

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

ONE HUNDRED EIGHTH LEGISLATIVE DAY

NOVEMBER 4, 1975



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Shea: "All right, with regards to the First Special Session of the 79th General Assembly, Mr. Madigan. Before that, I have Mr. Totten on an Announcement."

Totten: "Thank you ah..... Mr. Speaker. The meeting of the Suburban Legislators from the Suburban Cook County and the outlying five counties, we'll try to make arrangements to have that tomorrow other than this evening, and so it will be canceled this evening due to the late hour."

Shea: "And I thought you were going to buy me dinner tonight. Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move to adjourn until 10:15 AM tomorrow morning."

Shea: "The Gentleman's Motion is to adjourn the First Special Session of the 79th General Assembly until 10:15 AM tomorrow morning. All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Regular Session comes back in at 10:00. The First Special Session at 10:15. Thank you very much for your cooperation today. The House is now adjourned."



NOV 4 1975

1.

Doorkeeper: "All persons not entitled to the House Floor, please retire to the Gallery."

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to Order. The Members please be in their seats. We'll be led in prayer this morning by the Reverend Krueger, the House Chaplain."

Reverend Krueger: "Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen. Oh, Lord, Bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. Robert Herrick said: 'Gather ye rosebuds while ye may. Old time is still a-flying, and this same flower that smiles today tomorrow will be dying.' Let us Pray. Oh God, the sovereign good of the soul who requires the hearts of all Thy children. Deliver us from all slough in our work, all coldness in the causes that effect those who we are here to serve. And grant us by looking unto Thee, renew our strength, through Jesus Christ Our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Message from the Senate."

Jack O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following Preamble and Joint Resolution in the adoption which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to-wit: Senate Joint Resolution 54 adopted by the Senate, November 3, 1975, Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Agreed Resolutions, Representative Giorgi."

Jack O'Brien: "House Resolution 505, Winchester. House Resolution 506, Leinenweber. House Resolution 507, DiPrima. House Resolution 509, Mautino. House Resolution 511, Kane. House Resolution 512, Borchers. House Resolution 513, Ryan. House Resolution 514, Emil Jones. House Resolution 517, Lucco."

Speaker Redmond: "Reperesentative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "I don't have 517. House Resolution 505 by Winchester recognizes Sixty-Fifth Wedding Anniversary of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas Jenkins of Rosdclare. House Resolution 506 has to do with certain public universities of the State of Illinois by Leinenweber and Walsh. DiPrima, 507 recognizes Robert S. Clementi of Chicago who has been



elected National Commander of the Italian-American War Veterans for the ensuing year. Resolution 509 by Mautino...ah...recognizes the Marine Corps League for electing "Red" White of Dixon as its Commandant for the ensuing year. House Resolution 511 by Kane, recognizes Norman D. Bess who was elected and installed as Commander of the Illinois Department of AMVETS. House Resolution 512 by Borchers and DiPrima recognizes the Veterans of Foreign Wars has been more than seventy-five years in the forefront of the battle of veterans' rights and Americanism. House Resolution 513 by Ryan recognizes Robert D. Sonne who was unanimously elected State President of the American Legion Auxiliary at its Fifty-Fifth Annual State Convention held in Chicago. House Resolution 514 by Emil Jones recognizes Charles H. Wacker School PTA of Chicago for sponsoring a Father/Son Banquet on Wednesday, November 19. I move for the adoption of all the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolutions are adopted. Representative Giorgi...Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Resolution 517 by Lucco recognizes the Edwardsville Tigers who will represent the Southwestern Conference in the Class 5A Illinois High School Football Championship Play-offs. I move for the adoption of that Resolution."

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

Jack O'Brien: "House Resolution 503, Telcser, et al. With respect to the memory of Robert J. O'Rourke. House Resolution. House Resolution 508, Tuerk, respect the memory of Robert Bruce Rutherford. House Resolution 510, Merlo, et al., respect the memory of the Honorable Joseph Kerwin. House Resolution 512, Neff, et al., respect to the memory of H. B. Ihnen. House Resolution 515, Younge, et al., respect to the memory of William W. Johnston. House Resolution 516, Washburn, et al., respect to the memory of Mr. John Hughes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washburn."



Washburn: "Thank you...ah...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ah...Resolution 516 that Representative Giorgi just...ah...read. I'd like to just say a couple of words on that if I might. Seldom can anyone on this...ah...House Floor speak for all the other Members, but I'm sure in this case that I speak for every Member, not only every Member, but every employee of the House too, when I say that...ah...John Hughes when I say that John Hughes was a Distinguished Gentleman in every sense of the word, and it certainly was a privilege for each and everyone of us to know him and to have him as a friend and as an associate. As I said so many times, if there were more John Hughes on this earth...ah...the world would be a much better place in which to live, and I would ask leave Mr. Speaker to have every Member's name added to that Resolution. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Leave granted that all Members names added to the Resolution. Representative Shea at Emil Jones microphone."

Shea: "Well Mr. Speaker and Mr. Minority Leader. I can only second what you said. I got to know John probably in the last six years. I will only say it was one of the finest experiences in my life and I'm sure he'll be sadly missed by us all."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman's moved for the adoption of the Death Resolution of John Hughes. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Resolution's adopted. Any announcements? Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I wonder if...while there's a lull in the action, I might have leave of the House to withdraw the total ve...veto Motion permanently on House Bill 361."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted. Representative Washburn."

Washburn: "Again, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. For the Record I'd like to report that Representative Randolph is still at home recuperating from surgery."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? The Record will so show. Representative



Washburn."

Washburn: "Ah...Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We're privileged to have with us this morning in the Rear Gallery, thirteen members of the National Honor Society, National Honor Students from Watsika High School with their Principal John Dowling and their sponsor Mrs. Mary Pricker and Mr. Eugler. Would the thirteen Honor students from Watsika High School please stand and be recognized?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea, your 'phone is ringing.

Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the Regular Shes...Session now stand in Recess for fifteen minutes."

Speaker Redmond: "You heard the Motion. The Mo...all in favor indicate by saying 'aye', 'aye", opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. We stand in Recess for fifteen minutes."

Speaker Redmond: "The First Special Session will now come to Order. Members please be in their seats. Led in prayer by Reverend Krueger, the House Chaplain."

Reverend Krueger: "In the Name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Amen. Oh Lord, Bless this House of Thy service this day. Samuel Johnson said: 'Inalucence, interruption, business, and pleasure all take their turns of rickerdation. And every work is lengthened by a thousand causes that can, and ten thousand that cannot be recounted. Perhaps no extensive and multifarious performance was ever undertaken within the term of originality fixed in the undertaker's mind. He either runs against time as an antagonist not subject to casualties.' Let us pray. Our Father, fulfill the office of Thy Name towards Thy servants. Do thou govern, protect, preserve, santify, guide and console us. ,Let us be so enkindled with love toward Thee that we may not be despised by Thee. That all our Legislative efforts will be pleasing to Thee. Oh Mericiful Lord, Most Tender Father, for Jesus Christ's Sake. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Representative Shea."



Shea: "Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House, I move that the Roll Call for the attendance of the Regular Session be used for the Roll Call for the First Special Session of the 79th General Assembly of this State."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Gentleman has moved that the Attendance Roll Call of the Regular Session be used for the Attendance Roll Call of the First Special Session. All in favor, indicate by saying 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Attendance Roll Call for the Regular Session will be used for"

Shea: "Might I inquire of the Chair if there are any Committee Reports?"

Speaker Redmond: "Just a minute. Representative Waddell, for what purpose do you rise?"

Waddell: "Mr. Clerk, are there any messages of any? There are no messages."

Shea: "Might I ask that the House stand at ease for a few minutes."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? The House will stand at ease. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe there appears in the Calendar ah..... First Legislative Day House Bill 1. Just checking, Mr. Speaker, we have will be on Second Reading tomorrow, First Legislative..... Will that be moved to Second Reading at that time? There's an Amendment that we have to adopt on that Legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, on Second Reading, Second Legislative Day, tomorrow."

Bradley: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I noticed on the Calendar House Bill 24 appears in the list of Bills that have been vetoed. The object of that Bill has been accomplished by another Bill, which was signed by the Governor, and I would like to make the appropriate Motion to have it stricken."

Speaker Redmond: "I believe that we're now in the First Special Session, Representative Friedrich. If you'd make that Motion when we're in Regular Session. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of Privilege."

Speaker Redmond: "State your Point."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, yesterday, when we were in Special Session I raised the question as to who in this House has the authority to determine whether or not a Bill fits within the



NOV 4 1975

6.

proclamation by which we are in Special Session. That issue was deferred until today and I'm wondering if that matter is going to be resolved in today's Special Session now, or if there will be a subsequent Special Session today or tomorrow, but I do think, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that this is a matter of great significance and consequence, one that should be resolved, defensively and expeditiously and I would appreciate the advice of the Chair as to what we're going to do about it and when."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we're at ease right at the present time. I can't tell you what is going to happen with respect to the First Special Session until Motions are made from the Floor and carried. My off-hand impression is that the First Special Session will be recessed or adjourned today until sometime tomorrow, and tomorrow the Resolution of the problem will be undertaken."

Schlickman: "Well, may I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that on behalf of the House you invite the Chairman of the Elementary and Secondary Education Committee to provide to this House a report with respect to his ruling?"

Speaker Redmond: "I will discuss the matter with the Chairman of the Committee."

Schlickman: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, I have in my desk a volume of responses to letters which we might have received from our constituency. It infers in this volume of mail relative to the issue of the moment should be responded to. Who accepted the prerogative of giving me this response? Mr. Speaker, do you understand the question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Somebody violated the Rules without approaching the Speaker's ah....."

Kosinski: "I have a volume of mail for response to my constituency, provided by somebody. Who provided me with this?"

Speaker Redmond: "I have no idea. The only permission that the Speaker has given anybody is to distribute official mail."

Kosinski: "Is this official mail."

Speaker Redmond: "I didn't know it was being distributed."

Kosinski: "You understand this gives me the prerogative of putting my name to some kind of response to my constituency."



Speaker Redmond: "I have no knowledge of it whatsoever. Nobody showed it to me. I don't have any idea what it is. I don't....."

Kosinski: "Well, I resent this. I can answer my own constituency. I don't need the help of any entity of this Body."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know who did it, Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Would you like to see a sample of it?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I'll be glad to see a sample. I don't know what I can do. I don't know who the author was, but..... I don't know anything about it."

Kosinski: "I'll give you a sample."

Speaker Redmond: "O'kay. Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, just a Parliamentary Inquiry, if I might, following up what Representative Schlickman asked. I had a Bill on the Calendar which was sent to the Education Committee. That was House Bill 4. Ah..... The Chairman, in his wisdom, ruled that that was not within the confines of the this Proclamation. Ah..... and I just want to know what step we have to take since, evidently it was assigned to the Committee, what steps would we have to take or would the Chair, would the Speaker Rule that the Chairman was in Order in ruling that Bill ah... outside the Proclamation. I just don't know what steps to take at this time, Mr. Chairman."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't think there are any steps anybody can take right now, because we're at ease."

Jaffe: "Well, I'm just asking. I'm trying to pick your brain, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Difficult task. House will come to Order. Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the First Special Session of the 79th General Assembly stand in recess until after the adjournment of the Regular Session."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the Motion. All in favor, indicate by saying 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The First Special Session stands in re... adjournment until after the, in recess until after the adjournment of the Regular Session. House will come to Order in the Regular Session. Introduction, First Reading of Bills. It's expected that there will be a meeting of the Rules Committee to consider Bills which the Sponsors consider to be emergency around the



NOV 4 1975

8.

Noon hour. There are no Introductions."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3166. Skinner et al. A Bill for an Act to provide for the reduction in certain amounts authorized to be expended from the General Revenue Fund subject to review and restoration by the General Assembly. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any more Introductions? Now what..... Might as well put the show on the road, don't you think? The Order is total Veto Motions, and on the Calendar under total Veto Motions appears a Motion to over-ride the Governor's Veto with respect to House Bill 169. Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Ah..... would you pass that, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Pass that one. 174. Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Can you wait a minute? I have a Bill on the Floor. I'll take that one now. No, I think I better pass it, I don't see enough people here."

Speaker Redmond: "Pass that one. 182. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I always seem to come up to bat when there is nobody here. I wonder if we can rearrange the schedule sometime and put me down in the middle. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this House Bill 182 is a very simple Bill that's not difficult for anyone to understand. Since 1906, the exemption for the surviving spouse for Inheritance Tax has been \$20,000. Well, certainly if \$20,000 was realistic in 1906, it is no longer realistic now. The Federal exemption is \$60,000 and that, at this point, is a little more realistic. There are three Bills which have passed which increases exemption for Inheritance Tax, but this one merely takes care of the surviving spouse. We have passed legislation and we've run up and down the State, many people have, campaigning on what we've done for the Senior Citizens. What I'm trying to do is do something for the Senior Citizens that have worked and saved and bought their home, put a little money in the bank and tried to be independent from welfare and all the other gadgets that are going along for People. I'm trying to do something for People who have tried to do something for themselves. I can tell you this, I didn't do it for that purpose, but I think this has been the most politically popular Bill that I ever introduced in my life, and I've had more mail on it and more editorials than any other Bill. The



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Governor, in his Veto message, said that it would cost nine million dollars a year and in his letters since, he has written letters saying it would cost eighteen million dollars. The truth of it is, the Governor doesn't know how much it is going to cost, because there are no accurate figures. The Attorney General's Office, who administers this law..... Mr. Speaker, I think I'll Postpone Consideration. It is obvious I'm not getting the attention. The People are not here."

Shea: "Take it out of the Record. House Bill 342. Mr. Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, could we hold this Bill, please?"

Shea: "Pardon me, Mr. Griesheimer, I did not hear you."

Griesheimer: "I'm requesting that it be held and passed at the present time."

Shea: "All right, take it out of the Record. House Bill 361. Mr. Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Mr. Speaker, we took that out of the Record earlier this morning permanently."

Shea: "You Tabled that? Or you withdrew your Motion, did you not, Mr. Hirschfeld? House Bill 364 out of the Record. House Bill 419. Mr. Hoffman, R. K."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker....."

Shea: "Mr. Hoffman, would you wait one second, please?"

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have great faith that the Membership that is here is listening and I would proceed with House Bill 419. House Bill 419 addresses itself to the Personnel Code. This Bill, when considered by the House, received only 13 negative votes and in the Senate received only three. All this Bill does is try to achieve a little fairness in those benefits that already are given to State employees. What this will allow is that unused sick time, personal leave, may be accrued and put at the end of the Service career of a State employee, so that he will be in a service status until such time as he uses up his accrued time for retirement. The Governor has indicated that this proposal will cost in excess of one million dollars. We find that for the three different analysis that we had do this, the overall costs will be between five and six hundred thousand dollars. One of the largest things, largest items that it does address itself to is the fact that absenteeism, whether it be in private business



or a State employee, is becoming a growing concern. Mr. Speaker,...."

Shea: "Yes, Sir."

Hoffman: "Could I have the attention of the House?"

Shea: "I will try once again, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One of the growing concerns in industry is the amount of time that people are missing from the Job. It's costly to the employers and it's costly to the State of Illinois when State employees do take sick time as a prerogative and not for its usefulness. Presently, the good service employees that we have in State government are forced to make a decision with their accrued credit time, to either take it or not take it. If they're conscientious and stay on the job, they are penalized in that they receive on 50% credit later on. Consequently, we almost encourage good employees to be bad employees. I repeat, this will not add any additional benefits. It will present a viable option for career employees to put these days as credit toward the retirement. It has been endorsed by the Pension Laws Study Commission, with the comment that the concept is in full conformity as to the directions the Pension Code was designed. As I indicated, we have very good support from the House and the Senate prior to this and I would ask at this time that the House over-ride the veto of House Bill 419."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves that the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding House Bill 419 become law. Is there any discussion? On the question, the Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think this is a very important Bill. As previously, Representative whose carrying this Bill explained, I think this is a very important Bill to the State of Illinois in a sense that by giving these people this additional credit and it's something they've already earned, that we are going to save a lot of absenteeism and ah.... I think that it is a good Bill. It came before my Committee, the testimony was outstanding and I think this Bill deserves to be overridden."

Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ah.... as



NOV 4 1975

11.

Representative Hoffman stated, this Bill was approved by the Pension Laws Commission and also was in compliance with the State Employees Retirement Act. I have information that was supplied by the Illinois Department of Personnel, and they state that the average number of sick days on the books at the time of retirement is 25, and it would seem to indicate that many employees are taking sick time, rather than lose them upon retirement, and therefore, these people, I think, that they've showed ah... conscientious service to the State of Illinois and therefore are deserving of this type of legislation, and I would suggest an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I arise to oppose this Motion, and I do it for three reasons. Number 1, it's violative of the traditional basis for sick leave, personal leave and vacation time. These Personnel Policies and Practices were originally intended to insure that employees, while employed, would have the time to meet their individual need, whether on a voluntary or involuntary nature and provide them with the refreshment that their minds and bodies needed to continue as effective employees. What this Bill would do is to provide that vacation leave, vacation time, personal leave, sick leave, would be the basis for post-employment benefits. That's my first objection. My second objection is that the Bill is discriminatory. It would benefit healthy employees and penalize sick employees, sick employees who would have to utilize their sick leave and wouldn't have it as the basis for increased Pension benefits. Now, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, there's a difference of opinion between the Sponsor, as to the cost, and the Governor. The Sponsor says that the Bill will cost somewhere around a half a million dollars. The Governor says it will cost about 1.9 million dollars, and I have a staff report that indicates it will cost close to 1 million dollars. Well, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, on this Bill, as with all Bills that are presently before us involving appropriations, that we should heed the warning and advice given by the Comptroller of this State. If we're going to avoid fiscal crisis, we've got to do one of two things. We've got to decrease appropriations or increase taxes. Now by this Bill, we will be increasing appropriations and compounding



NOV 4 1975

12.

the present, the existing financial crisis, so Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, because I think that this Bill is violative of the nature, the character, vacation pay, sick leave, personal leave, because it's discriminatory and disfavors the sick employees and because of its cost, I urge a 'no' vote on this Motion to override."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre. The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

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

Shea: "He indicates he will, Sir."

Ewing: "We're talking about how many sick days ah.... per year that are going unused by employees."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the synopsis, it indicates the employees are allowed three personal leave days each year, one sick day per month."

Ewing: "Do we have any ah..... estimate of how many sick days go unused by employees each year?"

Hoffman: "Yes, Representative, on your desk, you had a real quick synopsis of that which we've gleamed, and they are relatively speaking 100 retirees eligible, eligible is the key there, too, for approximately 25 days, so it averages 25 unused sick time days."

Ewing: "All right. Mr. Speaker, if I may speak for this Bill."

Shea: "Proceed, Sir."

Ewing: "Ah..... I feel that it's very unfair to ah.... make sick days collectable until the time the one retires. I am sure that when the State instituted sick leave for employees, that they did so with the idea of compensating people when they were sick. If we are now going to make it a given right to have one sick day or one free day every month, then I think we should do it ah.... by Legislation and not tack it onto the end where the State will be paying for everyone to have a free day once a month whether they're sick or not. Now, if we're really going to try and hold down sick expenditures, I believe this is an excellent place to start, and I would oppose the override on this measure."

Shea: "Is there any further discussioon? The Gentleman from Cook, R. K. Hoffman, to close."



Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have had probably more misinformation, misunderstanding on this particular Section than on a lot of the Bills that we've discussed. One of the things you have to remember is that the perogative is presently in the Statute. These State employees are allowed this now. However, we're trying to do two things. One, encourage career employees to remain on the job. Now for those of you in industry, the most expense item that you're faced with day after day is absenteeism. Absenteeism on the job, whether it be in any one of our Code Departments or in private industry. It's expensive. It's immeasurable. It's not something that we can see. It has a dollar savings, but it does have impact, fiscal impact for the State of Illinois. What we are incurring to, for these employees, and these are employees, Ladies and Gentlemen, that after many years of service don't get a gold watch. These people have nothing but their retirement to look forward to. We are saying to them, for being as good and faithful state employees, we will allow you to utilize the benefits which you already have toward retirement, and that is the time, Gentlemen and Ladies, that we should be concerned with our State employees. These same State employees that have worked long and hard for us at the time that they are going to retire, they should have something. Again, I ask you to think thoughtfully on this. It's something the State employees should have. The Pension Laws Study Commission and some of the Members that have spoken here have looked at this and find that it is totally in conformity to the direction the Act should take. So I would ask for an 'aye' vote to override the Governor's Veto of 419."

Shea: "The Motion is shall House Bill 419 become Law, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding? All those in favor will vote 'aye'. Those opposed will vote 'nay'. Shea 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished. Have all voted who wished? Take the Record Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 117 'ayes', 18 'nays', 8 Members voting 'present' and the Gentleman's Motion, the Gentleman's Motion with regard to House Bill 419 prevails. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz, for the purposes of an announcement, and I would ask you to listen to this announcement, because it affects every Member on the Floor of the House."



NOV 4 1975

14.

Katz: "Yesterday, the Rules Committee of the House met with regard to implementing the procedure that appears in the Joint Rules, under which a Member who has a Bill that is "necessary for the operation of government" can have his Bill considered even at a Veto Session. Now you will recall that the Rules Committee two weeks ago met and decided to ah..... eliminate from the Calendar matters that were not in the nature of vetoes and accordingly, we are devoting this Session to vetoes. However, there is still the provision under which a Member who has a Bill that is necessary for the operation of government, may appear before the Rules Committee and if a majority of the Members of the Rules Committee agree, then that Bill will go to Committee and be heard during the current session. In order to implement that procedure, a form has been drawn up called "Request for Determination of Emergency Status of Bills". That form is in the hands of the Clerk and any Member who has a Bill that he or she has filed that he or she would like to have considered as an emergency matter should proceed immediately to the Clerk's desk and fill out the form. The form will be self-explanatory. However, because of the fact that there's so few days left, twelve o'clock noon today is the deadline for the filing of that form as regards Bills that are pending, so accordingly, Members who do want to have their Bills so considered should proceed immediately to the Clerk's desk and get the form and file that. Once filed, all of those Bills will be considered by the Rules Committee as to whether or not they should be accorded emergency status, and that concludes the announcement. I do want to add one other thing, that of course the Rules Committee of the House has no control over the flow of Bills in the Senate and so the same problem will be presented when that Bill reaches the Senate, and that's all Mr. Speaker, and that concludes the announcement."

Shea: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to inquire of the ah.... Acting Chairman of the Rules Committee the following question if he would respond. We've talked about it privately, but I want to make sure it's clear."

Shea: "We don't want any private conversations."

Schneider: "Oh no, we're always above board, Jerry, especially when



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

you're in the Chair."

Shea: "And Mr. Katz will reply."

Schneider: "All right, does the Rule Committee make the assignment to ah... the substantive committee, or is it going to go to ah.... that reliable Committee on the Assignment of Bills."

Katz: "Ah.... the Vice-Chairman of the Rules Committee is pleased to respond to your question. The answer to your question is that the Assignment will be made by the Committee on Assignment of Bills after the Rules Committee has by majority vote approved the Bill as an emergency matter. The status of Bills as regards assignment or of the bypassing of Committee would be left to the normal procedure; namely, the assignment of Bills would be made by the Committee on Assignment of Bills and any effort to bypass Committee would be required the normal procedures provided in the Rules which means only the Floor of the House could allow such a Motion. I trust that answers your question."

Schneider: "Well, that's close, Harold, and I would just like to be sure that the Committee on Assignments knows that if there's an emergency education bill, that it usually goes to education and not to executive."

Shea: "Or Cities and Villages. The Gentleman from Cook, or from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, would the ah.... Chairman of the Rules Committee or the Vice-Chairman who made the Motion respond to a question?"

Shea: "He indicates he will, Sir."

Hoffman: "Representative Katz, Representative Katz, on the basis of our time table that is presently established, is it safe to say that for all practical purposes, for all practical purposes, in order to successfully move an emergency Bill through, you're going to have to bypass Committee to come anywhere close to the timeframe?"

Katz: "Mr. Hoffman, I'm not really able to answer that question, because it of course depends on how quickly the Committee met. I think it would be safe to say that the normal six and a half day rule on notices would have to be dispensed with. As far as the Committee hearing, it is perfectly possible to have a Committee hearing that would be immediate and so I can't really answer your question and say that



it couldn't have a Committee hearing. That would be up to the Committee on Assignment of Bills first and then it would be up to the Sponsor to talk to the Chairman of that Committee and see how quickly such a Committee hearing could take place."

Hoffman: "My understanding is that we have six days left on the Calendar, and if that is the case, the normal, the normal procedure of holding committee meetings and just the reporting back of what's involved, it seems to me that ah..... a committee meeting is practically ruled out, and I think that puts an additional burden, an additional burden on those who are making the decisions about what is and what isn't ah..... an emergency Bill, because I think they have to be very hard and very fast in their discrimination of what Bills come out on the Floor and what don't, because those that pass that Committee are, for all practicable purposes, going to have to be moved immediately to Second Reading and therefore, I would encourage those people on that Committee to ah..... make it extremely difficult for anything to get out."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, for which purpose do you arise?"

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask the distinguished Chairman of the Rules Committee a question, if he would yield."

Shea: "The Vice-Chairman indicates he will, Sir."

Deuster: "Ah..... it was my understanding, Representative Katz, that ah.... when we return to Springfield on Wednesday, October 22, one of the first acts that we took here was that we adopted a Resolution to the affect that this Fall Session would be confined entirely to the consideration of vetoes, and that was, as I recall, adopted as a House Resolution. Is that your recollection?"

Katz: "My recollection, Mr. Deuster, is that we adopted a Resolution relating to the Bills that were then on the Calendar that had been carried over from the Spring Session. It did embody a general policy as you indicate of confining the Session to the question of vetoes. However, the specific thing covered in the Resolution was the question of Bills then on the Calendar of the House. We, of course, in the House have no power to change the Joint Rules. They were jointly adopted, temporary joint rules, by both Houses, and all that the Rules Committee and the Speaker had done is simply to implement



and set up a procedure for enabling a Member to proceed under the temporary Joint Rules. Now I have no doubt that the ah.... views expressed by Mr. Hoffman, a few moments ago, will certainly have been heard by all the Members of the Rules Committee. The Rules Committee will carefully consider such requests, but the question of this procedure has not previously been disposed of by the Action taken at the last week's session. That related to the Bills then on the Calendar. We are now talking about new Bills that the Members may want to file for which they contend there should be an exception under temporary Joint Rule 2, and that is all this procedure does."

Deuster: "Well, now, my second question is obviously, as you conceded, the Action of the Rules Committee runs directly contrary to the spirit, if not the exact letter of the Resolution we adopted and I presume that although the Rules Committee has acted to open the door for emergency matters, as we've seen it opened in the past, which simply requires a majority vote, that you are now presenting to the full House a Motion or a Resolution, so that the whole Membership here can confirm or reject the suggestion of the Rules Committee. Is that what you're doing now?"

Katz: "No, that is not what we are doing now. The previous action that was taken was an action that was taken by House Resolution adopted by this House upon the recommendation of the Rules Committee, and that remains in affect and the Rules Committee has adhered totally to that Resolution. However, there still remains temporary Joint Rule 2 and some Members indicated that they desired to have their Bills considered under temporary Joint Rule 2. The House has no power to change a joint rule. I'm sure that the Gentleman from Lake is aware of that, so all the Rules Committee has done is simply to set forth a procedure. It's nothing more than that. This does not guarantee in any way that Bills will or will not be heard ultimately as has been indicated in the incisive questioning of the Gentleman from DuPage, it would not be possible for Bills to be heard without at least a waver of a House Rule relating to six and a half days notice, so that every Member of this House will have an opportunity to pass on any such matter even if permitted by the Rules Committee, so that the power of the House remains absolute and the Members of the House will have



an opportunity as to any such matter to exercise the discretion of the entire House as to whether the Bill ought to be ah.... preceded with in an expeditious manner, so the Gentleman from Lake can be heard at that time with regard to any such request.'

Deuster: "I might say in response and this is not a question, the announcement that the Vice-Chairman has made of the Rules Committee, is an announcement of a desire to function in a way contrary to the majority views of this House expressed in the Resolution which we have adopted and namely is that we ought to confine this Fall Session to a Consideration of Vetoes and that's all, and we should not open the barn door for the consideration of any special legislation that Members might want to introduce, and I think that in view of the fact that this suggestion is running contrary to the majority views, it would be proper for ah..... the presentation of a Resolution, so we can revoke our prior action, if that's your desire. I think this is wrong. I think it's unfortunate. I think we'll regret it, and I would urge you to move in the proper direction, which would be to have us reconsider that Resolution or adopt a new Resolution. Thank you."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Citizen Kane. Back on the Order of the Calendar appears House Bill 396. I inadvertently passed Miss Younge's Bill, so Miss Younge, on House Bill 396."

Younge: "Pass that down, please. I will take it up at a later time."

Shea: "You don't want to call it now?"

Younge: No."

Shea: "All right, take that out of the Record. House Bill 437. The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham. Turn Mr. Cunningham on."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's been my painful experience that the number of Bills, number of votes that my Bills get is in reverse ratio to the length of time that I take for presentation. Accordingly, my presentation of this Bill will be, will be appropriately slight. Last May when you passed this Bill 119 of you agreed that it was a great Bill and should be the Law of the State of Illinois. You all know what it does. It merely requires the State to pay the entire judicial salary. I respectfully submit to each of you that it wouldn't make a particle of sense if it were



the Law that you had to go the County Courthouse and collect a portion of your salary as State Representative, and I say to you that the State Judges are just as much a State Officer as are a State Representative. You should remember that the Court Administrator appeared repeatedly before the Committees of this House to urge the common sense of this particular Bill. Prior to the last raise of the Judiciary..... that the Judiciary was granted there were only two counties in the State that had an add on, and those counties were Cook and DuPage, and then the other 101 counties had the responsibilities suddenly of paying an add on of 7500 to each circuit judge. Obviously it's a matter of great moment to the downstate counties, but I would say to you, as the great man said here before, it's neither east nor west. It isn't a question of downstate versus Cook County or any other section of the State. This is a Bill that deserves your support. It's common sense. It's reason. The present arrangement is just absolutely impossible where the administrator each year has to compute from the census how much each county should contribute to the add on for the judges. Remember, the judges are stabilized. It's a function of government. Vote common sense. Vote green. I'm authorized to say that there's no pressure coming from the Second Floor for you to vote otherwise."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. J. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think Roscoe has very inaccurately presented this case. I think he's misrepresented the position of the Governor and the Administration on this particular Bill. As was pointed out in the Veto message, this would be an additional cost. This would be a cost that would drain the State revenues at a time when we are all....."

Shea: "Mr. Houlihan, would you please let me interrupt you. Sir, there will be no shooting of film from the balcony or pictures taken in the Chamber of the House unless the red light behind the Speaker is on. So would you please refrain from taking pictures? Proceed, Mr. Houlihan. I'm sorry for the interruption."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Shea. This Bill would cost approximately 1.7 million dollars. This is not in the budget. This is at a time when we are all recognizing the serious fiscal consequences of our actions



on overrides. There are many other issues pending. These are issues which I think will have to be paid. They're formulas. They are monies that will have to be paid out. It is not, at this time, the appropriate action to change the procedure on payment of judges. I believe, Roscoe, you should take this idea up in the next session, try to get it budgeted and see if there are the resources, certainly not to proceed in this fashion at this time."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, William Walsh, the Assistant Minority Leader."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't know if I'm more reluctant to agree with Representative Houlihan or to disagree with my good friend, Roscoe. However, I must disagree with Roscoe because it is absolutely correct that we are spending too much money in this Session. The affect of this Bill if it passes will be another almost two million dollars. Earlier today we approved an override which will result in perhaps as much as two million dollars and I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, that we're taking our eye off of the ball. Last week, we firmly established that we did not want to increase cost. We did not want to increase expenses, because the effect of that would definitely be a tax increase. If we piecemeal, add money back into this budget, are going to have the same affect as we would have had if we would have overridden the larger amount last week. Now I suggest to you that the add on provision is a factor of the County Board. The County Board acts to increase judges salaries, not the State Legislature. There is in theory of philosophically, there's no reason why we, in the State Legislature, should pay that amount that is imposed by another unit of government. It is fitting that we pay the amount that the State establishes judges should be paid, but not the amount that the County Board by their action increases the salaries. So I urge you, for those reasons, to vote 'no' on the Gentleman's Motion."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm one of those who have continually argued for fiscal responsibility. One of those who have continually urged that we should not continue to spend, spend, spend. On the other hand, there are some of these



measures that make some sense. If you look at the Judiciary and its function, ah..... you will see that what Representative Cunningham is saying is absolutely true, that these basically are State-wide offices. The Judges in our Courts. I can tell you time and time again that the Circuit Judges and the Associate Circuit Judges in my County are told by the Supreme Court that they must go up and hear cases in Chicago to help relieve the case load up there. They are, indeed, not performing county functions. It seems to me that this is one of those Bills that does indeed make sense. I don't understand how people who voted to override and spend over 130 million dollars last week can be talking about how this measure, which costs a merely two million dollars ah..... is going to break the budget of the State. It's one that indeed makes sense. It's one that the State should take care of at a time when our counties are in trouble financially. It seems to me it would be much better to pay these salaries than to increase fees to county treasurers for the collection of inheritance tax and so forth. I think you ought to take a good hard look at this and in my judgement, it's one of those Bills that we ought to vote to override."

Shea: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to correct my Minority, Assistant Minority Leader. He suggested that this Bill allows local county governments the option of adding on an extra amount of salary. I do not believe that is the case. I believe this is a mandated salary which will be extracted from the county coffers if the local county co..... whether the local county board wants to pay it or not. This is another case of State government mandating a program, without providing the additional money. The Governor signed the pay raise for the ah..... judges and it seems to me that we certainly ought to be paying their entire salary."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I support this legislation very strongly. I had a conference last week with the Chairman of the County Board of Franklin County and they were making up the budgets there for the ensuing year in Franklin County and they expect a deficit of \$250,000 in the coming



fiscal year. Much of the deficit that that county is going to experience is a direct result of the obligations of the General Assembly that have been imposed on the counties without providing the method of paying for them. We just got a new probation system where the Judges have the discretion of appointing the Probation Officers, fixing their salaries and the counties have to foot their bill. And one of the problems that the County Problem Commission comes up with continually in its hearings throughout the State is that we continue to impose obligations on the counties without giving them the ability to pay for them. Now certainly there is every reason to believe that its a proper function of the State of Illinois to underwrite the Judiciary salaries throughout the State. The present formula is not only inequitable, but its a financial burden on the small counties in the State of Illinois such as those that we represent, which they cannot any longer afford to bear. So I would urge the Members of this Assembly to support this legislation and spend this 1.7 million dollars, which really isn't very much and place this obligation in the place where it rightfully belongs and remove some of the financial burdens from the small counties which absolutely cannot afford to take this financial burden upon themselves. Thank you very much."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly oppose this Bill and I think for the, certainly for the reasons that ah... the Gentleman from Cook enumerated that the State does not have this money. You recall the words that ah.... Comptroller Lindberg pointed out, the State is broke. Certainly some of the counties aren't in good shape either, but we certainly have to save the State and cannot afford this item. Now we did and have and for a longer period of time, the counties have had a mechanism available to them to pay for these Judicial salaries and that is they receive the fine revenue that these judges produce by way of fining violators of the law, and I think that you will find that the judges recognize that there is inflation and will commence to ah.... show up in their fines and you'll notice in your counties, if you bother to check, that the fine revenue increases every year to a greater extent than inflation, so there is



this ability to pay. The counties do receive a vast amount of money from these judicial offices, so in a time where the State does not have the money, all I can say is that we should be responsible here and as much as I would like to see my county get the amount of money that they would receive from this Bill, nevertheless, I would have to urge a 'no' vote."

Shea: "Ah..... the Speaker just asked me to inform the Members of the House that at 12:30 we would break until Two O'Clock for lunch; so that you can make your lunch plans accordingly. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz, on the question."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'll be very brief. I think that this Bill was originally introduced to point out the fact that there was a discrepancy as far as where the money was coming from in reference to the salaries of the judges, but I think what we should look at as far as the total dollar amount and the various funds that it comes from, I'm sure that the Membership will remember the fact that a certain percentage comes from the General Revenue Fund presently. A certain percentage comes from the Road Fund and a certain percentage comes from the various counties, and there was a difference as far as the costs from the respective counties based upon the workload within those respective counties. I think its rather inappropriate at this time to make a drastic change in the funding procedure for the salaries. I'm recommending a present vote and I would also recommend to Representative Cunningham that his Bill is inadequate, because it does not provide for all the new judges that have been approved as far as their salaries are concerned, so at this time, I am recommending a 'present' vote. Thank you."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, to close."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, first I must respond to the charge that's made that there is a misrepresentation as to the position of the Second Floor. You can all observe that there's no arm twisting going on. For the Honorable Gentleman from the Thirteenth District to say that he is more privy than I to the innermost thoughts of the Governor is to raise rather serious doubt in view of his vote last week to override on the School issue, while



the Governor was speaking the opposite direction. I'm indebted to my friend, Cal Skinner, for correcting the ignorance of the Assistant Minority Leader in regard to the fixing of the Judicial salaries. The County Boards have absolutely no control upon it. This is pointed out by Representative Hart. This is a burden that's poured down upon their heads by this particular Body. We have decreed that they are going to get large sums of money, which are beyond the power of these counties to pay. Now you may all sense that there is an undertow here that may well be fatal at this time. I hope and pray that this is not so, in regard to other legislation. Let me say to you in all sincerity, let every tub sit on its own bottom. Let every Bill stand on its own merits. You have no right to tie these two issues together in regard to this Bill and any other issue and this Bill should rise or fall on its own merits. I ask you to believe that. Those of you who are obsessed with the override should recognize that it might well create the tide that you seek and others fear in regard to these override legislation, but I urge you to believe that the merits are with this Bill. Your constituents will bless you and will be grateful always if you'll give a green vote, and I'll appreciate it too. Thank you."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Lawrence moves that House Bill 437 become law, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All those in favor will vote 'aye'. Those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, moves for Postponed Consideration."

Cunningham: "You are absolutely right, Mr. Speaker. We can work something out. I will be in to talk to you."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, rises and raises an objection to the Speaker putting any Bills on the Veto Motions on the Order of Postponed Consideration."

Matijevich: "Amen."

Shea: "On the Order of House Bills on Third Reading appears House Bill 468. Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 468 is a Bill to provide a simplified procedure for handling special assessment projects where the State property is improved by a local improvement."



A typical situation as you know is a street paving job in front of a mental health clinic or anyother State property, university building. Part of the cost is paid by the city and part by the adjoining property owners. Now the present procedure is that we come before the Legislature with special appropriation bills to take care of the State's burden. What this Bill provides is that the State would be responsible for paying its fair share of local improvements just like you and I would pay as individual property owners or just as the city or the school district or park district would pay for its fair share. Some of you who have been here for a couple of sessions know that this Bill has been before you on a number of occasions. It's passed this House. It passed the Senate by a resounding majority. It has been vetoed on two separate occasions by the Governor. He says that the appropriation process is an orderly way to handle it. I disagree with that philosophy, based on the fact that we have two individual cases in the City of Peoria that we're not sure whether or not we ever got the money from the State for such a project. What I'm saying in this Bill is that it has the proper safeguards built into it. It has a maximum of \$25,000 and funds are distributed by local government affairs department. It's a simple Bill. It's a fair Bill. It's the right way to go, and I ask for your support to override this Veto."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk, moves that the House Bill 468 become Law, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. On the question, the Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers."

Byers: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Shea: "He indicates he will."

Byers: "Ah..... Mr. Tuerk, will this allow a local government to just send us a Bill for say \$25,000 to the State of Illinois?"

Tuerk: "Yes."

Byers: "And where would this money come from, what fund?"

Tuerk: "Well, it would be administered by a Local Government Affairs Department. Ah..... the funds would be provided by ah...the appropriation process."

Byers: "And then we would not have any direct appropriation. We'd be bypassing the appropriation for these types of assessments?"



Tuerk: "Anything under \$25,000, that's correct. It would be administered through the Statutes as provided in this Bill."

Byers: "Wouldn't we be giving up ah... our prerogative on appropriation if we let this Bill become law?"

Tuerk: "I don't think we would be giving up any prerogative. I think we'd be facing our responsibility as responsible Members of this Body, relative to the State's burden on whatever Bills it has to pay just as you and I would have to pay as individual property owners or a park district would pay or a school district, because of the property that exists on a particular project that is undergoing a local improvement."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, if I might address the Bill."

Shea: "Proceed, Sir."

Byers: "I feel that this Bill will take away the right as a Member of the Appropriations Committee and for us to just approve money in one huge sum and for people to come up and take money from this. I think we will be giving up our right of appropriation and I think we should keep hold of as much of this as possible, since it's the tax dollars that we're spending and I would urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Shea: "The Lady from Lake, Miss Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, I would like to speak in favor of this Bill. Those of us who have represented local governments know what it costs to have special assessments done. Now, if the State pays for a share of the property in the.... for the special assessments, it's only fair, because otherwise, it's the taxpayers in the local areas that is going to be burdened with more payment. I think this is a very good Bill and I don't think it's going to cost that much and I don't see any reason to feel that we're going to lose control over it, because we have too much control in the Central government and not enough common sense to apply locally, which we should allow the local governments to apply. They have it, but sometimes we don't. I think it's a very good Bill and I plan to vote for it."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."



Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a very simple Bill and it's a reasonable Bill. Some of the comments made about it indicates a misunderstanding. This Bill does not give away any rights of the State of Illinois. This Bill will not increase any payouts by the State of Illinois. It will not cost us any more money. On the contrary, by treating the State up to a \$25,000 limit as the law treats all property owners, we'll be saving the State money, because the General Assembly will not be then required to make an appropriation for every \$5,000, \$10,000 or \$250 assessment which is made against property owned by the State, which is an assessment involved in an assessment procedure that applies equally to all taxpayers. This Bill was a good Bill. Last session when it was sponsored by Representative Day, it's the same Bill, under its present sponsorship and I can see no reason why this Bill should not become law and I urge that we sustain the Motion to override."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill is unprecedented and in my opinion violates the traditional Constitutional relationship between the State and units of local government. Specifically, it would give to a Board of Local Improvements the authority to impose upon State government a financial obligation, thereby making the State subservient or subordinate to a unit of local government, and I might respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we have adequately satisfied our responsibility with respect to units of local government by the amount of the income tax that we provide to units of government, municipalities and counties to the revenue sharing program. I might suggest also, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that by this Bill passing, the State will not only be put into a subservient or subordinate position with respect to units of government, but it will lose any discretion it will have with respect to projects that are of a local nature. Local improvements are the subject of special assessment procedures, and for the reason, Mr. Speaker, that the principal is bad, it's unprecedented, violates a traditional constitutional relationship of State to local government and the fact there is already a mechanism by which the State can contribute within



its discretion relative to these local projects and already adequately compensates and funds the operations of municipalities and counties through the mechanism of Revenue Sharing, I urge a 'no' vote on this Motion to override the Governor's Veto concerning House Bill 468."

Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk, to close."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I believe there's a great deal of misunderstanding on this Bill, particularly those who have spoken against it, who have served in government at the local level. Let me reiterate and re-emphasize the point that I made in the opening remarks that the State is going to be expected to pay its fair share. Now there's proper hearing devices built into the Bill. They can come forward and object. The judge has an opportunity to render a decision as to whether or not the State is in fact benefiting from the local improvement, and what the Bill says is that this simplified procedure, rather than having to come to the legislature on each and every local improvement project that the State benefits, that they, in fact, will pay their fair share up to the limit of \$25,000, which is a safeguard in the Bill. Anything beyond that would come before the Appropriations process and the Legislature. I want to make that perfectly clear that all the safeguards are built in for the proper hearing. The State can come forward and object. The Judge has an opportunity to rule and I think everything is in order. There's nothing mysterious about the Bill. We're not taking away any prerogative of the State. We're just saying, in affect, that the State has to pay its Bills just like anybody else has to pay its Bills. And on some occasions, even the Appropriations process doesn't work, as evidenced by the fact that I did comment that there were a couple of jobs in my own City that ah..... to this day, we're not sure whether or not the City ever received the proper funds or the local improvement was ever paid for by the State, despite the fact that the Appropriations process did prevail, but the funds weren't released. So I would urge you to reconsider this, to consider it very importantly and pass this Bill over the override of the Governor."



Shea: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk, moves that the House Bill 468 become Law, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All those in favor will vote 'aye'. Those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman, to explain her vote."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, ah.... I would like to be recognized when you're completed with this, please, for another matter."

Shea: "All right. Have all voted who wished? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk, you have a Motion?"

Tuerk: "No, I'm not going to move to postpone and take the time of the House. I get the message, but I just don't buy that practice. Thank you very much."

Shea: "The Gentleman's Motion fails. House Bill 729. Take that out of the Record. Oh, I'm sorry, Mrs. Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to take House Bill 3067, which is a Committee Bill from the Calendar to be placed in the same position on the Spring Calendar."

Shea: "That is on House Bills, Third Reading?"

Chapman: "Yes, Sir."

Shea: "Does the Lady have leave? Hearing no objections, the is there objection? Hearing none, the Bill will be put on the Spring Calendar. 3067. The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, I was uncertain whether the Rules permitted us to point out to this House that we're honored with the presence of the Beaver Gradé School from Hamilton County, with Miss Gaye Urby as the teacher, and the right rear balcony."

Shea: "No, the Rules don't permit you to do that, Sir, but one of your Leaders would be happy to do it for you."

Cunningham: "They're represented by Representatives O'Daniel, Keller and myself in the right rear balcony."

Shea: "Mr. Walsh, do you have a new spokesman on your side?"

Walsh: "He can't do that, Mr. Speaker. We'll talk to him. Yes, I'll take care of Roscoe."

Shea: "House Bill 751. Mr. Ewing, the Gentleman from Livingston."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Motion to override the Veto on House Bill 751, which is a very simple Bill



and passed out of this House 155 votes to nothing. It provides that senior citizens may sign up for the Homestead Exemption when they are 64, and under our local taxing laws, this makes it available to them when they are 65 or 66. We have run a survey across this State, Ladies and Gentlemen, and in 85 of our 101 counties, your senior citizens have to be 65 for the entire year before they can sign up for the Homestead Exemption. This makes this relief available to them when they are 66 or 67, depending on when their birthday might fall. I believe that the original intention of the senior citizen legislation providing for the Homestead Exemption was to make this available to them when they are 65, because senior citizens income goes down when they are 65, not when they're 66 or 67. And I would ask for a favorable override of the Governor's Veto of this measure."

Shea: "Question is, shall House Bill 751 become law, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding, and on the question, the Gentleman from Cook, or from Sangamon, J. David Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I want to join in support of Representative Ewing's Motion, because this is, in fact, the original legislation of which I had something to do with, was the intent that when they became 65, they would qualify for the Homestead Exemption, but the way the construction of the dates and the birth-days and the ruling by the various counties, that a lot of times, the would-be recipient is 77 before they are entitled to receive, actually receive their exemption, and also, I think a consideration here, that ah..... this is Representative Ewing's first Bill, and I think it was put in with good intent and there is a need for the intent of his legislation and I urge you to support him."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to support the Override Motion on House Bill 751. I'd like to point out what I think is an error in ah..... the Governor's statement regarding this Bill. Mr. Speaker....."

Shea: "Yes, Sir?"

Schuneman: "Could we please have a little attention. I really don't believe the Members know what's going on."



NOV 1876
 Shea: "Proceed, Sir."

Schuneman: "I'd like to point out what I think is an error in the Governor's statement regarding this Bill. One of the reasons for his Veto, he says, is that all other tax relief programs for the elderly start at age 65. Therefore, he says, it would be inconsistent to lower the age to 64 in this particular instance. But I'd like to point out to the Members of the House that in fact the present Homestead Exemption does not start at age 65 and that's precisely the reason that this Bill was introduced. I'd like to also point out that this matter carried the House by a vote of 153 to nothing. It passed the Senate by a vote of 48 to 1, so it is the overwhelming desire of the Legislature that this matter become law and I would urge your support. Thank you."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Logan, Mr. Lauer."

Lauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there's one thing that I think is important that hasn't been brought out here and in speaking in favor of this Motion, I would like to point it out. Realize that the impact of real estate taxes, upon which this Homestead Exemption would fall, the levy is made in one year and it is collected in the next year. Many people at the time that they are just retiring at age 65 and are going on the reduced income, that they have not been use to, and since it is a reduced income, they have not had time to adjust to it and in the transition period, it is of great importance to recognize that the payment of tax, that one additional year in many cases creates a considerable hardship for those people in learning to adjust to the reduced income. I think it is of great importance that we do override this Veto, because this is one where there is a misunderstanding on the part of the Governor's advisors as to the importance of the Bill and the thrust of the substance. I strongly solicit an 'aye' vote on this Motion to override the Governor's Veto."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, too, rise to support the override Motion on this issue. Basically the reason being as outlined by those who have spoke before, that we are talking about implementing a program to give tax relief at age 65. Under the



current structure of our property taxation in Illinois, the trigger mechanism must begin a year earlier. It must begin at age 64 if that tax relief is to come at age 65. That's basically what we're talking about. We're talking about changing the date of the trigger mechanism rather than changing the date of the tax relief, so that in fact at age 65 taxpayers do, indeed, have this exemption. Seems to me that it makes sense...ah...it's a measure that we...ah...have condoned and it is indeed consistent with other tax relief programs in this state at age 65, and I would suggest that the Governor has been ill-advised in vetoing this measure, and that we ought to override his Veto."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan, seek recognition? Did you seek recognition, Mr. Ryan? The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing, to close."

Ewing: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. In closing, very simply. This is a Bill which would make tax relief available to Senior Citizens when they're 65 or 66. It does not have financial implications for the General Fund of the State of Illinois, and I would ask for a favorable vote. Thank you."

Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill...the Motion of the Gentleman is, shall House Bill 751 become law, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 145 'aye' votes, 11 'nay' votes, 3 Members voting 'present', and the Gentleman's Motion Prevails. On the Calendar appears House Bill 1121. Mr. Collins. Out of the Record. 1317, Mr. Laurino. Out of the Record. 1348, Mr. Giglio. Is Mr. Giglio on the Floor? You want to call 1348 Sir? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Giglio on a Motion on House Bill 1348."

Giglio: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ah... House Bill 1348 was the Bill to change the Ethics Act. If you recall during the Session was brought out that...ah...former Representative Day and Representative Washington helped me work



on this thing for the past two Sessions. It was one where we would change it to allow people to bid competitively with sealed bids on state contracts. We changed it so the provisions so there wouldn't be any conflict of interest by which anybody that had anything to do with drawing up the contract could not be part of it, and also, that if you... you had to be doing business with the state, at least, five years prior. As it now stands, if you're married to somebody that's a Member of the Illinois General Assembly or you, yourself are, and you own a business, you can't legitimately bid on...ah...any state work. If there's any question's, I'd be more than happy to ans...answer them. If not, the vote the last time was overwhelmingly. There were no votes, there were a lot of present. I would ask that those voted present would vote green."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Giglio moves that House Bill 1348 become law, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Mr. Schlickman?"

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. In arising to oppose this Bill or the Motion to Override the Gubernatorial Veto, I call your attention that there are two parts to a contract. The first part is the negotiation of the contract establishing the price, establishing the specifications. Now if that's all we were talking about, I would have no objection to this Bill. But there's another part to a contract and that's its implementation or administration. And what this Bill would allow is for a Member of the General Assembly to have an interest or responsibility with respect to a private contract while he's a Member of the General Assembly. Now you and I know, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that with respect to contracts there's often a slip between the cup and the lip, and differences do arise as to performance and complying with specifications. I think it would be a very sensitive, discreet matter to have a Member of the General Assembly

in contest with an Administrator of state government



as to the quality of work performed, and right there is where you have the conflict of interest. So I respectfully suggest Mr. Speaker and Members of the House that this Bill which would amend our Purchasing Act with respect to ethics or conflict of interest is not sound good public policy and as a consequence, the Veto of the Governor should be sustained and we should defeat this Motion to Override, and I urge a 'no' vote."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Giglio, to close."

Giglio: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ah...in response to the last Gentleman. I only say this. I don't see anything wrong whether a person's a Member of the Illinois General Assembly and he's a businessman or what have you. When it's done legally, above-board, which this Bill is trying to do, I think they have a perfect right to bid a job or contract legitimately without having anything wrong about it, and go at it the way they're suppose to go at it, like a businessman would and therefore I would ask for your favorable support."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves that House Bill 1348 become law, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the Record Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 43 'ayes', 59 'nays', 11 Members voting 'present', and the Gentleman's Motion fails. Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Point of Order. I think yesterday we determined that on these Motions, the Rules say that the Speaker shall declare the Veto of the Governor sustained. I make the Point of Order. You didn't do that."

Shea: "Well, the Motion filed by the Gentleman is, shall the Veto... ah...shall the Bill become law, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. That Motion failed."

Matijevich: "Well, Rule 45D says, 'If the Motion fails to receive the affirmative vote of 107 Members, the Speaker shall declare that the Governor's Veto is sustained', and I think the Rule is clear on it, and yesterday the Parliamentarian evidently told the



then Speaker that the Rules call for him...ah...declaring so, and I think he ought to do it and follow our Rules."

Shea: "Might I check with the Parliamentarian, Mr. Matijeovich?"

Matijeovich: "I wish you would."

Shea: "Would the House please be at ease? The House will be at ease. On the Order of House Bills, Mr. Matijeovich. Turn Mr. Matijeovich on, please."

Matijeovich: "I didn't hear you say the Governor's Veto is sustained."

Shea: "I stated that the Motion filed by the Gentleman is lost."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Speaker. You have...have you ruled on my Point of Order? I know what you said. I make the Point of Order that under Rule 45D, if the Motion fails to receive the affirmative vote of 107 Members, the Speaker shall declare that the Governor's Veto is sustained. You've got to do that under our Rules. You follow your own rules. Those Rules have been made for all of the Members of the House, and I think you in that Chair have got to follow them. You haven't ruled on my Point of Order."

Shea: "I think the effect of the rulings are the same, Mr. Matijeovich. I told you..."

Matijeovich: "Are you going to say that the...the...Governor's Veto is sustained or not?"

Shea: "If mere words change the law, which I don't think they do, then your question is on this Motion the Governor's Veto is sustained. Is that it?"

Matijeovich: "That's right."

Shea: "All right. With regards to the filing of this Motion, the Governor's Veto is sustained."

Matijeovich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I know what you're trying to get around. The Rules say that the Speaker shall declare the Governor's Veto is sustained, and Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I know what you're trying to do. You're trying to protect yourself so that if a certain Motion on a certain Veto is sustained you want to make it clear that it can be brought up again, and as far as I'm concerned, our Rules are very clear. That once the Motion on a Override is sustained, the Speaker



shall declare that it be sustained. Now I think that you've got to follow your own Rules."

Shea: "Well, I thought that I just did Mr. Matijevich and I have noted with particular clarity on all those Bills that have been put on Postponed Consideration that you have objected."

Matijevich: "This is a different issue, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "All right, and the question on this one was the Motion of the Gentleman was regarding this Bill, and my statement is with regards...this Motion, the Veto of the Governor is sustained."

Matijevich: "Well, I'll just close Mr. Speaker in saying that as far as I'm concerned, and I want it in the Record that the Rules say that 'the Speaker shall declare that the Governor's Veto is sustained'. The Rules don't say on this Motion. The Rules say that thee...you should declare it sustained. You haven't done it and I want that clear in the Record and this may come up again."

Shea: "On the Order of House Bills Total Vetos appears 1144. Is Mr. Giorgi on the Floor? House Bill 1487, Mr. Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to Override the Total Veto of the Governor on House Bill 1487. This Bill was not controversial when it passed the House. I don't remember any descending vote. It was handled by Senator Savickas in the Senate, also, I don't remember any descending vote. It merely calls for elevator inspections to try and stop some of the accidents we've had in the State of Illinois involving elevators that are not inspected annually. Ah...the department responsible for this Bill favored the Bill. There was a question with regard to Cook County and we put in a Homerule exclusion because the simple fact of the matter is, Cook County already has this law, but none of the other 101 counties do. In the Governor's Veto Message, he struck down the Bill saying that he did not favor Homerule exclusions. I don't favor Homerule exclusions as I tried to discuss with great specificity here two years ago,



but in this case Cook County already has a Bill and I would appreciate the necessary votes for an override on House Bill 1487."

Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 487...The motion of the Gentleman is, shall House Bill 1487 become law? The veto of the Governor notwithstanding? Is there any discussion? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 56 'aye' votes, 30 'nay' votes, 20 Members voting 'present'. The motion of the Gentleman fails and the veto of the Governor is sustained with regards to this motion. Mr. Matijevec, renews his objection for the record. I draw to the Members of the House the attention that it is almost 12:00 noon and any filings for hearing before the Rules Committee on this date shall be filed by 12:00 noon according to the announcement of the Rules Committee, so that if anybody wants their motion for emergency Legislation heard today it should be on file with the Clerk within the next few minutes. On the Order of House Bills appears House...House Bills total vetoes appears House Bill 1510. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevec. You want that out? On the Order of House Bills Third Reading appears House Bill...er...I'm sor...House Bills total vetoes appears House Bill 1539 and on that question the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan...D.L. Jim, would you like to handle this Bill for Dan? With the same..ah..same dispatch? On the order of Total vetoes appears a motion with regards to House Bill 1588. The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino? Out of the record. On the Order of total vetoes appears House Bill 1592. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor. Out of the record. 1615. Mr. McCourt, out. 1659. Mr. Carroll, out. 1668. Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Well thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 1668 will allow a person appointed in mid-term that is a Member to fill a vacancy in the Legislature to purchase pension



rights for the full year, allows active Members of the General Assembly to terminate concurrent Membership service in the Illinois Municipal Retirement Fund. Now I would...ah...say this in support of the motion, Mr. Speaker. There are times when vacancies occur due to no fault...ah...of the succeeding Members..."

Shea: "Mr. Mann, would you excuse me for a minute while I try to get some order. Would the Ladies and Gentlemen please be in their seat. I think this is a Bill that effects all the Members of this General Assembly. It effects our Pension System."

Mann: "Thank you Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "Proceed sir."

Mann: "Ah...I was saying that there are occasions when a vacancy occurs...ah...and these vacancies have nothing to do with the succeeding Member and if a...if a vacancy should occur and a Member is appointed it seems to me that if that Member is willing to pay for a full years credit in our system then he should be permitted at lease for one year to get the fruits of that system. It will not diminish the integr...the financial integrity of that system because the Member's paying for it. Now you may recall in its original form...ah...this extended for two years but the feeling in the House was that it should be amended down...ah...to one year. Now secondly, that language in the...ah...in the Bill which permits Members who are also holders of Municipal Retirement Pensions to opt out of the Pension has nothing to do with our fund. I want to emphasize that. Our Fund is not effected by Members who also would have a simultaneous credit in a Municipal Retirement Fund if they want to bring out. So I think this is a good Bill for the Members,I don't think it in any way...ah...effects the integrity of our Fund and I would encourage your support. Thank you Mr Speaker."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann moves that...that House Bill 1668 become law, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding and on that question the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sevcik."



Shea: "...Did he have his light on or did somebody just hit it back there? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

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

This particular Bill...ah...stated that the Pension Laws Commission did not necessarily take a position on that. As a Member of the Pension Laws Commission, I know that they wanted to take this up for consideration at a later date. However, it is my feeling as Representative Mann stated that this Bill was revised down to...ah...the balance of the year that the Member was appointed and with regard to the...ah...concurrent participation in the I.M.R.F Fund that this would simply mean that if a person is participating simultaneously in the I.M.R.F. program that he would irrevocably...ah...make a decision as to whether or not he wanted to...ah...participate simultaneously. Now in addition, I know that the Judges do have a prerogative where by they may discontinue...ah...participating in the program without making any further contributions...ah...they can not transfer any time that they...ah...incur while a Member of the General Assembly and it's my personal opinion that...ah...this Bill should receive the support of the Membership which did pass it overwhelmingly when it was previously presented to the Membership. So I would urge an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Beatty, on the question."

Beatty: "Would the...Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Beatty: "Representative, what effect would this Bill have on a Member leaving in a year. The Member such as Representative Calvo, is not on the bench. So what position would this Bill place someone under those circumstances? Would the Member be able to secure Pension benefits for the remainder of the year... where he leaving. You're mentioning a case where he came in as a Member late in the Session. If he were to leave before the term were over, what if anything, would your Bill do?"

Terzich: "Well...ah...our Bill. I do not believe effects that situation. I would think in the case of...ah...Representative Calvo...ah... where he has payed in for...ah...the entire biennium and he would



probably want to match up...ah...his Legislative Pension with his Judicial Pension and it would be my feeling that ...ah...he could do so. But there are people on the Floor. that know more about that than I do."

Beatty: "But your Bill does not effect the situation where someone leaves in the middle of a term. It does not effect that Member that's leaving, it effects a new Member coming in?"

Mann: "That's correct."

Beatty: "As far as you understand it."

Mann: "As far as I understand it."

Beatty: "Thank you."

Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, moves that House Bill 1668...Oh, I'm sorry. Mr. Mann to close."

Mann: "Well thank you Mr. Speaker and...ah...I do want to thank Representative Terzich for his support because he's very knowledgeable in this area...ah...as the Chariman of that Committee. Ah... one thought does occur to me. I think it is unfair for a Member coming in, who has to pay a fragment or a part of his Pension requirement, which is taken out of his check. It seems to me that if he has to pay it that he should be...ah...the Beneficiary of it. Let me emphasize, we're not talking about the Bill in its original form where two years credit was granted, we're only talking about the Bill in its amended form which came out of here by a very, very lopsided margin and which one year was involved provided the newly appointed Member...ah...paid in to the Pension that amount. So, there's...there's nothing in here that invades our Pension system. I think it's fair. It doesn't apply to a lot of people but it could apply to any of us and I would ask for your support."

Shea: "The Gentlemans motion is, shall House Bill 1668 become the mot...the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Yourell, 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 111 'aye'



31, 'nay', 14 Members 'present' and the Gentlemans motion prevails. House Bill 1704, Ms. Adeline Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Would you take it out of the record please?"

Shea: "Out. 1716. Mr. Taylor. 1539, Houlihan, D. L. Out. 1717. Taylor. 1809, Kane. Mr Kane. Citizen Kane. House Bill 1809."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, could I ask leave of the House to consider 1808 and...that is a partial veto and 1809 at the same time. I would like...they're companion Bills and I'd like to move to override both."

Shea: "1808 appears where on the Calendar sir?"

Kane: "I believe on partial vetoes. Amendatory vetoes."

Shea: "What is your motion with regards to 1808? Is it to override?"

Kane: "To override. Yes."

Shea: "The Gentleman asks leave of the House to consider House Bills 1808 and 1809 which he wishes to make motions to have those Bills become law, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding heard together, is there objection? Hearing none, you may proceed sir. Please start with 1808."

Kane: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1808 and 1809 are companion Bills. The purpose of them is to exempt investment officers of the State Board of Investment from the Personnel Code...ah...The provision for that is that the State Investment Board at the present time is moving to...ah...bring the money that is under its jurisdiction ah...in House...ah...and from outside of the jurisdiction of Investment Office...Of Investment Advisors. The feeling of the Board is that this will create a major savings for the Pension Systems and will be able to get more money..ah..but at the same time...ah...the Board feels that the investment officers that are being hired want to handle equities and want to handle bonds...ah..that these persons should be outside of the Personnel Code...ah...Primarily because we would like them...ah...to be...ah...directly accountable to the Board and also the fact is that in todays market you can't hire invest...good investment people within the kind of salary range that is in the Personnel Code



and I would ask for a favorable vote to override the Governors Amendatory veto of House Bill 1808 and his total veto of House Bill 1809."

Shea: "I'm sorry Mr. Kane. Did you explain both Bills?"

Kane: "Yes, I explained both Bills and I asked for a favorable vote to override the Amendatory veto of House Bill 1808 and the total veto of House Bill 1809."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, moves that House Bills 1808 and 1809 become law, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Kane...or from Sangamon Mr. Kane to explain his vote."

Kane: "I would like to point out to the Members of the House that both of these were...came unanimously out of the Pension Committee. They were on the Consent Calendar and they passed out of the House almost unanimously on the first time around and the feeling is very strong on the State Investment Board that if we are going to be able to invest the Funds of the Pension Systems, the State Employees Pension System, the General Assembly Pension System and the Judges Pension System, that we are going to need to have the control over these Investment Officers in order to one, compensate them properly and also...ah...to have the control over them that we need so that if they do not follow the directions of the Board that we'll be able to remove them and get somebody else. I'd ask for a favorable vote."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz to explain his vote."

Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would hope that the Membership would take a look at House Bill 1807 and 1808....."

Shea: "1808 and 1809."

Lechowicz: "1808 and 1809. Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ah...The coverage under jurisdiction A and C would mean only that the investment officer position will become classified and assigned a salary grade under the Personnel Code. Coverage under jurisdiction C deals with conditions of employment, holidays, sick days and etc.



However, without this protection under jurisdiction B, such employees would not become certified under the Personnel Code. If there's anything that you'd want to do as far as especially the State Board of Investment is to have a certain amount of control on...on these people. This is exactly what these two Bills do and I think that it's long overdue that we would have this type of a procedure, especially for an Investment Board that has the jurisdiction of investing the State money. I think it's a good Bill, I don't know why it was vetoed to begin with, unless there's some concern as far as whether we should have any control whatsoever. I think if the people would just take a look at the content of the Bill, as the Sponsor initially indicated, it did pass overwhelmingly by the House. It did not receive any descending votes within the Committee system, it was a good Bill then, it's a good Bill now. I strongly recommend an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Maragos to explain his vote.

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I too arise in support of this motion. Because of the fact that was previously explained, we use the best talents in many areas and sometimes we do not get the opportunity to get better talents if we need to because we are afraid to pay them. This is a full time job, the investments of the state are really needed and I think we should give this very important measure the support to override because it doesn't make that much difference in the overall picture of the funding of the state and I think in the long run, if we get expert personnel and if we get the full attention of this, we'll make more money by having these investments properly attended to rather than a haphazard basis that they are now and therefore I ask for your support."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. On these questions there are 96...Ms. Stiehl....Miss Stiehl wishes to be recorded 'aye'. On these questions there are 97 'ayes', 18 'nays' and 33 Members voting 'present'...and the Gentleman moves for postponed consideration



and the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich objects and renews his objection. On the order of total vetoes appears 1837. Mr. Collins. 1851. Mr. Kelly. 1966, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a veto of a Bill that reestablishes the Commission on the Organization of the General Assembly. The Bill contains no appropriation of any state money. Not one cent is involved. The Commission on the Organization of the General Assembly many years ago, came forward with a number of recommendations which recommendations have included offices for Legislators and many things that make it possible for the Legislature to operate at the level we operate and over the years the Commission has been using the money that was given by foundations in the initial phase, it has not spent any state money at all. Year after year, the recommendations of the Commission have been continuing to be implemented and Illinois a few years ago was rated third among the Legislatures of the United States and the principal, a principal cause was cited, was the Commission on the Organization of the General Assembly. Now the Governor in the veto Message refers to the Commission as one of the most successful Commissions in the history of the General Assembly. I'm not able to figure out really from the Governor's veto Message why he vetoed the Bill. He says that the duties as specified are vague, he refers to the fact that the Leadership of the General Assembly is given the right to refer matters to us for example, the Joint Rules that we've been trying to get that the House past last time was...ah...the draft of them was done by the Commission...ah...the Bills were overwhelmingly passed. The language that the Governor objects to as possibly being vague was the identical language that appears in the Bill that the Governor signed two years ago. The Commission wants to continue to monitor its improvements, it is entirely within the Legislative Branch, the Executive has no interest in the matter, no state money is involved in any way. I believe it has been a useful commission. It has been a low key Commission, it is not spending any state funds, it is trying to improve the



NOV 4 1975

45.

Legislature and implement the recommendations that were made in this volume that I have here, some years ago and I would very much appreciate your favorable consideration to...ah... a Bill that passed this House and passed the Senate and a Commission that has tried to do good work, it's not, it's a low key Commission, no money...state money is involved and I would urge and...that this House override the veto of the Governor which is an inexplicable veto and I do urge that you move in the direction of an override. Thank you."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz, moves that House Bill 1966 become law, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding and on that question the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question? Mr. Katz and I hope the General Assembly. If I'm to understand, this costs the State nothing, right?"

Katz: "Absolutely right. No appropriation."

Kosinski: "And if I'm to understand, either the Governor was not informed as to what the intent of this Legislation was or he was misinformed because his veto actually doesn't contain logic. If this costs the state nothing what was the reason for the veto?"

Katz: "Well it...It was not that it cost the state anything, the Governor does make reference to the fact about the fiscal problems of the state in the course of the veto but this does not involve the appropriation of a single cent of state money. The Governor indicated that the Commission had done its job so well that perhaps it ought to...ah...fold it's tent but the Commission still has a number of recommendations which we continue to try to have. I think that there is nothing in the Governor's veto that explains it. I have not been able to understand why the Governor chose to veto the Commission that he himself says has done good work and that involves no state money, so the Honorable Gentleman from Chicago, Mr. Kosinski, I'm just not able to explain it. It's an incomprehensible veto to me and I believe that it was an abuse of the Executive..."

Kosinski: "If I understand correctly, the media has supported you in



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

your intent and the media has indicated they could not understand why the Governor is suggesting a Veto. Is that correct?"

Katz: "Well, no one has been able to explain to me why the Governor Vetoed this Bill. It doesn't make any sense at all to me and ah....."

Kosinski: "Then, Mr. Katz, let's just Override the Veto and let it go at that."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to the Motion to Override the Veto. It would appear to me ah..... that ah... the Governor may have sensed the Point here that's been sensitive to other Members of the General Assembly. Since the Commission has issued its report, ah..... which many of us, I think have read and which agree that they've done a good job, the Commission has not done anything to my knowledge. To recreate a Commission that has originally carried out the purpose for which it was created just to have it seems to me rather a spacious argument and at this time there would be no reason to keep this Commission in existence until Members of the General Assembly felt again that there was a job to be done and that ah... the Commission would then have a reason for existence. I think at this time if the Governor is right, and the Commission should not exist and I would request that the Motion not be supported for the override."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think you've heard me speak on the Floor of the House enough times to know that I'm very interested and concerned in trying to protect the Legislative process, the Legislative branch of government. Before I even knew that the Governor had vetoed this particular Bill I had talked with the staff of the Executive Committee because in my ten years in the Legislature, I don't know anybody who's taken the ball and run with idea of how we're going to reform this Legislative process, how we're going to reduce the volume of Bills and so I have, in fact, I've just talked to Jack



Lauer, who is the Minority Co-spokesman on the Executive Committee and we are forming a seven Member Sub-committee on the future legislative organization and management needs. Frankly, if I were going to vote on Representative Totten's Bill today on the elimination of all Commissions, I would vote for it. When I didn't vote for it, I said we've got to have a reasonable alternative. We now have that reasonable alternative. The Committee System now is beginning to function. We can do all the work Representative Katz has said through the Committee System. I guarantee you that as Chairman of the Executive Committee, with that subcommittee that I've just named that we can do all the work you've done and better, Harold, and just watch us operate. There's nobody on the Floor of the House that is more concerned about the Legislative process than I am and I can do it, so we can override this Veto. I didn't even know that the Governor was going to Veto it, but I want it done through the Committee System and we can do it."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, the Assistant Minority Leader, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to enthusiastically support the Gentleman's Motion to Override the Governor's Veto and suggest that the Veto was ah.... entirely ill-advised, and I'm sure that the Governor regrets having done it. There has been nobody, there has been no force this legislature that has done more to upgrade the Legislature and make it indeed an equal part of government than the Commission. They've been in operation for approximately ten years and in all of those ten years, they have contributed greatly. They are responsible for the rules of this House, which provide that the Membership decide what happens and not just a few Members thereof. I suggest to you that it is very, very important that the Commission be continued and that this override pass. Now it has been pointed out there is absolutely no State cost in the functioning of this Commission. The Commission operates on grants. The grants have been sufficient for their operation. They've made a tremendous contribution and I would urge that this Veto be overridden."



Shea: "Mr. Katz to close."

Katz: "This Bill was reported out do pass by the House Executive Committee on a 16 to 1 vote. It involves no State money. It is a Commission that has been trying to improve the lot of everyone. It has recently proposed joint rules that were passed by the House at the recent Session. It is trying to do and has done constructive work and I would respectfully solicit your vote."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz, moves that House Bill 1966 become Law, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All those in favor will vote 'aye'. Those opposed will vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, to explain his 'no' vote."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, just as the Model T did its job during the 20's, the COOGA Agency did its job, but just as the Model T was placed in a Museum to be honored and respected, I think this Commission should also be put on the shelf to be honored and respected. Now the Sponsor of this Motion said there are no State funds involved, and that's true. There are other funds involved, and it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, if we want a Commission to concern itself with our philosophy, with our policy and our objectives, we should do it with our own money rather than outside money that may be governed by philosophy, policy, objectives that may not be consistent with ours, and was pointed out by other Members of this House, we do have a standing Committee structure, and I would encourage a 'no' vote."

Shea: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wished? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 129 'ayes', 21 'nays', 6 Members voting 'present' and House Bill, and the Gentleman's Motion that House Bill 1966 become Law, the Veto the the Governor notwithstanding, prevails. On the Order of Total Vetoes appears House Bill 1539. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1539 is the Bill which changes the Motor Fuel Tax Allocation formula by increasing the distributive shares under



the formula to all units of local government. This Bill is similar to a Bill passed and adopted by the 78th Session of the General Assembly. That was Public Act 78-1252. The distinction between the two Bills is that that Public Act had a one year repealer on it and it expired as of July first of this year. House Bill 1539 would affect a permanent change in the funding distribution formula of the Motor Fuel Tax Allocation. The Transportation Study Commission's Report to the 79th General Assembly recognizes the inequity in the current MFT allocation formula. Local units of governments have not had very substantial increases in funding that the State system and the State programs have enjoyed, both from State bonding programs and Federal funding that local units of government have not been eligible for. Indeed, as the Transportation Study Commission Report indicates the estimated revenues for counties, municipalities and townships for fiscal 76, under the current MFT formula, are actually less than what these units of local government received in fiscal 73. And yet as each of us are very much aware, the highway maintenance and construction costs in that same period of time have risen dramatically. What is a fact is that local units of government are unable to meet their highway needs with existing revenues, and I would emphasize that 86% of the roads in this State are under the jurisdiction of these local units of government. In total dollars we are speaking of 16 and a fraction million dollars, not to be raised by new taxes, but rather which will be shifted from the road fund back to local government. In effect, this legislation

Shea: "Mr. Houlihan, will you excuse me for a moment?"

Houlihan: "Yes, Sir."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, it has been pointed out to me that this Bill is being called out of order and I would suggest that the Chair run down the list ah..... as you have been doing....."

Shea: "Sir, the Gentleman was off the Floor at the time I called it and in an attempt to accommodate the Members, I've gone back to it as I have for your Members several times this morning."



Walsh: "Well, now, Mr. Speaker, I haven't heard that at all....."

Shea: "Well, I have."

Walsh: "And ah..... if, if I had, I wouldn't have raised the question, Mr. Speaker. I don't think we ought to go back. There are a lot of Motions to consider and I think we ought to consider them all and then go back to this."

Shea: "Well, I'm on this Bill, Mr. Walsh. Proceed, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "In effect, then, this Legislation establishes our commitment to the need to local government. The Veto message of the Governor was that the problem needs more study. Ladies and Gentlemen, that is the same message we have received from this Governor in each of the last three years on this similar type of legislation. We overrode that Veto last year and I earnestly solicit your support in an override this year and to provide a return of Motor Fuel Tax funds to those units of local government from which they are derived."

Shea: "The Gentleman's Motion is that House Bill 1539 become Law, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder, on the question."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, we find ourselves in the dilemma of whether or not local units of government can at this time use the funds now allocated to State for their highway building program, and it seems to me that while we know our units of government back home are fighting for funds to build their roads and maintain them, the State is also in a critical area in highways, and I've heard time and time again from the Members of this House on both sides of the aisle from upstate and downstate that we need transportation between the counties and between Members of Southern Illinois and the Northern Illinois regions, and it seems to me that if we're talking about a communication system by truck, passenger cars, what have you, we can't afford at this time to transfer those funds to the counties as badly as they may need them, and it seems to me that the priorities that we were established and have been established for many years and yes, were established up until last June, should be maintained. It seems to me that this....."



Shea: "Mr. Schraeder, would you excuse me for one moment? Proceed, Sir."

Schraeder: "It seems to me that the balance now in operation that was fiscally sound in June certainly ought to be fiscally sound now. Let us maintain the State highway system's allocation of funds for that State highway system. Let us sustain the Veto."

Shea: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Often on Bills like this, people ask who gets what and that is a legitimate question. On the Clerk's desk, both on the Republican and Democratic side is a four chart ah.... indication of who will get what from this Bill. There is one chart that shows how much money will go to each county in total. There is a second chart that shows how much will go to each county government, for county road purposes. There's a third chart which shows how much will go to all the townships in a given county, townships or road districts, that is, for each county in the State, and the final chart indicates how much the largest city or the largest two cities in every county in the State of Illinois will get. In the case of Cook County, there are about twelve cities enumerated, so if you want to know who gets what, go up in front of George or Chalkie and grab a copy of the ah.... of the printout. Secondly, if you haven't heard from your local township road commissioner, it's because he doesn't know how little money he's getting in the County Treasury. Now they automatically get informed by the County Treasurer. There's no indication in Law. Nevertheless, for the first six months of this year, your local township road commissioners have been getting an extra \$100 per mile of township roads than they did previously to that under last Session's House Bill 2792. That stopped in July. Because it stopped, they're not going to have the money that they think they have. They might not even know about it yet. In fact, when I was out at the township highway commissioner's convention this week, they didn't even have it on their list of Resolutions to endorse the override of. I passed out a sheet and a lot of them came up and got it, but you know how road commissioner's are, they'd rather get out on the truck and do a good job than write letters to us. In the case of cities, ah.... there will be a proportionate



drop and that is also the case with counties. All right, now all of you know that I'm against the education veto override, and the reason I'm against that is because the most optimistic revenue estimate as of September 30 of next year is \$59 million in the hole, in the red. That's without any General Fund Override Vetoes. Well, why am I Co-sponsor of the Override of this Veto. One reason is the actual merits of the Bill. This is a way to get money spent in my district, just as its a way to get money spent in all of our districts. The second reason is it's not from the General Fund. It's from the Motor Fuel Tax Fund. The Road Fund. This is the fund that I think we're going to get a shot from the Federal government on when the Federal government raises Motor Fuel Taxes. The County governments and the State governments are becoming influential enough in Congress that we are going to get a share of that money when they raise the MFT tax on the Federal level. That is going to replace this. If that does not occur, having been on the losing side of whether we issue two hundred million dollars worth of bonds in the Road Fund or not, contending that there was no need whatsoever because we wouldn't be short of money, perhaps this will give the administration an opportunity to have been telling the truth last July when we passed that Bill. There's no other way they're going to need the money and this is only 17 million dollars, so I would urgently suggest that a 'yes' vote will get money to fill the potholes in front of your constituents homes, which I suspect are more important to your constituents than freeways designed to 80 mile per hour speed limits."

Shea: "Gentleman from Cook, Houlihan, J."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for a question? Ah..... Representative Houlihan, what is the fiscal impact on the State of Illinois, the Road Fund, under the new formula? What amount of dollars would be lost?"

Houlihan: "In total dollars, what we are speaking of is 16 and a fraction million dollars, which would be shifted from the Road Fund back to local units of government across the State of Illinois. That total



NOV 4 1975

53.

amount is 16 and a fraction million dollars of the total DOT budget of 2.4 billion dollars, and I would point out that the House Sponsor of the Appropriation Bills for the Department of Transportation agreed in the Appropriation for the Department of Transportation to an Amendment which would fund this measure."

Houlihan: "Are you aware of the opposition of the County Superintendent's of Highways to this particular legislation?"

Houlihan: "I'm aware of a letter that Secretary Bond has distributed with a copy of a letter from a Mr. Huffington. Having read Mr. Huffington's letter, it is very obvious to me that he obviously does not understand what the Bill is about, and I refer you to paragraph 2 of his letter that says 'We also pose an attempt to reclassify in a piecemeal fashion without the redistribution of funds.' The fact is that this is the redistribtuion of funds."

Houlihan: "Representative Houlihan, one final question. This would bring to the City of Chicago approximately how many dollars?"

Houlihan: "It would bring to all municipalities in the State an increase in the revenues that they are presently receiving under the current MFT formula. The share that the municipalities receive under the Law and this is not being changed is based upon population. Of the total 16 and a fraction million dollars that we are speaking about, the estimated share that would go to the City of Chicago is 2.8 million dollars. Further, we have also in the Bill restricted the increased share of 2.8 million dollars to the City of Chicago to earmark that for residential street repair and improvement."

Houlihan: "But aren't you aware that the City also has never adopted a complete budget for those dollars, lining out exactly what the program is that the City Council in fact does it project by project so it would be virtually impossible to trace these funds and in fact these dollars could be used to ah.... free up additional dollars for funding something like the Crosstown Expressway?"

Houlihan: "Well, first of all, I think any attempt to inject the emotional issue of the Crosstown Expressway into this Bill is an absolute distortion as to what we are trying to do. This is in no sense any kind of a crosstown vehicle, package or anything else. To answer



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

your question specifically as far as how it would be used by the City of Chicago, I have met with the Department of Streets and the Commissioner of Streets in the City. They see no problem with the earmarking of the funds here, and they do support the Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support the Motion to Override. If any of you have had the time to take a look at the figures that Representative Skinner made available, you'll see that there's no inordinate benefit to any municipality or to any county in particular. You will see that this is a fair and equitable distribution. I know that when we had the DOT Bill up last year, many, many Members were aware of the fact that local roads in their own area, some of which the State has the responsibility to do take care of are not being taken care of. We see programs where the State Department of Highways is trying to get out of the responsibility. This gives them the perfect opportunity. There is no excessive amount going to any city in the state. Every single one will share an equitable redistribution, and I strongly urge support of the Override Motion."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the Previous Question."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves the Previous Question. All those in favor will say 'aye'. Those opposed 'nay'. Now back to Mr. Houlihan, D. L., to close."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I think what is obvious from the debate here on this question is that this Bill does have bipartisan support. This legislation had bipartisan support in the 78th Session. This Bill has passed both Houses by very substantial majorities. It does have State-wide application and affects every municipality, county and township in this state. It is a very reasonable approach to what is a very serious problem and I urge your support of the Override Motion."

Shea: "The Gentleman's Motion that House Bill 1539 shall become Law, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All those in favor will vote 'aye'. Those opposed will vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr.



Lechowicz, to explain his vote."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I stand in support of the Override on House Bill 1539. I think what we should take a look at is the Governor's accountability book which shows the local units of government receiving less Motor Fuel Tax Funds in 1976 than they did receive in 1973. Everyone is aware of the significant increases in costs in highway construction and maintenance during that period of time. Let me be very specific in the dollar amounts that have been distributed to the counties, municipalities and townships in the State. In 1973 and let's propose in 1976, the counties in 1973 received 72.3 Million Dollars while in 1976, they are suppose to receive 72.2 Million Dollars. Municipalities, 100 Million in 1973, in 1976 100 Million. In townships 31 Million in 1973, 31 Million in 1976. There are approximately 130,000 miles of highway in Illinois. The State's jurisdiction is approximately 18,000. The counties approximately 16,000. The townships, 74,000 miles and municipalities, 29,000 miles. I think that this Bill is needed Legislation to correct an inequity that should have been corrected in 74 and 75. This General Assembly passed in 1975 the change in the Motor Fuel Tax Funds going to townships, counties and municipalities. They received an overwhelming vote of this House and inturn, the townships and the counties and the municipalities were able to provide the repair of streets in their jurisdiction that are long overdue in the repair. I again ask that this House reconsider their initial vote and place the money where it really belongs on a local level so that these streets can be properly maintained and repaired. Thank you."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners, to explain his vote."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I speak as a Downstate Legislator, who probably isn't all that familiar with the appropriations process and transportation. I speak as one, however, who has gone to the Department of Transportation on many occasions with disastrous results because of accidents occurring in my district. I've got solutions to problems creating those accidents, or the reasons for those accidents occurring and they say, you're right, you've got a



NOV 4 1975

56.

dangerous situation here. You're right, your solution is a good one. We'll give you permission to do it, but we won't give you the money. You'll either have to go to the municipality, the county or the township. Well, if they're going to require this of me, as a Downstate Legislator, everytime I go to them with a specific problem, by God, we better start funding those counties and townships and municipalities that are going to have to come up with the money. I've got a situation in my District where they want a municipality to come up with \$10,000, which is half of their annual levy to put in a traffic signal. Where they're going to require it, I'm going to vote to get more money to that small municipality and that township that I have to go to to get these problems solved. For that reason, I'm voting 'yes'."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell. You don't want to talk?

The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I oppose this Motion to Override the ah.... the ah.... Total Veto of the Governor and I'll tell you why, although, Dan Houlihan and I have talked about it often. Quite frankly, the Motor Fuel Tax Fund just doesn't have the money, and in terms of what the borrowing of the 200 Million from the Supplemental Freeway Grant, we have to pay that money back. If we do not.... if we take this 17 Million from the Motor Fuel Tax Fund, what we are going to have to do is cut the State Only Monies. The State Only Monies are monies basically in Cook County and Downstate areas, which deal with unmarked highways. If we override this Veto, what you really are doing, is going back down to the 115th and that's just the reason we went up the 215ths before, so we could pay off our debt and pay our bond debts and also so we could fund the 'State Only' monies for unmarked highways, so I would urge you not to give the 'aye' votes on this Motion."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, to explain his vote."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my 'yes' vote, I'd like to say that I represent a county that borders on Wisconsin and one of the most common questions my constituents present to me all the time is how come the Wisconsin roads are so



much better from ours? As a result of several years of research, I discovered that the State of Wisconsin and the State of Michigan and our Illinois Department of Highways knows this. They've been up there investigating. They have the State contract with the counties to perform maintenance work and they find that they have much more economy. They make better use of the dollar and they found that local government does a better job than the state. It has been brought to my attention that quite often every time we have a new Governor elected, we have a new bunch of political hacks out there driving these State trucks around. They don't know how to patch holes and compared to our Lake County Highway Department, which is professional, you find the State of Illinois ah.... highway workers are held in low repute. And it is my feeling that we ought to decentralize the maintenance and the development of our highways by giving more funds out to local units of government. I had introduced legislation to do this and it's being studied. Well that's fine, by the Transportation Study Commission, but here we have a Bill, which is an opportunity for us to do it right now. To nail it down. To send those funds out and to get the job done by local, professional highway people, which in most instances, will do a better job for your tax dollar than the officials of the State of Illinois, and I enthusiastically urge an 'aye' vote because I think that's a responsible vote and a vote at this time of stress and a need for economy is going to improve the performance that we get out of our public officials in stretching that highway dollar, so I urge an 'aye' vote."

Shea: "Have all voted who wished? Mr. Yourell to explain his vote."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Motion, because I would remind the Members of the House it wasn't too many months ago when the Governor came before this Body and indicated that he would like to have a 200 Million Dollar Bonding Program in the State of Illinois for Roads. And I think if you look at this Bill, you'll find that this is a bargain compared to that one. This only cost 16 Million. The other one



4 1975

cost 200 million plus tremendous amounts of interest, so I think if you look at the, at the areas to be benefited, there's something in this Bill for every part of the State of Illinois, not only Cook County, and those who are really interested in township government, really ought to get behind this one, because this is going to benefit your township roads, so I would ask you to support this Motion to Override. It's much cheaper than the 200 Million Dollar deal."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain my vote. You know, this problem of local effort to fix roads seems to me quite reasonable with the Bill. First of all, all you're doing is returning to the taxpayers the dollars they're putting in from the vehicles that use the road. Everybody here knows that most of the roads in this State are not State roads. I recall just about a year and a half ago, when a little girl was killed walking across the highway, a State highway, in Northfield, Illinois and we asked the State of Illinois if they would put a stop light in there outside of that new high school, and they said they didn't have the money. They wanted the township and the village to do it. They wanted the school to do it. They wanted everybody else to do it, because they didn't have the money. We had a road problem on a State highway right smack through the middle of my village last year which some of you will recall coming up in debate, a very difficult thing to get the state to take care of it. They wanted the village to do it. They wanted the county to do it. We couldn't get the state operation, which was far and remote from those local problems, to be responsive as we wanted them to be and as quickly as they should have been. If this money goes back to your municipalities and your counties and your townships, you will have within your own communities, a better chance to have quick response to the problems that your constituents are already and are always writing to you about. It seems to me that it is imminently reasonable to put the money back. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."



NOV 4 1975

59.

Shea: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. Well, all right, let's give everybody a chance to talk. Let's start with Mr. Schraeder, then."

Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if those Members of the House will remember, and I don't see how you possibly can forget of all the Amendments that was on the Department of Transportation's budget, 55 to 60 Amendment and the bulk of them dealt with special projects in each one of our own particular areas. And at that time, we were critical of the administration. We were critical of the past administration, Ogilvie, Kerner, Shapiro and the rest of them, because they didn't provide Transportation facilities, highways if you please, and now we're saying just a couple of months later that those statements we made then didn't really mean what we said. We didn't want the State to build those highways. We really wanted it to go to the counties and townships. Now this is reverse. Either you weren't sincere then or you're not sincere now, and I would only suggest that if you wanted those special projects as you so earnestly sought in June, that maybe we better take a look at that vote and say 'yes, the Governor ought to be sustained'. These green lights are contrary to what you spoke about in June. Let's change them to red."

Shea: "On this question, there are 111 'ayes', 34 'nays' and 11 Members voting 'present'. Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time, I'd like to be recognized for Verification."

Shea: "You are there, Sir. Mr. Houlihan moves for a Verification of the Affirmative vote. Mr. D. L. Houlihan moves for a Poll of the Absentees. Proceed, Mr. Clerk, with the Poll of the Absentees."

Fred Selcke: "Arnell. Boyle. Brummet . Caldwell. Campbell. Carroll. Chapman. Downs. Hirschfeld. Ron Hoffman. Katz. LaFluer. Leverenz. Miller. Randolph. Rayson. Rose. Sevcik. Sharp. Stearney."

Shea: "Proceed with the Verification of the Affirmative Vote. Will the Members please be in their seats."



NOV 4 1975

60.

Fred Selcke: "Anderson. E. M. Barnes. Gene Barnes. Beatty. Berman.
Birchler. Bluthardt. Borchers. Brandt. Capparelli. Cantania..."

Shea: "Excuse me, Mr. McMasters wishes to be voted 'aye'."

Fred Selcke: "Cunningham. Daniels. D'Arco. Darrow. Davis. Deavers.
Deuster. DiPrima. Duff. Ralph Dunn. Dyer. Ewell. Ewing.
Farley. Fleck. Friedland. Gaines. Garmisa. Geo-Karis. Giglio.
Giorgi. Greiman. Griesheimer. Grotberg. Hanahan. Hart. Gene
Hoffman. Dan Houlihan. Hudson. Huff. Jacobs. Jaffe. Emil
Jones. Dave Jones. Kane. Keller. Kelly. Kempiners. Klosak.
Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Kucharski. Laurino. Lechowicz.
Leinenweber. Leon. Londrigan. Lucco. Lundy. Madigan. Madison.
Mahar. Mann. Maragos. Marovitz. McAuliffe. McAvoy. McCourt.
McLendon. McMaster. McPartlin. Merlo. Meyer. Molloy. Mudd.
Mulcahey. Nardulli. Neff. O'Daniel. Palmer. Patrick. Pierce.
Polk. Porter....."

Shea: "Mr. Downs. Excuse me, Mr. Downs wishes to be recorded 'no'."

Fred Selcke: "Pouncey. Reed. Richmond. Ryan. Satterthwaite. Schoeberlein.
Shea. Skinner. E. G. Steele. Stubblefield. Taylor. Telcser.
Terzich. Tuerk. Waddell, Washburn. Washington. White. Williams.
Winchester. Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "Mr. Leverenz wishes to be recorded 'aye'. The count, Mr. Clerk.
There are 113 'ayes', 35 'nays', 10 'present'. Proceed Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Ah..... Gene Barnes."

Shea: "Gene Barnes is in the aisle."

Houlihan: "Bluthardt."

Shea: "Mr. Bluthardt is in his seat."

Houlihan: "Ah..... Representative D'Arco, oh, I see him. Representative
Daniels."

Shea: "Representative Daniels. Is Representative Daniels.... he's in
the back of the Republican side, Sir."

Houlihan: "Representative Deuster."

Shea: "Representative Deuster. Is Representative Deuster on the Floor?
How is Representative recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Shea: "Take him off the Roll Call."



Houlihan: "Representative Ralph Dunn."

Shea: "Representative Ralph Dunn is in his seat. Representative Giorgi wishes to be recognized now."

Houlihan: "Representative Friedland."

Shea: "Representative Friedland is in his seat, Sir."

Houlihan: "Representative Anderson."

Shea: "Representative Anderson. Is Representative Anderson on the Floor? How is he recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Shea: "Take him off the Roll Call."

Houlihan: "Representative Grotberg."

Shea: "Representative Grotberg is right by his seat, Sir."

Houlihan: "Representative Huff."

Shea: "Representative Huff on the Floor? How is he recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "Aye."

Shea: "Take him off the Roll Call."

Houlihan: "Representative Kucharski."

Shea: "Representative Kucharski. Is Representative Kucharski on the Floor? How is he recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "Take him off the Roll Call."

Shea: "And would you put Mr. Anderson back on the affirmative Roll Call, please?"

Houlihan: "Representative Mann. Oh, I see him over there. Representative Maragos."

Shea: "Representative Maragos is back by Mr. Madigan's seat, Sir."

Houlihan: "Representative Jacobs."

Shea: "Representative Jacobs. Is Representative Jacobs on the Floor? How is he recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "Aye."

Shea: "Take him off the Roll Call."

Houlihan: "Representative McAvoy."

Shea: "Representative McAvoy. Is Representative McAvoy on the Floor? How is he recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "Aye."

Shea: "Take him off the Roll."



Houlihan: "Representative Polk."

Shea: "Representative Polk is in his seat, Sir."

Houlihan: "Representative Ryan. Oh, there he is. Representative Tuerk."

Shea: "Representative Tuerk. He is in the back of the aisle, Sir."

Houlihan: "Representative Terzich."

Shea: "Representative Terzich is on the Republican side hustling."

Houlihan: "Representative Steele."

Shea: "Representative Stubblefield."

Houlihan: "Representative Stiehl."

Shea: "He wishes to be recognized. Yes, Sir?"

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

Shea: "You're recorded as voting ah.... I.... How is he recorded, Mr. Clerk."

Fred Selcke: "Recorded as voting 'aye'."

Stubblefield: "Will you change that vote to 'no', please?"

Shea: "Change Mr. Stubblefield to 'aye' to 'nay'."

Houlihan: "Mr. Steele. Representative Steele."

Shea: "Representative Steele is in his seat, Sir?"

Houlihan: "Representative Washburn."

Shea: "Representative Washburn, the Minority Leader, is in his seat. Mr. Kucharski has returned to the Floor. Do you wish to be recorded as 'aye', Sir? Put Mr. Kucharski back on the Roll Call."

Houlihan: "No further questions."

Shea: "Mr. Katz, how do you wish to be recorded? Change Mr. Katz to 'aye'. Mr. Caldwell, do you wish to be recorded? Change Mr. Caldwell to 'aye'. Miss Stiehl, the Assistant Minority Leader, do you wish recognition?"

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. How am I recorded?"

Shea: "How is Miss Stiehl recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'no'."

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

Shea: "Change the Lady to 'aye'. Mr. Clerk, give me the Roll Call now, please. Mr. Campbell."



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

NOV 4 1975

Shea: "How is Mr. Campbell recorded?"

Fred Selcher: "Gentleman is recorded as being absent."

Campbell: "Vote me 'aye'."

Shea: "Vote Mr. Campbell 'aye'. Could I have the Roll Call now, Mr. Clerk?"

Fred Selcher: "Give me time to add it."

Shea: "The Roll Call is 112 'ayes', 35 'nays', 11 Members voting 'present' and the Gentleman's Motion prevails and House Bill 1539 on his Motion to Override, or to have 1539 to become a Law, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan. Fifteen minutes, Mr. Madigan. Prior to that, might I recognize..... Put Mr. Huff back in the Roll Call would you please? Mr. Washburn, for the purposes of an announcement."

Washburn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask that the Republican Members of the Rules Committee meet in my office as soon as we recess for about 10 minutes, and then I understand the Rules Committee will meet in the Speaker's office, but if the Republican Members, oh..... go ahead."

Shea: "You're going to have your meeting. Mr. Madigan will announce the Rules Committee."

Washburn: "Well, the Republican Members of the Rules Committee will meet in my office as soon as we recess, for about 10 minutes."

Shea: "All right, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, we were scheduled to recess until 2:30, with a Rules Committee meeting at one o'clock. It's now according to my watch 2:15. Do you wish to postpone both items?"

Shea: "I talked to the Speaker and if we could have the Rules Committee at 1:45 and the Members return to the Floor at three o'clock, Sir."

Madigan: "I so move, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "The Gentleman's Motion is that the Rules Committee will meet at 1:45 and that the House now stand in recess until Three o'clock with the stipulation that the Clerk can read any First Readings that he's got. All in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the House stands in Perfunct and then recess until three."



NOV 4 1975

64.

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3167. Palmer/Cunningham et al. A Bill for an Act to require the imposition of a Mandatory Death Sentence for certain specific crimes involving murder and provide the procedure for imposing such death sentence. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3168. Polk. A Bill for an Act to add Sections to the Mobile Home and Mobile Home Park Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill....."

Shea: "Mr. Clerk, can I announce that the Rules Committee will meet in Room 118. The Rules Committee will meet in Room 118 at 1:30."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3169. Hanahan et al. A Bill for an Act making certain appropriations to the State Board of Education. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3170. Hanahan et al. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the State Scholarship Commission. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3171. Hanahan. A Bill for an Act to provide for the Supplemental Appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Board of Education for Fiscal Year 1976. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3172. Kempiners et al. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3173. Kempiners et al. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3174. Kempiners et al. A Bill for an Act to amend the Elections Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3175. Kempiners et al. A Bill for an Act to amend the Elections Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3176. Kempiners et al. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3177. Kempiners et al. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3178. Kempiners et al. A Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3179. D'Arco. A Bill for an Act making a supplemental appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of Dangerous Drugs Commission. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3180. Bradley et al. A Bill for an Act making a supplemental appropriation to the Joint Committee of Legislative Information Systems. First Reading of the Bill.



Shea: "The Hour having reached Three O'Clock, the House will be in Session. We'll stand at ease for a few minutes while the Rules Committee finishes. They were on the last Bill, Gene. The Rules Committee has ended and the House will now be in Order. On the Order of Total Vetoes appears House Bill 1996. Miss Younge."

Younge: "Would you pass that down, please?"

Shea: "House Bill 2042. Mr. Kozubowski. Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, just a suggestion if we may, seeing that a number of Members have not yet been able to make it into the Chamber, is there another order that we could go on because....."

Shea: "There just ain't much other stuff to go to."

Duff: "Well, I really was only thinking of the fact that a number of people would probably like to be on some of these Roll Calls."

Shea: "I will tell you nobody will be penalized, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "Because some of the Members are just coming from the Rules Committee, Mr. Clerk, House Bill 2147, Mr. McCourt. He's not here. 22.... or 2328. Mr. Maragos isn't here. 2560. Mr. Collins. Is he here? 2696. Miss Stiehl. 2825. Mr. Garmisa. 3028. Mr. Brinkmeier. 3070, the Executive Committee. Mr. McPartlin. 3098. You want..... that he wants out of the Record. 3122. Mr. Lechowicz. He isn't here. You want to go ahead with that Mr. Lechowicz? On the Order of Item in Reduction Veto Motions, 1302. Mr. Hart. On the Order of Item in Reduction Vetoes appears your Motion to Override on 1302. I guess.... well, we start.... Whose Bill is 1302? Is that your Bill?"

Hart: "I'm the Sponsor of the Bill, but I didn't make the Motion."

Shea: "What do you want to do with the Bill?"

Hart: "I want to hold it for the maker of the Motion. I think it's ah..... well, I can't remember now. I didn't make it, but....."

Shea: "I'll start with Mr. Cunningham. Do you yield to him on Motion #1, Sir?"

Hart: "I would yield to him on any kind of a Motion."

Shea: "Now to the Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, with regards to Motion #1 on House Bill 1302."



Cunningham: "Can you pass that by for a little while, Mr. Speaker? The other one that's going to vote for my Motion isn't here yet."

Shea: "Mr. Mautino. Motion #3. That's to Override. Is that your's Mr. Cunningham? 1947. Mr. McClain.. 2989. Mr. Hanahan. That's out of the Record. Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Point of Inquiry. Do I have a Motion on 1302?"

Shea: "Sir, if you do, it would be Motion 3. Is that Mr. Choate's Motion. Yes, Sir, it is your Motion to Override. Do you want that called now?"

Choate: "It's not really to Override. It's to restore \$100,000, but looking around at the ah.... Membership, I don't think I want to call it right now, with the vacant seats that there is around here."

Shea: "Might I read this and understand if this is right, Mr. Choate. I move that the following Item of House Bill 1302 do pass the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding, page 7."

Choate: "It's an Item Veto."

Shea: "All right, we'll get back to that. On Item Veto Motions, 1079. Mr. Kosinski. Mr. Kosinski. 1079. House Bill 79. Emil Jones. 221. Londrigan. 504. Palmer. 574. Washington."

Washington: "House Bill 574 originally simply amended the State Employees Retirement System Article of the Pension to increase the maximum monthly benefit amounts for survivors annuities from 250 to 350 dollars per month for the spouse only and for dependent parents from 350 per month to 500 per month. The Amendatory Veto simply lowered the amount for survivors from 350 to 300 and this has the endorsement of the Personnel and Pension Commission and in addition to the Amendatory Veto takes the Governor out of the General Assembly Retirement System and puts him back into the State Employees Retirement System. I don't know of any opposition to this simple Amendatory Veto and I move adoption of the Amendatory Veto to House Bill 574."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington, moves to accept the Amendatory Veto..... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington, moves to accept..... I'll get it right here in a minute, Harold. The question is, shall the Gentleman's Motion that the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 574 be



accepted by the adoption of this Amendment? On the question, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes...ah...Representative Washington, I...I understand that the, the reduction here from Three Fifty to Three Hundred Dollars over...what was that second part of your statement was with regard to the Governor?"

Washington: "Well the Governor, by his second part of his Amendatory Veto took the Office of Governorship out of the General Assembly Retirement System and placed it back into the Employees Retirement System."

Terzich: "The...ah...This was in reference to the Bill where it allowed the elected...ah...State Official, such as the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor, the Secretary of State, etc., to go into the General Assembly Retirement Fund?"

Washington: "That's correct. That Bill was signed into law, September 11, 1975 and the Governor simply thinks that it's inappropriate that the Governor of the, the Office of Governor be included in that catagory and he took it out."

Terzich: "But it...ah...it's all right for all the other elected officials to be in it but not the Governor?"

Washington: "Right. They remain in tact as of whatever the Bill was, Public Act 79959, signed September 11 of this year."

Terzich: "Well he...he thought that it would be all right for all the other public officials but not the Governor of the Ill, of the...ah... State of Illinois to be in..."

Washington: "By entrance I would assume that the...the Message is rather truncated, there's no at...lengthy explanation, he just deems it inappropriate for the Governor to be in that...You could readily assume your conclusion here."

Shea: "Mr. Washington, do you want to split the Motions and perhaps we could get part of it out of the way and part of it..."

Washington: "If the Chair deems it advisable and expedient I have no objections."

Shea: "Well whatever you want to do sir but I...I get the jest of the questions only go to the second half and I'm sure the first half, that portion that deals with widows and orphans, you won't have



any problem with."

Washington: "Well I...I didn't gather that the questions were adversary but just for me elucidate, I think we ought to go with the whole thing."

Shea: "All right sir. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Ah...Will the Sponsor of the Motion yield for a question, Mr. Speaker? Ah...Representative Washington, I...ah...can't understand why...Oh, here's my question. What happens if we don't go along with your Motion, on the Governors not being in the Legislative Pension Fund? The Bill doesn't fail does it?"

Washington: "As I understand, if we don't get 89 votes on this, the Bill is dead. Perhaps the Speaker can enlighten me here."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, if we don't go along with this Amendatory Veto, is the Bill dead?"

Shea: "If...It's my understanding that if this Bill does not receive 89 votes, the Bill is dead. As I understand it and correct me if I'm wrong Mr. Washington, to become immediately effective both parts would take 107 votes, 89 would make it effective July 1, of next year, less than 89 would mean that the Gentleman's Motion fails."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, if I may address myself to the Motion. I think the Governor made a mistake by doing this but we should not hazard this Bill because of that error and I think we should put a Bill in next year to restore the portion that's been transferred out of the, by the Amendatory Veto, so I guess we should support the Motion."

Shea: "Would all those people who are not authorized to be on the Floor of the House by the Rules of the Floor please remove, remove themselves from the House? Would all those people that are on the Floor of the House, who are not authorized by the Rules of this House to be on the Floor, please remove themselves? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have one question. You know originally when this Bill was passed by the House, it had nothing to do with the Governor being in or out of the Pension Program, it



simply had to do with the..ah..State Employees maximum amount for survivors and I'm just wondering if that request is germane, you know, through this specific Bill?"

Shea: "Turn on Mr. Washington please."

Washington: "I don't profess to be an authority on the Constitutional question here but suffice to say that there is precedent for it...ah...there have been similar Bills in which the Governor, this Governor and the preceding Governor did similar actions as you find in 574. But as I said before, I don't feel competent to give a definitive answer on the question. Perhaps the Speaker can."

Shea: "Would you rephrase the question?"

Terzich: "When we originally passed this Bill, there was nothing in the Bill with regard to the Governor being in any Pension Program. The Bill only dealt with the...ah...survivors amounts under the Illinois Employees Retirement Program and in the Governors Message he inserted that provision about including him under the similar program but the original Bill didn't have anything to do with the Governor."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker...hold on."

Shea: "Yes sir."

Washington: "Can we take this Bill out of the Record?"

Shea: "Please take the Bill out of the Record. Can I...Mr. Washington can I address myself to one other thing you might think about. At the time the Bill passed both Houses, the section that is now sought to amend was not even law. So it presents a further hiatus."

Washington: "It does, I will say no more."

Shea: "Well Gentlemen, Ladies, Members of the House. Now that we are... have all the Members of the Rules Committee and I'm sure a full House, we'll start back where we took off so I keep my commitment to my good friend Gene Schlickman, so nobody feels slighted, hurt or left out. On page 7 of the Calendar appears House Bill 1996, Miss Yvetter Younge do you want to take that out, call it? Take it out of the Record. House Bill 2042. Mr. Kozubowski. 2147. Mr. McCourt. Take that out of the Record. 2328. Mr. Maragos. 2560, Mr. Collins. What does it do Phil?"



Collins: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, I think we better pull it out of the Record at this time. No deal."

Shea: "2693, Miss Stiehl. 2825. Mr. Garmisa. 2988. The Election Code, that's out of the Record. 3028. Agriculture, Mr. Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Well Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 3028 is a House Agricultural Committee Bill. This is a Bill of course that would create a State Fair Board. I remind you that this Bill is the result of a long study conducted by a Committee which patterned that proposal after that which has been used successfully in the State of Indiana. Now I for one, don't want this action to be construed as criticism of the present Governor or the present Fair Manager. I think though, it is in my estimation at least it's an indictment of a system which has had a long history of abuse. Now just one example, you may recall that back in April of this year, that the Sangamon County Grand Jury recommended that two contracts awarded by the State Fair Manager be cancelled because of excessive costs and irregularities. I think one was for maintenance and repair, I think another was for the removal of manure. Now you would also recall that it was necessary to come in with a Deficiency Appropriation, I think in 1974 the Fair came up about One Million Dollars short. I would also remind you that a State Auditor General's report on the 1970 called the Fiscal Management of the Fair a disaster and concluded that it was operated almost completely without management supervision or/and control. Briefly in review I'd remind you that the new plan calls for the Fair to be run by a fifteen member Board. They will hire their own Fair Manager and of course the staff. I'd remind you too that a recent poll conducted by the Prairie Farmer became..came up with the results of over fifty per cent, seventy three per cent of the farmers in the State of Illinois that were polled indicated that they would prefer the present plan. Only ten per cent were in favor of retaining the present plan. I'd remind you too that this Bill was approved by this Body, last Spring, by a vote of 133 to 11 and I would respectfully solicit your support to override the Governor on this program."



Shea: "The Gentleman's Motion is that House Bill 3028 shall become law, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding and on that question the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. J. David Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. As it just was explained to you that in the, this House on last May, June the 5th we passed Legislation by 133 to 11 in order to put forth the State Fair Reform Bill which would put the State Fair under a separate...ah...agency and this was the result of Legislative action by this House. In the Appropriations Committee when the various item's on Malpractice and over-spending were brought to our attention the Appropriations Committee appointed a five member Committee headed by Representative Hanahan to investigate the matter and in so doing the..."

Shea: "Mr. Jones, might I disturb you for one minute sir, I want to remind my colleagues that the light behind the podium is on and they are shooting pictures and film. Go ahead sir."

Jones: "The Committee was appointed to investigate the matter and in so doing we studied the Indiana plan, went to Indianapolis and studied the Indianapolis State Fair and how it was operated and ..ah..scandal free and a Fair that's paying its own way and based on that Indiana plan was conceived originally House Bill 732 which got lost in the cutoff shuffle of May the 23rd and came out again as the Agricultural Committee Bill...ah...3028. The present system is a failure and the...the Bill provides that the Legislature initially will appoint the Members of a Commission who will then...ah...make the rules and regulations for the actual conduct of the Board when in three years will then be supplanted by members from Agricultural districts, the hands of the...the...the jurisdiction of the State Fair Board will be in the hands of the agricultural people for which the Fair was originally sponsored and the present system is a failure and we sure need to give it a chance with the new system. Now the Governor's Amendatory...ah...the Governors Veto...ah...mentions some Constitutional matters and I know that those are matters for, in my judgment for the courts to decide because I've been told on the Floor of the House many times that this..this would



be Unconstitutional or not Constitutional and likely....I was told that the State Income Tax would not be Constitutional but it turned out that it was and there is a Severability Clause in the Act that if one portion of it is declared invalid it does not invalidate the rest of the Bill. So, it's time for a change and this is not a new concept, I sponsored similar Legislation in 1972 during the Ogilvie Administration and it's not aimed at the present administration as such but at the system which is wrong and needs to be changed and your vote to override it here will do that. Thank you very much."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Craig."

Craig: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would like the.. to talk a little bit about trying to uphold the Governor's Veto on this measure. Now we have heard a lot about the State Fair and the system as it is now. Now I happen to be one that im...that now, that would like for a change, a reasonable change to be made now on the State Fair. I think I have done, have had that feeling and expressed it for some time. But to make a change of this type where we as Legislators and the Legislature of this State of Illinois, having a group of people appointed by County Fair Boards over the State of Illinois and when they are appointed I say they're only sending one man as their appointee from the various districts to operate and to hire and run that Fair, I think we are going a far shore when we give the right to spend money and we have no more control than we have over these particular people. Now, I...when they sent out a questionnaire they said now the present system or this. They didn't give them any other alternative. But let's be a little practical, whoever is Governor would you want? Yes even your own political party, if you please, from the various counties in this state can give you one man and one man only and you had to take that man irregardless friend or foe to run a State Fair that you are going to be held responsible for the payment of bills. Now you're delegating powers here away from yourself that I don't think this Legislature should even dream about doing. Now I think that if they wanted to do this



we could have had some other measures that would have been a great change and a great help at the present time. But when they talk about other State Fairs, I don't believe with all the scandal and I'll say this. They have been nitpicking pretty hard at the State Fair over the past eight or ten years. But, even with all that doing, they talk about drawing crowds at our State Fair. We'll draw from seven hundred to nine hundred thousand people at our State Fair, they talk about Indiana being the great State Fair that it is, in a Metropolitan area that's ten times the size of Springfield to draw from and they'd only draw about eight or nine hundred thousand people. So this isn't any great thing when they talk about Indiana State Fair. But all I'm saying to you is I think we need a Board set up where maybe that Board would never be in control of the Governor by his appointment in his first four year term of Office. This, I think, would be a reasonable approach. But to give this approach to a County Fair Board of ten or whatever they are in their various districts or whatever they be. To name one man and if you people don't think County Fair Boards, if you please, are a little politically motivated, you're mistaken. But I as a County Fair...and I've served on County Fair Boards. I don't know why the County Fair people want in this thing. They have been treated reasonably well and now then they're going to be getting in a dual role and maybe they won't come out as well as they think on the County Fair level. But all I'm saying is Gentlemen, please think before you delegate power away to people that you have no control whatsoever over the spending and the hiring of someone. I think it behooves us to keep some right with our...and within our powers. Thank you."

Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The...The Gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Brinkmeier, I'll call on you to close sir. Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Benton, Mr. Hart. Take that out of the record then. The Gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Brinkmeier to close."



Brinkmeier: "Well Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think the issue is very clear. I just very briefly would like to discuss the objections that were voiced by the Governor. Number one, the Constitutionality question. Very frankly, anytime anybody stands on the Floor of this House or anywhere and questions... debates an issue and says, 'Well, it's Unconstitutional.' I think they're on weak ground. That's a very common argument, you folks have heard it many times, when there isn't another valid argument, they come up with the Constitutionality question. Now that is not for us to determine here. We have a Judicial Department in this State that can make a ruling on that. I would point out too that the...the Senate Amendment #1 has a provision in it so that if one section of this law should be declared Unconstitutional the rest of it would still prevail. The other argument expressed by the Governor was the lack of accountability or responsibility. Now I would submit to you that having ten appointed which, indirectly elected people on that Board from the entire state, from all areas of the state, plus five appointments of the Governor, to me I think they would be responsible and I think they could be held accountable and I would urge your support."

Shea: "The Gentleman's Motion is shall House Bill 3028 become law, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding? On that Motion, those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In explaining my 'no' vote, I'd like to say that this still goes back to Legislative integrity. This Bill belongs to the Agriculture Committee and I understand that Gail Schisler, the Chairman of that Committee and as far as I'm concerned the Chairman of the Committee ought to be the one filing the Motion and since he didn't file the Motion, I think it's improper that somebody else file the Motion in his stead... I just don't think that's right, I think that if we believe in... in Legislative integrity, if we believe in the Committee system that the...the Chairman of the Committee ought to handle



the Bill for the Committee...ah...I think this is just a wrong procedure. I therefore vote 'no'."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I...I think I heard it said on the Floor of this House that the question of the Constitutionality of a Statute is something that we hear and we pretty much can leave that up to the courts. But Ladies and Gentlemen, I...I take the oath to uphold the Constitution of this State more seriously than that. I think what we're doing here is really folly if we...if we override this Veto, on this ground. We had almost an identical case in Illinois just recently on the State Election Board where it was held that that Bill, that law was Unconstitutional for virtually the same basis on which this Bill is Unconstitutional. What we will probably do by enacting this Bill is not have a State Fair for the next two or three years while the courts decide this question. It's obvious that you cannot delegate this sort of administrative Executive power to the kind of group that is set up in this Bill and it's just, you're just kidding yourself if you think you're going to get reform by burying your head in the sand and ignoring the clear mandate of our Constitution and the principle of the separation of powers."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Rigney."

Rigney: "Well Mr. Speaker, that Board's looking mighty good to me up there. I was in on this Bill from its very beginning two years ago when the Appropriations Committee went to Indiana and made a study of their system and basically what we're offering in this Legislation is a modified Indiana plan. I know you can say that it's a...a large board and you think it maybe looks somewhat cumbersome...ah...but one thing that we found out in Indiana and one thing that you can't argue with and that's success and I think the Indiana system the thing that has made it successful was the fact that over there in that State that those people are running for that office, they are declaring their candidacy to serve on that Board and they're dedicated individuals and that's what we're trying to create here in the State of Illinois."



Shea: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow....Mr. Lechowicz..."

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

Shea: "Mr. Darrow, would you wait one second?"

Darrow: "Yes."

Shea: "Could we have some order please? Proceed sir."

Darrow: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Two things

bother me about this Bill. First of all the Constitutional question, we'll run into the same problem and end up in court next week the same way as we did with the Board of Elections. On top of that, there's no provision for a Personnel Code and like the Board of Elections, the employees will be political hacks and we will see real inefficiency compared to the way the State Board...er...compared to the way the Fair is now being run. So I would solicit a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to explain my opposition to this piece of Legislation. While I certainly can agree that the motives are...are completely admirable and...and...and good with this Bill. I find a lot of fault with it. I find that I don't feel there are any guarantees that it can improve the situation and have the State Fair operate with efficiency or...or be better managed and the further problem I have with it and probably a far more important one is that what we're doing is replacing what is indeed Executive function with Boards and Commissions again. Ah...We're diluting the res... the public accountability by spreading responsibility now to a fifteen member board. If we were to do this with every state agency that...that has trouble...ah...we would land up having a...ah...a fourth branch of government and that's Boards and Commissions and I don't think that's the route we should be looking to."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I think that in our haste to try to develop Legislation to resolve some problems that have come about or...or have continued for a



good many years in this area, I think that we...we put together a peice of Legislation just a little too quick. I...I wonder if every Legislator in this body would give a little thought to what would happen to the State of Illinois if the General Assembly would relieve itself of it's authority over schools in the same manner that they're doing here with this particular piece of Legislation in regards to Fairs. I think that any time a Legislative Body and a group of elected officials take their...area of responsibility and...and give it to someone else, I think that they're...they're not taking the time to put together the proper Legislation to resolve a problem, only to place it in the hands of another party and we don't know whether or not their going to have success with it either. I can't vote for this Bill. I served on the Agricultural Committee, I heard the piece of Legislation. It is modified over what they have in other states and I just don't feel it's a piece of Legislation that I could support at this time. I'd still rather have the...ah...the authority in this Legislative Body."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 116 'ayes', 36 'nays' 15 Members voting 'present' and the Gentleman's Motion prevails. House Bill 3078. Mr. McPartlin."



Shea: "House Bill 3098. Mr. Stone on that Bill."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Two years ago, two years ago, the Federal Government ruled that the per diem expenses paid to Members of this Legislature was salary. Last year the State of Illinois acquiesced in this ruling and gave us a W-2, a withholding statement commonly referred to as a W-2 for all per diem money that we received. By doing this they have assured that we include all per diem expenses as regular salary when we file our Income Tax. Now the statutes of the State of Illinois provide that the salary paid to Members of the Legislature shall be included for...ah...shall be included when...when our pensions are figured after we retire. This Bill merely provides that all money received by Legislators during their term shall be included in salary, in their salary for purposes of figuring their pension. It seems to me that if we are to carry through and, and treat all wages or salaries the same that...that the salary paid to us as per diem should be included for our pension. I sincerely hope that we can add your votes on...on this matter to override the Governor's veto."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think this is a very important Bill and one which I have had very, a great deal of adverse comment back in my district when it was passed and it looks like nothing but a way to fatten our already very generous retirement benefits. Now if anybody knows anything about taxes, they know that you, if you get a flat rate for expenses you have to count it as income except you get to deduct your expenses. So we don't have the per diem isn't all income. All we have is income is what we can account for in our expenses. I think it's wrong to include this in our pension, I think when we're asking the rest of the State, the Schools to take less, for us to take more for ourselves and I would hope that we would sustain this veto. Thank you."

Shea: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "If we want a pay raise, we ought to have the guts enough to stand up here and vote for it. This is a back door pay raise



NOV 4 1975

79.

and there's no reason on earth that those people that have been elected in the last five years ought to vote for it. I would urge a 'no' vote."

Shea: "Mr. Deuster, the Gentleman from Lake."

Deuster: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question? Representative Stone, it's my understanding that any Legislators who would seek to receive the additional benefits would have to supply a contribution to the Pension Fund based on the per diem, is that correct, is that still in the law?"

Stone: "Yes sir, that is absolutely correct. We would pay the...the same rate on this money that we paid on the rest of our salary."

Deuster: "Is it your understanding that there would be no actuarial imbalance as a result of this?"

Stone: "That is my understanding sir."

Deuster: "Thank you."

Shea: "The Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Fleck."

Fleck: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Stone: "Yes sir."

Fleck: "What effect would this have upon my pension. Let's say I came down to Springfield, which I did, once between June and the Veto Session and I had one day of per diem. Now it seems to me that some of these eager beaver Legislators who feel incumbent upon them to spend 90 per cent of their life in Springfield creating all 'sorts of problems in this state would get a bigger pension because they're writing up a bigger per diem all the time. Is that true?"

Stone: "If you assume the statement you made to be correct then your conclusion is correct. Yes sir."

Fleck: "In other words, I'm being prejudice against because I don't spend a lot of time in Springfield and I don't run up a bigger per diem than a lot of Legislators."

Stone: "Sir when my, the people in my district elected me, they elected me to come here when there was business to be done and when the House is in Session. I've made it a point to always be here. I believe I have been here everyday that the...the House was in Session."



NOV 4 1975

80.

Fleck: "I understand, but I didn't get any good commission appointments or committee appointments that are working, so a person in that position would be making less on his pension because he might have voted for the wrong person in leadership or something like that. Is that correct?"

Stone: "Well, it's my understanding that..."

Fleck: "That would affect...my point is that would affect what his pensions benefits would be."

Stone: "It is my understanding that it would not, but I do not want to give you a catagorical no answer. It is my understanding that it's per diem received down...during our Regular Session."

Fleck: "Only our Regular Session and not."

Stone: "That's my understanding, I...ah..."

Fleck: "Does anyone have the answer?"

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "No."

Shea: "Mr. Stone to close."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I see Charles Clabaugh standing on the other side of the aisle. You know, when Mr. Clabaugh came down here thirty-seven years ago now, ah...there was no per diem expenses. He paid all of his living expenses out of his salary, and at...at that time, I understand his salary was twenty four hundred dollars a year. So you see, he wasn't receiving twenty four hundred dollars a year net, he received twenty four hundred dollars, less expenses. Now, our salary now is twenty thousand dollars per year plus thirty-six dollars per day expenses. So our salary now is figured on a different basis that it was when Mr. Clabaugh first came down. We...paid his expenses here out of his salary. That is exactly what we are doing now, except the thirty-six dollars per day is not included when they figure our pension. I personally feel that this is unfair to the Members and that we...and that we should include all of the salary that we receive when our pensions are figured, and I certainly solicit your yes vote."

Shea: "The Gentleman's motion is, shall House Bill 3098 become law?

The veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All those in favor will



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'nay'. Clyde?"

Choate: "'Aye'."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Moultrie, Mr. Stone."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to put this on Postponed Consideration."

Shea: "The Gentleman wishes to put this on Postponed Consideration."

Oh, excuse me John. Representative Matijevich makes an objection to the Bill going on Postponed Consideration."

Matijevich: "Amen, again."

Shea: "Mr. Mugalian?"

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Record would have me joining in Mr. Matijevich's objection."

Shea: "I think Mr. Matijevich is filing a written Motion and you can certainly join your colleague. Mr. Schlickman wishes to join with them?"

Schlickman: "No, no. Mr. Speaker, I rise on a Point of Personal Privilege. There was just placed in my desk a memorandum from a law firm in the City of Chicago representing an organization of individuals, The Voluntary Association. Ah...this is contrary to our Rules."

Shea: "Would you bring it up here, and let me find out who it's from and I'll get it straightened out?"

Schlickman: "Yes sir."

Shea: "Mr. Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, I think I can clarify that. I asked that it be distributed. Ah...it was distributed by a new page who maybe didn't understand that she should have put my name on the bottom of it, but it is, indeed, my distribution and I think under the Rules, I have the right to do that."

Shea: "Well, we've got it straightened out now. Mr. Beaupre said that it was at his request, so there is nobody who has any question about where the material came from. Well, what do they call it, post facto or ex facto Gene? Non protunct. You're the lawyer, I'm just using your words."



NOV 4 1975

82.

Shea: "On the Order of Total Vetoes appears 3122. Mr. Lechowicz. On the Calendar on the Order of...Item Vetoes #289...Let's see, I better look at the motions, 1302, Mr. Hart, are we back on your Bill again? So I'll start with Mr. Cunningham, is that correct? The Gentleman...on 1302, the Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Crawford County is one of the nicest counties in the whole State of Illinois and it has no lake but the State of Illinois over the years has seen it fit to acquire six hundred and ninety acres of very valuable farm land in Crawford County for the often stated and repeated purpose of constructing a lake there to develop the recreational potential that that Community deserves. We've asked, last Spring you magnanimously agreed that a Hundred Thousand Dollars was a reasonable amount to expend for the construction of a dam. A Hundred Thousand Dollars is infen...infinitesimal part of the budget that we are dealing with and I've dealt with here over the many months. It's ridiculous to say that it would cause any embarrassment whatsoever to the State budget, we ask, we pray, we beg that you'll have...let us put back the Hundred Thousand Dollars that was there and then we ask you to come down and fish in Crawford County Lake. That's all the money that's necessary to go ahead with it, we have six hundred and ninety acres that are available. The need is there, the opportunity is yours. We'd appreciate your vote to override."

Shea: "The Gentleman...Give me the Motion please, Mr. Clerk, so I have this one right. The Gentleman moves that House Bill 1302, the veto of the Government...Governor notwithstanding on a specific item on page 13, line 26 to 32. On that question the Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart, the chief Sponsor of the Bill."

Hart: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to...ah...advise the Members of the Body of the...the Department of Conservation's position on this appropriation. Of course the ultimate decision will be by the Membership here. But



NOV 4 1975

83.

the Department of Conservation opposed this appropriation as follows. 'The only land held by the Department of Conservation is the Crawford County Conservation Area, because of natural features, including the largest Red Maple Tree in Illinois, abundant wildlife and mushrooms that the Department believes it would be undesirable to build a lake on this property.' They are developing a recreation area, including a lake at nearby Sam Parr State Park and the Department feels that the recreational needs of the citizens in this area would best be served by keeping the Crawford County Conservation for natural use and the Sam Parr State Park for the capitol intensive recreation use and for these reasons the Department opposed the motion and...ah...asks that the Membership go along with the Governor and delete this item from the budget."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. In opposing this motion, I rhetorically ask the Membership if we don't have enough money in our General Revenue Fund to pay for the costs of the operation of state government. If we don't have enough money in the General Revenue Fund to fully fund the states contribution to public education, if we don't have enough money in the General Revenue Fund to take care of the mentally ill in the amount that is required and should be given, if we don't have the money in the General Revenue Fund for Special Education, how in the hell do we have money, not the one hundred thousand that the Gentleman is asking for, but a quarter of a million dollars for this local project and I urge a 'no' vote."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers."

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

Shea: "He indicates he will sir."

Byers: "Mr. Cunningham isn't there some money already spent for a lake in your district year that the Governor approved?"

Cunningham: "Yes, there is a lake down, ten mile lake in Hamilton County, which is Representative O'Daniels section of the District. I should note that both he and Representative Keller are with



on this particular Motion. I would hope to hear from each of them shortly in behalf of it."

Byers: "Well, ah...Mr. Speaker if I might address the Bill?"

Shea: "Proceed Sir."

Byers: "I believe that one lake would be enough for this district, and...ah...that's more lakes than we got in our area, and...ah... I agree with Representative Schlickman and urge your 'no' vote."

Shea: "Mr. Cunningham to close."

Cunningham: "We mustn't let this degenerate into our common greed in regard to this problem. We're taking out an insurance policy down in our district. We're organizing a bipartisan effort for Michael Howlett for governor. We won't have to come to you on bended knee next year to get this, but why do you put us in that ridiculous position. This is just the...a simple request to extend the hand of understanding in our particular problem. You're snuffing out the hopes and aspirations of all the people of our area with a negative attitude that does no credit to any of you. The Sponsor of the Bill doesn't seriously resent this. It's a tongue in cheek presentation on his part in regard to the Department of Conservation. They do not deny that they have me correctly, for the express purpose of the construction of the lake at this site, and nothing that the Department of Conservation can say can erase or in anyway eradicate that truth. It's an embarrassment to them. We should be offering a Bill to give the land back to the farmers, but we'll not do that because we'll keep pushing till the day comes that we get a lake in Crawford County, to which they're entitled. And we hope and request that you push with us. Give us a vote of confidence on this and vote 'aye'."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Co...ah...from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham moves that the specific Item Veto of the Governor regarding House Bill 1302 become law, the Veto of the Governor, notwithstanding. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the



Record Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 9 'ayes', 93 'nays', 7 Members voting 'present'. The Gentleman's Motion fails. Mr. Mautino. Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yeah, I have to raise this because this is...is this a Item Veto and it hasn't been made an issue out of, so I make the Point of Order under Rule 46D, that the Speaker shall declare that the Item has failed to be restored. I'd like to have you make that little statement."

Shea: "The Motion of the Gentleman fails to restore the Item to pass, notwithstanding the Governor's Veto."

Matijevich: "You got it all loused up,, but I...think my objection has been raised."

Shea: "All right. Mr. Mautino. Mr. Mautino's Motion reads 'I move the Item on page 13, lines 13 through 15 of House Bill 1302 do pass the Item Veto of the Governor to the contrary, notwithstanding'. The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Now discretion is a greater part of va...valor, and after seeing the previous vote on the same Bill 1302, and the fact that House Bill 1588, I do not have 107 affirmative votes which is the authorization for lakeI ask that Motion #2 in the Line Item Veto at this time be Tabled."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart. The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino moves that the Item Veto of the Governor notwithstanding, that portion of the money in House Bill 1302 be returned on page 13, lines 13 through 15. Oh, you tabled it? I was trying to get a free ride of the Board. The Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate on #3. That's on page 7, lines 8 through 13. Page 2, is it Mr. Choate? I move that the following Item of House Bill 1302, do pass, and the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding, page 2, lines 8 through 13. The Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Well, I realize Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House that this is maybe an inopportune time to talk on the Motion. However, I want you to listen and listen clearly and listen to the difference in this Motion than in the preceding



Motions. Let me give you the background as far as this Motion is concerned, and let me first tell the Membership of this House that there is only One Hundred Thousand Dollars...One Hundred Thousand Dollars involved. It has to do with a drainage district in Union and a part of it reaching over into Alexander County by a small part. It has to do with a drainage district in the fertile farmlands of the Mississippi River bottoms and it has to do with the very salvation of farmers in that area simply because of the Mississippi River and some of its tributaries flooding in the Spring time and prohibiting those farmers the opportunity of planting their crops. When the Department of Conservation's budget came about, some of the farmers came to Springfield and petitioned the state to admit to the fact that they did own forty percent of the land involved in this drainage district. Therefore it was incumbent upon the State of Illinois to share its...its equitable part as far as the drainage district is concerned. Cleaning out and dredging some of the drainage districts. I've got to say to the Membership that the Department of Conservation cooperated with the Sponsor of this Bill, Representative Hart. They cooperated with me as far as the drafting of the Amendment is concerned, and it was on the advice and the consent of the Department of Conservation that the Hundred Thousand Dollars was derived at that it was a bonifide part and a obligation of the State of Illinois to share with the farmers of that area, forty percent of the cost of the drainage districts. And if you want to know the truth about it, it's because of areas owned by the state that brings about the stopping up of the drainage districts. It's because of the releasing of beavers in various states impounded areas of water. It's because of the state having the refuges and the wild animal life, bringing debris into the drainage districts that have brought about this situation. However the farmers in the past have supported the drainage of these districts and the dredging problem one hundred percent. For the life of me, I don't understand why the Hundred Thousand Dollars was removed from this Bill when it was the Department



that gave us the figure and consented to it. At this point I know of no objections that the Department has brought to the Sponsor of this Bill regarding the hundred thousand dollars. If you want to be financially responsible as far as the State of Illinois is concerned you will support the Department position, you will support our position and say that it is an obligation to the state, which they have admitted to help bring about the relieving of their flooded conditions as far as the farmers in this particular area are concerned. I would appreciate, Mr. Speaker, enough votes to see that this Motion is carried."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate, moves that on page 2, lines 8 through...the items beginning on line 8 be restored to the Governors veto or be restored to House Bill 1302, the veto of the Governor not withstanding. On that is there any question? Mr. Hart, the Sponsor of the Legislation?"

Hart: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I...ah...join with my colleague from the 59th District in asking that the funds here be restored and it is absolutely true that the Department of Conservation has furnished me with no information, no memo or no...ah...communication where in they state any objection to the Gentlemans motion and I know personally that...ah...that the project is right and should be undertaken by the State of Illinois. So I would urge the Members give...of this body to support the motion of Representative Choate and restore these funds."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I call the attention of the Membership that what we're talking about here is another proposed appropriation from the General Revenue Fund and that this motion does not differ from motion #1 which was overwhelmingly defeated, in principal, by degree but not by principal and I furthermore call to the attention of the House that we are Constitutionally prescribed to keep appropriations within the limit of Revenue estimates and the Revenue estimates that we have, that have been provided to us from various sources



state that we do not have sufficient revenue to cover these overrides and I further suggest that this one hundred thousand dollars can be better spent, priority wise, in other areas involving the health, welfare, morals and safety of the citizens of the State and I urge a 'no' vote."

Shea: "Th Gentleman from Union...no, the Lady from Adams, Mrs. Kent. Mrs. Kent, do you want to talk? Oh, all right. The Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate to close."

Choate: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let me point out to my learned friend, Representative Schlickman, that there is a vast difference between this motion and other motions that have preceded it. The vast difference is simply this. That's the Department readily admitted the states obligation in this particular field. That the Department itself is the one that said the hundred thousand dollars would be a fair and equitable portion of the states burden, financial burden that is. That the Department itself cooperated in the drafting of this Amendment and I for the life of me can not understand why it was deleted. I do not know why, I would like an explanation why because the Agency involved admitted responsibility and I would appreciate the Memberships vote."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Union moves for the adoption of his Motion to restore the Item Veto on House Bill 1302. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. Representative Jaffe to explain his vote."

Jaffe: "The liberals are waiting for you...Mr. Speaker, I don't know who pressed my speak button but none the less I have to say as a Representative of Southern Illinois, that we in the deep South really need this particular vote and I'm going to vote 'yes' on it and I see we need about another twenty one votes or so and I think we should actually get that. Oh, we need forty. The South's in deeper trouble than I thought."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart, to explain his vote."

Hart: "Well thank you very much Mr. Speaker, I know we're all having a lot of fun here but...but really this is somewhat similar in



NOV 4 1975

89.

the concept to the Bill that Representative Tuerk presented earlier. When the State of Illinois has an obligation to participate in a local improvement project such as a drainage of certain areas then if the State does not participate the burden is more placed on the other land owners in the area. How can it be fair to the other land owners in Union County where there area is, needs draining, to ask them to underwrite the ent...entire cost of this drainage project. If the State of Illinois owns a portion of the land that's creating the problem or that needs to be drained then certainly it is their obligation to under...to fair, play...pay its fair share of the cost of that project. So I don't really understand the opposition to the Gentlemans motion here. This is not just some appropriation...ah...for a specific project out of nowhere, this is an appropriation ...ah... which was called to the attention of the Department of Conservation, as Representative Choate said, and when it was called to their attention they came up with an estimate of the amount of money that would be required for the states fair share and participated as he said, in the drafting of the Amendment, it was placed on the Bill and the Bill passed with that in there. I would like to know...ah...what if any ...ah... the position the Department then took...ah...to the Governor when he made this judgment on the appropriation. Ah...I'm not sure that they took any position on it, certainly not, I'm very doubtful that they opposed it. But anyway regardless of whether or not they did oppose it or did take no position on it, it is the duty and the responsibility of the State of Illinois to help drain this area that needs draining and not leave it all to be paid for by the local land owners and have the state get a benefit there that they're not entitled to. So I would urge...ah...strong consideration of this appropriation and to restore it in this budget."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff to explain his vote."



Duff: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it just seems to me that a couple of Bills that we've treated earlier today were, were treated with a sense of fairness by the Members of the House who didn't feel that the vetoes were necessarily so much sound as retributive and I don't think...I think, I know that the Sponsor of this motion is much too much of a Gentleman to believe that the Governor didn't veto the appropriation, he vetoed the Sponsor. I have a feeling that the equity that the equity that Representative Hart just spoke to where the local people have paid all the costs and where the state owned sixty per cent of the land and where the state itself made the proposition with the hundred thousand dollars that there's some real merit. An awful lot of people in this House Floor are going to vote for millions of dollars worth of overrides, I'm not, but this is a hundred thousand dollars where equity for people in a local situation...ah...is required. I think it's only fair not to let the Governor single out a Member of this House for reasons other than the validity of the item in fact and take advantage of the House and the Legislation that we sent him before. It seems to me that all of us ought to think about the fact that it could happen to us."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz to explain his vote."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise with some hesitation in explaining my 'aye' vote on this matter because of the wonderful presentation that was made by Representative Choate in detailing the fact that this was an agreement between the Department and the respective drainage district in that County and they attested to the fact that there was a state responsibility as far as a hundred thousand dollars. I would just like to remind the Membership that just two years ago, two brief years ago, this is the same section, in fact many areas throughout this state, unfortunately were under a deluge of water and in this section specifically, I was down there, Clyde invited me down, to do a little hunting and this was supposedly after the water subsided. But I just want to attest to one fact that this land was so water soaked and I think



NOV 4 1975

91.

if you remember, the Membership that was serving in this General Assembly, we had a special Resolution. Many people were flying around this state, Federal money was supposedly coming in to aid these Counties and in turn the...this House and this Senate passed a Resolution requiring additional Federal Aid for these Counties, for these farmers who were wiped out and their crops were wiped out and providing additional money, providing them loans to help them in their situation. Now we have a Bill stating that we need a hundred thousand dollars for this area of the State to provide relief that is required by this state and we're saying 'no'. I can't understand how two years ago a Resolution passed this House by a vote of about 140 to 3 or 4 and in turn today we're having a difficulty in providing the states responsibility for an area that is consistently being flooded by the Mississippi River. Let's go to the fact as far as how much the Federal Government spends, supposedly, on Flood Control. How much the State of Illinois spends on Flood Control, how much we spend in Civil Defense and in turn the responsibility is ours and I would hope that the Membership would just reflect two brief years ago when a lot of sections of this state was under water and a lot of people were concerned. This is a dollar amount that should be properly spent. I'm not from downstate, but I was there and I witnessed it personally and it's money that should be approved. Thank you."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. The Gentleman moves, Mr. Choate, for a poll of the absentees. Call the absentees will you Mr. Clerk." Is the Parliamentarian here? Poll the absentees. Lauer 'aye'. How is Mr. Huff recorded? Jack let me look at that."

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

Shea: "Let me look at the...Catania 'aye'. The question is, does this take 107 or 89 votes? It's my opinion that it takes 107 votes. I've checked it with the Parliamentarian. This was a complete veto of a line item and it takes 107 votes to restore it



...Mr. Mahar votes 'aye', Mr. Tuerk votes 'aye', Mr. Peters votes 'aye', Mr. Madison votes 'aye'. Mr. Mautino, 'aye', Mr. Darrow, 'aye'...Mr. Lundy votes 'aye'. What's the Roll Call now Mr...Mr. Brinkmeier votes 'aye'. On this question there are 112 'aye', 27 'nay', 15 Members voting 'present' and the Gentlemen's motion prevails. On the order of Total vetoes appears House Bill 2328. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I respectfully ask that we...the House votes to adopt and pass House Bill 2328. The Governor's veto notwithstanding. This has to do with the Port District, Chicago Regional Port District of the City of Chicago and after many years of attempting to get some cooperation from the State to not pay any taxes..."

Shea: "Mr. Maragos, could I disturb you for one second? Gentlemen, the light behind the podium is off. I request that you do not film unless the light's on. If you want to film come and let somebody on the Speaker's Rostrum know and we'll arrange that for you. Proceed sir and I'm sorry for the interruption."

Maragos: "It's all right. Repeating again...Mr...Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 2328 transfers all the assets and liabilities of the Chicago Regional Port District to the city of Chicago from the state. Originally the land upon which this Port is located was donated to the State of Illinois by the City and as a result we felt that we should have a jurisdiction in order to better combine the services of the Port of Chicago with this particular Port District and I ask for your support on the override of this particular veto."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the motion to override the...the Governor's veto on House Bill 2328 and I think this is a very important Bill. I must admit that when the Bill was first introduced I...I did oppose it. But upon reflection I think that this Bill is the only hope for the salvation of the Chicago Regional Port District. As Representative Maragos has correctly stated, this



NOV 4 1975

93.

Port District, which should be the premier Port of the Midwest is falling behind others such as Burns Harbor, Milwaukee, etc., in futile efforts to try to get the State of Illinois to exercise some responsibility in protecting this Port and contributing to the...the economic welfare of the State of Illinois. We have tried for years to get the property and the facilities to institute the facilities for containerize operations at the Chicago Regional Port District. On three separate occasions we have been swarted by the act of the Governor in failing to recognize the importance of this facility at the Regional Port District. We tried for years for...to get the establishment of a foriegn trade zone in, for the Chicago Regional Port District and only recently received this authorization and only because Federal Funds were made available, the state again, advocating its responsibility. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Port, which should rank among the leaders has steadily gone downhill. It has no source of revenue. The only revenues it realizes is what it realizes from its rentals. There is no taxing power, there is no bonding power and if we don't take this action today, I see nothing else on the horizon but chaos and the ultimate failure of the Port. The city I think has the facilities, they have the willingness to make this Port viable again. I can't impress upon you strongly enough how important I think this Bill is. The Chicago Regional Port District means much more to all of us than...than just those of us who reside in the Chicago area. This means helping economic conditions for the entire State of Illinois. I firmly believe that this Bill may be our last chance to save the Port and to save Revenue for the State of Illinois that are rapidly evaporating and running away to Indiana and Wisconsin and elsewhere. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I implore you it's in the interest of everyone of us who are citizens of the State of Illinois to vote to override this veto. This Port is all important for our economy and I...I think that everyone of us should face this responsibility today and give a over...an...a vote of confidence for the Chicago Regional Port District. Support this Bill, I think it's all important that we get behind it now. I can't



think of any reason for turning our backs on the Port District now. The state has had its chance. It has failed. I think now we have to go forward in this matter, and I urge you all to give an affirmative vote to this Motion."

Shea: "The third Member of the Thirtieth District, Mr. Giglio."

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

I, too, like to speak in behalf of this...ah...Override. I think Representative Collins brought up some very good points, and...ah...I'd like to say not only to the Thirtieth District but to the vital economy of the Chicago and Cook County area plus the State. If you just look and see what's going on in the State of Indiana, the new slips that they have in Burns Harbor where the new steel mills are, these ships are going right into there and the Port of Indiana supercedes far what the State of Illinois had in the...ah...Port District area. So without taking too much time of the House, I hope you take these comments very serme...serious thought and give us a...ah...resounding vote for this Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, The Assistant Minority Leader, William Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I beg to differ with the Members of the Thirtieth District, who are...ah...so enthusiastically in favor of this Bill. I'd like to point out that the Governor in his Message says that the Port Authority extends far beyond the City of Chicago and well into the suburban towns of Cook County, and also, indeed, into DuPage County. Now I suggest to you Mr. Speaker, that if the Authority includes those areas, then the people of those areas ought to have some decision making power in what happens to the Port and how the Port is operated. Now Mr. Speaker, the Governor again points out that if the Authority is underfunded, then the Authority ought to find means to be properly funded, and there's nothing to suggest that the City of Chicago, who have revenue problems all their own, that we're told about, almost daily, when we're here, that they could fund it any better. Now I suggest to you Mr. Speaker that we ought to maintain the Port Authority as it is, and



if, indeed, we are losing revenue because the Authority is mismanaged, then find managers of that Authority who can broadly represent the state and not just one small geographical area of the state, because it is a state problem, not a City of Chicago problem. So I would urge you to vote 'no' on the Gentleman's Motion to Override."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos to close."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would like to state further that in answer to the Min...Assistant Minority Leader remarks. This particular Port District is self-funding. It raises its own funds from its bond issues, and the only income it has is from its rentals and leases that it has in its own Port District. And the fact that when the Governor's Veto stated that the Authority goes beyond the City of Chicago limits, it is really a smoke screen, because presently Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the only property that is owned by this District is within the city limits and not outside. Originally they had the Authority, but it was found that it is not needed to have any other property that it has, and it has no funding. The City of Chicago is willing to undertake this responsibilities, and it will be by bond issues, not taxes. As I repeat, this will not cost the people of the State of Illinois, any tax money whatsoever. So therefore, I ask for your support on this particular important issue."

Shea: "The Gentleman's Motion is, that House Bill 2328 become law, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Deuster, to explain his vote."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In explaining my 'no' vote...ah.... Many people have asked, why is it that the City of New York is going down the road toward insolvency and bankruptcy, and yet the City of Chicago is in good condition. Many of the leaders of Chicago, and I believe the Mayor himself has said that one of the reason's that Chicago has not gone the way of New York is because the City of Chicago does not provide all the services of...in the way that the City



NOV 4 1975

96.

of New York does. They have separate units of government which carry on their separate...ah...functions, and this metropolitan area Port District is one of them. In a way voting 'yes' might saddle the City of Chicago with this financial responsibility which a day in the future might contribute toward sinking Chicago. I don't think any of us want to sink Chicago. None of us want to see Chicago go the way of New York, and I think a responsible vote on this matter would be a 'no' vote."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Fleck, to explain his vote."

Fleck: "Mr. Speaker, I just rise to...ah...disagree with the previous speaker. I don't think that there's any person in this room or across the hall in the Senate who knows anything more about financing the City of Chicago than Mayor Daley does, and I say that as a Republican and I also say that as a citizen of the City. I had the misfortune of spending a week in New York the earlier part of this month, and I'll tell you, I came back from that town feeling damn glad and happy that we did have a Mayor Daley who understands the financing. I don't think this Legislature should put itself in the shoes of that Mayor when it comes to financing the City of Chicago, cause I don't think we're going the way of New York."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Madison County, Mr. Lucco, to explain his vote."

Lucco: "Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to explain my 'yes' vote."

Shea: "Proceed Sir."

Lucco: "We have a Port Authority known as the Tri-City Port Authority in my district at Granite City. Very much coal, very much grain is shipped out both ways on the Mississippi River. Much of the Southern Illinois coal and Southern Illinois grain goes up the Mississippi to the Illinois Canal and out this Port that we're now talking about, and I certainly would urge an 'aye' vote on this."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."



Matijevich: "Ah...Mr. Speaker...ah...I, too, think that really the vitality of Chicago is dependent upon its Port facilities, and I think the Governor erred in this case, and I join all of those voting 'aye' to provide the City of Chicago decent good Port facilities. I think it's important to Chicago. I think it's important to the State of Illinois and I vote 'aye'."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, very briefly. The motto of the City of Chicago is 'I Will'. This is a good Bill. We ask nothing from the rest of the state. Thank you."

Shea : "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the Record Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 119 'ayes', 30 'nays', 4 Members voting 'present', and the Gentleman's Motion that this...House Bill 2328 become law, the Motion of...the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding prevails. Mr. Bradley in the Chair."

Bradley: "On the Calendar under total Veto Motions, appears House Bill 2825. Representative Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ah...I would ask for a Override of the Governor's Veto of...ah...House Bill 2825, the Governor's Veto notwithstanding. House Bill 2825 would exempt persons who process junk autos into specific grades of iron and steel suitable for melting by steel mills from the requirements of returning auto titles to the Secretary of State, and their licensee requirements and their licensee record keeping requirements. Now in the Governor's Veto Message he says that the scrap processors that would receive this exemption would dispose of that portion of the vehicle that contains the vehicle identification number. Well now, that is true. But what we're talking about here Ladies and Gentlemen is the absolute end of the line for a junked auto. What we're talking about here is the auto when it is nothing more than a flattened pancake that's been through all the various processes where licensing would be required and now it's in the hands of the processors and ready for the steel mills. And without this Bill, we're going to have a serious problem, I know in our town or



any other town that do have a problem with abandoned automobiles. I have a telegram here that I got this morning from Jim Leshen, the Executive Director of the...ah... he says 'Representative Garmisa, strongly urge Override of Veto of House Bill 2825. Scrap processors cannot by legal definition in thirty-six states handle motor vehicles. They handle scrap. They are at the end of the line in the disposal and recyclable materials. The materials they receive contain no engines, no gas tanks, no wheels, and in most instances, are unidentifiable. As any type of motor vehicle, in most instances, they have been crushed and/or cubed and it is impossible to identify them as any type of motor vehicle. The requirements that they identify and maintain records of individual automotive bodies they receive is not only impossible, but would severely effect ongoing programs in employments at local levels in the State of Illinois'. This is from the Vehicle Recycling Board, James B. Leshen, the Executive Director. We also have a telegram here from Sam Bores who is the...ah...Executive Director of the Illinois Institute for Environmental Quality. Now Sam Bores says that the Illinois Institute for Environmental Quality concurs with the intent and purposes of House Bill 2825. Junked and abandoned automobiles are major solid waste problems for Illinois. The problem is being resolved by individuals in industry in response to the economic demand for secondary materials. The proposed Amendment would allow the system to continue. No government subsidies are involved. The Task Force believes this to be the best form of resource recovery. They urge approval of the Bill. Samuel G. Bores, Director. Ernest L. Harden, Secretary, Illinois Institute for Environmental Quality. I would urge a 'yes' vote to the Override of House Bill 2825."

Bradley: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. L...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Palmer? Pardon me Mr. Palmer. Pardon me Sir. We have an...ah...announcement or rather request. If anybody has found a pair of eyeglasses would they please bring them up to the Clerk's desk. We have a Gentleman who has



lost them and needs them so he can see how to vote. Mr.

Palmer proceed Sir."

Palmer: "Yes, if the Sponsor will yield for a question or so."

Bradley: "He indicates he will yield Sir."

Palmer: "Wouldn't this Bill actually help all those automobile theft rings that steal cars, strip them in two to three hours?"

Garmisa: "In no way, shape or form, Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "I don't understand. The way, if I understand it, they strip em, they can do it very readily, very fast, within the time limit I've stated and then...ah...they could take the parts including the motor identification number to the scrap processor so to speak and have it melted down without anything, without anything showing at all. It seems to me that that would help the...those groups. Maybe I misunderstand it, but ...ah...maybe you can explain that."

Garmisa: "Ah...yes, Representative Palmer. I think first of all we have to...ah...go into the various steps involved here then. This might be a little lengthy, but I'm happy to clarify the question that you're just asking there. Now in order to most properly understand the cycle through which an automobile passes from the steel mill to the automobile manufacturer to owner to auto wrecker to scrap processor, and back to the steel mills. It's essential to identify and understand the different roles that are played by the various industries to which an automobile passes during its free flight. In explaining these roles, I want to...it should be presumed that one industry is more...is no more important than any other. Rather each is important in its own individual and distinct way. Now the first industry that would become involved in this thing after an automobile is no longer useful as a motor vehicle is that of the hauler. The collector, the tow truck operator. Now it's there function to transport these vehicles to an auto wrecker or scrap processor and they derive their financial gain by furnishing the transportation services. At this time the titles still have to be available. Now the next step is that of an auto wrecker or a motor vehicle salvage dealer. Now he really operates an open



NOV 4 1976

100.

air-used parts warehouse. He derives his principle source of revenue from the sale of reusable parts. The hulk after it has been cannibalized for its usable parts is then flattened or smashed by a car smasher or car flattener so that it can be loaded on to a flatbed truck or a railroad car. In some instances the auto wrecker or salvage dealer performs the flattening himself. Now up to this stage, they have to show their vehicles...their title, their licensing, and everything else. And now we're talking about the cannibalized hulk. It's been stripped of its usable parts and it's been flattened. It's then sold to a scrap processor, and here's the fellow we're talking about. Now the scrap processor is a manufacturer who has invested literally millions of dollars in expensive machinery and equipment and he utilizes this to convert the automobile hulk when it finally reaches him at the end of the line and to prepare grades of scrap from having a new form, shape, name, chemical content use. At that stage, there's no way to identify the vehicle and this is the fellow that we're interested in and if he has to supply the title which is impossible for him to do, he would then go out of business and we would find that these heaps of automobiles would be clogging up our streets. They'd be in our Forest Preserve Districts. We wouldn't be able to destroy them or get rid of them at all, and right now these materials are sorely needed in industry."

Palmer: "Well, let me say this, that I...I agree this problem should be approached in some way. But I'm greatly concerned about that title, and if we're going to keep down the theft of automobiles that title has to be traceable at every step along the way. Now if we can work it out in some way that would...ah,ah... accomplish your result, not put anymore economic burden on the processor than is necessary, and yet at the same time preserving that traceability of that title, I think you've got...you...you... we've got a pretty good idea. I don't know that this Bill does that."

Bradley: "Further discussion. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."



Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I do have a further question, from Representative Garmisa."

Bradley: "He indicates he'll yield."

Deuster: "Ah...Representative Garmisa, when I lived in Chicago, I had a car that broke down and I could barely drive it, but it was drivable. I took it as an individual to a scrap yard and I drove it up in there, and they had one of these big machines and I had the title with me and I gave them the title and they gave me Fifty Dollars as I recall, and I stood there and had one of my children with me to watch to see what would happen. That's why I remember it so vividly. They took this machine, they smashed the car up into a cube and that was that. Ah... now, the law presently requires that you present a title. It seems to me if I, as an individual, could dispose of a car by taking it directly to the yard and to the scrap processor and convert it in a matter of fifteen minutes into the scrap cube. Certainly a theft ring could do the same thing, unless the law has changed, or the processes have changed, I think the Governor ah...Governor's Veto was wise, because there is a serious risk here. If one individual could do it, certainly a theft ring could. Now have things changed or what happened today that's different than when I scraped my car?"

Garmisa: "Talking about Representative Deuster...it's a good example of what I'm trying to tell you happens in the regular processing of these materials. You brought your car into the auto wrecker. Now you...he cannot flatten that car without him having a valid title to that car. He did have the valid title and the car is now flattened. Now he's through with that car. We're talking about the guy that he sends this bulk, it's nothing but a bulk that might only be a foot and a half by a foot and a half squared, and that bulk then is sent to the processor who is ready to put this thing into the mills. Now these processors at this point have no way of attaching a title to a piece of solid rock or a piece of solid steel, is what it is. Everything else has been removed. At this stage, you're talking about a manufacturing process and they have...and if they were to have the title attached



NOV 4 1975

102.

to this here bulk you're talking about, they couldn't possibly stay in business and service and dispose of all of the junked autos and all the junked hulks around the streets in the City of Chicago or anywhere else in the State of Illinois."

Deuster: "Are you saying that processors and wreckers are not one in the same?"

Garmisa: "No Sir, they are not."

Deuster: "Thank you."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Garmisa, to close."

Garmisa: "What we're talking about here Ladies and Gentlemen is clearing the environment all over the State of Illinois by disposing...by being able to dispose of all of the junked hulks that are nothing more than an unidentifiable piece of metal that has to...that we have to get out of our streets, out of our Forest Preserve Districts, our parks, or our highways. And the only way that the processors that are at the end of the line, say they can stay in business, is and I understand the Secretary of State is all for this Bill. He has not...ah...voiced any objections to it. It is a good Bill. We need this Bill. We need the metals that the industry will derive thereof, and I do ask for your support of the Override of this Veto."

Bradley: "The question is, shall House Bill 2825 pass? The Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Mr. Leinenweber, did you want to explain your vote on this? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Fleck, to explain his vote."

Fleck: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think there is indeed a lot of confusion on this and I'll explain why. Last Friday, I was at one of these scrap processors. They had a shredding operation. They shred approximately three and a half hundred million pounds of steel in automobiles per year. There are two of these shredding operations in Cook County and five to six in the entire State of Illinois. Now when you're worried about stealing cars and auto theft rings, the money is not in the hulk of the car because the transportation it costs to the processors is too much for a car thief to bear. What they do is they steal the



NOV 4 1975

103.

car, they strip the car, and then they abandon the hulk on the roadway, and that is it. What happens? The County Sheriff's Police, the City Police drag that car to their pound, and they finally auction it off and even after it's stolen. So this is really a Bill where the insurance industry got involved in it, because they want to save their backside. It's very bad. The Institute of Environmental Quality went up the wall when they found out about the Governor's Veto of this Bill. It does... it kills and stifles any recycling of metal, and I'm talking in tons and tons and hundreds and hundreds of tons of steel and it's going to cost a lot of energy, payment by the steel industry to produce virgin ore to replace that metal, and I think this Bill obviously won't get Overridden, and I've got to compliment the insurance industry on one great stroke against recycling metal in this state."

Bradley: "Mr...The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber, to explain his vote."

Leinenweber: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm voting 'aye' on this for one reason, and I see that it is an attempt, a rather minimal attempt to reduce red tape and regular governmental regulations on the private business industry. As it has been pointed out by many speakers, this Bill is absolutely unnecessary...this regulation is absolutely unnecessary and ought to be done away with. If you want to get rid of all the junk cars on the street, make it profitable to do so, and I suggest you vote 'aye'. If you want these junks to continue to clutter up the streets then don't give an 'aye' vote. I would urge an 'aye'."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Yes Mr. Speaker. Ah...I have the staff analysis on the Veto here. The Republican Staff Analysis, and I'd like to read it into the Record. 'The Governor's comments are reflecting fears of Senate Republican Staff that the Bill would break the link between stolen cars and police trying to find the car. However, no law enforcement officers testified against the Bill in Committee, and the only way law enforcement personnel could find stolen vehicles



at a plant would be to go through the wrecks, car by car, and trace the identification number.' All right there's one parenthesis which perhaps Representative Garmisa could clear up, and the reason I'm voting 'present' still, and that is it's related to House Bill 2220, which defines scrap processor, and this is bottled up in a Senate Committee. Now I don't see a loophole that's...that nonpassage of 2220 would give the crooks, and if he would reassure us that there isn't such a loophole, I'll be happy to vote in favor of it."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea, to explain his vote."

Shea: "Well, I would like to tell Mr. Skinner that I was the Chief Sponsor of House Bill 2220, and that the difference between the two Bills is that I think this one is much cleaner than 2220. This I think does the job and will allow us to clean-up the streets of the municipalities in the cities and get these junks off the street and into the processing plants. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote on these Bills...ah...on this Bill, because I think it's so important to doing the job we're trying to do in the municipalities of this state."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Palmer, to explain his vote."

Palmer: "Well, I would agree that it's going to clean up the streets, but I'll tell you something else. I think it's going to clean-up the evidence in certain areas of criminal offenses of stolen cars, and that's the point that I think we should address ourselves to. I agree that there should be something done in respect to this matter, but I believe that that title should find its way back to the Secretary of State, and that a legal disposition of that car is made. I think without...ah...the title, the way the Bill is set up now, I believe that there is no way that that can be done. Thank you."

Bradley: "Mr. Friedrich were you seeking recognition Sir? Have all voted who wished? On this question...take a Record. On this question there are 122 'ayes', 12 'nays', 14 voting 'present', and this Motion having received a majority is hereby declared adopted. If the House will stand at ease just briefly, we would like to take time to allow the Clerk to read in some House Bills first reading."



Fred Selcke: "House Bill 3181, Dave Jones. Amends the Court of Claims Act, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3182, Jones. Appropriates \$433,500.00 to the Court of Claims, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3183, Jones. Appropriates \$263,420.77 to the State Comptroller, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3184, Schraeder. New Act, provides for transfer from Motor Fuel Tax Fund to Common School Fund of \$81,000,000,000, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3185, Schraeder. Provides the transfer from Motor Fuel Tax Fund to General Revenue of Thirty-one point Three Million, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3186, Getty. Amends Fiscal Year 1976 appropriation, Illinois Law Enforcement Commission, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3187, Londrigan. Appropriates \$405,000.00 to Capital Development Bond Fund and the Capital Development Board for Land Acquisition henceforth, First Reading of the Bill. No further...ah...First Readings."

Bradley: "On the Calendar under Amendatory Vetoes appears a Motion to accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 221, Mr. Londrigan. Mr. Londrigan House Bill 221. Amendatory Veto. You accepting the Veto Sir?"

Londrigan: "Yes, I make a Motion to accept the Veto. It's merely a clarifying language. No problems at all. The Governor's people thought it should say 'unpaid as well as approved' and everybody's in agreement on it now and I ask approval."

Bradley: "The question is, shall the Governor's Specific Recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 221 be accepted by the adoption of the Amendment? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question we have 156 'ayes', 1 voting 'no', 1 'present', and this Motion having received the Majority is hereby declared adopted. under Amendatory Veto Motions appears House Bill 504, Mr. Palmer."

Palmer: "Mr. Speaker, I move to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto and language change in House Bill 504. When House Bill 504 left the House last Spring, it provided some measure of relief for a



home owner who had contracted to have some home repairs done on his house and it applied then to the single...ah...the residents owner occupied residents and it provided two things additional to the Mechanics Lien Act, one is that the contractor had to give the owner notice that the names of those persons with whom he had subcontracted his work and provided also that the subcontractor had to notify the owner that he was doing the work and the nature in the extent of the work, etc., with a notification that...ah...not to pay the contractor until he received a waiver. This is a matter of concern to many people throughout the state and was devised to protect the unsoph...unsophisticated property owner. It went over to the Senate and they added the Owner Occupied Residences of...of multiple family residences, five units or less. The Governor saw fit to veto out the...that portion of the Bill. It provided for five...ah...the multi residents feature of the Bill and left it then in the position that it left the House last Spring. Ah...I then now move to concur with the language changes made in this Bill by the Amendatory Veto."

Bradley: "The...The question is, shall the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 504 be accepted by adoption of the Amendment. All in favor will vote, will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Bradley 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 149 'ayes', 2 'no's', 2 voting 'present' and this motion having receive the Constitutional majority is hereby declared adopted. The Gentleman from ...Berman 'aye', Lechowicz 'aye'. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider, for an announcement."

Schneider: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I think the...ah...Calendar shows two listings for the Committee on Education. The correct listing is Thursday at 8:30 in the morning for the Committee. I thought while we had a full House I should make that announcement for those people who are interesetd. So the meeting is Thrusday at 8:30 in our usual meeting place, C-1."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."



Shea: "Mr. Speaker, might I ask the Chair to look at the posting notice for that Committee and see if that Bill was posted on a day the House was in Session?"

Bradley: "In respect to your request sir, without looking I am sure that the House was not in Session when that was posted."

Shea: "Then I would say that It is an improper posting of the meeting and there can be no meeting according to the Rules of this House."

Shea: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "I rise...Oh...Thank you Mr. Speaker...ah...I don't know if this is the time to get involved in that discussion, but I think..ah...the individual challenging the posting time is certainly aware of the fact that the Committee, many Committees met during the summer. I also want to point out that the Rules appear to be silent on the question of motion. We are not considering a Resolution nor a Bill and I think that when a motion comes before the Committee that a Chairman has to make that distinction and I think many times we have argued about the viability and the credibility of the Committee system and I'm not likely to be the kind of person as Chairman to run to my Majority Leader to raise questions about whether or not I have posted properly. I think the responsibility of a Committee and a Chairman are to function in that...ah...with that responsibility and so my feeling is that it's clear that we as a Committee acted properly in posting the motion and it's up to the individual who has filed the motion...ah...to have a response or for me at least he would anticipate it and I think it's consistent with the Rules, I think it's consistent with fair procedure for all Members and I think we ought to hear the Bill while, rather hear the motion and consider whatever the challenges are at a time if and when that Bill is heard on the Floor. So I believe it's on that basis in part at least that I made that decision and I think it's a just and a fair one."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Well I think this statement of the Gentleman comes a little premature. I think that immediately following the adjournment of



this Session, we're going into a Special Session and I think at that time there's several questions several of the Members would like to raise about how a Committee Chairman could sit on a Committee Report for a week because he wants to do something contrary to the Rules of this House."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Well thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Once again to point out to Mr. Shea, who appears to be a bit of a peripatetic Parliamentarian...ah...he...he found it important to appear in Committee the other night because he felt that none of the Members could raise questions that he had to raise and I suspect that's how he reflects on the Democratic Members as well as the Republican Members because he had to raise the question. Now I think that of course is an insult to those people who serve on the Committee. But more importantly it should be pointed out that the motion was filed like any other motion to reconsider within the twenty-four hour time. I sat on the proposal, indeed I was out of town until I was informed by Mr. Polk of his interest. My... my Clerks had not released the Bill by the next morning and that is the time, I think, if you will check Mr. Shea, in which the motion was filed indeed when it, again when it was posted. So I think you're presumptuous as always about your infalability and I would judge that...ah...again the decision is fair and that maybe if you stuck to being a Majority Leader and quit acting as a Member of a Committee in which you only have the right to ask questions and not vote, then I think the system would function very well without you."

Fred Selcke: "House Joint Resolution, Constitutional Amendment 35. Maragos et al. Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 79th General Assembly of the State of Illinois. The Senate concurring herein. There shall be submitted to the electors of the State for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least six months after the adoption of this resolution, a proposition to amend Section 4 of Article IX of the Constitution to read as follows: Article IX, Section 4. Real Property Taxation.
(a) Except as otherwise provided in this Section, taxes upon



NOV 4 1975

109.

real property shall be levied uniformly by valuation ascertained by the General Assembly as the General Assembly shall provide by law. (b) Subject to such limitations as the General Assembly may hereafter prescribe by law, counties may classify or to continue to classify real property for purposes of taxation. Any such classification shall be reasonable and assessments shall be uniform within each class. The level of assessment or rate of tax of the highest class in a county shall not exceed two and one-half times the level of assessment or rate of tax of the lowest class in that county. Real property used in farming in a county shall not be assessed at a higher level of assessment than single family residential real property in that county. (c) Any depreciation in the value of real estate occasioned by a public easement may be deducted in assessing such property.

First Reading of the Constitutional Amendment."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker I was wondering if it's the appropriate time to make a motion regarding assigning certain measures to the Revenue Committee for the Committee on Assignments?"

Bradley: "Could you hold that....We'd like to go back to Amendatory Vetoes. On the Calendar appears House Bill 79, in respect to this Amendatory Motion, Mr. Emil Jones." While we're waiting for Emil Jones. Mr. Jones, just a minute. For what purpose does the Gentleman from McClain, Mr. Deavers arise?"

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker, on page four of the Calendar I have seven Bills. 1454, 1455, 1458, 1459, 1460, 1461 and 1462. I'd like to Table them."

Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Leave being granted the Bills are Tabled. Could you read those...those Bills one more time Mr. Deavers for the Clerk?"

Deavers: "1454, 1455, 1458, 1459, 1460, 1461 and 1462."

Bradley; "Now back to Mr. Jones who...with respect to House Bill 79."

Jones: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 79 was a Bill to amend the Small Business Purchasing Act to provide for to set aside Construction contracts. Ah...Under the Governors Amendatory Veto he restricted it to the General Service



NOV 4 1975

110.

Construction Contract only and I move that we accept the Governors Amendatory veto."

Bradley: "Discussion? If none the question is, shall the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 79 be accepted by adoption of the motion? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 127 'ayes', 2 'nays', 5 voting 'present' and this motion having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared adopted. Mr. Lechowicz, do you have a motion sir or on a Committee report?"

Lechowicz: "We'll have them in..in a minute Mr. Speaker, we're just trying to find the time."

Bradley: "All right."

Lechowicz: "Let me ask you a question. Do you know what time we're coming back in the morning?"

Bradley: "I'm going to give it a guesstimate at 10:00. I think..."

Lechowicz: "All right, so Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House I'd like to make an announcement if I may and ask leave of the House to have the following Bills heard tomorrow morning in Appropriations Committee at 9:00 in Room 114 and the Bill numbers are as follows. House Bill 3130, Representative Londrigan, House Bill 3154, Representative Taylor, House Bill 3169, Representative Hanahan. House Bill 3170, Representative Hanahan. House Bill 3179, Representative D'Arco, House Bill 3180, Representative Bradley, House Bill 3181, Rperesentative Jones...J. D. Jones. House Bill 3182, Representative J. D. Jones. House Bill 3183. Representative J. D. Jones."

Bradley: "Well on the Gentlemans motion, I think we'd better have a Roll Call but first the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, are you seeking recognition sir?"

Lechowicz: "That's Appropriations I, we'll meet tomorrow morning on those Bills."

Bradley: "Appropriations I. Mr....The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes on the Gentlemans motion."



Barnes: "I have a similar motion, maybe we can take them both at the same time."

Bradley: "Well let's take the motion by...What's your motion sir?"

Barnes: "It's the same. I would move to be joined in that motion for Appropriations II to have House Bill 3131 heard tomorrow morning at 9:00 A.M. in room 1..ah..118."

Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, on the motion."

Schlickman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Bradley: "Which one sir Mr. Barnes or Mr. Lechowicz? Let's go to Mr. Lechowicz on the..on the..."

Schlickman: "That's the Gentleman I had in mind."

Bradley: "Fine."

Schlickman: "When were these Bills introduced?"

Lechowicz: "Gene, I believe you heard them read this afternoon. I believe these Bills were the product of a discussion that was held in the Rules Committee and in turn they were discussed in length at the Rules Committee, they were read for the first time and assigned this afternoon. That's why...May I also add that most of them are ordinary and contingent expenses of the respective agencies and with...I guarantee you they'll have a full hearing, you're more than welcome to attend the hearing tomorrow morning they will be discussed in length."

Schlickman: "Well..."

Lechowicz: "I would like to also add that Representative Londrigan just came up to me and asked that my original motion be amended to include House Bill 3187 as well, which was introduced today."

Schlickman: "Well Mr. Speaker, would it be in order, since we have no synopsis of these Bills that in addition to giving us the number of the Bills we are told the amount that is appropriated to be appropriated, the fund from which the amount would be appropriated and the object and purpose of the appropriation."

Bradley: "How soon did you want this sir?"

Schlickman: "Right now before we vote on it. Because we're...he's asking us to suspend the Rules..."



NOV 4 1975

112.

Bradley: "Hold that request, hold that request for just a second. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This comes as a total surprise to me as the minority spokesman on this Appropriations II and I would ask that the Sponsors of both these Motions hold them for a few minutes so I can find out what's wrong."

Bradley: "Hold the Motion, then, for just a few moments. We will go to the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce, on a Motion."

Pierce: "An announcement, Mr. Speaker. The Energy Subcommittee of the House Committee on Environment Energy and Natural Resources was scheduled at 4:00 PM this afternoon. We'll postpone that meeting because it's getting so late until 9:00 AM tomorrow morning when the full Committee is meeting in Room 118 just to hear reports from subcommittees. Mr. Getty's subcommittee on Natural Resources will meet at 8:00 AM, so the Calendar is in error. The Subcommittee on Natural Resources meets at 8:00 AM and the full Environment Energy and Natural Resources Committee will meet at 9:00 AM in Room 118. The meeting scheduled for 4:00 PM this afternoon of the Energy Subcommittee will be consolidated with a full Committee meeting tomorrow morning at 9:00."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, the Assistant Minority Leader, could I ask you to wait one minute, Sir? Mr. Ryan, Mr. Ryan, are you and Mr. Lechowicz getting together on a proposed meeting for tomorrow? O'kay. Mr. Walsh, proceed Sir."

Walsh: "Ah.... I just want to be brought up to date. Is the Gentleman moving to suspend the Rules relative to posting?"

Bradley: "Yes, Sir."

Walsh: "And what, he's talking with ah....."

Bradley: "He's now back discussing with your spokesman on the Committee the Bills and the appropriate actions to take."

Walsh: "Perhaps you can answer this, has he talked with the Minority Leader?"

Bradley: "I, frankly, don't know, Sir."

Walsh: "Wouldn't you have advised him to talk to the Minority Leader before going this?"



NOV 4 1975

113.

Bradley: "I thought he had, Sir. Now, the Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker, I have a Resolution on the Table and I wonder if the Clerk would read it and then I'd like to make a Motion."

Bradley: "Resolutions. Read Mr. Hill's Resolution."

Fred Selcke: "House Resolution 529. Hill et al. Whereas in the Northern Illinois areas plagued by illegal importing and sale of heroin from Mexico; and whereas it has been alleged in the Aurora Beacon News and Chicago Sun Times and by others that there exists a large, wide, well-organized, illicit drug network that begins in the open fields of Mexico and ends with the delivery and sale of heroin in Northern Illinois; and whereas it is alleged that this major, illicit drug network has been shipping in Mexican brown heroin into Northern Illinois for more than ten years; and whereas it is alleged that the City of Aurora and the communities of Blue Island and Roseland are an integral part of this illicit drug network and that these communities are often used as dropoff points for heroin which is then distributed through the Northern Illinois area; and whereas it is alleged that this illicit drug network causes additional crime such as robbery, burglary and theft, all committed in an attempt to raise funds to purchase heroin, and whereas it is alleged that the City of Aurora, in addition to the above allegations, is the sender of a war between competing drug operations and is experiencing an abnormally high crime rate because of illegal drug activities; and whereas these allegations if true cause the People of Aurora and the entire Northern Illinois area and the State of Illinois immeasurable harm. Therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 79th General Assembly of the State of Illinois that we direct the Illinois Legislative Investigating Commission to investigate the allegations of an illicit Mexico-Northern Illinois drug network to investigate the movement of heroin into and out of the City of Aurora and the entire Northern Illinois area and investigate the fencing of items taken by robbery, burglary and theft and report its findings together with its recommendations, if any, to the General Assembly within 120 days after the day of the adoption of this House Resolution."



Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I talked to the Leadership on both sides of the aisle. I talked to the Chairman of the Executive Committee and the Minority Leader and also the Chairman of the Commission, and they have told me that they certainly are for this Resolution and not in opposition to it, and at this time I would like to suspend Rule #41 and have House Resolution 529 considered immediately."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves for the unanimous consent to suspend the appropriate Rule for immediate consideration. Is there objection? Hearing none, the Rule is suspended. Now, on the Resolution."

Hill: "I move the adoption of ah....."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of the Resolution. All those in favor will vote 'aye'. Those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. Duff 'aye'. On this question, there are 134 'ayes', 1 'nay' and the Gentleman's Motion to adopt the Resolution is adopted. Geo-Karis 'aye'. Go ahead, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, I had it on 'yes' and one of my little gremlins around here went and grabbed before I had a chance to put it back."

Bradley: "Well, then we just got you changed from 'nay' to 'aye'. All right let's see we've got all kinds of People who wants to make Resolutions. We'll start with Mr. Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, wish to request that we suspend the appropriate Rule for immediate consideration of House Resolution 504. I believe the Clerk has it on the desk there."

Bradley: "Will you read the Resolution 504. Mr. Walsh, would you come to the Podium?"

Fred Selcke: "House Resolution 504. Williams. Whereas the Progressive structure of taxation at the Federal level has provided the Federal Government within an elastic revenue base, which expands more rapidly than does the economy as a whole during inflationary times; and whereas State and Local governments have adopted forms of taxation which bounce the impact of Federal taxation, providing for a Nation-wide taxation which promotes economic growth, which is fair and equitable; and whereas the free enterprise economy as eliminated capacity to absorb taxation while supporting economic growth; and whereas State



and Local governments have acted responsibly in the maintenance of a just system of taxation have not levied taxes to the point of overburdening the private sector; and whereas inflation has decreased the ability of local governments to sustain needed service for the People; and whereas the needs of local governmental units vary from State to State and according to services which local units are required to perform; and whereas the Federal government has recognized the problem facing local governments in providing needed services without excessive taxation and as has enacted a program of financial aid to the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972 to address the situation; and whereas the situation facing the State and Local governmental units has become worse between the enactment of the Fiscal Assistance Act of today and whereas there is overwhelming evidence in government which have received revenue sharing funds from the Fiscal Assistance Act have made responsible use of these funds for the benefit of these people. Therefore, be it resolved by the House of the 79th General Assembly of the State of Illinois that we memorialize the Congress of the United States to continue a program of Federal Revenue Sharing as enacted by the State and Local Fiscal Assistance Act of 1972 and substantiate the form, in which it has been conducted; and be it further resolved that the Secretary of State of Illinois is directed to transmit copies of this Preamble and Resolution to the Honorable and Members of the Illinois Delegation to the Congress of the United States."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to suspend the Rules for immediate consideration and adoption of the Resolutions. Is there objections? Mr.

Walsh."

Walsh: "Ah..... I object, Mr. Speaker."

Bradley: "There is objection. The Gentleman moves to suspend Rule for immediate consideration. All those in favor will vote 'aye'. Those opposed will vote 'nay'. It requires 107 votes. Yes, Sir, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, I just wanted to explain my vote."

Bradley: "Oh, sorry. All those in favor will vote 'aye'. Those opposed will vote 'nay'. It requires 107 votes for immediate consideration of the Resolution. Mr. Walsh to explain his vote."



government, and as I said in the beginning, it's our money that's coming back to us. At least, part of it is and we ought to memorialize Congress to continue that program for the benefit of our communities."

Bradley: "Mr. Brinkmeier, do you wish to explain your vote?"

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, as far as I'm concerned, Revenue Sharing is one of the biggest frauds that has ever been perpetrated on the People of the United States, particularly those here in Illinois. I would just want to make one observation only. I would like for each one of you to remember for every dollar that we get back from Washington, we're sending them about \$1.82, the last time that I saw this. Now we're sharing our revenue all right. We're sharing with Alabama, Mississippi and Georgia and so on, some of these other States, and if that's what you want, vote green, but if you want to keep that money home in Illinois and spend it here where I think we need it, then I think you should be voting red."

Bradley: "Mr..... Mrs. Geo-Karis, to explain her vote."

Geo-Karis: "Ah..... first of all, I would like to be recorded as green, and the reason I would like to be recorded as green, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to explain my vote, now whether we like it or not, our money goes to Washington and I think what we have to keep in mind is at least we are getting some of it back for local use, and it's better than nothing. That's why I'm voting green."

Bradley: "Mr. Lechowicz to explain his vote."

Lechowicz: "Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, if I may. Revenue Sharing is provided for a very needed monetary amount of money into the cities. Representative Bluthardt was absolutely correct, as the Mayor of Schiller Park and the Mayor of Franklin Park, who is presenting this Resolution before he can attest to it. These items have..... This Resolution has the full support of the Illinois Municipal League. I discussed this with Steve Sargent and Tom Fitzsimmons last night and they in turn just reminded me of the fact of the importance in every one of our meetings within the State of Illinois that we have, Revenue Sharing has always been a top priority. I have discussed this issue in Boston, at the National League of Cities meeting, where the President of the League at that time, went on record and the Mayors throughout the States went on record strongly requesting President Ford to reinstate



NOV 4 1975

118.

the Policy of Revenue Sharing. Ladies and Gentlemen, may I just stress the importance of this Resolution, based upon the fact of all the municipalities in Illinois and what it means to all the residents of these respective municipalities. I strongly recommend an aye vote. Thank you."

Bradley: "Mr. Williams to close."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was just watching the vote there, but I wanted to point out that the State of Illinois also gets about \$110 million here and here we're talking about Revenue, but I think everyone, I see we have 110 votes, so thank you."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Take the Record. On this question, there are 116 'ayes', 22 'nays', 7 Members voting 'present' and the Gentleman's Motion prevails. Now the Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Resolution. All those in favor will say 'aye'. Those opposed 'nay'. In the Opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Motion carries. Now the Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd, on a Motion."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'm sorry to take time for this Resolution, but I would also move for the unanimous consent to consider ah..... House Joint Resolution #70."

Bradley: "Have you got a copy of the Resolution?"

Mudd: "Yes, Sir."

Bradley: "What is it, Fred? It's Joint House Resolution, what's...."

Fred Selcke: "House Joint Resolution 70."

Bradley: "Read the Resolution, please."

Fred Selcke: "Whereas the Illinois Department of Conservation is presently engaged in site and campground development at the Two Lawn Parkway project and where as it was and is the intent of the 79th General Assembly that such work cease for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976; and whereas such intended 79th General Assembly was expressed from the \$300,000 appropriation for the above project was deleted from House Bill 1552 by the Senate by the Adoption of Senate Amendment #5 and by the House of Representatives concurrence in such Amendment; and whereas House Bill 1552 subsequently became law, Public Act 79-277, without the \$300,000 appropriation for the site and campground development at the Two Lawn Parkway Project; Therefore be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 79th General Assembly



State of Illinois, Senate concurring herein, that we again state that it is the intent of the 79th General Assembly that work cease during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976 on site and campground development at the Two Lawn Parkway Project and that a copy of this document be presented to the Governor and to the Director of Conservation."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves for the suspension of the appropriate Rule for the immediate consideration of the Resolution, and on that, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Ah..... Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Mudd: "Yes, Sir, I would."

Pierce: "Does this have to do with the Rock Island Trail, Conservation Trail?"

Mudd: "Yes, Sir, it does."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, this Rock Island.....I'm going to oppose the Gentleman's Motion. Ah..... the Rock Island Trail was a subject that came before the Committee on Environment Energy and Natural Resources when Representative Neff presented three trail Bills. They're not on interim study in the Committee. I would say just this. The Resolution may have merit or may not have merit, but I would suggest the Resolution be referred to a Committee, preferably the Committee on Environment Energy and Natural Resources, which could meet tomorrow morning at Nine when we have a scheduled meeting on the Resolution. I think this is ah..... controversial resolution. There's some merit in the Resolution and there's some people opposed to it, including the Department of Conservation."

Bradley: "Is that agreeable to you, Mr. Mudd?"

Mudd: "Ah..... I would like..... I think there's some misunderstanding on this Resolution. When the General Assembly considers the Bills that contained the funding for this project this year, they specifically cut out the dollar amount that made this project possible as far as construction to proceed this year, and to me what that meant in both the Senate and the House, to me what that meant, that this Legislature said, in effect, we do not intend to put \$300,000 into the Appropriation for any project for this purpose this fiscal year. Now we made a judgement and a decision as a Legislative Body, and to allow the Conservation Department to proceed and expend these funds and commit



future funds for this project over and above the decision that this Legislature has made earlier this year, for allowing the Administration to go over the head of this policy making project, I think it's a serious decision. I think ah..... I certainly would oppose the Legislative Body and its policy making decision and I would hope that every Legislator on this Floor would also do that. I don't think that we should give the power to any administrative body to spend funds that we distinctly delete from an Appropriation Bill. Now this is \$300,000 and committing to a Million dollars for a parkway that the District....."

Bradley: "Mr. Mudd, please. Mr. Meyer is raising a Point of Order."

Meyer: "I don't believe there's a Motion in front of the House, Mr. Chairman."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moved for the suspension of the appropriate Rule for the immediate consideration....."

Meyer: "Is that debatable?"

Bradley: "Is that your Point?"

Meyer: "That's my new Point."

Bradley: "Well taken, Sir. The Gentleman has had the Resolution read. It's a nondebatable Motion. It takes 107 votes. All those in favor will vote 'aye'. Those opposed will vote 'nay'. Now, Mr. Meyer."

Meyer: "Mr. Speaker, this is an important Resolution. It should be referred to Committee. As Chairman Pierce indicated, the Environmental Committee, we had over 30 people that came down to testify on the Rock Island Trail Bills. Representative Neff, who was the Sponsor of those Bills, three in a series, agreed to put them in Interim Study Committee. This Resolution should be considered with these Bills, and for that reason, I am opposing the Motion."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd."

Mudd: "I can see where ah.... some of the Members feel that the Administration has more authority on spending funds than we do or earmarking those funds, so I would suggest that we do send a Bill to Committee and I might remind the Members that this is a very important Resolution because while we are considering these Bills in interim study, the



Conservation Department is expending money working on this trail, so...ah...I believe it is important. I would only hope that we will get a Committee to consider this Bill before they expend these funds. So I move that it go to a Committee."

Shea: "All right. Now Mr. Pierce do you have a Committee Meeting tomorrow?"

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, there's a Committee Meeting scheduled in Room 118, we just confirmed that, at 9:00 A.M. The Appropriations can meet on the Floor of the House, Mr. Lechowicz, if that's all right. Well, whatever's meeting, we're scheduled 118 in the Calendar."

Shea: "Do you have a Motion with regards to this Resolution which was just assigned to your Committee?"

Pierce: "Well, I will...I will move to suspend the Rules that we will...ah...for immediate...ah...for the consideration of the Resolution, at the Meeting tomorrow morning at 9:00 A.M. of the Committee, and at that time, I...I so move."

Shea: "Is there objection? Hearing none, leave is granted. Now Mr. Maragos had an announcement."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. It's not a announcement. I'd like to have a Motion that House Bill 3160 be put on the Interim Study Calendar of the Revenue Committee, and I'd like to have leave for that purpose."

Shea: "Mr. Maragos moves that House Bill 3160 be taken from the Speaker's Table, placed in the Committee on Revenue, and placed in Interim Study. Does he have leave? Hearing no objections, it will be Ordered. Now..."

Maragos: "Parliamentary Inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "You've got another one?"

Maragos: "I want an inquiry if I may, Mr. Speaker. Ah...on the Constitutional Amendment's, do they need any special Motions to be referred to a Committee or...er...ah...?"

Shea: "Sam, I don't know. We'll look at it tomorrow. Is that okay?"

Maragos: "Thank you."



Shea: "Okay, now back to Mr. Garmisa with Railroad Relocation Problems. Turn on Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to move to suspend the Rule adopted October 22 and 1975 so that House Bills 3164 and 3165, Committee Bills of the Committee on Transportation appear on the Calendar tomorrow on the Order of House Bills Third Reading and be considered by the House during the current Session."

Shea: "The Gentleman's Motion is to advance to the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day, today, have the Bills read a second time, and then advance to the Order of Third Reading. Is there objection? We have objection or a Parliamentary Inquiry from Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I won't object if I know what it's all about. But I'd like to know what it's all about first. I want to know what the emergency is and...ah...and I'd be happy not to object."

Shea: "All right. I think that perhaps the Bills they are talking about Gentlemen and Ladies are the Bills regarding Railroad Relocation and on that question perhaps one of the Member's of the Committee, Mr. Dunn or Mr. Neff. Let's go to Mr. Dunn first, and let him explain the necessity of why these Bills need to be advanced."

Dunn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Your Speaker is correct. We have two Bills. One is an Appropriation Bill, the other is a Substantive Bill. They are both Committee Bills originating in the Committee on Transportation of the House. The purpose of these Bills is to enact the state plan in order to have available a plan to dovetail with the...ah, ah...federal plan, the Conrail Plan, so that ten central lines...railroad lines in the State of Illinois that are proposed for abandonment can be subsidized and operated for a period of two years. Now there is a real need for immediate consideration of these matters because the final system plan of the U. S. Railroad Association will become effective, I believe, next week, and railroad lines, railroad



NOV 4 1975

123.

service will be terminated in February of 1976. If we don't have a plan in action and adopted and signed by the Governor during the Session that we're in now, we will have no vehicle to take over these lines that are proposed for abandonment, and there will be interruption of services in many of your districts throughout the state. So we need to have this done this Session. We need to get these Bills through the House, through the Senate, and we need to have them signed by the Governor."

Shea: "Is there any further discussion or objection with regard to these Bills? Does the Gentleman have leave on his Motion? Hearing no objection, Mr. Clerk, read the Bills a second time."

Fred Selcke: "Ah...House Bill 3164. A Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments. Any from the Floor?"

Shea: "Any Amendments from the Floor? Third Reading."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 3165. A Bill for an Act to appropriate One Million, Six Hundred Thousand from the Road Fund in the Department of Transportation for Rail Freight Service Assistant Program, and so forth, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Shea: "Any Amendments from the Floor? Third Reading. Now, let's see. Mr. Lechowicz, the Committee on Appropriations. Did you and Mr. Ryan work out all your...Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm not sure what the Motion is. Could we have the Motion restated and the Bills...ah...I certainly have some discussion before we go to it, the vote at least."

Shea: "All right, now, Mr. Lechowicz, from the Committee on Appropriations has a Motion."

Lechowicz: "Ah...thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to also apologize to the House for the confusion that transpired about fifteen minutes ago. But many of the Bills that were read for the first time today, we in turn did not know that they were forthcoming, and for that reason the Motion was held in abeyance until we finally got a total number of



Bills that have been read by the Clerk for the first time, and have been assigned into the respective Committees. Mr. Speaker, I would like to, at this time, suspend the appropriate Rules to have the following Bills heard in Appropriations I at 8:30 tomorrow morning in Room 114. The Bill numbers are as follows: House Bill 3130; House Bill 3141; House Bill 3154; House Bill 3179; House Bill 3180; 3182; 3182; 3183; 3184; 3185; 3186 and 3187. I briefly mentioned some of the Sponsors before on the Bills. We will work tonight to make sure that the analysis is completed for tomorrow morning. I'm also...it's been brought to my attention there'll be objection to two Bills, and on that I'll yield to Representative James Houlihan, who will be objecting to two Bills, I believe, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "Now, before we get there, so we get the Record straight. The two Bills that you read on the first Motion that you have not read now. 3154, 3169 and 3170."

Lechowicz: "That is correct Mr. Speaker. On Appropriations II, and I will refer to Representative Boyle on that. They will meet tomorrow at 9:00 A.M., and will consider three Bills, House Bill 3131, 3169 and 3170."

Shea: "All right. The Gentleman's Motion is to suspend the appropriate Rule for immediate...for suspending the Rule with regards to posting and notice on these Bills and for consideration in a meeting of Appropriations I in Room 114 at 8:30 tomorrow morning. On that question, Mr. Ryan, the Minority Spokesman."

Ryan: "Well, thank you Mr. Speaker. I am not the Minority Spokesman on this Committee. Representative Totten is, but in his behalf I would like to"

Shea: "Well, is he on the Floor? Then are you speaking?"

Ryan: "I am speaking."

Shea: "Okay Sir."

Ryan: "Can't you tell? I'd like to ask the Sponsor of the Motion about a couple of these Bills, if that's in Order."

Shea: "He will yield Sir."

Ryan: "Representative Lechowicz, can you tell me what House Bill 3184



and House Bill 3185...ah...what the contents of those Bills are? They were just introduced. I can't seem to get a copy of them, and don't know what's in them for sure."

Lechowicz: "Well, I would like to yield to the Sponsor of the Bill, if I may, Representative Schraeder. I do have a copy of the Bill that was filed with the Clerk. House Bill 3184 which I believe is sponsored by Representative Schraeder, provides for a transfer from Motor Fuel Tax Funds to Common School Funds, the dollar amount of approximately Eighty-One Million Dollars. House Bill 3185 provides for a transfer from Motor Fuel Tax Funds to General Revenue, the amount of Thirty-One point Three Million Dollars. Ah...these are again, were Bills I was just informed about, about ten minutes ago as many of the Members were. They will have a full discussion in Committee, and the vote will be taken."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Representative Lechowicz, I question whether these should go into the Appropriation Meet...ah,ah... Committee, and...and...Appropriations I. It would seem to me they would be more appropriate in Appropriations II where we handle all the Education Bills during the Regular Session. If they have to go to an Appropriations Committee, I would certainly think that they would go to Appropriations II, but my first thought is they shouldn't even be in Appropriations because they are transfers."

Lechowicz: "Yeah, but they're transfer of appropriations George."

Ryan: "Should be in the Rules Committee."

Lechowicz: "And I'll tell you, I just signed a copy for the wonderful Attorney General. He transferred funds from one fund to another today, and that was a transfer of funds, and that's exactly what this is."

Shea: "The Minority Leader, Mr. Washburn."

Washburn: "Thank you...ah...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ah...I do have a copy of the Bills that were just laid on my desk a couple of minutes ago, and as Representative Lechowicz indicated they are transfer of funds. Certainly not ordinary and contingent expenses of any department. Ah...under



the Rules that we...ah...spoke about in the Rules Committee the other day, Bills such as this should be referred to the Rules Committee. They are not contingent and expense Bills. They do not contain that type of money. Now the Rules Committee met this afternoon and took up similar legislation and it was my understanding that when we left, the Chairman would call another meeting of the Rules Committee, probably, tomorrow. We didn't finish today, and...ah...certainly these two Bills cannot go into....or should not go into either Appropriations Committee. They should be referred to the Rules Committee, and I'm looking at the Chairman over there, and I suspect we'll meet again tomorrow, and I want to alert the Membership as to what the two Bills do. They transfer money from the Motor Fuel Tax Fund in the amounts of Eighty-One Million Dollars in one Bill, 3184, I believe it is, and in 3185, they transfer Thirty-One point Three Million, another Thirty-One point Three Million in addition to the Eighty-One Million from the Motor Fuel Tax Fund. So Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that these two Bills be stricken from that list contained in Representative Lechowicz' Motion, and that they be referred to the Rules Committee for consideration at the call of the Chairman of the Rules Committee."

Shea: "Mr. Schraeder, those are your two Bills, Sir. Those are transfer Bills, not Appropriation Bills."

Schraeder: "Yes Sir."

Shea: "All right. Why don't you file the appropriate Motion with the Clerk on those two Bills to have them heard before the Rules Committee Sir?"

Schraeder: "Very well."

Shea: "And then we'll take those two Bills out of the request...those are what Bills again, Mr. Washburn?"

Washburn: "I have them numbered...ah...Representative Lechowicz, I believe it was...ah...3184 contains a transfer of Eighty-One Million Dollars from the Motor Fuel Tax Fund to the Common School Fund and 3185, transfers Thirty -One point Three Million from the Motor Fuel Tax Fund to the General Revenue Fund."



Shea: "All right. Those Bills are taken out of Representative Lechowicz' request. They will be on a request before the Rules Committee according to the Rules, and I'm sorry for the inconvenience to the Minority Leader. Now is there any further objections Sir, on behalf on the Minority Leader. Turn Mr. Washburn on, please."

Washburn: "Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. As far as I know, the other Bills have been cleared and should be heard in Appropriations tomorrow morning."

Shea: "All right. Now back to Mr. Ryan, the Minority Spokesman."

Ryan: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Now, are we...the Motion made by Representative Lechowicz is only for Appropriations I, as I understand it, or is that now include Appropriations II?"

Shea: "No Sir. It appr...it moves for the Bills on 3130, 41, 54, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 86 and 87 for Appropriations I."

Ryan: "And that's the Motion we're going to act on."

Shea: "Yes Sir."

Ryan: "Thank you."

Shea: "On the Motion, the Representative from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, J."

Houlihan, J.: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, if the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee could briefly explain 86 and 87. I don't have those Bills in front of me."

Shea: "Turn Mr. Lechowicz on please."

Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ah...yes Jim. House Bill 3186 is a Appropriations Bill, Illinois Law Enforcement Commission for approximately...it's the federal money for Four Hundred Ninety-Eight Thousand, Seven Hundred Sixty-Five Dollars. House Bill 3187 appropriates Four Hundred Five Thousand Dollars from the Capital Development Bond Fund to the Capital Development Board for the Land Acquisition to expand the State Police Training Academy."

Houlihan, J.: "I have no objection's to those."

Shea: "All right. Now, is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."



Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I had asked previously for information with regard to these Bills...ah...that are the subject of the Motion under consideration. Ah...I've gotten information piecemeal, but I still don't know what all of the Bills are about in terms of dollar amount, in terms of funds, in terms of object and purposes. So at this time, I'm asking for a Division of the Question."

Shea: "Can I ask to simplify that matter Sir, if we'll just hold the Gentleman's Motion for about two or three minutes while you look over the Bills and we'll go to Mr. Boyle to Appropriations II for a minute?"

Schlickman: "Where are the Bills?"

Shea: "The Gentleman...the Chairman, I'm sure, has them in front of him, and he'll make em available to you right now."

Schlickman: "Good."

Shea: "Now Mr. Deuster, do you want approximately the same thing?"

Deuster: "No, Mr. Speaker, I was going to request that the distinguished and Vice-Chairman of the Rules Committee, Representative Katz comment...if he would, on what's going on here. When we came down here last month, we adopted a Resolution, everybody did here by a majority, that this would be a limited Session. Of course, this afternoon, Representative Katz commented we're going to open the door just a little bit. We would allow emergency matters just to be considered by a simple majority of the Rule Committee, and that that...the rules of the ballgame now would be that anybody that had legislation he wanted to consider, that you would simply go to the Rules Committee. There would be a form to fill out, and if they found that it was an emergency, wonderful...ah...we could consider that legislation. Now comes a Committee Chairman...ah...with the suggestion that we're going to change the Rules another way and just open up the flood gates, so I...if I might just conclude, I'm just about at the end. The question is, what are the Rules now? Are we just going to open the door wide, and any Committee Chairman wants to consider any Bills, why we'll do



that, or are we going to abide by the suggestion made earlier in the day by Representative Katz, that we would confine ourselves to emergencies that were so determined by the Rules Committee. Well what are the Rules prevailing right now?"

Shea: "Mr. Katz, the Gentleman from the Rules Committee, or Mr. Matijevich, did you want to comment that the Gentleman spoke almost an hour according to the clock up there?"

Matijevich: "Yeah, I was going to say, if you think things are going dizzy around here, Don Deuster, look at that clock, boy, they're really rolling it."

Shea: "This is going to be the quickest Session in town. Mr. Katz."

Katz: Yes. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House, and the distinguished Gentleman from Lake. The Rules Committee did meet today. It went through a large number of Bills and probably about twenty. Very few of those Bills were deemed to be emergencies. There were several Bills that involved appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of state government which is an additional basis on which matters are exempt. Those matters are exempt under the Joint Rules, but the Rules Committee will be doing business at the usual place and Mr. Deuster and any other person who would like to be present is invited to do so, and the announcement will be made on the Floor as to when and where they meeting of the Rules Committee will take place."

Shea: "All right now. Are we back to Appropriations I, II or Deuster on Rules? Deuster on Rules."

Deuster: "Well, in response to the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz, I want to ask you, has Representative Lechowicz filled out the forms and asked for an opportunity to appear before your Committee tomorrow or the Sponsor's of these Bills? Have you reviewed them or have these come out of the blue, as a surprise to you?"

Shea: "They're Appropriation Bills Sir that are exempt from the Rules. Now back to Mr. Lechowicz' Motion. Mr. Schlickman have



you had a chance to examine the Bills, Sir?"

Schlickman: "I did not because the mover of the Motion, the Chairman of the Committee doesn't have copies of them."

Shea: "Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Representative Schlickman did come over and ask me. I told him I didn't have a copy of all the Bills. I called. They'll be here momentarily. I also informed him that his staff has them as well as our's. We're in the process of getting the Bills for him. He'll have them in two minutes."

Shea: "All right, then, we'll hold that. Now back to Representative Boyle with regards to Appropriations Committee #2."

Boyle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Hopefully, while we're resolving this problem with respect to Mr. Schlickman's objections, I'd like to move to suspend the appropriate Rule to hear the following Bills, Appropriation Bills on the House Floor at 9:00 AM. They are as follows: House Bill 3131, which is a 25 million dollar supplemental appropriation for unemployment compensation. House Bill 3169. Appropriation of Federal Funds for the Office of Education, and House Bill 3170, which is an appropriation for the State Scholarship Commission and if there are no objections, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move to suspend the appropriate Rule to hear these Bills at 9:00 AM tomorrow morning on the House Floor."

Shea: "Is there objection? Hearing none, the Minority Leader, Mr. Washburn. Mr. Schlickman."

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

Shea: "The Sponsor of the Bills or the Motion?"

Schlickman: "Sponsor of the Motion."

Shea: "Yes, he will."

Schlickman: "House Bill 3170, an Appropriation to the Scholarship Commission. The amount."

Boyle: "About 3-1/2 million dollars. I've been advised that's correct. Three and a half million dollars."

Schlickman: "From the General Revenue Fund?"

Boyle: "It all comes out of the General Revenue Fund."

Schlickman: "Is this Federal money?"



NOV 4 1975

131.

Shea: "Will you explain, Mr. Pierce, the holding of the Comptroller with regard to Federal money, I guess. Turn Mr. Pierce on."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I understand that these are Federal funds that are already here in Illinois to guarantee the student loan programs and our friend, the former colleague, the State Comptroller has refused to honor the vouchers on the grounds that an appropriation is required. The Governor's office disagrees and says it's not required and meanwhile the scholarship commission is afraid that the banks might stop making these loans, and they've completely reduced their State appropriation last spring here because of the Federal funds being available and now the Federal funds are locked up and so this is an emergency matter required by the Comptroller and I understand the funds are already available but they can't, they can't spend them."

Shea: "Now the first Bill, 3131 was assigned to that Committee three days ago, or two days ago, when it was introduced and leave was granted at that time for immediate hearing, so we're talking about the two Bills on Federal funds now. Is there objection. Hearing none.... Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "I don't have objection, but I have another question of the Sponsor from Appropriations I, Representative Lechowicz."

Shea: "Well, can we get through with 2 first, now, that we're....."

Ryan: "I didn't know what order you were going to take them."

Shea: "Well, I was going to get through while we were waiting for the Bills in 1."

Ryan: "All right."

Shea: "Mr. Boyle, the Chairman of Appropriations II, moves to suspend the appropriate Rule so that House Bills 3131, 3169 and 3170 may be heard tomorrow morning at nine o'clock on the House Floor. Is there objection? Hearing none, the Gentleman receives unanimous consent. Now back to Appropriations I. Are the Bills down?"

Lechowicz: "No. I'm waiting for Ralph Nickell. Wherever you are, Ralph please hurry."

Shea: "Well, let's..... and Gene, why don't you ask one of your people over there, you know. It's a bipartisan effort. Mr. Washburn, the Minority Leader, seeks recognition."



NOV 4 1955

132.

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

Now as I read my list here of the Bills that Representative Lechowicz is talking about, it lists House Bill - it's written in here - House Bill 3130. Is that right, Ted?"

Lechowicz: "Yes, ah.... Bud, you're correct and it's my understanding that Representative, I believe it's Representative Londrigan's Bill."

Washburn: "I believe you're right."

Lechowicz: "And he informed me that he has a substitute Bill that's going to be used in lieu of that and that's the one for the \$450,000 as far as the Capital Development Bond Fund, but ah.... he asked me to have that one postponed as well."

Washburn: "Well, if I ah.... if I understood the actions of the Rules Committee this afternoon that House Bill 3130 went down the drain, in Rules Committee this afternoon."

Lechowicz: "Bud, I'm sorry. I don't know what happened in Rules this afternoon. If that's what you tell me, I'm sure it's true, and then I would strike that one out as well."

Shea: "Now, 3130, I don't think we.... I don't know if you want to say we took a vote on it, but it was my understanding that that is an Appropriation Bill. Is there....."

Washburn: "I think.... I wish we could get the Chairman's attention, of the Committee, Representative Katz. If I might, Mr. Speaker....the status of House Bill 3130 as it was acted upon in the Rules Committee this afternoon, Representatives Katz, is in question at this point. I thought that ah.... ah.... that Bill was defeated in the Rules Committee earlier today."

Katz: "That Bill was, as I recall, ah.... Mr. Minority Leader, did not receive the required number of votes to be deemed not an emergency, so that it failed to get the votes. Now if it..... there was the suggestion made by the Minority Leader, as I'm sorry, by the Majority Leader, ah.... that in another form it could be exempt as an appropriation bill for an agency of State government, but the vote that was taken in committee, it did not garner the necessary 12 votes and it failed."

Washburn: "That is your recollection is correct, and is not 3187 the replacement for that Bill, Representative Londrigan. Well, then, what's



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

the necessity of having 3130 on there, if you have 3187, which is ah....."

Shea: "Turn on Mr. Londrigan."

Londrigan: "3130 was already posted without my knowledge. When we get to Committee, we will withdraw that Bill, 3130, and just go with 3187."

Washburn: "You will withdraw House Bill 3130."

Shea: "Why don't you just Table it now, then."

Londrigan: "I will table House Bill....."

Shea: "The Gentleman asks leave to Table House Bill 3130. Is there objection? Hearing none, the Bill will be ordered Tabled. Now back to the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz', Motion..... The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, as I understand this, 3130 has just been Tabled and the Bill that takes replacement of that is 3187."

Shea: "Yes, Sir."

Ryan: "Can somebody tell me where the money from 3187 is coming from and where it's going and what it's for."

Shea: "It's coming out of the Capital Development Fund, Capital Bond Fund and Capital Development Fund for the purchase of \$405,000 real estate in Sangamon County for the Police Academy."

Ryan: "Thank you."

Shea: "Now on the Gentleman's Motion. Does he has unanimous consent? All right, all right, the Gentleman moves to suspend the appropriate Rule for..... to hear the number of Bills tomorrow in Committee. All those in favor will vote 'aye'. Those opposed will vote 'nay'. It requires 107 votes. Now, Mr. Schlickman, I've got to pose the Motion before you can ask for a division. Isn't that the correct parliamentary procedure, Sir?"

Schlickman: "Yeow, but....."

Shea: "I didn't open the Bill. Will you dump the Roll Call, Mr. Clerk. All right, now, Mr. Schlickman, on a Parliamentary Procedure."

Schlickman: "I simply request a division of the question."

Shea: "Do you want to vote on each Bill separately?"

Schlickman: "To expedite matters, I'd like to withdraw House Bill 3141 and House Bills 3181, 3182 and 3183 and vote on them separately."



NOV 4 1975

134.

Shea: "All right, now let's see if we can't simplify this. We'll make it two Motions. Does he have unanimous consent for the hearing of all Bills except 3141, 3180, 81 and 82?"

Schlickman: "3181, 3182 and 3183, which is the package."

Shea: "All right, 3181, 82 and 83. Does he have unanimous consent for the other Bills. Hearing no objections, unanimous consent is granted. Now with regards to 3141, 3180,..... I'm sorry, 3141, 3181, 3812 and 3183, the Gentleman moves to suspend the appropriate Rule for the hearing tomorrow..

Schlickman: "I want a division of these Bills."

Shea: "Now you want those one at a time?"

Schlickman: "Yes, Sir."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Kane, from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Point of Parliamentary Inquiry."

Shea: "Yes, Sir."

Kane: "That request that the Gentleman from Cook makes, ah..... does he have an absolute right to that request, or is that subject to the Rule of the House and does he have to make a Motion to ask for a Division of that question?"

Shea: "My understanding from the Parliamentarian is that he has to make a request to divide and it takes a Majority of those voting. Simple Majority of those voting on the question. Would you get out your Rule Book and see if the Parliamentarian is wrong, Sir? Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To expedite matters, I'll make a Motion that his Motion lay on the Table. Let's take a Roll Call and let's get going."

Shea: "That's a nondebtable..... Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, that doesn't help anything. The question is, may he..... may one Member demand a division and if he may, then the Motion to lay that on the Table just doesn't apply at all."

Shea: "Mr. Kane."

Kane: "I think the Speaker's already ruled on that and the ruling is that it's subject to the Rule of the Body and he has to make that Motion."

Shea: "Well, I ask him if he could show me a Rule other than my Ruling. Is there one Mr. Schlickman?"



NOV 4 1975

135.

Schlickman: "Well I simply move for a division of the question."

Shea: "All right, the Gentleman moves for division of the question. It takes a Majority of those voting on the question. I don't.... Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I thought it was just common sense that any Member has the right to divide if the question is divisible. I didn't rely on my common sense, but I looked at the Rules, and under Rule 61 ah.... 62d, if a Motion is divisible, any Member may call for a division of the question. Ah.... I think he has that right."

Shea: "He's called for it."

Matijevich: "Well, someone said that you lied that on the Table, and I thought that was who we were voting on."

Shea: "Lying that on the Table..... He's called for the division."

Matijevich: "Well, he has that right. That was my point."

Shea: "Well, it takes a simple Majority to carry it. Is that right, Sir?"

Matijevich: "That's my Point. He has the right under the Rules. He automatically has the right. You don't vote on it. He has that right."

Shea: "Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Ah.... Mr. Speaker, I direct your attention to Robert's Rules of Order, which clarify this by providing that the demand of a single Member compels the division, so that a Member has that right....."

Shea: "Where do you find that, Sir?"

Deuster: "On page 17 of my Book and I can cite the section if you want."

Shea: "What's the section number?"

Deuster: "Just a moment. Ah.... Section 29."

Shea: "In my Book on Robert's Rules 29 is the division of the Assembly, not a division of the question, Sir. Well, let's see, back to Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, in reference to Mr. Deuster's ah.... reference to Robert's Rules, it says 'calls for a separate vote on a resolution which is one of a series on different subjects offered by a single Motion', and I would think since these are all appropriation bills, they are the same subject and that it wouldn't carry on a.... by a



NOV 4 1975

136.

single Member compelling a specified separate vote.

Shea: "Now back to Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, I'll must renew mine in a form of Order. My point of Order is not under Robert's Rules, but under our Rules of the House, Rule 62d. If a Motion is devisible, any Member may call for a division of the question."

Shea: "Does call for mean request of vote to separate? I think that this ah....."

Matijevich: "I think it's explicit, it means that by calling for it, he is requesting that there be a division, if a Motion is divisible. I think that the only thing the Chair can do is rule on whether the Motion is devisible. If it is divisible, then I believe that Member has the right to divide, and I so make that in a form of a Point of Order, that ah..... that....."

Shea: "Well, John, just let me say this to you and I say it quite respectfully."

Matijevich: "It's about time."

Shea: "I don't know whether call for means absolute right to or may request a vote thereon, and can I only say this. Take a look at House Resolution 279 and let's put it in there one way or another, so you don't stump me again."

Matijevich: "Well, all right...."

Shea: "I'll just say, as I interpret it, call for means that the Member has the right.... you know, and I'm not....."

Matijevich: "That's why you make Points of Order."

Shea: "That's the Rule not me. I know I'm going to Rule and I'm going to Rule that we'll take a vote on each one."

Matijevich: "All right."

Shea: "So, we'll start with the first one. On House Bill 3141, the Gentleman moves to suspend the appropriate Rule and have it heard for hearing tomorrow morning. All those in favor will vote 'aye'. The opposed will vote 'nay'. Pardon me? We made the Motion. I'm calling for a vote. It's a nondebatable Motion. You can explain your vote. Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "One question, Mr. Speaker. This is a request to have Bills heard in Committee tomorrow morning, and I think we're



setting a precedent here whether we're going to be able to divide the question from now on during this Session of the General Assembly, when we're going to be posting Bills for Committee. I'd like a Ruling from the Chair whether this question is proper at this time."

Shea: "Well, Sir, all I can tell you is under the present Rules, I have doubts which way this shall go. In order to accommodate the Members I'm trying to do it in the best fashion I can sitting up here. Now I will tell you this. In the opinion of the Chair, we are sitting here with Members Bills. The only thing we're asking to do is get them heard and if we spend all night, we're going to get every Member a chance to get there. I would ask the Gentleman on the Rules Committee, Mr. Katz, I would ask you for tomorrow morning at the time we call a Rules Committee to certainly clarify this so that one Member may not tie up this Assembly for hours over votes on Motions that contain multiple Bills going to Committee, so that we would spend endless hours voting on it."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "Now, on 3141, on 3141, Mr. Davis, you want to talk on this?"

Davis: "No, I simply want the right to a Point of information. Who determines whether or not a Motion is divisible? Is it up to the Speaker or is it up to this House?"

Shea: "It's up to the Speaker, I would imagine, unless somebody wants to appeal the Ruling of the Chair."

Davis: "Very good, then, you have determined it is divisible."

Shea: "I think I have to under the circumstances and I would hope Mr. Katz would get the Rules straightened out."

Davis: "Well, unless there's an appeal, then we proceed....."

Shea: "All right now, on 3141. It takes 107 votes to get it heard tomorrow. All in favor will vote 'aye'. Those opposed, vote 'nay', and Mr. Schlickman to explain his vote."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in explaining my vote, I just simply call to the attention of the Membership that this Bill provides for an appropriation of \$850,000 of the General Revenue Fund, to reconstruct a dam, and I suggest in terms of priorities that \$250,000 could be spent in a better fashion by providing the State's share for 200 school teachers salaries."



Shea: "Have all voted who wished? Mr. Schoeberlein to explain his vote."

Schoeberlein: "Mr. Speaker. This is just not an ordinary dam. This is a washed out dam in the Fox River, and it has created problems from the dam clear up to the Geneva Dam. Now, this is a State responsibility. The land on each land of the Dam is owned by a taxing body, Batavia, Illinois, and this water is rushing under the Dam and has taken off a piece of it on the east side of the Dam. Now, how would people like to live along that River where the population is increasing and People are going down there to fish or other things in the water. It's a filthy place and it is something that should be considered as the repairs are not made. I don't come in here with pork barrel Bills. I might now run again, but I'd like to see this Dam replaced or something done to it. I vote for other People for the same reason and this is Bipartisan and why people should pick on these things when it is a public stream, when it is a the Fox is beautiful they say, the Fox River and I would like to see this to be a unanimous Bill on this particular Bill."

Shea: "Have all voted who wished? Take the Roll Call. On this question, there are 122 'ayes', 7 'nays', 6 Members voting 'present' and the appropriate Rule is suspended and be heard tomorrow in Committee. With regards to House Bills 3141, 3142 and 3143, 3181, 82 and 83, will you tell me the subject matter of those Bills, Mr. Clerk? What is the subject matter of those Bills, Mr. Lechowicz?"

Lechowicz: "House Bill 3181, 82 and 83 have been introduced by Representative J. David Jones and it's an appropriation for outstanding claims for the Illinois State Fair Agency. It's deemed not as an emergency. The appropriation for outstanding claims against the Illinois State Fair Agency. All three of them deal with the State Fair Agency."

Shea: "All right, they all deal with the same subject matter. The Ruling of the Chair will be that those can be heard at one time. The Gentleman..... Yes, Sir. Yes, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would either the Sponsor of the Motion or the Sponsor of the the Bill yield to a question?"

Shea: "I don't know if they will or not. I'll ask them. Mr. J. David



NOV 4 1975

Jones, will you yield, Sir? Turn Mr. Jones on. He indicates he will yield."

Schlickman: "Now I understand that House Bill 3182 is the appropriations for implementing House Bill 3181?"

Jones: "The three Bills are the recommendations and the book that I have you there from..... this is the Auditor General's Report to how to resolve the various Bills that the..... the various Vendors Bills there were in House Bill 3107 the last day of the Session and they were subject to approval by the Auditor General, and his report is there and this is the ah..... appropriation. The same money was appropriated last..... the last day of the session and this..... all this provides is the method of resolving the report that..... the clearance that we suggested, required of the Auditor General on these Bills."

Schlickman: "All right, House Bill 3181 is the Bill that amends the Court of Claims Act and gives to the Court of Claims authority to receive claims and to consider claims from vendors. Is that correct?"

Jones: "That is correct."

Schlickman: "Now House Bill 3182 appropriates to the Court of Claims \$433,400."

Jones: "Well, that is the amount of the Bills that there is a question about, and if they would al..... the Court of Claims would approve them, then there would be money there to pay them, just like....."

Schlickman: "Don't you think it's rather presumptuous for us to appropriate \$433,400 from the General Revenue Fund when the Court of Claims hasn't even heard these Claims."

Jones: "But we have already.... you do that on a distance of claims. You don't know what's going to be until it happens and the money is there. This is the same amount of money that was appropriate. It's just a transfer in 3107."

Schlickman: "Well, never before in my time in the General Assembly have we told the Court of Claims that you've got so much money to take care of Claims that are going to be presented to you. I think you're putting the horse behind.... the Cart in front of the horse."

Jones: "It's a recommendation from the Auditor General Sir."



Shea: "All right, now, Mr. Lechowicz, renews his Motion for the hearing of those three Bills in Appropriations. Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid I'm not able to follow just where we are. Those three Bills came before the Rules Committee. My recollection is that they were deemed not emergencies by the Rules Committee. By what authority do we now circumvent the Rules Committee and the Chairman of the Committee come up and make a Motion to have them heard in Committee....."

Shea: "Two of them are Appropriation Bills, are they not, Sir? Is there one that's a substantive Bill?"

Katz: "All of the three Bills were before the Rules Committee today, Mr. Majority Leader."

Shea: "I thought they were put off, Mr. Katz, and I'm confused about what happened. The two Appropriation Bills in the Opinion of the Chair are proper. The substantive Bill should be presented to the Rules Committee again."

Katz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would raise a serious question with the Speaker as to whether or not ah.... as to the authority on which they are proper. Is this an ordinary ah.... expenditure for the operation of State government. I don't really see that that would qualify under that Ruling. Is it your ruling that this kind of program ah..... would qualify as an appropriation Bill necessary for the operation of state government?"

Shea: "Would somebody get me a copy of 81 and 83 please. Mr. Kane."

Lechowicz: "Appropriation Bills are exempt, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, I would direct....."

Shea: "I'm going to look at your question. Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, I thought that the Vice-Chairman of the Rules Committee said earlier today that ah.... that the House as a whole Body had control over these Bills and not just the Rules Committee to determine what was essential to State Government, and that is the House Votes are to have a hearing on a Bill, then that's it."

Shea: "Mr. J. David Jones, in order to expedite where we are this evening, as request of the Chair, these three Bills be taken and given back



so that he may file a Motion with the Clerk and appear before the Rules Committee. Is there objection? Hearing none, the Bills will lie on the Speaker's Table and Mr. Jones will file the appropriate Motions. That's for all three Bills, and Lechowicz then has no Motion left. Now you've got everything posted for tomorrow. Do you have some other Motions?"

Lechowicz: "Well, now that we've cut down our workload immensely, the Appropriations I Committee will meet at Nine O'Clock in Room 114."

Shea: "Now the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, on the adjournment."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker....."

Shea: "All right, Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Before we get to the adjournment, I have a Motion on House Bill 3156."

Shea: "On what?"

Barnes: "On House Bill 3156. The ah..... the Appropriation for the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves that the appropriate Rules be suspended so that House Bill 3156, which is again the appropriation for some Federal money for Voc-Ed be able to be heard in Appropriations II tomorrow morning at nine o'clock. Is there objection? Hearing none, leave is granted. Now back to Mr. Garmisa, on an announcement."

Garmisa: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the ah..... Legislative Advisory Commission to the Regional Transit Authority will meet right now in Room 114, so I'd like to have a quorum there and come on right down. Thank you."

Shea: "Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, the House will adjourn pursuant to the death Resolution for former Representative Frank Wolf and will adjourn until 10:00 AM tomorrow morning."

Shea: "Read the Resolution. Read both the Resolutions. This is for a Death Resolution of a former Member and we will adjourn on this and on the Second Resolution, and then, hold on Mr. Clerk. Mr. Totten I see you. I'll recognize you during the Special Session. Is that all right, Sir?"

Fred Selcke: "House Resolution 470....."



Shea: "Will the House please be at ease. This is a Death Resolution for a former Member."

Fred Selcke: "Terzich et al. Whereas this Chamber was deeply saddened at the passing of one of its highly esteemed former Members, the Honorable Frank C. Wolf of Chicago who served with honor and distinction in the House of Representatives from the 21st Legislative Districts for ten terms; and whereas during his 20 years in the General Assembly, Mr. Wolf was known among his legislative colleagues and other observers as an extremely able, hardworking and effective lawmaker; and whereas this Chicago native and Northwestern University graduate was active in many worthy civic, paternal and religious organizations and contributed generously of his time and energy to the community, and whereas Mr. Wolf was a great believer in the American Democratic system, an individual who had faith in our system of government and proved as a politician and Legislator that the word politics can be an honorable one; and whereas in addition to his legislative career, Frank Wolf also made an impressive mark in local government in Chicago and Cook County holding important jobs over the years with the Chicago City Treasurer, the House of Corrections, the Board of Inspectors, the Municipal Court and the Recorder of Deeds; therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 79th General Assembly of the State of Illinois that we express our profound sorrow at the death of our most esteemed former colleague, Frank C. Wolf, a fine legislator for two decades, a fine politician, a fine human being; and be it further resolved that a suitable copy of this Preamble and Resolution be presented to Mr. Wolf's lovely widow, Amelia, his loyal companion and source of strength during a beautiful marriage, as a formal expression of this Chamber's respect and esteem for Mr. Wolf."

Shea: "Mr. Terzich moves for the adoption of that Resolution. All in favor will say 'aye'. Read the other Resolution."

Fred Selcke: "House Resolution 482. Yourell et al. Whereas this Body has learned with deep sorrow the recent passing of Mr. Frank C. Wolf, Chicago, Illinois, whose active political and professional life in this State expands a period of 42 years; and whereas Mr. Wolf received his early education in Chicago public schools, later attending



YMCA Business College and Northwestern University, specializing in advertising and also business administration; and whereas during the period from 1933 to 1949, he was administrative secretary to the House of Corrections Superintendents and the Board of Inspectors, City of Chicago and later served as administrative secretary to the City of Chicago Treasurer, Chief Baliff of the Municipal Court of Chicago, and the administrator assistant to the Cook County Recorder of Deeds; and whereas his career in politics included the post of Precinct Captain, Secretary to the 23rd Ward of Regular Democratic organization which he held for 20 years; and whereas he served with distinction in the 68th, 69th, 70th, 71st, 72nd, 73rd, 74th, 75th, 76th and 77th General Assemblies, giving vigorous representation to the People of his district and holding the administration and respect of his many associates to both parties, and whereas his passing will be mourned by his beloved wife, Amelia, and his warm friendship and wise counsel will be sincerely missed by a host of friends and associates; therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 79th General Assembly of the State of Illinois that we express our deep regret and sorrow upon the death of Mr. Frank C. Wolf, a great citizen, a former Member of the House and respected friend and be it further resolved that a suitable copy of this Preamble and Resolution be presented to Mrs. Frank C. Wolf, 4046 West 26th Street, Chicago, Illinois; and be it further resolved that this House now stand adjourned."

Shea: "Mr. Terzich moves for the adoption of the Resolution. Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as you know, ah.... Frank Wolf was elected to ten consecutive terms in the House of Representatives and all of us Members who had any association with Frank Wolf know him to be a very honorable able Legislator, who had always extended a hand to every Member of the Legislature, who represented his District in such a fine manner that they saw fit to put him in the House of Representative for 20 years. Frank was one of the most knowledgable men in the area of Pensions and I know that ah... not only myself, but all Members of the Legislature took his advice and counsel on this and he was the motivator of many, many fine Pension programs, including many of those for us Legislators, and ah..."



I cannot think of a greater man that contributed so much to his country and his State and his fellow man as Frank C. Wolf and I'm sure all Members of this House mourn in his passing."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Resolution. All in favor will say 'aye'. The House is now adjourned."



HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

INDEX
SEVENTY--NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

NOVEMBER, 4, 1975

PAGETIMESPEAKERINFORMATION

1

Doorkeeper All persons not entitled to Floor
 Redmond House will come to Order
 Reverend Krueger Prayer
 Redmond Roll Call for attendance
 O'Brien Message from the Senate
 Redmond Agreed Resolutions
 O'Brien House Resolution 505
 Redmond

2

Giorgi Explains House Resolutions
 Redmond Agreed Resolutions adopted
 Giorgi Moves Adoption of Resolution 517
 Redmond Resolution adopted, Death Resolution
 O'Brien Reads Death Resolutions
 Redmond

3

Washburn Asks leave to have every Member's
 name added to Death Resolution 516
 Redmond Leave granted
 Shea
 Redmond
 Giorgi Moves adoption of all Death Resolu-
 tions
 Redmond Death Resolutions adopted
 Hirschfeld Leave to withdraw total veto Motion
 permanently on House Bill 361
 Redmond Leave granted
 Washburn Representative Randolph absent
 Redmond Record will so show

4

Washburn Introduction
 Redmond
 Shea Move Regular Session stand in recess
 Redmond Stand in recess
 Redmond First Special Session come to Order
 Reverend Krueger Prayer

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>
-------------	-------------

SPEAKERINFORMATION

5

Redmond	Roll Call for attendance
Shea	Leave to use Roll Call of Regular Session
Redmond	Leave granted
Shea	
Redmond	
Waddell	
Shea	Stand at ease a few minutes
Redmond	House will stand at ease
Bradley	Question
Redmond	
Bradley	
Redmond	

6

Friedrich	Motion
Redmond	Make that Motion in Regular Session
Schlickman	Personal Privilege
Redmond	State your Point
Schlickman	Question
Redmond	We're at ease right now, problem will be taken up tomorrow
Schlickman	Suggest you invite Chairman of Elementary and Secondary Education Comm.
Redmond	Will discuss it with the Chairman
Schlickman	
Redmond	
Kosinski	
Redmond	Somebody violated the Rules
Kosinski	Who provided volume of mail?
Redmond	No idea
Kosinski	"Is this official mail?"
Redmond	I didn't know it was being distributed
Kosinski	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
7		Redmond	Have no knowledge of it whatsoever
		Kosinski	I resent this
		Redmond	I don't know who did it
		Kosinski	Would you like to see sample
		Redmond	Be glad to
		Kosinski	
		Jaffee	Parliamentary Inquiry
		Redmond	We're at ease
		Jaffee	
		Redmond	Difficult task. House will come to Order
		Shea	Move First Special Session stand in recess until after adjournment of Regular Session
		Redmond	You've hear the Motion. House will come to Order in the Regular Session There are no Introductions
8		O'Brien	House Bill 3166, First Reading
		Redmond	Any more introductions?
		Geo-Karis	
		Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	
		Redmond	
		Friedrich	Explains House Bill 182
9		Shea	Take it out of Record, House Bill 342
		Griesheimer	Hold this Bill
		Shea	
		Griesheimer	Requesting Bill be held
		Shea	Take it out of the Record. House Bill 361
		Hirschfeld	Took out of Record earlier this morning permanently
		Shea	You Tabled that?
		Hoffman, R.K.	

PAGETIMESPEAKERINFORMATION

	Shea	
	Hoffman, R.K.	Explains House Bill 419
10.	Shea	
	Hoffman, R.K.	Could I have attention of the House
	Shea	
	Hoffman, R.K.	Asks House over-ride veto of House Bill 419
	Shea	Gentleman moves Veto over-ride
	Mudd	Speaks for the Bill
	Shea	
	Terzich	Suggest you vote "Aye"
11	Shea	
	Schlickman	Oppose this Motion
12	Shea	
	Ewing	Will Sponsor yield?
	Shea	Indicate he will
	Ewing	Question
	Hoffman, R.K.	Answer
	Ewing)	
)	Discussion
	Hoffman, R.K.)	
	Ewing	Speak for this Bill
	Shea	
	Ewing	Speaks on the Bill, opposes over-ride
	Shea	Is there further discussion
13	Hoffman, R.K.	To close
	Shea	Motion is shall House Bill 419 become Law?
14	Katz	Announcement
	Shea	
	Schneider	Inquiry
	Shea	
	Schneider	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>
-------------	-------------

SPEAKERINFORMATION

15

Shea

Schneider

Question

Katz

Answer

Schneider

Shea

Hoffman, G.

Question of Chairman, Rules

Shea

Hoffman, G.)

Katz)

Discussion

16

Hoffman, G.

Shea

Deuster

Will Chairman of Rules yield?

Shea

Indicates he will

Deuster)

Katz)

Question

Answer

17

Deuster)

Katz)

Second question

Answer

18

Deuster

Reconsider that Resolution, or
adopt a new Resolution

Shea

House Bill 396

Younge

Take it up later

Shea

Younge

Shea

Take it out of the Record, House
Bill 437. Cunningham

Cunningham

Explains House Bill 437

19

Shea

Houlihan, J.

Talks on the Bill

Shea

Houlihan, J.

Continues to talk on the Bill

20

Shea

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>
1	
21	
22	
23	
24.	
25	
26	

SPEAKERINFORMATION

Walsh

Urges "NO" vote

Shea

21

Beaupre

Talks for the Bill

Shea

Skinner

Leave to correct Assistant Minority Leader

Shea

Hart

Urges support of this Legislation

22

Shea

Leinenweber

Opposes Bill

23

Shea

at 12:30 break for lunch, back at 2:00

Lechowicz

Talks on the Bill

Shea

Mr. Cunningham to close

Cunningham

To close

24.

Shea

Mr. Cunningham moves Postponed Consideration

Cunningham

Shea

Mr. Matijevich objects

Matijevich

Shea

House Bill 468

Tuerk

Explains House Bill 468

25

Shea

Byers

Will Sponsor yield

Shea

Indicates he will

Byers)

Question

Tuerk)

Byers)

Tuerk)

Discussion

Byers)

Tuerk)

Byers)

Tuerk)

26

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>
27	
28	
29	
30	

SPEAKERINFORMATION

	Byers	If I might address the Bill
	Shea	Proceed
	Byers	Urges a "No" vote
	Shea	
	Geo-Karis	Would like to speak in favor of Bill
	Shea	
27	Mugalian	Urge we sustain the Motion to over-ride
	Shea	
	Schlickman	Urge a "No" vote
28	Shea	Is there further discussion
	Tuerk	To close
29	Shea	Have all voted who wish
	Chapman	
	Shea	Take the Record
	Tuerk	Move to postpone
	Shea	Gentleman's Motion fails
	Chapman	Leave to take House Bill 3067 and placed in same position on Spring Calendar
	Shea	
	Chapman	
	Shea	Does the Lady have Leave? No Objections, it will be on Spring Calendar
	Cunningham	Does Rules permit introduction?
	Shea	No
	Cunningham	
	Shea	
	Walsh	
	Shea	House Bill 751
	Ewing	Asks favorable over-ride of Governor's veto
30	Shea	Shall House Bill 751 become law?
	Jones	Supports Motion

PAGE TIMESPEAKERINFORMATION

	Shea	
	Schuneman	Supports Override Motion
	Shea	
	Schuneman	
31	Shea	
	Schuneman	Urges support of override
	Shea	
	Lauer	In favor of Motion
	Shea	
	Beaupre	Supports override
32	Shea	
	Ewing	To close
	Shea	Gentleman's Motion prevails
	Giglio	To explain Motion on House Bill 1348
33	Shea	Vote
	Schlickman	Opposes Motion to Override
34	Shea	
	Giglio	To close
	Shea	Motion to override fails
	Matijevecich	Point of Order
	Shea	That Motion failed
	Matijevecich	
35	Shea	
	Matijevecich	
	Shea	House will be at ease
	Matijevecich	
	Shea	Stated the Motion lost
	Matijevecich	Haven't ruled on my Point of Order
	Shea	Effect of rulings are the same
	Matijevecich	
	Shea	

PAGETIMESPEAKERINFORMATION

36

Matijevich

Shea

Governor's Veto is sustained

Matijevich

You've got to follow your own Rules

Shea

Matijevich

Different issue

Shea

Matijevich

Shea

Order of House Bills Total Veto
appears 1487

Hirschfeld

Would appreciate the necessary vote
for override on House Bill 1487

37

Shea

Motion failed, Veto of the Governor
sustained

Mann

Explains Motion on House Bill 1668

38

Shea

Will try to get some order

Mann

Shea

Proceed

Mann

Explains Motion

Shea

Mr. Mann moves that House Bill 1668
become law

39

Shea

Terzich

Urge an 'aye' vote

Shea

Beatty

Will Spnsor yield?

Beatty

Question

Terzich

Answer

40

Beatty)

Mann)

Beatty)

Discussion

Mann)

Beatty)

Shea

Mr. Mann to close

Mann

To close, asks support

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>
-------------	-------------

SPEAKERINFORMATION

		Shea	Motion prevails
41		Geo-Karis	Take House Bill 1704 out of record
		Shea	House Bill 1809
		Kane	Leave to consider 1808 at same time
		Shea	
		Kane	
		Shea	What is your motion
		Kane	
		Shea	Leave to hear both Bills
		Kane	Explains both Bills
42		Shea	Did you explain both Bills?
		Kane	
		Shea	Vote--Mr. Kane to explain his vote
		Kane	To explain his vote
		Shea	Mr. Lechowicz
		Lechowicz	To explain his vote
		Shea	
		Lechowicz	Recommends an 'aye' vote
43		Shea	
		Maragos	Support this motion
		Shea	Gentleman moves for postponed consideration
44		Katz	Explains veto of House Bill 1966
45		Shea	Moves House Bill 1966 becomes law
		Kosinski	Will Sponsor yeald
		Katz	
		Kosinski	Question
		Katz	Answer
		Kosinski	
46		Katz	No one able to explain why the Governor Vetoed this Bill
		Kosinski	Let's just Override the Veto

SPEAKER

INFORMATION

	Shea	
	Totten	Opposes the Motion
	Shea	
	Matijevich	Talks on the Motion
47	Shea	
	Walsh	Supports the Override Motion
48	Shea	
	Katz	To close
	Shea	The Gentleman move House Bill 1966 become law
	Schlickman	Explains his 'no' vote
	Shea	The Gentleman's Motion prevails
	Houlihan	Explains House Bill 1539
49	Shea	Excuse me
	Houlihan	
	Walsh	Bill being called out of order
	Shea	It had been called before
50	Walsh	
	Shea	
	Walsh	Don't think we should go back
	Shea	
	Houlihan	Explains the Bill
	Shea	
	Schraeder	Talks on the Bill
51	Shea	
	Schraeder	Let's sustain the Veto
	Shea	
	Skinner	Urge a 'yes' vote
52	Shea	
	Houlihan, J.	Will Sponsor yield
	Houlihan, J.	Question
53	Houlihan, J.	Are you aware opposition

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>
-------------	-------------

54

SPEAKERINFORMATION

Houlihan, D.)
)
 Houlihan, J.)
)
 Houlihan, D.)
)
 Houlihan, J.)
)
 Houlihan, D.)

Answer
 Final question
 Answer
 Discussion

Shea

Duff

Supports Motion to Override

Shea

McGrew

Moves Previous Question

Shea

All those in favor

Houlihan, D.

To close

Shea

Shall House Bill 1539 become law

55

Lechowicz

To explain his vote

Shea

Kempiners

To explain his vote

56

Shea

McClain

Opposes Motion to Override

Shea

Deuster

To explain his vote

57

Shea

Yourell

To explain his vote

58

Shea

Duff

To explain his vote

59

Shea

Schraeder

Against Motion to Override

Shea

111 'ayes' 34 'nays' and 11 'present

Houlihan

Recognized for Verification

Shea

Mr. Houlihan moves for Verification

Selcke

Verification

Shea

Proceed Verification Affirmative
vote

60

Selcke

Proceeds

PAGE TIMESPEAKERINFORMATION

Shea	McMasters vote 'aye'
Selcke	Continues Verification
Shea	Downs wishes to be recorded 'no'
Selcke	Continues Verification
Shea	Leverenz wishes to be recorded 'aye'
Houlihan	Barnes
Shea	Barnes is in the aisle
Houlihan	
Shea	
Houlihan	
Shea	
Houlihan	Deuster
Shea	How is he recorded
Selcke	He's recorded as voting 'aye'
Shea	Take him off the Roll Call
Houlihan	Representative Ralph Dunn
Shea	Representative Dunn is in his seat
Houlihan	Representative Friedland
Shea	He's in his seat
Houlihan	Representative Anderson
Shea	How is he recorded
Selcke	Recorded as voting 'aye'
Shea	Take him off the Roll Call
Houlihan	Representative Grotberg
Shea	He's in his seat
Houlihan	Representative Huff
Shea	How is he recorded
Selcke	"aye"
Shea	Take him off the Roll Call
Houlihan	Representative Kucharski
Shea	How is he recorded

PAGETIMESPEAKERINFORMATION

Selcke

Take him off the Roll Call

Shea

Put Anderson back on Affirmative
Roll Call

Houlihan

Shea

Houlihan

Representative Jacobs

Shea

How is he recorded

Selcke

'aye'

Shea

Take him off the Roll Call

Houlihan

Representative McAvoy

Shea

How is he recorded

Selcke

'Aye'

Shea

Take him off the Roll Call

Houlihan

Representative Polk

Shea

He's in his seat

Houlihan

Representative Tuerk

Shea

He's back in the aisle

Houlihan

Representative Terzich

Shea

He's on the Republican side

Houlihan

Representative Steele

Shea

Houlihan

Representative Stiehl

Shea

Stubblefield

How am I recorded

Shea

Mr. Clerk, how is he recorded

Selcke

'aye'

Stubblefield

Change it to no

Shea

Houlihan

Mr. Steele

Shea

He's in his seat

Houlihan

Representative Washburn

Shea

He's in his seat

PAGE TIMESPEAKERINFORMATION

	Shea	Put Mr. Kucharski back on the Roll call
	Houlihan	No further questions
	Shea	
	Stiehl	How am I recorded
	Shea	How is she recorded
	Selcke	'No'
	Stiehl	Change it to 'aye'
	Shea	Change it to 'aye'
63.	Campbell	How am I recorded
	Shea	How is he recorded
	Selcke	Recorded as being absent
	Campbell	Vote me 'aye'
	Shea	Vote Mr. Campbell 'aye'
	Selcke	
	Shea	House Bill 1539 Motion to Override prevails
	Washburn	Announcement
	Shea	
	Washburn	
	Shea	
	Madigan	Question
	Shea	Rules Committee at 1:30, Member return at 3:00
	Madigan	I so move
	Shea	House stands in Perfunct, then recess until 3:00
64	O'Brien	First Readings
	Shea	Announcement
	O'Brien	Continues First Readings
65	Shea	Stand at ease while the Rules Committee finishes. House Bill 1996
	Younge	Pass that down
	Shea	House Bill 2042

PAGE TIME

SPEAKER

INFORMATION

Duff

Shea

Duff

Members might want on Roll Call

Shea

Nobody will be penalized

Duff

Shea

Motion to Override House Bill 1302

Hart

Sponsor of Bill, didn't make Motion

Shea

What do you want to do with it

Hart

Hold it, for maker of the Motion

Shea

Hart

Shea

Motion #1 on House Bill 1302

66.

Cunningham

Pass for a little while

Shea

Choate

Point of Inquiry

Shea

It would be Motion #3

Choate

It's not really to Override

Shea

Do I understand right

Choate

It's an Item Veto

Shea

Item Veto Motions

Washington

Move adoption of Amendatory Veto to House Bill 574

Shea

Mr. Washington move to accept

67

Terzich

Question

Washington

Answer

Terzich

Washington)

Terzich)

Washington)

Terzich)

Washington)

Shea

Do you want to split Motions

PAGETIMESPEAKERINFORMATION

68

Washington

If Chair deems it advisable

Shea

Whatever you want

Washington

Think we ought to go with the whole thing.

Shea

Duff

Will Sponsor yield

Washington

Duff

Question

Shea

If Bill does not receive 89 votes, the Bill is dead

Duff

May I address myself to the Motion

Shea

Those not authorized, leave the Floor

Terzich

Question

69

Shea

Washington

Don't feel competent to give definitive answer

Shea

Rephrase question

Terzich

Explains the Bill

Washington

Shea

Washington

Can we take this Bill out of the Record

Shea

Take this Bill out of the Record

Washington

70

Collins

Take it out of the Record

Shea

Brinkmeier

Explains House Bill 3028

71

Shea

Gentleman's Motion is that House Bill 3028 become law

Jones

Speaks on the Bill

Shea

Jones

Continues to speak on the Bill

72

Shea

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>
73	
74	
75	
76	
77	
78	
79	

SPEAKERINFORMATION

	Craig	Speaks on the Bill
73	Shea	Is there further discussion
74	Brinkmeier	To close
	Shea	Shall House Bill 3028 become law
	Matijevich	Explain his vote
75	Shea	
	Mugalian	Expalin his vote
	Shea	
	Rigney	Explain his vote
76	Shea	
	Darrow	
	Shea	
	Darrow	Wouls solicit a 'no' vote
	Shea	
	Holewinski	Oppose this legislation
	Shea	
	Mudd	Talks on the Bill
77	Shea	Gentleman's Motion prevails
78	Shea	House Bill 3098
	Stone	Speaks on the Bill
	Shea	
	Ewing	Speaks on the Bill
	Shea	
	Skinner	Explains his vote
79	Shea	
	Deuster	Would Sponsor yield?
	Stone	
	Deuster)	
)	
	Stone)	Discussion
)	
	Deuster)	
	Shea	

PAGE TIMESPEAKERINFORMATION

Fleck Will Sponsor yield?

Stone

Fleck Question

Stone Answer

Fleck)

)

Stone)

)

Fleck) Discussion

)

Stone)

)

Fleck)

)

Stone)

)

Fleck)

)

Stone)

)

Fleck)

Shea

Schlickman

Shea

Stone To close

Shea Shall House Bill 3098 become law

Choate 'Aye'

Shea

Stone Put on Postponed Consideration

Shea Matijevich objects.

Matijevich

Shea

Mugalian Joins Matijevich's objection

Shea Filing written Motion

Schlickman Point of Personal Privilege

Shea

Schlickman

Shea

Beaupre

80

81

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>
-------------	-------------

SPEAKERINFORMATION

82

Shea	On the Order of Total Vetoes
Cunningham	Speaks for Motion to Override House Bill 1302
Shea	Motion to Override
Hart	Explains the Motion

83

Shea	
Schlickman	Opposes Motion
Shea	
Byers	Will Sponsor yield?
Shea	Indicates he will
Byers	Question
Cunningham	Asnwer

84

Byers	If I might address the Bill?
Shea	Proceed
Byers	Urge 'no' vote
Shea	
Cunningham	To close

Shea	Gentleman's Motion fails
------	--------------------------

85

Matijeovich	Point of Order under Rule 46D
Shea	
Matijeovich	
Shea	
Mautino	Asks Motion #2 be tabled

Shea	
Choate	Mr. Choate explains Motion #3

87

Shea	
Hart	Urges Members to restore funds
Shea	
Schlickman	Speaks on the Motion

88

Shea	
Choate	To close
Shea	Gentleman moves adoption of Motion

PAGE TIMESPEAKERINFORMATION

	Jaffe	
	Shea	
	Hart	Speaks on the Motion
89	Shea	
90	Duff	To explain his vote
	Shea	
	Lechowicz	To explain his vote
91	Shea	Have all voted who wish
	O'Brien	
	Shea	Gentleman's Motion prevails
92	Maragos	Explains House Bill 2328
	Shea	Request
	Maragos	Continues explanation
	Shea	
	Collins	Supports Motion to Override
94	Shea	
	Giglio	Speaks in behalf of Override
	Shea	
	Walsh	Urges a 'no' vote
95	Shea	
	Maragos	To close
	Shea	Motion is, shall House Bill 2328 become law
	Deuster	To explain his vote
96	Shea	
	Fleck	To explain his vote
	Shea	
	Lucco	To explain his vote
	Shea	
	Lucco	Continues to explain his vote
	Shea	
97	Matijevich	Explains his vote

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>
98	
99	
100	
101	
102	
103	
104	

SPEAKERINFORMATION

Shea

Ewell

Good Bill

Shea

Have all voted? Gentleman's Motion
Prevails--Mr. Bradley in the Chair

Bradley

House Bill 2825

Garmisa

Speaks on Override of Governor's
Vetoe of House Bill 2825

98

Bradley

Is there any discussion?

99

Palmer

Will the Sponsor yield

Bradley

He indicates he will

Palmer

Question

Garmisa

Answer

Palmer

Question

Garmisa

Answer

100

Palmer

Bradley

Is there further discussion

101

Deuster

Speaks on the bill

Garmisa

Answers Mr. Deuster

102

Deuster

Question

Garmisa

Answer

Deuster

Bradley

Shall House Bill 2825 pass

Fleck

To explain his vote

103

Bradley

Leinenweber

To explain his vote

Bradley

Skinner

To explain his vote

104

Bradley

Shea

To explain his vote

Bradley

Palmer

To explain his vote

Bradley

Motion adopted, House will be at
ease.--House Bills first reading

PAGE TIME

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
105	Selcke	House Bills, First Reading
	Bradley	Amendatory Veto-House Bill 221
	Londrigan	Make Motion to accept the Veto
	Bradley	Motion adopted-House Bill 504
	Palmer	Motion to accept Amendatory Veto
106	Bradley	Motion adopted-House B
	Schneider	Announcement
	Bradley	
107	Shea	Check Posting Date
	Bradley	House was not in Session
	Shea	Improper posting
	Shea	
	Schneider	Discussion
	Bradley	
	Shea	
108	Bradley	
	Schneider	
	Selcke	House Joint Resolution, Constitutional Amendment 35, First Reading
109	Bradley	
	Maragos	
	Bradley	
	Deavers	Leave to table seven Bills
	Bradley	Leave granted
	Deavers	
	Bradley	House Bill 79, Mr. Jones, E.
	Jones, E.	Explains House Bill 79
110	Bradley	Motion adopted
	Lechowicz	
	Bradley	
	Lechowicz	Question
	Bradley	Answer

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>
-------------	-------------

SPEAKERINFORMATION

Lechowicz

Announcement, Leave to hear Bills

Bradley

Lechowicz

Bradley

111

Barnes

Bradley

Barnes

Leave to hear House Bill 3131

Bradley

Schlickman

Will Sponsor yield?

Bradley

Schlickman

Bradley

Schlickman

When were Bills introduced

Lechowicz

Answer

Schlickman

Lechowicz

Schlickman

Question

Bradley

Schlickman

Right now, he's asking us to suspend the Rules

112

Bradley

Hold that request

Ryan

Hold Motions

Bradley

Mr. Pierce, on a Motion

Pierce

Announcement

Bradley

Walsh

Question

Bradley

Walsh

Bradley

Walsh

Bradley

Walsh

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>
-------------	-------------

113

SPEAKERINFORMATION

Bradley

Hill

Resolution, Will Clerk read it?

Bradley

Read Mr. Hill's Resolution

Selcke

Reads House Resolution 529

114

Hill

Suspend Rule 41, to consider Resolution immediately

Bradley

Rule suspended

Hill

Bradley

Resolution adopted

Geo-Karis

Bradley

Williams

Suspend Rule for immediate consideration of House Resolution 504

Bradley

Read the Resolution

Selcke

Reads Resolution

115

Bradley

Gentleman moves to suspend Rules

Walsh

I object

Bradley

There is objection

Walsh

Bradley

116

Walsh

To explain his vote

Bradley

Bluthardt

To explain his vote

117

Bradley

Brinkmeier

To explain his vote

Bradley

Geo-Karis

To explain her vote

Bradley

Lechowicz

To explain his vote

118

Bradley

Williams

To close

Bradley

Gentleman's Motion prevails

PAGE TIMESPEAKERINFORMATION

	Mudd	Move unanimous consent to consider House Joint Resolution #70
	Bradley	Do you have copy of Resolution
	Mudd	
	Bradley	
	Selcke	
	Bradley	Read the Resolution
	Selcke	Reads Resolution #70
119	Bradley	Gentleman moves to suspend Rule for immediate consideration of Resolution
	Pierce	Will the Gentleman yield
	Mudd	Yes
	Pierce	Question
	Mudd	Answer
	Pierce	Opposes Motion
	Bradley	
	Mudd	
120	Bradley	Mr. Meyer raising a Point of Order
	Meyer	Motion before the House
	Bradley	
	Meyer	
	Bradley	
	Meyer	
	Bradley	Nondebatable Motion
	Meyer	Opposing Motion
	Bradley	
	Mudd	Moves Bill goes to committee
121	Shea	
	Pierce	
	Shea	
	Pierce	Leave to suspend Rule for immediate consideration in committee tomorrow

PAGE TIMESPEAKERINFORMATION

Shea

Is there objection? Leave granted

Maragos

Motion-House Bill 3160 be put on
Interim Study Calendar-Revenue Comm
ittee

Shea

No objections, it will be ordered

Maragos

Parliamentary Inquiry

Shea

Maragos

Inquiry on Constitutions1 Amendment

Shea

Maragos

122. Shea

Garmisa

Move to suspend Rule

Shea

Have objection

Matijevich

Wants to know what it's all about

Shea

Bills regarding Railroad Relocation

Dunn

Explains Railroad Bills

123

Shea

Does Gentleman have leave

Selcke

Reads House Bill 3164, second time

Shea

Any Amendments? Third Reading

Selcke

Reads House Bill 3165, second time

Shea

Any Floor Amendments? Third Reading

Ryan

Need Motion restated

Shea

Lechowicz has Motion

Lechowicz

Explains Motion

124

Shea

Lechowicz

Shea

Gentleman's Motion is to Suspend
appropriate Rule

Ryan

Shea

Ryan

Shea

Ryan

Ask Sponsor a question

SPEAKER

INFORMATION

125

Shea He will yield
Ryan Question
Lechowicz Answer
Ryan Questions if Bills should go to
 Appropriations Committee
Lechowicz Transfers of Appropriations
Ryan Should be in Rules Committee
Lechowicz

126

Shea
Washburn Suggests Bills go to Rules Committee
Shea
Schraeder
Shea File appropriate Motion with Clerk
Schraeder
Shea Take those to Bills out of request
Washburn House Bills 3184 and 3185

127

Shea
Washburn
Shea
Ryan
Shea
Ryan
Shea On the Motion
Houlihan, J. Could Chairman explain Bills 86 and
 87
Shea
Lechowicz Explains House Bills 3186 and 3187
Houlihan, J. No objections

128

Shea Is there further discussion?
Schlickman Still doesn't know about the Bills
Shea Hold Gentleman's Motion
Schlickman Where are the Bills?

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>
129	
130	
131	

SPEAKERINFORMATION

Shea

Schlickman

Shea

Deuster

Question of Rules Chairman

Shea

Matijevich

Shea

Katz

Talks about Bills heard in Rules

Shea

Deuster

Question

Shea

Answer

Schlickman

Chairman doesn't have copy of Bills

Shea

Lechowicz

Will have copies in a few minutes

Shea

Mr. Boyle

Boyle

Move to suspend appropriate Rules

Shea

Is there objection

Schlickman

Will Sponsor yield?

Shea

Sponsor of Bills or the Motion

Schlickman

Sponsor of Motion

Shea

He will

Schlickman

Question

Boyle

Answer

Schlickman

Question

Boyle

Answer

Schlickman

Shea

Pierce

Federal Funds

Shea

Two Bills on Federal Funds

Ryan

Question of Representative Lechowicz

Shea

PAGETIMESPEAKERINFORMATION

Ryan

Shea

Mr. Boyle moves to suspend Rules so
House Bills 3131, 3169 and 3170 can
Be hear tomorrow Morning

Lechowicz

Shea

132

Washburn

Question

Lechowicz

Representative Londrigan's Bill

Washburn

Lechowicz

Washburn

Lechowicz

Shea

Washburn

Thought Bill was defeated in Rules

Katz

Bill did fail in Rules Committee

Washburn

133

Shea

Londrigan

Bill posted without my knowledge

Washburn

You will withdraw House Bill 3130

Shea

Londrigan

Shea

Gentleman asks leave to table House
Bill 3130. Leave granted

Ryan

House Bill 3187 replaces 3130

Shea

Ryan

Where's the money coming from

Shea

Capitol Development Fund

Ryan

Shea

On the Gentleman's Motion

Schlickman

Shea

Mr. Schlickman on Parliamentary
Procedure

Schickman

Request a division of the question

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
		Shea	Do you want to vote on each Bill seperately
		Schlickman	Want to vote on bills seperately
134.		Shea	Will make two Motions
		Schlickman	
		Shea	
		Schlickman	Wants a division of these Bills
		Shea	One at a time?
		Schlickman	Yes
		Shea	
		Kane	Point of Parliamentary Inquiry
		Shea	
		Kane	Question
		Shea	
		Lechowicz	Let's take a Roll Call
		Shea	
		Walsh	Motion doesn't apply
		Shea	
		Kane	Subject to the Rule of the Body
		Shea	
135		Schlickman	Simply move for a division of the question
		Shea	
		Matijeovich	He has the right
		Shea	
		Matijeovich	
		Shea	He's called for a division
		Matijeovich	That's my point
		Shea	It takes a simple Majority
		Matijeovich	He has that right, you don't vote
		Shea	
		Deuster	Member has that right

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
		Shea	
		Deuster	I can cite the section
		Shea	Whats the section number
		Deuster	Robert's Rules 29
		Shea	
		Kane	
136		Shea	
		Matijeovich	Point of Order
		Shea	
		Matijeovich	
		Shea	
		Matijeovich	
		Shea	Take a look at House Resolution 279
		Matijeovich	
		Shea	
		Matijeovich	
		Shea	That's the Rule
		Matijeovich	
		Shea	House Bill 3141, Gentleman move to suspend appropriate Rule to have the Bill heard in the morning
		Lechowicz	Question
137		Shea	Answer
		Lechowicz	
		Shea	
		Davis	A Point of information
		Shea	
		Davis	
		Shea	Takes 107 votes on House Bill 3141
		Schlickman	To Explain his vote
138		Shea	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
		Schoeberlein	To explain his vote
		Shea	Appropriate Rule suspended
		Lecowicz	Explanation of the Bills
		Shea	Ruling of the Chair-All Bills may be heard at the same time
		Schlickman	Will Sponsor of the Motion yield?
		Shea	
139		Schlickman	Question
		Jones	Answer
		SChlickman)	
)	
		Jones)	
)	
		Schlickman)	
)	
		Jones)	Discussion
)	
		Schlickman)	
)	
		Jones)	
)	
140		Shea	
		Katz	Question
		Shea	
		Katz	
		Shea	Two Appropriation Bills are proper
		Katz	Raise a serious question
		Shea	
		Lecowicz	Appropriations Bills are exempt
		Shea	
		Kane	
		Shea	
		Kane	
		Shea	
141		Lecowicz	Appropriation I will meet in the morning Nine O'Clock, Room 114
		Shea	

PAGETIMESPEAKERINFORMATION

Madigan

Shea

Barnes, E.

Have a Motion on House Bill 3156

Shea

Barnes, E.

House Bill 3156

Shea

Gentleman moves appropriate Rule be suspended to hear House Bill 3156 in the morning, Leave granted

Garmisa

Announcement

Shea

Madigan

Adjourn pursuant to Death Resolution
n

Shea

Read the Resolution

Selcke

House Resolution 470

142

Shea

House will be at ease

Selcke

Reads House Resolution 470

Shea

Terzich move adoption of Resolution

Selcke

Reads House Resolution 482

143

Shea

Terzich moves adoption

Terzich

Speaks on the Resolution

144

Shea

Resolutions adopted. House is now adjourned.