representative Maragos, during the presentation of my Motion, but I'll answer your question by speaking on one part of it. The only understanding I had, last Spring, was with some of the Gentlemen who originally had opposed this Billboth as Legislators and presidents of...one particula Bar Association, that if I would be reasonable in the Spring and not call that particular motion, that they were going to work out some reasonable understandings. And, instead of that the President of that particular Bar Association, was told that....to my face, in the Rotunda of this Capitol, Senator Sommers...targeting me as the number one Legislator to be defeated in the November election. I had no understanding with you at all about any other Bill that I can recollect, Representative Maragos, I don't recall that at all."

Speaker Cunningham: "Just a moment...The Chair recognizes Representative Leinenweber on a point of order..."



Leinenweber: "Excuse me....Oh, never mind..."

Speaker Cunningham: "Representative Maragos.."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I don't represent any bar association, I'm just a member of one of them....like any of the other lawyers....The only thing is if...Mr. Dunne..... Representative Dunne recalls he made a commitment. That at that time this was supposed to be taken off of the Calendar entirely and...not..consider Postponed Consideration and as a courtesy we said that if he was going to call that Bill at any time that House Bill 950, which was on Third Reading, would also be called....and that time there was an understanding that both Bills would come out together or not at all, therefore, as a courtesy to a Member of the House and not to any association, I don't care what happens out in the Rotunda, I'm only interested in what happens on the floor of this House and if a man's word is not worth it then I would like to know about it and if he denies it that he made that arrangement with us at that time then I can't say anything further at this timebut speak on the Motion when it comes up."

Speaker Cunningham: "Thank you, Representative Maragos. Representative Dunne, will you proceed?"

Dunne: "I'd like to just respond to that, Representative Maragos. I have, to be very honest with you, I have absolutely no recollection of agreeing with you only to put this motion back on....the Calendar...along with your Bill, that you're talking about. I really have no recollection of that. I would have no objection to you getting a Supplemental Calendar printed up to make your motion, that wouldn't trouble me at all, but I made this motion two weeks ago and it's been on the Calendar for the last two days and I really think it's of that nature, emergency nature, that we should take it up at this time. I really do not feel that I'm breaking any agreement with you. I honestly, Sam, don't recollect it. The only



thing that I very absolutely recollect was my discussions with some Members in this aisle, and the President..... and I want to correct that....of the Illinois Trial Lawyers Association, who assured me that some understandings were going to be worked out over the summer on this very important Legislation and that we would have the agreement in the Fall.....and instead, as I pointed out, he did absolutely nothing along these lines and I'm very disappointed in the integrity of the man who leads that association..."

Speaker Cunningham: "The Chair appreciates the mutual good will between the parties and the withdrawing of your objections, Representative Maragos. We thank you very kindly. Representative Berman."

Berman: "How many votes does his Motion require?"

Speaker Cunningham: "The question asked is....How many votes is taken?...Now this is a matter that's been debated two or three times and the Chair recognizes the law as created by Representative Shea in this matter and that is that if the proponent had filed within two days of the decision of the Rules Committee, his motion, only 89 would have been required to prevail at this time. We would have to ask the proponent whether or not he did file the motion. We're uncertain, at the Chair, whether he had done so. Representative Dunne, would you respond to that question? Did you file a motion with the Rules Committee within the prescribed two days?"

Dunne: "You're taking me back toApril....now....No...No, I didn't."

Speaker Cunningham: "Upon the representation made by the proponent....be the rule of the Chair that 107 votes be required...under the Shea law....Were there further questions, Representative Berman? Turn on the mike.... Representative Berman, please."

Berman: "Is the proponent finished with his motion? I wanted



to respond to it."

Speaker Cunningham: "The proponent hasn't made his statement yet. We asked him to do so at that time and then the Chair will recognize Representative Berman. I would ask of you to give the Speakers your attention that we might move along here expeditiously. This is my Mother's birthday and I was anxious to make a good showing. Representative Dunne, make your statement."

Dunne: "Well, just for the ruling on the number of votes it takesthe question you asked of me...I'd like to point out that when I filed the motion originally, to have this Bill put on the Calendar, I filed my appeal to the Rules Committee to have this assigned. The Committee did not post the Bill for hearingthe Rules Committee and did not inform me that it was going to be heard and they heard it in my absence. I wasn't aware that they had rejected it.....and kept it in Rules Committee....because they never posted it for hearing."

Speaker Cunningham: "Well, Representative Dunne, we're aware that some injustice may have been done but we'll have to abide by the rules strictly. It would appear that 107 votes are required.....but let us hear your presentation on your motion.....please."

Dunne: "I wonder if I could just indulge in the House for one minute before I go to my motion. I was cleaning out my desk for its next occupant ...here just a minute ago and I found something that I put in the desk last July and I'd like to auction it off very briefly, if I can? As I was leaving one Monday morning for Springfield, leaving my house, I was driving by the playground down the street and I couldn't believe my eyes, I almost drove into a pole, but there was my own twelve year old son wearing a T-shirt and I thought, as the son of the only elected Republican in the area, this was hardly the thing he should wear so I jumped out of the car, took it off of



him, brought it down to Springfield, had it laundered and I meant to do this last July but somehow I stuck it in my desk and forgot about it but I offer it right now to the other side of the aisle, I don't think I'll get any bidders here, but it is a nice clean, almost new... T-shirt.....It says....'Mayor Daley neighborhood program'. Anybody.....Do I have any bidders?

Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, very briefly, I will be brief. I think that if I came before you today and told you that the working man of this State had no protection by law....in the even of an injury of an industrial or worktime injury you would say that is an emergency matter and we must take up the matter and do something for them immediately and pass the Workmen's Compensation Act. Well, the men that are making the argument against no fault, make the same argument against Workmen's Compensation 50 or 60 years ago. I'm telling you today there are more people exposed to injury from automobile accidents in the State of Illinois than there are working men or working women exposed to an industrial or at work injury. And, 55 percent of the people injured in automobile accidents this day in the State of Illinois, in fact all over the country, are receiving absolutely no compensation for their lost time or no compensation for their medical expenses. To me, that, coupled with the fact that the Federal government is about to supplant the states again in one of the few areas that they still have control over a major area that effects the people of this State and that's the regulation of insurance. It is for those two very....very important reasons that I ask that you all please give this very important matter of 'no fault' insurance immediate consideration.....and return ...discharge the Rules Committee, report a very good Bill back to Third Reading on the Calendar where we can send it to Conference Committee



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

and come out with a Bill and send it to the Governor's Desk and give the people of this State for the first time a proper 'no fault' insurance Bill that will insure all of them fair and swift compensation for their injuries in automobile accidents. This is very definitely an emergency matter and I beg your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Cunningham: "Before the Chair recognizes Representative Berman, we would point out that the House is honored to have on the floor today, Attorney General William Scott, beneath the picture of Lincoln over there General Scott, welcome.....Representative Berman."

Berman: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would merely point out that this is hardly the hour to start debate on an issue that we debated in this Session of the General Assembly for many...many.... many hours. This Legislature acted upon a Bill, passed it, the Governor saw fit to veto it and the attempts to override that veto were not successful. I know that there will be a great deal of input on this subject of 'no fault' come January and the following months after January, by the industry, by the trial lawyers, by the consumers groups, by a large segment of our society. We don't have the time nor I think the patients to do justice to this very important subject. I would urge a 'no' vote on Representative Dunne's Motion."

Speaker Cunningham: "Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in opposing the Motion of the proponent of Senate Bill 416. I would like to remind the House that we had a Bill which passed and which both sides of the rotunda spoke and I deplore the attempt, at this late hour of the Session, to use a Conference Committee vehicle, which will not be the voice of the House, but only the few conferees, to adopt a program which was to have brought down vehemently by the House in its wisdom. --During these last...during this



last Spring Session we discussed this Bill.....and was amended extensively in the House Committees and when it did come out on the floorwas on Postponed Consideration and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I do not think in all fairness, if Mr. Dunne forgets the word he gave us, that he would not bring this up until we brought another Bill out at the same time and why he waits until the waining hours of this Session to bring it to head with this Bill, is beyond me. I think it's an injustice to the Legislative process.....if we have it brought into a Conference Committee to decide what the seekings and what the purposes and the Legislative intent of this House is and I ask you, if we believe in Legislative processes we can wait until January and introduce all the new Bills and if there is no emergency brought forth outside of his own personal pride that he wants to do something before he leaves this House, since he will not be returning in the 79th Session. So I ask you not to take up the House's time foolishly and let us defeat the motion to take this out and discharge it. Out of Committee...."

Speaker Cunningham: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Londrigan."

Londrigan: "I'm going to wait. Let's get it to a vote, I don't think any further debate will be necessary...hopefully.."

Speaker Cunningham: "Were there others that wish to be heard? If not, Representative Dunne to close."

Dunne: "First, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in responding to Representative Maragos, a Motion to discharge the Rules Committee was on this Calendar...on our Calendar through the entire Spring.....right up to the very last day. It was on the Calendar, it was not on Postponed Consideration. It was on the Calendar all Spring, so I hope everyone understands that now. I'm not taking something that was on Postponed Consideration, it was on



the Calendar.....and I waited week after week to call it and finally was assured by Members of this Assembly as well as some of the very strong associations that are very fervently interested in this, that if I would hold my call and not discharge Rules, you might recall we discharged Rules for such exciting things as revolving lights on some sort of cars and also other real important matters to all of the people in the State. Yet, I held my Bill with the understanding that we were going to, all factions on this issue, were going to come to an agreement so that we would have good 'no fault' Legislation for the people of Illinois. Now, I don't feel, in my heart, that I am violating...in any way....any agreement. I want that perfectly understood. Now, in closing, very briefly; again why should the people of Illinois have to wait until the very 'soonest', until October 1st of next year. I'm sure the administration, Members of the Senate, and Members of the House, with good will; are willing to, this very evening, work out a Bill that we can enact into law that will give the people of this State fair compensation. That's all I ask. It's an important matter. It's one we can well address ourselves to tonight rather than deny our people for another year the value of this type of Legislation. Thank you.

Speaker Cunningham: "The Motion is to take from the Rules Committee. All in favor will vote 'aye', all opposed will vote 'no'. 107 votes required. Did the Representative from Lake, Representative Deuster wish to be recognized, his light is flickering? Have all voted who wish to vote? Are there explanations? This Bill has received 31 votes.....er...Take the record.....On this question there are 31 'aye' votes, 37 'no' votes, and 14 not voting ...So the Motion has failed. Representative Maragos...."

Maragos: "Having voted on the prevailing side by which this



vote....measure...this Motion failed, I move that this Motion be reconsidered."

Speaker Cunningham: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I move that that lie on the table."

Speaker Cunningham: "The Chair did not hear Representative Leinenweber's Motion."

Leinenweber: "I move that that Motion lie on the table."

Speaker Cunningham: "All right. It has been moved that the Bill be reconsidered and that that Motion lie on the table. We'll take a vote on the second motion. Whether or not the Motion to table prevails. All in favor vote 'aye' and all opposed will vote 'no'. There is a little bit of disagreement between our advisors. We are going to take an oral vote unless there is a demand for a Roll-Call vote. All in favor of the motion to table say 'aye', all opposed say 'nay'....Do we need towe believe the 'ayes' have it. Under concurrences we find House Bill 2480. The Chair recognizes the distinguished Representative from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is going to require a three-fifths vote of the House to pass out.....Concurrence to the House Bill 2480, with Senate Amendments. This Bill went over to the Senate in the last days of June and there was no change in the percent of compensation given but there were four Amendments put on by the Senate. The first Amendment had to do with the effective date....which makes the effective date January 12th of 1975. The Second Amendment places back into the Bill the one week waiting period and it increases the earnings of an unemployment compensation recipient to the 275 per quarter and he has to make a minimum of a thousand dollars for the preceeding year that he asks for unemployment compensation. So, I move that we concur with the Senate



Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4 to House Bill 2480 and I need three-fifths vote."

Speaker Cunningham: "Representative from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Will the Sponsor yield.....for a question?"

Speaker Cunningham: "He will."

Tuerk: "Now as I understand it, Zeke, what this does is raise the Unemployment Compensation benefits by some 12 percent?"

Giorgi: "That hasn't changed since June."

Tuerk: "But it provides some administrative changes and beyond that....my second question is; this gets back to sort of the agreed Bill process that we all like so well?

Does this mean that come 1975, we're going to have the agreed Bill process, as a result of this type of action?"

Giorgi: "Yes, Representative Tuerk, I could guarantee that will be honorable..."

Tuerk: "What was that.....?"

Giorgi: "....will be honorable."

Tuerk: "In other words you are saying we're going back to the agreed Bill process?"

Giorgi: "Correct."

Tuerk: "Well that's wonderful."

Giorgi: "Thank you."

Speaker Cunningham: "If there are no furtherRepresentative Washington?"

Washington: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Cunningham: "He will."

Washington: "Representative Giorgi, as I read the Amendment here, Amendment 4, Senate Amendment....it provides that the floor, the minimum that could be made in order to qualify for benefits, is raised from \$800 to a \$1000. Is that correct?"

Giorgi: "That's correct. That's in a twelve month period."

Washington: "How many people will that effect, do you know?"



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Giorgi: "Well, their guess is that it will effect 5,000 people but I disagree with the people making the guesstimate.

Washington: "Well, what would you base your guess on and what would it be?"

Giorgi: "I would think maybe half of that. Maybe 2500 peopleare involved."

Washington: "Where would those people be located, mainly, do you know?"

Giorgi: "Well."

Washington: "Geographically..."

Giorgi: "I....suppose in the un...unorganized labor forces. You might find them in every hamlet in Illinois. No one area would have aconcerned group in it..."

Washington: "Well what was the bases....the rational for raising the floor?"

Giorgi: "What was the rational?"

Washington: "Yeah, what was the rational?"

Giorgi: "It seems this was the only way we could get it out of the Senate."

Washington: "Well, that may be true but let's get behind that. What...."

Giorgi: "That's the real reason, Harold."

Washington: "What forces, what institute, what lobby groups, insisted that this be placed in this Bill in order for it to get out of the Senate?"

Giorgi: "We had negotiations with the AF of L, the UAW, the National Association of Manufacturers and the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce and....the feeling was that most of our people should be able to earn \$275 in a 12 week or three month period and they ought to be able to earn a \$1000 to qualify for Unemployment Compensation. I think ...I intend to agree with you that there are some people here that fall into the cracks and I find that to be true when we're talking about welfare recipients, food stamp recipients, and people who just can't-



make it in the private market. I had the same feelings that you do but I think the emphasis now is on those that are on unemployment compensation and those payments haven't kept pace with the high cost of living."

Washington: "Well, in effect....this is my last question, and I thank you for your indulgence. In effect, won't this mean that that 2 or 3 or 4 percent, whatever the figure is, will be forced upon the welfare rolls of this State."

Giorgi: "It's my experience, Harold, that those people can better make it on welfare than they can on the unemployment compensation payments."

Washington: "But, Zeke, you are not only dealing with dollars and cents, you are dealing with the question of human dignity and pride. Does it occur to you and I'm not only lambasting you, you're stuck with this thing, but don't you feel as I feel, that if a person goes out and is gainfully employed and he does pay some dues into the compensation benefit claims and if he gets unemployed, don't you think he should have a choice of drawing benefits from there rather than to be forced into the welfare rolls? It's a very demeaning experience for a lot of people it may shatter their pride and I....this is what disturbs me about this thing....Well, I was addressing it to the Sponsor. It's unfair to do so. Let me simply address myself to the Bill....or the Members, Mr. Speaker. This is a hard decision to make. I'm familiar with the labor-management negotiations of things like this and it's certain I'm totally opposed to it. At its best it's good but at its worst it does things like this. I ...I'm constrained to say that I must not support this if it's one percent, one half percent, ten people in this State who have worked and want to hold their head up in dignity and don't want to join the welfare ranks and I have to stand there with them and say that I support them."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

I think what should be done and I'm not going to be popular about this but that doesn't particular bother me. I think what we should do is not vote this in, send it to a Conference Committee, sit down and hammer this thing out and simply tell industry we're not going to let you force this kind of operation upon the citizens of this State. Why in the devil are they raising the ceiling from \$800 to \$1000? Labor doesn't want it. They've been blackjacked into it. It's business, it's management that wants this thing. I for one simply don't think we should permit them to set public policy for poor people in this State, particularly when it infringes upon their right to hold their heads up. I urge you to defeat this. Send it to a Conference Committee, let's sit down and hammer this thing out and knock out this floor. Put it back where it was at \$800. I urge you to do that."

Speaker Cunningham: "The Chair recognizes the Representative from Champaign, Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this seems to me that now we're on the subject of the poor people of the State of Illinois once again. If business and management is favoring this Bill I haven't heard that from business and management and I'm not favoring it as a Republican and Republicans are supposed to be for business and management. Now, I've got the greatest respect for the Sponsor of this particular Bill....from Winnebago. I heard him say that this is going to get back to the agreed Bill process but I've set down here for four years now and everytime something goes wrong we don't have the agreed Bill process and then when they hammer something out in the Senate the way they want it they say, all right, you pass it over in the House and then we'll go back to the agreed Bill process again and then we never get back there because the Senate



does it the way they want to. Now, I disagree with the distinguished Representative from Winnebago. This is going to eliminate at least \$5,000 people from coverage from unemployment compensation. I am not, as an owner of business myself, particular enamored of unemployment compensation. But, the people that are being eliminated are not the people that should not be on unemployment compensation. In the first place these are the poor people who are working trying to make the dollar but can't find the type of job that will give them sufficient benefits to apply for unemployment compensation. It's only the poor people. And, as Representative Washington so carefully deliniated, you give them two choices, if you pass this Bill you have only one. Now they can apply for unemployment compensation, they can come home and say to their wives and families, well, we're in a bad time like we are right now, we are in a recession. I lost my job. I'm going to have to take unemployment compensation but I'm still a laboring man. If you pass this Bill or concur in this the man has to go home to his family and say, 'I'm not employed, I'm not on unemployment compensation, I'm a welfare recipient'. I don't care what you think about welfare, it is a stigma and I think we have no right as Republicans or Democrats to inflict that stigma on any poor person in the State of Illinois. I hope we will not concur. Send this thing back to the Senate, make them get rid of that floor and come up with a decent Bill for the poor people of this State."

Speaker Cunningham: "The Representative from McHenry, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have to say, very honestly and very sincerely, Representative Washington and Representative Hirschfeld are speaking the truth. There are going to be some people who are



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

who are adversely affected. But, I just say, to the Members of the House, very sincerely, there is going to be an awful lot of people helped. This is a compromise, it is not our compromise, a management Bill or a labor Bill. At best it is just a little dab and a dribble to the real problems. But, as I see it now, we're not in that good posture that we could demand out of a Conference Committee, something that I truly believe that John Hirschfeld and Representative Washington are accurate about, that we should really do something more than this Bill. But, I suggest that, at this date, in December, that if we pass this, that next January..... and John, I want to point this out very sincerely, I am not happy nor have I been happy with the agreed process and I doubt if the agreed process will ever work..... ever again. But, I think this House of Representatives and the Senate of this State will meet its obligations in this coming Session and will adopt reasonable changes in the Workmen's Comp Law.....to fit the need. Right now where Representative Giorgi, Representative North, and Sims and Representative Skinner, Waddell and myself live, we have over 20,000 auto workers out of work today, we can't afford to wait, we need to do something. That's what this Bill will do. It will help some people today. Hopefully, next January, with the new Session, with the new way the things will be done, we will then address ourselves to the problems of saying 'no', we don't want to put people on welfare, when they are truly unemployed and should be on unemployment comp. So, I will support the motion to concurreluctantly, like Representative Washington, only because we need to patch it up today and hope for a better future tomorrow."

Speaker Cunningham: "If there is no further discussion..... recognize Representative Giorgi to close."

Giorgi: "Well, Mr. Speaker, as Representative Tuerk referred



to the agreed process, this is a product of the agreed process. Labor and industry sat down and hammered this compromise out. This protects the integrity of the fund which has to be maintained at a certain level and it doesn't really effect people that are qualifying now. This law takes effect January 12, and we will be back to work in the next 90 days and we can correct that inequity that they feel is in this Bill in the next 90 days, so I think the thing to do now is take this percent increase and accept that."

Speaker Cunningham: "The question is, does the House concur in the Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4, of House Bill 2480, it's final action. Requires 107 votes. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Representative Dave Jones 'aye'. ...I'll get to you....Representative Dyer 'aye'. Just a couple more and I'll get to you. Representative Washington to explain his vote."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I just can't stop, I've got to gnaw on this bone a little more. Representative Giorgi.....I have the greatest respect and admiration for him, we are friends and almost brothers in our mutual problems here in Springfield. I simply cannot agree with his conclusion. The agreed process brought about this monstrosity. The same machinery that brought about this monstrosity in terms of agreed process, will be here in January. If you think you're going to change this floor from a thousand back to eight hundred in January, you are sadly misled. I don't think that Zeke Giorgi wanted to mislead you. This is a bad Bill and unless you're prepared to sit down in a conference and hammer it out I simply don't think, in all fairness, that you are doing your job and are being responsible, not to 2000, but maybe 10 or 15 thousand people in this State. This is a horrible Bill. You just can't force people on welfare who want to be gainfully employed, but



who might be out of work for two weeks, three weeks, four weeks ...to march down to the public aid and get in line and stand there like a pauper when they want to work and have work and want to enjoy the fruits and dignity of that work. See and it's a crying shame, I'm absolutely unalterably opposed to this and it hurts me. I love the auto workers. I think they are a fine union. I think they are entitled to all they can get in terms of byproducts of their work, but if this means that 100,000 men in this State would benefit and 10,000 will suffer, I simply can't do it. I am not an exponent of cracking eggs to make an omlet....when you're dealing with people. This is a bad Bill. I don't think what I'm saying is going to change it but I want to go on record as being opposed."

Speaker Cunningham: "Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Mr. Speaker, just briefly, I'm going to suggest that we scrub this Roll Call and that we ask everybody to vote who's present and nobody to vote who is not present.....because there is an awful lot of green lights up there that are not on this floor. I think this issue is important enough for the poor people of this State that if we have those up there I'm going to have to ask for a verification. Now, I would like to say that I don't believe we can correct this inequity. We haven't corrected this in an entire year. We're in the final day of the Session and the inequity is still not corrected. I want the people of this General Assembly to know that I am not antilabor. That's not the position that I'm taking here, but I am pro poor labor and there is quite a difference and this Bill does not favor those laborers who are not making a decent wage....I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, with all respect, that we come up with a new Roll Call."



Speaker Cunningham: "Representative from Cook.....Representative Martin's button is onRepresentative Katz?"

Just a moment, the Chair recognizes Katz."

Katz: "Ah.....Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't think that this should be.....it is fair to say that all of those 5,000 people who are supposed to be disqualified are poor people. The fact is that a number of those people are the people who are not really attached to the labor market and are not ...really not in the growth that unemployment compensation is designed to assist. For example, you have students at the University of Illinois who may have worked a couple of months during the summer and who want to try to get benefits the rest of the year....and it may be that they didn't quite earn \$1000 in the summer, but it's not fair to say that that kind of person, as the result of not getting unemployment compensation, is going to go on the welfare rolls. you may have someone who has his own business and he has a side job and in the side job he manages to make a few dollars a week. You're talking a thousand dollars a year is only twenty dollars a week. Some people may not quite make a thousand....but they are not poor people, they are people who have one job or a business that's not under unemployment compensation and they have a limited amount of money for unemployment compensation. A thousand dollars is only twenty dollars a week and there are not very many people, no matter how poor, anywhere in the State of Illinois, who for very much work are not being paid a total of a thousand dollars a year. This does give a 12 percent increase to hundreds of thousands of people in Illinois who are being unemployed due to the recession. It's very important to the State of Illinois and to these people that they have this money. This is the only way they can get it now. For that reason, it certainly seems to me that the advantages



of this Bill far outweigh the disadvantages....and that we do have a responsibility to these hundreds of thousands of people to give them this additional amount of money without it costing the State of Illinois a cent. Since the State of Illinois does not support the unemployment compensation fund. It comes from employer contributions and so we are not in any way jeopardizing our budget and we are giving a 12 percent increase to hundreds of thousands of people who in the recession are unemployed and that's why I am voting 'yes'."

Speaker Cunningham: "Is there further discussion? We wanted to respond to the Representative from Champaign. The Chair is loathed to dump the record unless concurred in by the proponents. We appreciate the fact that the Representative does not persist in the motion. The Clerk will take the Roll. Will the Clerk take the Roll, please? On this Motion there are 119 'ayes', 4 'nays' and 11 not voting. So the House....11 'present'....Representative Hirschfeld?"

Hirschfeld: "I'd ask for a verification."

Speaker Cunningham: "Representative Giorgi, do you wish to poll of the absentees?"

Giorgi: "We...might as well go through the procedure, poll the absentees."

Speaker Cunningham: "Will the Clerk poll the absentees?"

Clerk Selcke: "David.....J. David....Dave Jones 'aye', ..."

Hirschfeld: "Anderson."

Clerk Selcke: "Jones....yeah, I've got him down here. Arnell, Barnes, Barry, Bradley..."

Speaker Cunningham: "Representative Barnes?"

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I didn't vote on this issue. I set here and tried to listen to the debate....and in looking at that tote board up there I wish everyone on the House floor would just take a minute to look at it. That tote



board reflects 119 votes and almost by number those
many of those same votes that are up on that tote
 board nowthey're talking about a percentage of
 people that may be necessary to go on the welfare rolls,
 those same votes were either not on the board, or voting
 'no', when we were talking about, just a couple of hours
 ago, trying to maintain some semblance of subsistence of
 people who were already on the welfare rolls. I think
 it's extremely contradictory.....to now be talking about
 a number of people that may be forced on those very
 welfare rolls that here a few hours agoso many of
 us were not willing to vote for money to sustain the
 rolls as they are presently constituted. I'm not going
 to vote 'no' because I had some commitments to make but
 I am going to vote 'present'."

Clerk Selcke: "Barry, Bradley, Capuzi, Carter, Clabaugh,
 DiPrima, Douglas, Duff, Gibbs, Giglio, Ron Hoffman, Hudson,
 Hunsicker, Huskey, Hyde, Juckett, Kennedy, Klosak,
 Kriegsman, Mann, Martin, McAvoy, McCormick, McLendon,
 North, Palmer, Pappas, Philip, Porter, Rigney, Sevcik,
 Tuerk, Ike Sims, Stedlin, Terzich, Thompson, Wall,
 J. J. Wolf, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Cunningham: "Representative Terzich, how do you vote?
 Representative Terzich 'aye'...."

Clerk Selcke: "On this question there are 121 'ayes', 4 'nays',
 and 12 'present'."

Speaker Cunningham: "Now, on this question there are 121 'ayes',
 4 'nays',Representative Kosinski?"

Kosinski: "How am I....Am I recorded 'present'?"

Speaker Cunningham: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'present'."

Kosinski: "Would you please change that to a 'yes'?"

Speaker Cunningham: "Representative Giglio 'aye'....Representative Capparelli 'aye'. Representative Thompson 'aye'. Representative Hirschfeld?"



Hirschfeld: "I withdraw my request."

Speaker Cunningham: "Thank you very much, Representative Hirschfeld. "

Clerk Selcke: "125 'ayes', 4 'nays'.....9 'present'...."

Speaker Cunningham: "On this vote there are 125 'ayes', 4 'nays', 9 'present'.....The House concurs in House Bill 2480. Is Representative Boyle on the Floor? Under concurrences the Chair finds House Bill 1114....and recognizes Representative Boyle. Would you move over, Representative Boyle, please?"

Boyle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1114 passed the Senate today....56-40, Deep Mine Reclamation Act. The Senate placed an Amendment, Amendment #1, on the Bill which is a technical Amendment. It makes certain technical changes and clean up some of the language of the Bill and I would move that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 and we need three-fifths vote."

Speaker Cunningham: "If there is no further discussion, we'llthe vote will be on concurring on the Senate Amendment to House Bill 1114. All in favor vote 'aye', and all opposed will vote 'no'....As noted by the Sponsor, 107 votes are required for concurrence in this matter. Okay, the Clerk will take the Roll. Will the Clerk take the Toll, please? On this question there are 120 'ayes' no 'nays', 4 voting 'present' and the House concurs in House Bill 1114. Under concurrences the Chair finds House Bill 2909 and recognizes Representative Hart.

Hart: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Senate adopted two Amendments to this Bill which I'm going to ask to concur in. The first one was to add \$300,000 to the Legislative Space Needs Commission for the purpose of remodeling what is now the fifth floor of offices....I think for the use of the Senate....in the future. The other is an increase in



the amount of the retirement and I move to concur in both Senate Amendments #1 and #2."

Speaker Cunningham: "If there is no further discussion....

Take the Roll Call. On House Bill 2909....All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed 'nay'. 107 votes required..... Have all voted who wish to vote? Representative Hart.. to explain his vote."

Hart: "We're not only concurring on the Senate Amendments here but we're also passing this Bill in its final form and there is many valuable things in the Bill and I would ask the Members of the House to be attentive to their switches so that we can pass this. It's an omnibus appropriation Bill. It provides \$2,000,000 for reimbursement to the courts....to the counties under the Juvenile Court Act.. It provides money for the Business and Economic Development Commission for certain other commissions and dues and so forth and in addition it does provide the money that is needed by the State Legislative Space Needs Commission to do the work that they have planned. So I would appreciate it if the House would support this measure with 107 votes so that it can become law....and These appropriations, most of which were dumped, actually last June in a Bill that should have been passed, now can be approved and the money can be spent. Every county will get some money from this through the Juvenile Court Act Reimbursement.

Speaker Cunningham: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Roll. On this question there are 111 'ayes', 4 'nays', and 11 voting 'present', so the House concurs in the House Bill 2909. Under concurrence appears Senateah...Senate Amendments 1 and 2, thank you..... Under concurrences appears House Bill 1277, Representative from Knox, Representative McMaster.....Representative Shea?"

Shea: "I would like to inform the Chair that the following Bill after 2909 was House Bill 2910 that is waiting to



have concurrence of a Senate Amendment. That was Representative Barry's Bill. Since he has resigned and now become an Appellate Court Justice, I'm going to handle this for him.....and I'd hate to have to tell him, Roscoe, that you tried to slip him one and forget his Bill."

Speaker Cunningham: "Representative Shea, would you yield just for this one Bill on our assurances that we will be there shortly and no offense intended.."

Shea: "Just so long as I can tell Representative Barry, now, Mr. Justice Barry, you didn't try to do it to him."

Speaker Cunningham: "We shall be obliged to your explanation. Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1277 was the Surface-Mine Reclamation Bill. There was Amendments put on it in the Senate which is rather lengthy. It cleans up language and changes the permit period from one year to three years which I feel gives both local government and the areas involved a better opportunity to plan for reclamation of land. It requires the industry to submit plans to the county board as well as the Department of Mines and Minerals. It retains the bark and surface soil or top soil....is kept in. It creates an aggregate Mining Problems Study Commission that hopefully would be appointed immediately after the first of the year and report back by the first of May. If necessary separate aggregate mining laws from regular coal strip mining laws, if this is the desire of the Commission. I have no qualms in accepting the Amendment. I think the Amendment is good and helps the Bill and for that reason I would urge that we concur in the Senate Amendment to House Bill 1277. I would also like to ask for the 107 votes, please."

Speaker Cunningham: "The Representative from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."



Tuerk: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question."

Speaker Cunningham: "He will."

Tuerk: "Tom, what's the topsoil requirement now, as the Bill stands?"

McMaster: "The same as it passed out of the House last May or June, Fred. Eighteen inches of topsoil if it is there and available, if not, what is there and in no case less than eight inches. This is of course where the land is being returned to row crop purposes."

Tuerk: "Eighteen inches, right?"

McMaster: "Yes."

Tuerk: "Thank you."

Speaker Cunningham: "Is there any further discussion? If there is no further discussion we'll take a vote on concurrence, Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1277. All in favor vote 'aye' and all opposed vote 'nay'. Requires 107 votes. Have all voted who wish to vote? The Clerk will take the Roll. On this question there are 134 'aye' votes, no 'nays' and none voting 'present'. So the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1277. Under concurrences the Chair finds House Bill 2910 and recognizes the distinguished Representative from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is as I said, Representative Barry's Bill. House Bill 2910 was on a request from the administration straightening out a problem that had to do with appropriations to be used from the road fund and general revenue fund..... This particular Bill effects both law enforcement and the court where 25 percent of their account comes from road fund and 75 percent the general revenue. The Comptroller, under new opinion by the Attorney General, said, you had to specifically go against one fund or the other and you couldn't commingle them. This allows the practice that has been happening in the past, the commingling of



the two funds, to continue, but only until October the first. There was an Amendment in the Senate to limit this Bill until October the first so that we may handle the problem in the next Session of the General Assembly, but yet will not cause any disruption of the present agency policies and I would appreciate the support of the House.....in concurring with the Senate in Amendments. This does require 107 votes."

Speaker Cunningham: "If there are no further questions, the motion is to concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2910. All in favor will vote 'aye', all opposed will vote 'nay'. 107 votes required. Have all voted who wish to vote? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 121 'ayes', one 'nay', 5 voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2910. (See Special Request.)



Speaker Cunningham: "Under Senate Bills, Second Reading, the Chair finds Senate Bill 1682 and recognizes the Representative from Peoria, Representative Day.....Which one? Will the Clerk read the Bill, please?"

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bills, Second Reading. Senate Bill 1682, an Act making certainnonsubstantive revisions of the law to resolve differences and so forth. Second reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Cunningham: "Are there Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #1, Lundy, amends Senate Bill 1682 by deleting Section 2, and renumbering Sections 3 through 61, as Sections 2 through 60 respectively."

Speaker Cunningham: "The Gentleman has moved adoption of Amendment #1. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "I'd like them to explain Amendment #1 so the Body could understand what it is and then perhaps we will have some discussion."

Speaker Cunningham: "The Chair blushes. Representative Day."

Day: "Mr. Speaker, this is Representative Lundy's Motion.... er....Amendment."

Speaker Cunningham: "The Representative from Cook, Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a simple Amendment and it removes from this Bill, which is a 1974 Revisory Bill, a section which deletes a part of the present statutory law. That present statutory law is now involved in some litigation in the Federal Court in Chicago and it seems to me is not,that being true, properly the subject of a revisory Bill. It seems to me we ought to leave that statutory provision on the books until the litigation concerning it is terminated and therefore this Amendment would remove from the Bill a section of thefrom the revisory Bill, the section which deletes, from the present law,



the statutory language, which is presently the subject of litigation."

Speaker Cunningham: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "I might first ask, with leave of the Chair or leave of the House, speak to the Sponsor of the Bill, if he will yield to a question?"

Speaker Cunningham: "The Sponsor will yield."

Shea: "Mr. Day, it has always been my understanding that Revisory Bills deal with more or less cleanup measures which are noncontroversial. Now, it's my opinion, I wish you'd enlighten me if I'm not, Section 2 said that an Act in relation to ratification of proposed Amendments to the Constitution of the United States of America, being inconsistent with the Illinois Constitution, that Act is repealed. Now, I think that Mr. Lundy raised an important point. Can you tell me who...who, in the Legislative Reference Bureau, made a determination that the Act, with regard to proposed Amendments to the Constitution, is inconsistent to the State Constitution?"

Day: "Representative Shea, I ...the answer to your question is 'no' I cannot tell you what individual, in the reference Bureau,...included this particular statute in the Revisory Bill. It is a product of the Reference Bureau as you know. The Bill is the typical Revisory Bill. I think that if you read the statute in question and read the Constitution, I think it would be obvious that the section which is repealed is contrary to the 1970 Constitution. As a matter of fact I think that the Sponsor of this Motion would probably agree to that. His point is, and I have discussed this with him, his point is that this is not a proper way to handle the repeal of the...of a statute such as this. I can't say that I disagree with him entirely....but I think that your answer to that question must depend upon a reading



of the statute and comparing it with the Constitution is very simple. The statute says that it only takes a Constitutional Majority of the Legislature to adopt an Amendment to the United States Constitution and of course the new Constitution clearly provides for a three-fifths vote. So, ...that's what we're up against. Now, the... does that answer your question, Representative Shea?"

Shea: "Well, what bothers me, Mr. Day, is that Revisory Bills, and I've handled some and you've handled some, are typically really noncontroversial Bills, nonsubstantive in nature. I find myself looking at a Revisory Bill the second article to be revised...is something I consider highly controversial in nature. Now, I know you say a simple reading will come to the conclusion, but as I remember we attempted to change the rules of this House and I think that a majority of the Rules Committee voted to change the rules of the House and were soundly defeated on the floor of this House, on this very issue. That,...I think, is what disturbs me more than anything else ...to look at a revisionary Bill and find what, in my opinion, is a highly controversial revision."

Day: "Well, Representative Shea, I...and also by way of.... speaking to the Motion, if that is in order at this time, I would only say this, that I would have no hesitancy in agreeing to this Amendment under normal circumstances. However, if you will look at this Bill, you'll find that the last six pages consist of the index. The Bill itself corrects....probably more than a hundred different technical problems that exist as a result of duplicate Bills which were passed, mis-numbering and many...many technical corrections that are necessary in order to remove ambiguity from the Statute Books as a result of the last Legislative



Session. Now, ordinarily, as I say, I would have no objection to this Motion. We could simply take this part out of the Bill and go ahead and pass the rest of the Bill, but the real problem here is that this is the second to the last day of the Session as I understand it and if the Bill is advanced to Third Reading today, it will have to be passed when we come back in, just prior to the convening of the next General Assembly. That's going to put us right up against the deadline. On the other hand, if we amend it now and then adopt it on the morning of the eighth of January in 1975, we're going to be in a position where it'll have to go back to the Senate for concurrence in that Amendment. I just think that that is a riskyposition to put the entire Revisory Bill in because there may or may not be a quorum in the Senate on that day and they may or may not get to this Bill and in which event it would be....we would be without a Revisory Bill for this Session of the General Assembly.....I think that would be too bad because I think that the problems that would arise as a result of that would be of such a nature that it would cause a great deal of confusion and certainly raise a lot of technical questions in law suits that would be coming along in the next year or so."

Speaker Cunningham: "The Chair recognizes the Representative from Lake, Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I understood from the Speaker, the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Blair, that the House would be coming back, not on the morning of the eighth, but at 10 a.m. on the morning of the seventh whichgive us a full day...that day... ..afternoon, which will give us the seventh to pass the Bill on Third Reading and have it go back to the Senate for a simple concurrence and final action in a House Amendment... If they don't do it the afternoon of -



the seventh we could come back at 11 a.m. the morning of the eighth for their concurrence but certainly we can handle the Bill on Third Reading on the seventh, which is Tuesday, not the last day of the Session but the next to the last because of course we could meet the morning of the eighth as well. This Bill didn't receive a hearing in either Senate or House Committee which is common with Revisory Bills and I don't criticize that..... If the Sponsor of the Bill, the Gentleman from Peoria, at least should be gracious enough, as long as the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lundy, found an error, a controversial matter that shouldn't be in the Revisory to accept his Amendment and have his Amendment adopted. Then we can fight the matter out in the next Session or in the courts as it's being fought out. The Bill didn't receive a Committee hearing, as I said, in either House. Mr. Lundy, who is quite conscientious, apparently found the controversial matter, that's before the courts, in the Bill. The Assistant Minority Leader, Mr. Shea, was somewhat upset, as was I, in finding the controversial matter in a Revisory Bill. So, I think, in all good grace, the Gentleman from Peoria should withdraw his opposition to Amendment #1. We should adopt it today. Read the Bill a second time. Pass it on the seventh and sent it back to the Senate for concurrence on January 7."

Speaker Cunningham: "The Chair recognizes the Representative from Cook, Representative Lundy for his close on the Amendment."

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all let me assure the Members and most especially the distinguished Gentleman from Peoria, whom I hold in the highest regard, that I have no desire whatsoever to complicate his life or make it difficult to pass this Revisory Bill. That is not my purpose. Indeed, if the Amendment I'm offering here is adopted I will work asclosely as I can



with him to insure that we have time to pass the Bill on Third Reading here in the House and get it over to the Senate in time for them to concur in this very simple Amendment. Now, what's at issue in this Amendment is not the proper majority for ratifying Federal Constitutional Amendments, it is the propriety of including in a technical Revisory Bill a matter which is a subject of great controversy. I think all of us would agree that this is simply not an appropriate kind of Bill in which to try to resolve this issue. We can debate the question of the proper ratification majority for hours or days but we shouldn't have to do it on Second Reading when we are considering a Revisory Bill. Let's adopt this simple Amendment. Delete this section from the Bill so that it will be truly just a technical cleanup Bill and then I will work with the Sponsor here in the House and with the Senate Sponsor, with whom I've discussed this matter, and in order to make sure that the Bill is adopted before the end of this 78th General Assembly. The real issue here is whether a controversial matter ought to be included in a Revisory? I think most Members would agree it ought not to be and therefore I ask for your vote in support of the Amendment."

Speaker Cunningham: "The motion is to adopt Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1682. All in favor will say 'aye', all opposedAre there five who demand a Roll Call? One, two, three, four....Well it appears that there is sufficient demand for a Roll Call and so we'll decide it in that manner. The motion is to adopt Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1682, all in favor will vote 'aye', and all opposed will vote 'nay'. Representative Waddell votes 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this motion there are 68 'ayes', 30 'nays', one voting 'present'. So Amendment #1 is



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

adopted. Are there further....Representative Richard Walsh...'no'. Representative Charles Fleck 'no'. Representative Craig 'no'.....'Aye', sorry, Bob. Are there further Amendments? Senate Bill 1682 is advanced to Third Reading. It is my proud pleasure to ...introduce my successor, Representative Simms from Winnebago. Thank you for being very indulgent."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Representative W. Timothy Simms in Chair.

Speaker Simms: "House Resolution 1239,.....Under Motions, Supplemental Calendar, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mugalian is recognized."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, since copies of the Resolution have not been distributed, I wonder if it would be in order to have the Clerk read it. It's not very long."

Speaker Simms: "The Clerk will read the Resolution."

Clerk Selcke: "House Resolution 1239, Mugalian, WHEREAS, Airforce...General George S. Brown, Chairman, Joint Chief of Staff, to deliver a speech at Duke University on October 10, 1974, in which he included the following remarks; The American people might get tough-minded enough to set down the Jewish influence in this Country and break that lobby. It is so strong now you wouldn't believe it. The Jews own, you know, the banks in this Country, the newspapers. Just look at where the Jewish money is; and WHEREAS, although General Brown apologized for his unfortunate and ill-considered remarks, it is apparent that he believes the truth of his remarks; and WHEREAS, the President of the United State's National Security Council, indeed the Congress of the United States, you and I are expected to depend upon the Chairman of the Joint Chief of Staff, conduct of foreign policy and establishment of the United States Global Military strategy and other fateful decisions regarding war and peace; and WHEREAS, General Brown, as clearly evident, has deep rooted, virulent, anti-Semitism, but of no or less importance has demonstrated a mind set that clearly disqualifies him from the responsibilities of his office and indicates an understanding of history and current politically, economic and military conditions that is ignorant, naive and neurotic; and WHEREAS, the



National policy then may be influenced by bigots in higher places or may be the result of a complete misapprehension of who are our Nation's friends and enemies is a threat to all Americans and that, therefore, the people of the State of Illinois have a direct and immediate stake in the attitudes and personnel that shape such National policy, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives, 78th General Assembly, State of Illinois, that we request President Gerald S. Ford to reconsider his refusal to fire General George S. Brown, Chairman, Joint Chief of Staff and dismiss him from this quote, 'incensure'; and be it further Resolved that we do express our grave...concern that high governmental officials can hold the views expressed by General George S. Brown, which are so totally divorced from reality and colored by a strong prejudice against ethnic or religious communities in this United States; and be it further Resolved, a suitable copy of this Resolution be forwarded to President Gerald R. Ford."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, the reason I am asking for immediate consideration of this Resolution and a vote up or down, is that our failure to act today is a form of action to delay...is to delay in the same way that the Germans delayed before Hitler came to power, and to delay the way the Italians delayed to allow Mussolini's Fascist to take over. Some of you may have seen the movie, 'The Gardens of the...Finzi Contini'...which describe the situation so tragically and so poignantly. How people put their head in the sand and said, it can't happen here, how they permitted the kinds of attitudes that are so sorrowfully expressed by General Brown. To take over and to destroy the freedoms in those countries: If we don't act on this Resolution today, it will be saying that the kind of attitude expressed by



the Chairman of the Joint Chief of Staff are all right. It will explain that we are not aware of the lessons of history. Not to vote on this proposition, this Resolution today is to ignore the frightful history of this world during the last fifty years. I urge everyone to vote 'yes' so that we can debate this Resolution and vote it up or down."

Speaker Simms: "The distinguished Gentleman from LaSalle, Representative Fennessey.....er....The distinguished Gentleman from Cook, Representative Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, while the Resolution was being read and while the Sponsor was talking, there was a great deal of chatter and inattention on the House floor. Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate it, before I comment, if we might gain some attention to this subject."

Speaker Simms: "If the House would give Representative Duff some attention....Representative Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have in my own heart the sympathetic feeling toward the intentions of the Sponsor of this Resolution. I don't see my colleague, from the First District on the Democratic side of the aisle, in his chair right at the moment but were he here I think he might share what I'm about to say. If Representative Katz is not here, I would feel reluctant to suggest his opinions are mine. This Resolution, to those who did not listen to the words, suggest that General Brown has spoken in an anti-Semitic way which should cause his censure or removal from office, but....the rhetoric ...the rhetoric of this Resolution is extensive. I could, perhaps, support Representative Mugalian in an impassionate criticism of the actions that was taken, but the words which were read to us included such characterizations as neurotic, and so forth. I feel that if the Representative



truly wants to achieve his cause, in a nonpolitical way, he might consider for a moment putting in a Resolution which would intend to achieve his cause without the word which could not be accepted by those of us who believe in the basic elements which he suggests to intend to accomplish. This is, in rhetoric..a nasty Resolution; in intent...a wholesome one. I can't vote for those words, Representative Mugalian."

Speaker Simms: "Any further debate? The distinguished Gentleman from Lake, the distinguished Majority Leader, Representative Walsh...."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I talked with the Chairman of the Executive Committee, the Committee to which this Resolution would probably be referred if permitted to be referred.. and he said that the Committee could be called for a meeting on January 7, at say....2:30, a half hour before we reconvene this Session that some people will not permit to die....and consider the Resolution then and perhaps we could then if the Committee acts on it, be able to consider it more advisedly. So, could I ask the Gentleman, in order that we may avoid lengthy debate, a long Roll Call, and perhaps many people voting on something that they aren't too certain of, could I ask the Gentleman to withdraw it, permit it to be referred to the Executive Committee and ...for their consideration and for our further consideration if they approve?"

Speaker Simms: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "As I pled....I think this Resolution speaks for itself and the....I don't think that my rhetoric in any way approached the reality of General Brown's own words. It would take more hyperboles than I am capable of to really characterize a...kind of 'mindset' that must be possessed by an individual of this kind and I just refer to one sentence that I reproduced, of General Brown's own words, to wit; this is General Brown's



quotation. He says that the Jews own, you know, the banks in this Country, the newspapers. Now, anyone that knows anything at all about financial matters, financial institutions or newspapers knows that 99 percent of the big financial institutions and newspapers of this Country are not owned by Jews. The man that has this kind of understanding of such elementary economic conditions in this Country....ah...there is no way for me to over-describe or over-state his incompetence."

Speaker Simms: "The motion is to suspend the appropriate rule which takes 107 votes. The voting is now open. Those in favor of the motion signify by voting 'aye' and opposed 'no'. Representative Waddell 'no'.....Have all those that voted.....that wished?.....The Clerk will take the record... On this issue there are 26 'ayes', 16 'nays' and the motion fails. Under Resolutions, House Resolution 1192. The distinguished Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, Honorable Leader. House Resolution 1192 is unfortunately not printed and distributed. Anyone who wishes copies may pick them up here. I would ask that this be ...Are we on Second Reading? I want to offer an Amendment. What do you have to do to get me there?"

Speaker Simms: "Will the Clerk,ah....Representative Matijeovich, for what purpose do you rise?"

Matijeovich: "Only a point of order. What order of business are we on?"

Speaker Simms: "We....just under motions. We're on House Resolution 1192, Representative Skinner."

Matijeovich: "No. Under what order of business ...tho....?"
We were under motions....and I'm under motions...on the Calendar. If we're still under motions I'd like to be heard one of these days."

Speaker Simms: "To the Speaker's Table, House Resolution 1192. Will the Clerk please read the Amendment to Representative



Skinner's Resolution?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment to House Resolution 1192, Skinner, Amendment #1, amends House Resolution 1192 in the next to last paragraph by changing 'requested' to 'directed' and by changing 'investigation' to 'conduct program audit of'."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, the Resolutionwas drawn up by the Reference Bureau before I had glanced at the law that governs the Auditor General. I find the law says that we are empowered to direct the Auditor General to conduct program audits and the original language said that we request the Auditor General to investigate licensing programs....And, I think...You know, I'd like to have it in proper form so that we can vote on it. I would move its adoption."

Speaker Simms: "Representative Skinner moves the adoption of the Amendment to House Resolution 1192, all in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposedthe 'ayes' have it the Amendment is adopted."

Skinner: "Now,Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly, I think this is a far reaching Resolution. We've had twowe've looked.....there have been two groups, that are independent of each other, look at State licensing programs in the last month,.... or at least they've been released. One is this report that you have on your desk in your office right now on 'day care'. What it shows is that the day care licensing in the State leaves something to be desired. Now, I've been informed by the Legislative liason of the Department of Children and Family Services that they have made great strides in correcting those shortcomings that are pointed out. I'm sure Mary Lee Leahy will also look at the other licensing programs her Department controls. There are other licensing programs spread through many...many departments in this State government



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

and I think licensing, given the passing of the preemption laws this past Session, are one of the most important functions of State government. For that reason I think that there is the need for someone to be regulating the regulator. I think there is the need for people who are in jobs of licensing, of administering licensing laws, to know that someone, sometime, is going to look at their work on something of a regular and recurring basis. So, if I may read the relevant part of this Resolution. 'As Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 78th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that the Auditor General be directed to develop a plan to conduct program audits of every licensing program of the State of Illinois on a regular and recurring basis and to begin implementation of that plan as soon as possible and furthermore that a copy be sent to the Auditor General.' Now, I think, the key words in this are 'very program' and 'on a regular and recurring basis'. I have contacted the Auditor General, he has presented a rather detailedI guess you would almost call it a research design....He indicates that the initial phase will take about six man months and will require a supplemental appropriation of \$18,000....which once this passes I shall prefile for next year's Session. If there are any questions I certainly would be happy to attempt to answer them. If anyone is now interested in this Resolution and would like to come up and pick a full copy of it up along with the, as long as they last, along with the fiscal note and the program design. I would be happy to give them to them."

Speaker Simms: "Is there any discussion? The distinguished Gentleman from Cook, Representative Berman."

Berman: "Does this.....personal point of parliamentary inquiry. How many votes does this Resolution require?"

Speaker Simms: "More 'yeas' than 'nays'."



Berman: "Simple majority?"

Speaker Simms: "Simple majority."

Berman: "Well, won't it involve the expenditure of State funds?"

Speaker Simms: "There is a fiscal note attached and it does not create a special committee nor does it expend funds."

Berman: "Does the Resolution require the Auditor General to do anything?....."

Speaker Simms: "Representative Skinner. Do you care to respond to the Gentleman's inquiry?"

Clerk Selcke: "Turn him on."

Speaker Simms: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "If I may referthe questioner to page 336 of Chapter....well....Chapter 15. The Auditor General Control Act. He will note in Section 303-2 that the ...that either House of the General Assembly in a Resolution identifying the agencies can direct that audit to be done...that program audit to be done....or management audit to be done....and that is all I am attempting to do within the Auditor General's Act. I do not even see a requirement for a fiscal note ...Nevertheless, I have gone ...you know, that one step further and gotten it for you and the Auditor General says it will cost \$18,000 to do the preliminary part."

Speaker Simms: "Representative Berman."

Berman: "In addressing the Resolution, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that we're being asked here to adopt a Resolution which is far more extensive than the \$18,000 would indicate. We are being called upon here to authorize a plan that will touch upon 181 occupational licensing units which are the number of licensing units which are only in the code department. The number of licensing units outside the code departments are not even estimable at this ...as of this moment. I think it would take the Auditor General,



according to our estimates from our staff, in excess of six months just to identify all the existing licensing units. I think if we're going to act responsibly and I do not know as of this moment whether it's required to undertake this kind of audit... I think that we ought to be able to evaluate exactly what we are calling upon the Auditor General to do. I have in my position a letter dated December 4th, yesterday, from the Auditor General, and I quote from it, 'We feel it is important to point out that a project of the scope envisioned by proposed House Resolution 1192, was not contemplated in establishing the current staffing and budgeting of our office. In fact, the staffing of the Operational Audit Division just began on October 1, 1974. For these reasons, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would urge that this Resolution, at this time be defeated and that we take a closer look at it after January 1st to see its justification. I think it's too late in the Session, we don't have the funds, the scope of the Resolution is just too broad for us to recommend this kind of action at this time.'

Speaker Simms: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McPartlin."

McPartlin: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I feel that the Auditor General does not have the funds at the present time to go into a program audit as.....such as this. But, if this Resolution could be referred to the Legislative Audit Commission, after January 1, I think it could be worked out....and this is where it should be rather than come in here on the floor of the House at the present time. If it is referred to the Audit Commission, the Resolution still can go through and still be enacted on."

Speaker Simms: "The Majority Leader, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think we're making something way more complicated



than it actually is. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Berman, said it would take six months to pick out what these licensing agencies were, that's really absurd. That can be done by running a computer tape and determining what agencies are to be covered by this Resolution. There has long been a need and the newspapers have brought this need out front by showing that the Insurance Department, for example, has licensed people for insurance licenses that clearly should not have been. So, there should be, and we've all recognized the need for an overriding agency, someone to police the licensing agencies, and that's really all we're doing here. Just someone to look into the general area of licensing, who will gather some expertise, from the various agencies that license and be able to direct them not just from the standpoint of fraud but in administrative work also. To be able to oversee what is being done in licensing and make recommendations and where there is fraud, to step in and step in immediately and not long after ...some, I think, 2,000 for example, insurance agents have been licensed and the department is unable to revoke these licenses because they don't know who the people are. So, I suggest to you that this isn't a difficult thing at all. The fiscal implications are almost nothing. The Auditor General has said that he is willing to cooperate. Why don't we go along with the Gentleman's Resolution. What have we to fear? It sounds to me like a very good idea and I would suggest that you vote 'yes'."

Speaker Simms: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Kempiners."

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

Speaker Simms: "The previous question has been moved. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Skinner to close."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, it is true that the Auditor General is in the embryonal stage and definitely needs to be developed widely. I want to read the original...the Act that we passed, it is obvious to me that we, in this General Assembly, have decided that we want the Auditor General to operate on a scope of the General Accounting Office, in Washington. They are to be our watchdog. That is, the Auditor General and his staff. Now, it is obvious the Auditor General is grossly understaffed at this time, in fact, I was telling Representative McPartlin....if he starts talking in millions of dollars for the Auditor General I certainly shall be one of the first ones to stand up and say, 'Is that enough?'. We have, yesterday, an article, that was distributed by the 'AP' throughout the State, saying that the Governor had empowered that mythical office of internal investigations, that somehow seems to self-perpetuate itself even though we've destroyed it, to investigate the professional licensing functions of the State of Illinois. Now, we have a very clear choice, it seems to me, in this Resolution. We can say, 'we trust the Governor', I don't mean to say we trust the Governor. We trust the Executive Branch. I would like to point out that that Executive Branch has proven incompetent under virtually any Governor you want to look at, to make the licensing program a very important function of State government, and make those licensing programs work the way that Legislature intended, as reflected in the Statutes. There is an alternative. We have our own watchdog. It won't be an in-House watchdog. It will be a Legislative watchdog that will keep an eye on these programs brought as the Legislature. That is why I propose this Resolution at this time. I have asked the Auditor General to ignore no program...Certainly we don't even know how many licensing programs the State has right now. That



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

alone ought to be need enough, or evidence enough, for why we need a regular and recurring series of program audits of all State licensing programs."

Speaker Simms: "The question before the House, shall the House adopt House Resolution 1192? All those that are in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed It seems there is a request for a Roll Call. All those in favor of the Resolution signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. The distinguished Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz "

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Resolution was heard briefly in the Appropriations Committee at our last meeting. At that time it was requested of the Sponsor that two changes be included in that Resolution. In turn we could have an opportunity to talk to Bob Cronson, the Auditor General, to find the fiscal impact of the Resolution. In turn we received a reply from Bob Cronson. The initial cost of the first phase of the study he approximated would cost the State of Illinois \$20,000. I asked him as far as the program audit section that this Resolution is mandating, he said that cost would be astronomical. I pointed that out to the Sponsor of the Bill...er the Sponsor of the Resolution in the Appropriations Committee that we should leave the type of audit to the descretion of the Auditor General. You're talking about 181 code agencies....licensing within the State, when you start conducting a program audit on everyone of them we better be in a position, Mr. Majority Leader, to justify that type of expenditure. I would hope that this Resolution is defeated at this time and that the man who appeared in the Appropriations Committee would live up to his word, as I understood it, within that Committee and try to work out a very sensible solution to a problem that was brought up and discussed before the



Economic and Fiscal Commission. I would hope that this Resolution is defeated. Thank you."

Speaker Simms: "The distinguished Lady from St. Clair, Representative Stiehl. The distinguished Gentleman from Cook, Representative Phil Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ...find it difficult to see the reluctance to support this Resolution that we have before us. There has been a good deal of discussion about the cost er....the inherent cost of this program, however, I would point out to the Membership the Resolution mandates the Auditor General to develop a program that will be considered for developing programs audits of these various agencies. We, in the Audit Commission, know that the thrust of the Auditor General's programs, as intended by he himself, has been in the area of program audits and really sometimes to the exclusion of a fiscal audit if possible. We've heard testimony in the Audit Commission where some states have actually moved away from the fiscal audit almost entirely, feeling it more beneficial if the program audit of the program be followed. I think that this Resolution is one that does merit support, it doesn't say 'spend money'.....it says 'develop a plan'. ...It says develop a plan as soon as possible. It doesn't say do it immediately. It gives the Auditor General, I think, a lot of leeway in developing his plan and presenting it.....And, moving in, what I consider a perfectly proper direction in this area of auditing. I find no objection to Representative McPartlin's suggestion that the Audit Commission move into this area. I think it could be done in conjunction with the intent of this Resolution. All we're asking the Auditor General is, to look into the matter, develop a plan and develop it as soon as possible. I think that everyone of us can support this Resolution and I don't think that the



spector of the astronomical cost is there. There certainly is no dollar amount specified and the Auditor General has great leeway as to what he has to do, how soon it has to be done and what he will spend. Obviously he can't spend money that he doesn't have and hopefully in the next Session we will be considering a budget for the Auditor General which will be realistic and will take into consideration all types of audits and will move in the direction to justify this Resolution. I think we're in a very sensitive area, a very important area and I do think that the Resolution merits our support."

Speaker Simms: "Representative Ryan, 'yes', Mr. McPartlin, the Gentleman from Cook is recognized."

McPartlin: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, what is taking place at the present time, we're trying to evaluate and we have a meeting next week, I have a meeting with Senator 'Tec' Clarke..in Chicago, with Arthur Young, to come up and try and evaluate just the depth of what these programs and efficiency audit are going tohow much it's going to cost. This is what it's going to come back to, it's going to come back to money. Now, we're meeting with Arthur Young and Associates, up there in Chicago, next week.....on this problem. If the Gentleman that has the Resolution would maybe put an appropriation on it.....I would be very much in favor of it but I don't think, at the present time, that the Auditor General has the money to go into this. We just finished an audit with the Department of Revenue and it's an inch and a half thick and this thing was very ...very costly. I know it's all new under the Auditor General's Bill, but it's a thing that we have to evaluate first and we have to come in ...in our next appropriation and do something about this because it's a necessary thing that we have to do. It's under the Constitution. If he would just hold



this. Hold it until January 8, which is less than.... well which is a month away....we would be very very happy and I would be the first one to go ahead and support him on this, but at the present time I don't think it's feasible because the money is not there."

Speaker Simms: "The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, to explain my vote I heartily....as much as I like the prior speaker, I think he is putting the 'cart before the horse'. When he wants an appropriation made for Arthur Young or whoever it is to investigate andthe good Bills to give us his honest opinion. The Auditor General is best equipped to investigate this situation of State licensing programs.. We ourselves, as Legislators, have taken upon ourselves to clean up our messes. It's high time that these Departments clean up their messes and the only way we can do that is give the Auditor General the authority to do it. We're not asking for money to be spent. We should have his opinion first and then he can have his evaluation groups decide whether the opinion is worth while....in making changes. I certainly solicit every 'aye' vote."

Speaker Simms: "Have all voted ...Have all those who wish to vote have voted? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yeah, I'm sorry, I thought putting your light on was enough. First of all, if I might, I'd like to suggest....I'd like to put the dispute in the Appropriations Committee into very sharp focus....My Resolution called for an investigation to start with and I figured after reading this law right here that investigation is not the right word to use. Now, there is three types of audits that the Auditor General can do. He can do the typical run of the mill, did you steal \$10,type of audit. That's the fiscal audit. Now, that is what



the Representative from Cook County wants the Auditor General to concentrate on. Now, I would suggest that if this is all that we want the Auditor General to do we should abolish the Auditor General. Certainly there should be a Constitutional Amendment filed. If an individual Member of this House is not supposed to initiate a program audit then we ought to change this law because this law says we can do it. Now, he asked me four or five times, would I agree to change this to a fiscal audit and at no time did I make an agreement to make such a change because that in fact would be gutting the Resolution, which is what I suspect he wanted me to do. Now, the question comes about how you get the money to do what I'm suggesting. In the Appropriations Committee I testified that I really didn't care if the Auditor General layed out a ten year program to complete the cycle, but that it was mandatory that we look at each and every licensing program in the State of Illinois because everyone that has been looked at so far is not working. If you want to turn on Channel 11, on December 13, Friday night, at about eight o'clock, you'll see another licensing program that is not working in the State of Illinois. Now, how can one appropriate money before one has an authorization. That is the question I would sincerely like to have answered. I don't think it can be done. I think this is an extremely important vote and I'm going to ask for a poll of the absentees because I think this could be the most important vote that we have today."

Speaker Simms: "Have all those that wish to vote cast their vote? The Clerk will take the record. Dave Jones 'aye'. There has been a request for a poll of the absentees. At this point there are 63 'ayes'....67 'nays'. Representative Skinner has requested a poll of the absentees. Will the Clerk please accomplish this task?"



Clerk O'Brien: "Anderson, Arnell, Barry, Bradley, Capparelli, Capuzi, Carter, Clabaugh, Deavers, Dee, DiPrima, Douglas, R. L. Dunne, Fleck, Gibbs, Ron Hoffman, Hyde, Jaffe, Juckett, Kennedy, Klosak, Kosinski, Lundy, Mahar, Mann, Martin, McClain, McCormick, Mugalian, Murphy, Nardulli,Nor...."

Speaker Simms: "Representative Murphy 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "North, ...Pappas, Pierce, Polk, Rayson, Rose, Sangmeister, Sevcik, Springer, Stedlin, Taylor, Terzich, Weddell, Wall, Yourell."

Speaker Simms: "On this issue there are 64 'ayes', 67 'nays', and this motion having failed to receive a majority of those votes cast is hereby declared lost. Senate Joint Resolution 91. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to suspend the provisions of Rule 41 (a), for the purpose of immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 91. "

Speaker Simms: "Representative Matijevich, for what point do you rise?"

Matijevich: "I want to make a point of order.....Is that motion in writing? You know I've had a motion on the Calendar, been in writing, it's there, I'm not being heard. I just wonder, you know we broke and went into caucus when we were right at my Resolution.....and we've hop-scotched all over,.....I haven't made a point of that.....because I give the latitude to the Speaker, but we've done it today and we haven't followed the rules..... I'd like to make a....you know...I don't want to make that....in any way.....in disregard to ...what I think is Chuck Campbell's right too... Because I've always felt..that any Member ought to have the right that the rules give to him.... But I'm a Member too...and we've hop-scotched all over here and I want to stand up for my rights now...."



Speaker Simms: "Well, Representative Matijevich, this is on the Calendar, it is in writing, it is a Resolution on the Speaker's Table and Representative Campbell has moved to suspend the Rules of 41 (a).....ah..Your Motion is, Representative Campbell, this is on the Calendar....you do not need to suspend, you need ..."

Campbell: "Then I'd like for the Clerk to read the Resolution "

Speaker Simms: "You're....ah...are you...."

Campbell: "Huh....I don't need it read?...Why?.....Would you rather I explained the Resolution?....."

Speaker Simms: "The Clerk will read the Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Joint Resolution 91; WHEREAS, the Legislative Advisory Committee on public Aid is is a Legislative Commission as provided by law; and WHEREAS, the Committee is authorized by law to conduct such investigations as may be necessary to provide it with information relevant to public aid policy and administrative practices; and WHEREAS, the Senate and the House of Representatives are determined it is in the public interest that the Committee be authorized to conduct meetings, which are closed to the public, for the purpose of hearing testimony for some witnesses, in a section of books, papers and documents relevant to an investigation which the Committee may conduct; and WHEREAS, final determination thereof, should be make at open meeting os the Committee, therefore, be it Resolved ..by the Senate, in the 78th General Assembly, of the State of Illinois, House of Representatives concurring herein, that an affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the Members elected to the Senate and to the House of Representatives that public interest requires the Legislative Advisory Committee on Public Aid, may conduct meetings closed to the public for the purpose of hearing testimony of witnesses ...inspecting books, papers and documents relative to any investigation in which the



Committee, by a two-thirds vote, may authorize. The authority shall expire June 30, 1975, unless extended by the 79th General Assembly."

Speaker Simms: "Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I talked to the Leadership on both sides of the aisle and as you know that this did receive the two-thirds vote in the Senate and it's necessary that we have a two-thirds vote here so I'm hopeful that we do get a 118. One of the reasons for this, the main reason for it, is to protect the confidentiality of the individuals. One particular case which you have read about is the Linda Taylor case, in welfare, that we're looking into. The Governor's Office of special investigation into Medicare and so forth, which we're wanting to get a report from the standpoint of the Committee on that. Testimony on open meetings may hamper ^{pending} investigations and prosecutions and we do want to protect the confidentiality certainly of the vendors and the doctors or pharmacists and so forth. So it is essential that we do this, it's only temporarily, until the end of the fiscal Session, and hopefully by that time all of the investigations will be completed. I certainly solicit all of your support because it looks like I'm going to need it all.... I move for the adoption."

Speaker Simms: "Is there any discussion? If.... Representative Davis?..."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, I want to join with my colleague on the other side of the aisle to say that we want the privilege of going into....this Resolution has already passed the Senate with the necessary vote ...but we do want the privilege of going into Executive Session in order to protect the witness who will appear before that Committee. We're now in the process of investigating the Medicare program, investigating those who are on public aid, who



are not supposed to be there and all forms of cheat and that sort of thing. We've got to be in the position to protect the witnesses and it's just a temporary arrangement whereby we can protect the witnesses and do a thorough job of investigating the Medicare program and all of the programs under public aid. The Senate has already passed it. Senator Moore has asked that we pass it here in the House....so that we can give these witnesses some protection. We'll need 118 votes....and I'd appreciate the votes of every Member on this side of the aisle. In other words we want to clean up our own House....We gotta have....be able to protect our witnesses."

Speaker Simms: "Is there further discussion, if not Representative Campbell has moved the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 91. All those in favor will vote by signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Takes 118 votes for passage. The voting is open. Representative Boyle 'aye'. Representative Barnes 'aye'. RepresentativeSchneider 'aye'... Have all those that voted.....that wish?.....Representative Redmond 'aye'....Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to explain my 'yes' vote....very briefly. As a Members of this Committee, I think that most of the Members of the House will recognize that I very seldom encourage governmental units going into secret Session. I think in a case like this, however, we have a reason to. There are a lot of things that are happening within the Department that the Director is willing to share with a Legislative Body charged with monitoring his department, he is reluctant to share this information in order to protect the individual...innocent individuals who are involved. This Commission, on behalf of this Legislature, has made great strides in sorting out corruption and welfare cheating... with the aid of the Department. By adopting this



Resolution, I think that you will help yourself as well as the State of Illinois. Earlier this afternoon we adoptedwe adopted or overrode the Governor's Veto, which will send money into the Department of Public Aid, if we can pass this Resolution, we'll be able to save some money in the Department of Public Aid....I would urge your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Simms: "Have all those that voted...that wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this issue there are 122 'ayes' and 5 'nays' and this Motion having received the two-thirds vote is hereby declared passed. If I can have the attention of the House, there is a car in the back parking lot that has left its light on. The license plate number is LF-8025. House Joint Resolution 90....House Resolution 1191, Representative Matijevech."

Matijevech: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have a Motion relative to House Resolution 1191.....that it be discharged from Committee and be immediately considered. It's going to need 107 votes. Really it shouldn't be a controversial Resolution at all. My intent in this Resolution is good and I'll be brief in explaining the Resolution so that you know what you're being voted on....as far as the Motion is concerned. The purpose... the purpose for the Resolution is, is that I am trying, by amending the Rules...Rule 1, that we avoid any stalemate as far as electing the Speaker, in the January Session of the next Legislature. Let me point out to you that under the Statutes, under Chapter 63, Section 23-3, we are obligated under the law to follow the rules of this Session of the Legislature in the next Session, unless they be changed. We know that we won't be able to change them when we're here January 8, on the first day of the 79th General Assembly. The change in the Rule will provide that if no candidate receives the majority of those voting for the office, balloting shall continue



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

until one candidate receives the majority. However, and this is a very pertinent part that I think ought to be changed....However, the Secretary of State shall ask prior to each ballot, if there are further nominations for the office of Speaker, if there are any such nominations, the Temporary Clerk shall add the names to any names remaining in nomination. Now, what prompted this Resolution was, I had recalled that two years ago, in my mind, Secretary of State Howlett, had made some sort of a ruling that nominations couldn't be opened. Our able counsel here, on the Minority side, Dave Epstein, looked up the transcript on it and I may have been misled because it was on another subject matter, when Roscoe Cunningham wanted to vote for Bill Walsh, the Secretary of State wouldn't accept that vote. He said only the House can change that. Now, it may be that under an interpretation we could still open up nominations, but let me say that if you have a stalemate and I've thought about the conversation that Dave Epstein and I had, and I thought that maybe this Resolution isn't needed after all.....but I thought it over in my mind again and the practicality, the reality of it ...are... if you have a stalemate and both candidates are three candidates are going to stick to their guns and they're probably going to control those Members that they have that are stalemating, you are going to have a very difficult time in getting a majority to pen up nominations. So, I think, as a practical matter, this is a good rule. I, frankly hope that I'm speaking now as a Member for the first time.....am going to be a Member of a Majority Party, in this Legislative Chamber. For our sake, for the Democratic sake, I hope that by January 8, we make up our minds to one candidate. I hope that happens, but it may not happen and let me say if it happens today this would be the reality. So, I'm saying that in



the event it doesn't happen and in the event there is a stalemate, I think we ought to have this Rule changed so that we can come to some compromise. So that we can come to some agreement. It's a good rule. I hope we don't have to use it, but it ought to be in our rules for the future. I ask for your vote. I'm going to need 107 ...that we do change this rule and I ask it with no malice toward any candidate for Speaker, with no rancor toward anybody, just saying to all of you, I think it's a good rule."

Speaker Simms: "Is there any further discussion on Representative Matijevich's Motion to take House Resolution 1191 and ...for immediate consideration. If not, takes 107 votes, all those voting in the affirmative vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Representative Matijevich.."

Matijevich: "I've got to have.....we're going to have to have two Roll Calls. This is strictly the Motion to discharge.....the Committee."

Speaker Simms: "Okay...."

Matijevich: "So, I need the 107 votes for that. I'm going to need 107 votes too for the Resolution. But, this is strictly for the Motion, now."

Speaker Simms: "Your Motion then is discharge Committee and place it on the Calendar..only?"

Matijevich: "Well, no...."

Speaker Simms: "But your Resolution says, 'for immediate consideration'.....Pursuant..."

Matijevich: "Right."

Speaker Simms: "Pursuant to Rule 73 (d), I move that the House Resolution 1191 be discharged to the Appropriations Committee and be immediately considered."

Matijevich: "Right."

Speaker Simms: "Takes 107 votes."

Matijevich: "Right."



Speaker Simms: "Right..."

Matijevich: "Right, but what I'm getting at, I still need two votes.....For immediate consideration, if they give me the vote, then I ask for the adoption of the Resolution."

Speaker Simms: "Okay, the Motion is, for immediate..."

Matijevich: "For immediate consideration.."

Speaker Simms: "The Motion is to discharge the Committee which takes 89 votes.....Okay, we have two separate Motions here...For immediate consideration....Okay..... which takes 107 votes.....All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all those that voted...that wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I...think it ill advised of us to try to anticipate the problems of electing a Speaker in the next General Assembly. If it is necessary to change this rule then the rule, with all of the rules that are adopted at the beginning of that Legislative Session, can be amended or be suspended by the Members of that General Assembly at that time. So, if there is something to be done in this area and it becomes apparent then it can certainly be done then and that would be the appropriate time to do it. I suggest to you that this is premature for us to anticipate problems that may never develop and I suggest to you that we defeat it because it should not be considered by us."

Speaker Simms: "Have all voted that wished? The Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, may I explain my vote?"

Speaker Simms: "The voting has been taken and the Clerk is taking the Roll.....On this question there are 103 'ayes'; and 14 'nays'....and this question having failed to receive.....the....appropriate vote..... is hereby



declared lost....Representative Matijevich.."

Matijevich: "I said I'd protect everybody's rights in this House. Tim Simms, you're going to be here, your right is just as important as my right....and I've got the right to poll absentees and you know it.....and I want that right.....now."

Speaker Simms: "The Gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees."

Matijevich: "And further than that, if the vote .."

Speaker Simms: "You have made a Motion, you've requested a poll of the absentees. The Clerk will call them."

Clerk Selcke: "Anderson, Barnes, Barry, Berman, Bradley, Caldwell, Capparelli, Capuzi, Carter, Clabaugh, Davis, Deavers, Dee, DiPrima, Duff, Epton, Ewell, Fary, Fennessey, Gibbs, Grotberg, Hanahan, Harpstrite, Hart, Hill, Ron Hoffman, Robert Holloway, Hyde, Emil Jones, Juckett, Kempiners, Kennedy, Klosak, Kosinski, Krause, Lechowicz, Mahar, Mann, Martin, McLain, McCormick, Kenny Miller, Tom Miller, Nardulli, North, Pappas, Randolph, Rigney, Ryan, Schoeberlein, Sevcik, Timothy Sims, Stedlin, Taylor, Terzich, Totten, Wall, Washburn, Washington, J. J. Wolf, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Simms: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Now, Mr. Speaker, because I think this could be a very important issue yet....when we come back here January 7. I ask for Postponed Consideration on this vote on this Motion."

Speaker Simms: "The Gentleman has asked Postponed Consideration. Is there any objection? If not, it is placed on the Order of Postponed Consideration. House Resolution 1204, Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I ask for suspension of Rules 41 (a), for the immediate consideration of this Resolution and further ask that the Clerk read the same."



Speaker Simms: "Would the Clerk please....comply with Mr. Palmer's request?"

Clerk Selcke: "Motions...I move that the House concur with the Senate in the restoration of the reduced items of appropriation in Senate Bill 1285 to the original amount over the reduction of the Governor ...as follows...page 1, lines 10 and 11, appropriation items....For State contributions..

Speaker Simms: "Mr. Palmer..."

Palmer: "I thought that ..I think that...really Mr. Speaker, I thought that we were on House Resolution 1204..."

Speaker Simms: "I think the Clerk has the wrong Resolution. Wrong Legislative proposal...On House Resolution 1285, Mr. Clerk...."

Clerk Selcke: "No...1204.....No. Well, wait a minute, give me time. Which one is it? House Resolution 1204, Palmer; WHEREAS, it should be of the highest priority for Congress to assure continuity in the Executive Branch of the government of the United States under its powers pursuant to the 25th Amendment of the United States Constitution; and WHEREAS, entrusted by that Amendment with the responsibility of approving the nomination, by the President of Nelson A. Rockefeller to be the next Vice President of the United States; and WHEREAS, it is necessary for world stability and the smooth operation of the government at home that there be a certainty that someone to be available to take over the helm of the Ship of State should a tragedy befall our President; and WHEREAS, Congress has unnecessarily delayed too long in the evaluation of Nelson A. Rockefeller to fill the position of Vice President of the United States. In this failure of Congress to perform its Constitutional duty of confirming the person nominated by the President has produced a Constitutional crisis; and WHEREAS, the Country has been without a Vice President far too many months,



thereby risking confusion at home and abroad should some emergency arise; therefore, be it Resolved by the House of Representatives, 78th General Assembly, State of Illinois, that it memorialize Congress to forthwith confirm Nelson A. Rockefeller, as Vice President of the United States, so that the people of the United States are assured of a smooth Constitutional transition in executive Leadership if some tragedy should befall our President."

Speaker Simms: "Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "Now, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment....er...this Resolution concerns itself with the 25th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States which has to do with Presidential succession. I think all of us remember the days in 1963 when an assassin's bullet killed our then President of this Country. There was much concern about this question of Presidential succession. In 1965 Congress ..the Congress proposed the present Amendment which provides that the President shall nominate the Vice President and then of course be ...who then shall be confirmed by both Houses of Congress. We have operated under this 25th Amendment, I believe the first being...now, President Ford, being nominated and taking that office ...of being confirmed on December 6th, 1973, a year ago tomorrow. President Ford took office as President on August 9th, 1974, and August 20th, 1974, he nominated Nelson Rockefeller as the Vice President. Pursuant to the mandate of the people of this Country, providing for Presidential succession. Now, time has gone by since that date. As a matter of fact almost three and a half months and I should like to suggest to you that this Country being the greatest Country in the world cannot afford the kind of delay that we have seen in reference to the foot-dragging by our Congress in getting this problem solved and neither did the people



of this Country, when they adopted...er...the Legislators, when they adopted this 25th Amendment. There has been much editorializing on this matter by many papers, the Chicago Tribune on October 15, 1974, talking about this matter, states that it would appear that these delays are motivated more by political desire to keep Mr. Rockefeller out of the forthcoming election campaign, at least as Vice President, than by any justifiable questions about Mr. Rockefeller's qualification. Mr. Rockefeller has not been one of our heroes but his nomination was an appropriate one under the circumstances and nobody has helped by continuing to delay his confirmation. Now the General Election is over. The Chicago Daily News, in its Editorial on November 16th and 17, the Sunday paper, er...Saturday paper in 1974, states that the total record of Nelson Rockefeller establishes him as a man who can be trusted to use power and authority conscientiously in the public interest. Congress now seems bent on proving that he has the patience of Job. It can enhance its own stature by knocking off the political horseplay and acting on the nomination. We'd like to see Rockefeller confirmed, but either way, Congress should quit stalling and make a decision. The State Journal, in its Editorial, ...and Register, on November 19th, 1974, stated that there's no reason why this Amendment....There is no reason why it should not accept that the Amendment does not contemplate political inspired foot-dragging by Congress or how biennial Congressional elections influence the Vice Presidential selection process. Now, there has been many other editorials on this matter. I think it's a matter of emergency. This Resolution is directed to the Congress, our stalwarts, who are the protectors of our national rights....and enunciate our national policies that at least they do what the people of this Country, whose Constitutional processes



has mandated them to do. Now, I know that the Senate has confirmed him, but it would seem to me that the elections are now over on, November 5, and that the ...this Country needs to have the Vice President just in case that there is a need for one. For this reason Mr. Chairman, er.....Mr. Speaker and Members of this House, I should like to have 107 votes to indicate that the House of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois is interested in this and perhaps can get some of our Congressional stalwarts to working on this thing. For this reason I would now request that this Rule be suspended....and that later we take the vote."

Speaker Simms: "The Chair recognizes the distinguished Minority Leader from Union, Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Mr. Speaker, might I ask the Sponsor of this Resolution one question if he will yield?Romie, isn't it true that the order of succession, in the event that a disaster of this nature would happen, that the President was not in office, the order of succession would be the Vice President and therefore after that in the event something happened then it would be the Speaker of the House of Representatives?"

Palmer: "I believe that is true... "

Choate: "I'm sure it's true and so I will say, Mr. Speaker, probably one of the shortest speeches that I'll make on a Resolution of this nature, but the Resolution is totally not needed because if something unfortunate, and the good Lord please forbid it, did happen to the President of the United States, Carl Albert, the Democratic Speaker of the House would be the President and I would predict to you would go down in history as being one of the greatest Presidents that has ever served this United States of America and that's the best reason that I know of to defeat this Resolution...."

Speaker Simms: "Is there any further..."



Palmer: "I should like to respond.."

Speaker Simms: "Any further discussion? Representative Palmer to close."

Palmer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm not casting any aspersions on the distinguished gentleman from Big Hustle.....er I believe that's Big Tussle, Oklahoma, he has been there a long time....But I would say this to you, that the reason for the enactment of this Amendment is to get away from these kind of things because when President Johnson was President without a Vice President for those fourteen months, at that time Representative McCormick would have been the Speaker of the House, who was then 74 years of age and I don't know how old Carl is, but the people didn't want it this way. Clyde, the people didn't want it this way. Clyde, the people didn't want it this way.... I agree that that makes him probably a little bit better than just....than otherwise, but the Constitution mandates that this be done and I think it should be done. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would ask for your favorable consideration of this Resolution by letting Congress know that.....where we stand here in Illinois."

Speaker Simms: "Representative Palmer has moved to suspend Rule 41 (a), which requires 107 votes. All those in favor indicate by voting 'yes', and those opposed by voting 'no'....The voting is now open. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, just very briefly. I'm sure that this Resolution is good. I'm voting 'yes'. In explaining my vote, however, I might say that it would be equally effective for everybody who is concerned about this subject to just write a letter to their Congressman. At the other end, I think, far more influential and important to the Members of Congress is to get a letter from a State Representative that they know emphasizing how



strongly and urgently a Member of the Illinois General Assembly feels about the subject. But I do support the Resolution and think that if it is adopted you ought to fortify it also by sending a personal letter and encourage every Member who feels strongly, as Representative Palmer, the Sponsor, does, to send a letter off to the Members of Congress, particularly the Members of the Judiciary Committee and urge them to get off and get moving and get us a new Vice President for the United States."

Speaker Simms: "Have all those that voted...that wished?

Will our Clerk please take the record? On this issue there are 36 'yeas' and 18 'nays' and this motion having failed to receive 107 votes is declared lost. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk Selcke: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the Bill of the following title Veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding, House Bill 2437. Action taken by the Senate December 5, 1974, Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has adopted the following Conference Committee Report, House Bill 2897, adopted by the Senate December 5, 1974, Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate had adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House, Senate Joint Resolution #92, adopted by the Senate December 5, 1974, Edward E. Fernandes, Secretary. Now you got Agreed Resolutions?"

Speaker Simms: "On the Order of Agreed Resolutions, the distinguished Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."



Clerk Selcke: "Wait a minute, I gotta read them first."

Speaker Simms: "The Clerk will read the Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Joint Resolution 90, Choate. House Resolution 1218, Washburn. House Resolution 1233, Waddell. House Resolution 1234, Madigan, et al. House Resolution 1235, Davis. House Resolution 1236, Caldwell. House Resolution 1237, Choate. House Resolution 1238, Washington. House Resolution 1240, Deavers, et al. House Resolution 1241, Blair, et al. House Resolution 1242, McPartlin. House Resolution 1243, Grotberg. House Resolution 1244, Porter. House Resolution 1245, Ralph Dunn. House Resolution 1246, Lemke. House Resolution 1247, Lemke. House Resolution 1248, Lemke. House Resolution 1249, Lemke. House Resolution 1250, Terzich. House Resolution 1251, Grotberg. House Resolution 1252, Molloy. House Resolution 1253, Fary. House Resolution 1254, Kent. 1256, Tuerk. 1258, Hirschfeld. 1259, Hirschfeld.....More?.....Agreed? 1260, Washington. 1262, McClain. 1263, Collins. 1264, Timothy Simms. 1265, Kelly. 1267, Hart. 1268, Molloy. 1270, Brummet. 1271, J. Houlihan."

Speaker Simms: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, these are several Agreed Resolutions. Just two of them have any substance. One is House Resolution 1241, which requests that the Insurance Laws Study Commission study Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association and look into their rate structure and House Resolution 1251 which urges Congress to delete unrealistic staff-child ratio requirements for day care centers. All of the rest are congratulatoryand incidentally the congratulatory Resolutions and the Resolutions wishing the departing Members 'Good Luck', will be coming in the Session on January 7. So we can all look forward to that. I move



then, Mr. Speaker, for the adoption of the Agreed Resolution."

Speaker Simms: "The question is then on the adoption of..... just one moment, there seems to a slight problem. There is an objection to House Resolution 1241. Motion is on the remaining Resolutions. All those in favor"

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, the Sponsor of that thing is not here. He was led to believe by the Leadership of the Oh!....You are here, all right...."

Speaker Simms: "....withdraws his objections.... The Motion is on the adoption of all of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed 'no'. Prevailing side has it. The Resolutions are declared passed. Further Resolutions?"

Clerk Selcke: "House Resolution 1261, Fleck, et al."

Speaker Simms: "Speaker's Table."

Clerk Selcke: "House Resolution 1257, Chapman, et al. Respect to the memory of Mr. Robert E. Haskel. Recognize Mrs. Chapman.....No....This is a Death Resolution..."

Speaker Simms: "Use the adoption of the Resolution. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is declared passed."

Clerk Selcke: "The Death Resolution is adopted. Now we've got the Adjournment Resolution. Is that all? Are we ready to quit?"

Speaker Simms: "Mr. Walsh..."

Clerk Selcke: "Are you ready, Bill?"

Speaker Simms: "The Clerk will read the Resolution."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Joint Resolution #92, Walsh. Resolved by the Senate in the 78th General Assembly, the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives, is concurring herein that when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, December 5, 1974, they stand adjourned until Tuesday,



January 7, 1975, at 3:00 p.m."

Speaker Simms: "The Gentleman from Cook, the Majority Leader, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution which says that when we adjourn, in a few minutes, that we will return here on Tuesday, January 7, at 3 p.m. for a Regular Session."

Speaker Simms: "All those in favor of the Motion signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay', the 'ayes' have it. The House is adjourned."



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
1		Speaker Telcser	House to order
		Dr. Johnson	Prayer
		Speaker Telcser	Roll Call
		Clerk Selcke	Messages from Senate
2		Speaker Telcser	Senate Bill 1527
		Hirschfeld	Move to accept changes
3		Speaker Telcser	
		Shea)) Hirschfeld)	Yield
		Speaker Telcser	
		Shea	
		Speaker Telcser	House adopts recommendations for change
4		Friedland	SB-1676 (Amendatory Veto)
		Speaker Telcser	
		Geo-Karis	SB-1452 (Amendatory Veto)
5		Telcser	House adopts Governor's change.
		Calvo	SB-166
		Speaker Telcser	
6		Walsh, William	Against
		Speaker Telcser	
		Palmer)) Calvo)	Yield
		Speaker Telcser	
8		Tuerk	Support
		Speaker Telcser	
		Calvo	To Close



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
9		Speaker Telcser	House adopts Governor's change.
		Tipsword	SB-1674 (Amendatory Veto)
10		Speaker Telcser	House adopts Gov's. change.
11		Collins	SB-1291 (Amendatory Veto)
		Speaker Telcser	House adopts Gov's. change.
12		Collins	SB-1641 (Amendatory Veto)
		Speaker Telcser	
13		Fennessey	Against portion of Motion.
		Speaker Telcser	
		Grotberg	Supports override
		Speaker Telcser	
		Hunsicker	Supports
14		Speaker Telcser) Palmer)	(Two minute skip in tape. Not on transcript.)
		Speaker Telcser) Shea)	Recognizes Rep. Shea. Parliamentary inquiry
15		Speaker Telcser) Collins)	
16		Speaker Telcser) Shea)	To close
		Speaker Telcser) Shea)	(One minute skip in tape.) House override SB-1641 Speaks on HB-2715, Am. #2 & 4.
17		Speaker Telcser	
		Skinner	Explaines vote.
18		Speaker Telcser	Recognizes Rep. Lundy.
		Lundy	Explains vote
		Speaker Telcser	House concurs
19		Collins	SB-89:
		Speaker Telcser	Discussion?



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Collins	- To explain vote.
20		Speaker Telcser	
		Collins	Postponed Consideration
		Speaker Telcser	
		Hoffman, R.	SB-328
		Speaker Telcser	
21		Hoffman, R.	Explains
		Speaker Telcser	
22		Skinner	
		Speaker Telcser	
23		Tuerk	
		Speaker Telcser	
		Palmer	Explain vote
		Speaker Telcser	
		Hunsicker)	Question
24		Speaker Telcser)	
		Day	Explain vote
		Speaker Telcser	
25		Shea)	Question
		Hoffman, R.)	
		Speaker Telcser)	SB-328, passed. Override
26		Skinner	SB-329
		Speaker Telcser	
		Yourell	Question
		Speaker Telcser	
		Skinner	
27		Hoffman, R.	Responds



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Yourell	
		Hoffman, R.	
		Speaker Telcser	
		Yourell	
		Hoffman, R.	
28		Speaker Telcser	The question is....
		Hoffman, R.	Explains vote
		Speaker Telcser	
29		Yourell	
		(Foul up in original tape)	
		Clerk Selcke	Roll Call
		(Foul up in original tape)	
30		Rayson	Votes 'present'.
		Speaker Telcser	
		Kosinski	Please read veto message..
		Speaker Telcser	SB-408
		Randolph	Sponsor
		Speaker Telcser	
31		Randolph	To close
		Speaker Telcser	
		Beatty	Explain vote
32		Speaker Telcser	SB-408...Passed. Override
		Geo-Karis	SB-876
		Telcser	Come back to it
33		Day	SB-1212
		Speaker Telcser	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Schlickman)	Yield
)	
		Day)	
		Speaker Telcser	
34		Tuerk	Explain vote
		Speaker Telcser	
		Leinenweber	Explain vote
		Speaker Telcser	
35		Day	Poll absentees
		Speaker Telcser	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Telcser	
		Shea	Vote me 'aye'.
		Speaker Telcser	New Roll-Call..Override SB-1212
36		Geo-Karis	SB-876
		Speaker Telcser	
		Griesheimer	Supports
37		Speaker Telcser	Further discussion?
		Rayson	
		Speaker Telcser	
		Rayson)	Question
)	
		Geo-Karis)	
		Speaker Telcser	
		Matijevich	
38		Speaker Telcser	SB-876..Passed..Override
		Day	SB-1218
		Speaker Telcser	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
39		Beatty) Day)	Question
		Speaker Telcser	
		Day) Ryan)	Yield
40		Speaker Telcser	Further discussion?
		Schlickman	Explains vote
41		Speaker Telcser	
		Day	
42		Speaker Telcser	SB-1213 passed. Override
		Campbell	SB-1244
		Speaker Telcser	
43		Schlickman	Yield
		Speaker Telcser	SB-1244 passed. Override
44		Kozubowski	SB-1248
		Speaker Telcser	SB-1248 passed. Override
		Campbell	SB-1296
45		Speaker Telcser	SB-1296 passed. Override
46		Neff	SB-1635
		Speaker Telcser	
47		Neff	Explain vote.
		Speaker Telcser	
		Totten	
48		Speaker Telcser	Fails to override.
49		Miller	SB-265
		Speaker Telcser	
50		Hart	Explains vote



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
51		Speaker Telcser	
		Schlickman	Explains vote.
		Speaker Telcser	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Telcser	SB-265 passed. Override
52		Speaker Telcser	SB-1324
		Hanahan	SB-1324
		Speaker Telcser	
53		Hanahan	Explain vote.
		Speaker Telcser	
		Shea)	Yield
)	
54		Hanahan)	
55		Schneider	
56		Speaker Telcser	Reduction veto restored
57		Speaker Telcser	Resolutions. Consideration Postponed.
		Brandt	SJR-87
		Speaker Telcser	
		Jones, J.D.	
58		Speaker Telcser)	SJR-87 takes 118 votes
)	
		Shea)	Explain vote/question.
)	
59		Brandt)	
		Speaker Telcser	Passed. Adopted.
60		Speaker Telcser)	SB-1276
)	
		D'Arco)	SB-1276
)	
		Speaker Telcser	
		D'Arco	Explains vote.
		Terzich	Asks for 'aye' vote.



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
61		Speaker Telcser	Have all voted who wish?
		Lechowicz	
		Speaker Telcser	Passed. Item restored.
62		Speaker Telcser	SB-1324
		Hanahan	SB-1324
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Line Item #1
		Hanahan	
		<u>Speaker Blair</u>	
		Hanahan	
63		Speaker Blair	Recognizes Rep. Wolf
		Wolf	Urges green lights
64		Speaker Blair)	Motion fails
		Hanahan)	
		Speaker Blair	Motion #2
		Hanahan	Explains
65		Speaker Blair	Motion fails
		Clerk O'Brien	Messages from Senate
66		Speaker Blair	Further messages
		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
		Speaker Blair	SB-1345
		Ebbesen	Leave to hear Motion 1 & 2.
67		Speaker Blair	
		Choate)	
		Ebbesen)	
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Motion #1
68		Ebbesen	Explains
69		Speaker Blair	Recognizes Rep. Choate



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
70		Choate	Opposes motion.
		Speaker Kempiners	
		Neff	
71		Speaker Kempiners	
		Ebbesen) To close
72		Speaker Kempiners))
73		Grotberg	Explains vote.
		Speaker Kempiners	
		Ebbesen	Explains vote
74		Speaker Kempiners	
		Miller, K.	Explains vote. Green
75		Speaker Kempiners	Motions fail #1 & 2.
		Houlihan	Question
		Clerk Selcke	Reads Motion #3.
		Houlihan, D.	Motion #3
76		Speaker Kempiners	
		Choate	
		Speaker Kempiners	
77		Dunne	Urges....'aye' vote.
78		Speaker Kempiners	
		Ewell	
79		Speaker Kempiners	
		Skinner	
80		Speaker Kempiners	
		Houlihan, D.	To close
81		Speaker Kempiners	
		Cunningham	



TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 12-5-74

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
82		Speaker Kempiners Kalvo	Motion #3 passes
83		Speaker Kempiners Speaker Kempiners Speaker Kempiners Campbell) Question)) SB-1559 Leave to hear all motions
84		Speaker Kempiners Choate Speaker Kempiners Campbell	Objects Motion 1
85		Speaker Kempiners Choate Campbell Clerk O'Brien Campbell Speaker Kempiners Shea Speaker Kempiners Shea))) Question))) Asks to consider #2 thru 6. There's objection
86		Speaker Kempiners Campbell Shea Campbell Speaker Kempiners Campbell Choate))))))) Motion #2 Against
87		Speaker Kempiners Rayson	

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Kempiners	
		Davis	
		Speaker Kempiners	Motion #2 fails.#3
		Campbell	Motion #3
88		Speaker Kempiners	
		Mugalian)	Yield
)	
		Campbell)	
		Speaker Kempiners	
		Shea	
		Campbell	Right
		Speaker Kempiners	
89		Campbell	To close
		Speaker Kempiners	
		Cunningham	Voting 'no'
		Speaker Kempiners	Motion #3 adopted
90		Campbell	Motion #4
		Speaker Kempiners	
91		Davis	Supports
		Speaker Kempiners	
92		Hirschfeld	Asks to override this veto.
93		Speaker Kempiners	
94		Rayson	
		Speaker Kempiners	
95		Borchers	
		Speaker Kempiners	
		Lechowicz	Move previous question
		Speaker Kempiners	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Campbell	To close
		Speaker Kempiners	On Motion #4
		Waddell	Cast me as 'no', please.
96		Speaker Kempiners	
		Lauer	
		Speaker Kempiners	
97		Barnes	
		Speaker Kempiners	
98		Holloway	Explains vote
		Speaker Kempiners	
		Rayson	
		Speaker Kempiners	
99		Thompson	
		Speaker Kempiners	
100		Ewell	Supports
		Speaker Kempiners	
		Douglas	Supports. Needs more votes.
101		Speaker Kempiners	Recognizes Rep. Geo-Karis
		Speaker Kempiners	
102		Beaupre	Supports
		Speaker Kempiners	
		McClain	Present
103		Speaker Kempiners	
		Borchers	Explain vote.
		Speaker Kempiners	
		Taylor	
		Speaker Kempiners	Recognizes Rep. Davis



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Davis	Moves previous question
104		Speaker Kempiners	
		Hirschfeld	
		Speaker Kempiners	Motion adopted
		Campbell	Motion #5
		Speaker Kempiners	
105		Rayson	Explain vote
		Speaker Kempiners	
		Davis	
106		Speaker Kempiners	
		Campbell	Explain vote
		Speaker Kempiners	
		Catania	Explain vote
107		Speaker Kempiners	
		Campbell	Poll absentees
		Clerk Selcke)
)
		Speaker Kempiners) Motion adopted
108		Campbell	Leave to consider #6, 7 & 8
		Speaker Kempiners	Leave granted
		Campbell	Motions 6, 7 & 8.
		Speaker Kempiners	
		Shea) Yield
)
109		Campbell)
		Speaker Kempiners	Motion 6, 7 and 8 adopted. Now Motion #1 to SB-1559
		Campbell	SB-1559, Motion #1
		Speaker Kempiners	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Shea)) Campbell)	Question
110		Speaker Kempiners)) Campbell)	Motion adopted Thanks
111		Speaker Kempiners	SB-1348
		Williams	Restoration of reduced item SB-1348
		Speaker Kempiners	
		Grieman	Support
112		Speaker Kempiners	
		Peters	Asks for green light
113		Speaker Kempiners	Motion fails
		Lechowicz	SB-1538
114		Speaker Kempiners	
		Lechowicz	Explains vote
		Speaker Kempiners	Motion adopted
115		Clerk O'Brien	Messages from Senate
		Speaker Kempiners	
116		Shea	SB-430
		Speaker Kempiners	
117		Walsh, Wm.	Against
		Speaker Kempiners	
		McAuliffe	Supports
118		Speaker Kempiners	
		Lechowicz	Supports
119		Speaker Kempiners	
		Rayson	
120		Speaker Kempiners	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Katz	
121		Speaker Kempiners	
122		Lundy	
		Speaker Kempiners	
123		Choate	Introduces Rep. Alsup's family.
124		Speaker Kempiners	
125		Tipsword	
		Speaker Kempiners	
		Maragos	Moves previous question
126		Speaker Kempiners	
		Duff	Objects
		Speaker Kempiners	
		Geo-Karis	Question
127		Speaker Kempiners)	
)	
		Shea)	
)	
		Schlickman)	
)	
128		Speaker Kempiners)	
)	
		Shea)	
)	
		Speaker Kempiners	
		Shea)	
)	
		Walsh)	
129		Speaker Kempiners)	
)	
		Shea)	
)	
		Walsh, Wm.	Republican conference
130		Speaker Kempiners	
		Choate)	Democrat conference
		Walsh, Wm.)	"Half hour"



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Kempiners	Order of Concurrences, Supplemental Calendar #2
		Stone	HB-2897
		Speaker Kempiners	House adopts CCR.
131		Fleck	HB-2815, Sen. Am. #1 & 3.
132		Kempiners	
		Deuster	Explain vote
133		Speaker Kempiners	
		McGrew	
		Speaker Kempiners	House concurs, SA #1 & 3
		Fleck	HB-2898, SA #1.
134		Speaker Kempiners	
135		Houlihan)	Yield?
)	
		Fleck)	
136		Speaker Kempiners	
		Skinner	Yield?
		Fleck	
137		Speaker Kempiners	
138		Maragos)	Question
)	
		Fleck)	
		Speaker Kempiners	
139		Cunningham)	Yield
)	
		Fleck)	
140		Speaker Kempiners	
		Beaupre	
141		Speaker Kempiners	
		Fleck	To close



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
142		Speaker Kempiners	House concurs
		Walsh, Wm.	Introduces Kriegsman family
		Speaker Kempiners	
		Catania	HR-1231.....Motion
143		Speaker Kempiners	
		Shea) Question
		Speaker Kempiners))
		Choate	
		Speaker Kempiners	
		Shea)
		Speaker Kempiners)
144		Catania)
		Speaker Kempiners)
145		Hanahan	Question
146		Speaker Kempiners	
		Collins	
		Speaker Kempiners	
		Catania	
147		Speaker Kempiners	
		Deuster	Explains vote
148		Speaker Kempiners	Motion fails
		Speaker Cunningham	
149		Hart	
		Speaker Cunningham)) Discussion
		Mugalian)
		Speaker Cunningham	
		Houlihan, J.	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
150		Speaker Cunningham	
		Kempiners	Clear up misunderstanding
		Speaker Cunningham	
		Mugalian	Persists in objections
		Speaker Cunningham	
151		Maragos)	Asks Dunne to withdraw
)	Motion
)	
		Speaker Cunningham)	
		Dunne	Responds
		Speaker Cunningham	
152		Leinenweber	Excuse me
		Maragos	
		Speaker Cunningham	
		Dunne	Responds to Maragos
153		Speaker Cunningham	
		Berman)	Question
)	
154		Speaker Cunningham)	107 votes required
)	
155		Dunne)	
156		Speaker Cunningham	Introduces Attorney General Bill Scott.
		Berman	
		Speaker Cunningham	
		Maragos	
157		Speaker Cunningham	
		Londrigan	Waive it!
		Speaker Cunningham	
		Dunne	To close
158		Speaker Cunningham	Motion fails



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Maragos	Move to reconsider
159		Speaker Cunningham	
		Leinenweber	Move it lie on table
		Speaker Cunningham	Motion prevails
		Giorgi	HB-2480...SA #1, 2, 3 & 4.
160		Speaker Cunningham	
		Tuerk)	Yield
)	
		Giorgi)	
161		Washington)	Yield
)	
162		Giorgi)	
163		Speaker Cunningham	
		Hirschfeld	
164		Speaker Cunningham	
165		Hanahan	
		Speaker Cunningham	
		Giorgi	To close
166		Speaker Cunningham	
		Washington	Explain vote
167		Speaker Cunningham	
		Hirschfeld	
168		Speaker Cunningham	
		Katz	
169		Speaker Cunningham	
		Hirschfeld	Requests verification
		Speaker Cunningham	
		Giorgi	Poll absentees
		Clerk Selcke	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Cunningham	
		Barnes	
170		Clerk Selcke)	
		Speaker Cunningham)	
		Kosinski	Change to yes
		Speaker Cunningham	
171		Hirschfeld	
		Speaker Cunningham	
		Clerk Selcke)	
		Speaker Cunningham)	House concurs
		Boyle	HB-1114...SA #1
		Speaker Cunningham	House concurs
		Hart	HB-2909...SA #1 and 2.
		Speaker Cunningham	
172		Hart	
		Speaker Cunningham	
		Shea)	
		Speaker Cunningham)	
173		McMaster	HB-1277
		Speaker Cunningham	
		Tuerk)	Yield
174		McMaster)	
		Speaker Cunningham	House concurs
		Shea	HB 2910
		Speaker Cunningham	House concurs
175		Speaker Cunningham	SB-1682, Second Reading No Committee Amendments
176		Clerk Selcke	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Cunningham	
		Clerk Selcke	Amendment #1
		Speaker Cunningham	
		Shea)	Explain Amendment
)	
		Day)	Yield to Lundy
		Speaker Cunningham	
		Lundy	Explains Amendment
177		Speaker Cunningham	
178		Shea)	Yield
)	
		Day)	
179		Speaker Cunningham	
		Pierce	
180		Speaker Cunningham	
		Lundy	
181-182		Speaker Cunningham	Amendment adopted. 3rd R
183		Speaker Simms	
		Mugalian	HR-1239
		Clerk Selcke	Reads Resolution
184		Mugalian	
185		Speaker Simms)	
)	
		Duff)	
186		Speaker Simms	
		Walsh	
		Speaker Simms	
		Mugalian	
187		Speaker Simms	Motion fails
		Skinner	House Resolution 1192



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Simms)	
)	
		Matijevich)	Question
188		Clerk Selcke	Amendment #1
		Skinner	
		Speaker Simms	
		Skinner	
189		Speaker Simms	
190		Berman)	Parliamentary inquiry
)	
		Speaker Simms)	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Simms	
		Berman	
191		Speaker Simms	
		McPartlin	
		Speaker Simms	
		Walsh	
192		Speaker Simms	
		Kempiners	Move Previous Question
		Speaker Simms	
193		Skinner	To close
194		Speaker Simms	
		Lechowicz	Urges defeat
195		Speaker Simms	
		Collins	
196		Speaker Simms	
		McPartlin	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
197		Speaker Simms	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Simms	
		Skinner	Poll of absentees
198		Speaker Simms	
199		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
		Speaker Simms	
		Campbell	SJR-91
		Speaker Simms	
		Matijevich	Point of order
200		Speaker Simms	
		Campbell	
		Speaker Simms	
		Clerk O'Brien	
201		Speaker Simms	
		Campbell	
		Speaker Simms	
		Davis	
202		Speaker Simms	
		Kempiners	Explains 'yes' vote.
203		Speaker Simms	Motion passed
204		Matijevich	House Res. 1191 - Motion
205		Speaker Simms)	
)	
206		Matijevich)	
		Walsh	
		Speaker Simms	
		Mugalian	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Simms	
207		Matijevich	Poll absentees
		Speaker Simms	
		Clerk Selcke	
		Speaker Simms	
		Matijevich	Postponed consideration
		Speaker Simms	
		Palmer	HR-1204 - Motion
208		Speaker Simms	
		Clerk Selcke	Reads Motion
		Palmer	
		Speaker Simms	Clerk has wrong Resolution
		Clerk Selcke	Reads 1204
209		Speaker Simms	
210		Palmer	
211		Speaker Simms)	
)	
		Choate)	
212		Palmer	
		Speaker Simms	
		Palmer	To close
		Speaker Simms	
		Duester	Explains vote
213		Speaker Simms	Motion fails Messages from Senate
		Clerk Selcke	Reads Messages
		Speaker Simms	
214		Clerk Selcke	"Wait a minute"



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Simms	
		Clerk Selcke	Reads Agreed Resolutions
215		Speaker Simms)	
)	
		Walsh)	
		Speaker Simms	Resolution adopted. Speaker's Table
		Clerk Selcke)	
)	
		Speaker Simms)	Motion passed
		Clerk Selcke	Death Resolution
216		Speaker Simms	
		Walsh	Adjournment Resolution
		Speaker Simms	House Adjourned

