

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

NINETY-FOURTH LEGISLATIVE DAY

OCTOBER 19, 1971

12:00 O'CLOCK NOON

THE HONORABLE W. ROBERT BLAIR,

SPEAKER IN THE CHAIR



GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
STATE OF ILLINOIS  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

A roll call for attendance was taken and indicated that all were present with the exception of the following:

Representative Gerald A. Bradley - illness;

Representative John P. Downes - illness;

Representative Benedict Garmisa - illness;

Representative Louis Janczak - illness;

Representative Leland H. Rayson - no reason given;

Representative John W. Thompson - no reason given.



Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Roll call for attendance. For what purpose does the gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce rise?"

Daniel M. Pierce: "Ah, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good morning. Ah, Representative, Representative Garmisa is excused because of his recovering from surgery. Representative Downes is recovering from illness and Representative Bradley, Representative Bradley is excused because of a death in the family."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "That will be journalized."

Daniel M. Pierce: "Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Capuzi."

Louis F. Capuzi: "Mr. Speaker, will you, would the Journal so show that Representative Janczak is absent because of illness in his family."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The Journal will so indicate. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Gerald W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, there was a Senate Joint Resolution presented yesterday, Senate Joint Resolution 53 by Senator Partee and I don't see it on today's calendar."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "It was, the message just came over this morning."

Gerald W. Shea: "I see. At the appropriate time may I be recognized with regard to that?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "At the appropriate time I'll take the appropriate action."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Messages. A letter from The Ethics Commission. Mr. Fredric B. Selcke, Chief Clerk, 412 State



House, Springfield, Illinois. Dear Mr. Selcke: Enclosed are the statements of Economic Interest filed by the members of the Illinois General Assembly. Pursuant to the Illinois Governmental Ethics Act, Chapter 127, it will be transmitted to you pursuant to Section 4-106 of that act. The State Ethics Board directs the respective recipients to hold such statements for public inspection for seven days or until October 22, 1971 before they are journalized. The Board also directs that there be proper security to protect these documents. Prior to the transmittal of any of this material to a printer, an authorized representative of each member of the Board of Ethics shall review for accuracy the material to be printed. The Chairman of the Board of Ethics shall then approve the material and it shall be printed for the Journal. Sincerely, Senator Cecil Partee, Chairman; Senator Jerald E. Clark, Representative George E. Lindberg; Representative Rolland F. Tipword."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "For what purpose does the gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Henss rise?"

Donald A. Henss: "For the purpose, Mr. Speaker, of changing the meeting date of the Higher Education Committee by agreement of leadership on both sides, the time for the meeting of the Higher Education Committee this week will be changed to 9:30 A.M. tomorrow morning, Wednesday, in Room M-5 and Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to suspend the provisions of Rule 17 so that House Joint Resol-



ution 94 which had previously been posted for another time may be heard tomorrow morning at 9:30 A.M. by the Higher Education Committee."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, is there objection? If not, then consent will be given to hear that one resolution in the Higher Education Committee tomorrow morning at 9:30 A.M."

Donald A. Henss: "Thank you very much."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "What purpose does the gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart rise?"

Richard O. Hart: "Mr. Speaker, on the calendar appears on the second page, Senate Joint Resolution 50, with the permission of the Senate Sponsor, I'd like to table that and with leave of the House. Also. . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, with no objection, S.R.J. 50 will be tabled."

Richard O. Hart: "Also, as Chief Sponsor of House Bill 1220 which is in Judiciary Committee, I'd like to table that."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, is there objection? If not, then House Bill 1220 in the Judiciary will be tabled. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hyde."

Henry J. Hyde: "Well, Mr. Speaker, there will be a Republican conference in fifteen minutes, that is to say at 12:30 P.M. in Room 212. We'll be at ease for fifteen minutes and then if all of the Republican members of the House would report at 12:30 P.M. sharp in Room 212, we'll have a half hour conference and hopefully be back on the floor, at 1:00 P.M."



So I now move that we do recess for purposes of a Republican conference to commence in fifteen minutes or at 12:30 P.M. in Room 212."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

Clyde L. Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Democratic members to come to Room M-5 at 12:30 P.M. sharp for where we will have a Democratic conference. Room M-5."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the House will now be in recess and for purposes of these conferences."

Recess at 12:15 O'Clock P.M.

Return at 1:00 O'Clock P.M.

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "With leave of the House now, we'll revert back to the Messages from the Senate."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of a bill of the following title: House Bill 614, 615, 618, 1684, 2047, 2048, 2049, 2672, 2897, passed by the Senate, October 18, 1971. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a bill of the following title: House Bill 1088. Together with the following amendment thereto, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House. Passed



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

the Senate, as amended, October 18, 1971. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a bill of the following title: House Bill 1951. Together with the following amendment thereto, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House, to-wit: Amendment Number One. Passed the Senate, as amended, October 18, 1971. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the House of Representatives: Senate Joint Resolution Number 53. Adopted by the Senate, October 18, 1971. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. No further messages."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea rise?"

Gerald W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, with regards to Senate Joint Resolution 53, I'm wondering if you can let that lie on the Speaker's table for one day without moving it to a committee?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, I could. Whether or not I will or not depends on if you have something to discuss with me later about that I'd be happy to discuss it with you. My normal course of action is after the day's business, the



Clerk comes in and I consider at that time referral to committees of all matters that have been introduced and all of these things are on the Speaker's table and I'd be happy to discuss that with you prior to the time I take it off the Speaker's table, but I don't want to be bound by saying that I won't take it off. On leave of the House, we'll go to Vetoes - Amendatory Vetoes - Motions there appears House Bill 785."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Motion. I move that the attached amendment be adopted as changed to engrossed House Bill 785 in acceptance of the Governor's specific recommendation for change. Signed, Glen Schneider."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

J. Glenn Schneider: "What?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Amendatory Vetoes Motion. Your motion with regard to House Bill 785. You want it held? All right, take it out of the record. House Bill 1163."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Motion. I move that the attached amendment be adopted as changed to engrossed House Bill 1163 in acceptance of the Governor's specific recommendation for change, dated October 14, 1971. Harold Washington."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Harold Washington."

Harold Washington: "Ah, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I ask leave at this time to consider House Bill 1164, which is a companion bill of 1163 and in effect involves the same





identical language and procedure."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right. Is there leave for purposes of discussion? I think we had better have separate votes on these, but if there is no objection then we can have them heard together, so read the motion respecting 1164."

Fredric B. Selcke: "I move that the attached amendment be adopted as is changed to engrossed House Bill 1164 in acceptance of the Governor's specific recommendation for change dated October 14, 1971. Harold Washington."

Harold Washington: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry before I proceed. Ah, I think we're all feeling our way on these amendatory veto procedures and I have filed a motion which is not exactly in accordance with the Governor's amendatory veto, but more or less extended in terms of its purpose. I would like to have that motion read on the substance of that motion read so the body will know exactly what is before us."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Yeah, the motions in both instances has already been read."

Harold Washington: "The problem is I want the body to be exactly sure what is before us. I understand that Representative Hyde has filed also a motion in this case, in this matter, you did not? Why? All right, then I will proceed. First by way of giving a bit of background. House Bill 1163 and -64 were, as you know, the Martin Luther King holiday bills and their purpose was simply



that on the 15th day of January each year there should be a state holiday. Now, this would not involve the schools because that had already been taken care of in a prior legislation which was signed by the Governor last session providing for a commemorative holiday in which is now in effect in our public schools. The bill passed out of here with an overwhelming vote, I think it was approximately 130 votes, went to the Senate where it was got an overwhelming number of votes and went to the Governor. The Governor did not veto the bill, he simply stated in his amendatory message that he felt that we should await the action of a Federal Congress until such time to make this bill effective. Now I do not quarrel with the Governor nor his purpose, nor do I challenge his motives because I think I sincerely as I would like to see January 15 declared a holiday in light of in memory of Dr. Martin Luther King. But the thing that concerned me about the message and attempting to go along with the Governor was the fact that if we wait for the Congress to act, I don't think we're ever going to have a holiday for Martin Luther King. As a matter of fact, we waited for over a hundred years and we still do not have a national holiday for Abraham Lincoln. And so in order to go along with the Governor, not to join issue with the Governor, but to stay in sympathy with the direction, but yet still to manifest a desire of this General Assembly, the 77th General Assembly, I simply added this language, that we should go along with Congress



as he desires and as I would like to but we should set a termination point when Congress should act. In other words, we should not go on infinitely and sit here and wait for them to act. And so I simply said it in my amendment to the Governor's amendatory veto that we would go along with Congress but if Congress did not act by January 1, 1972, then this amendatory veto with the amendment on the bill would go into effect. That is the question I present to you. I say again we voted overwhelmingly for this. What I am suggesting as an amendment to the Governor's amendatory veto is not a departure from his purpose. I do not think we have joined issue with him on this. I think we have simply extended his thought along logical lines to simply state that the Great General Assembly of the State of Illinois should not wait out indefinitely for the Congress to act which if they do not act and that if they do not act by January 1, 1972, then the bill which you have already stated overwhelmingly which in effect would be more votes than we would need to override, which you've already supported, that law would go into effect on January 1, 1972. I ask for your support in this. I do not think it would embarrass the Governor in any way, he has already manifested his intentions to support that kind of legislation and I would not embarrass with him or challenge his motives, I simply say that what I am saying is a reasonable extension to what I was trying to do, and I solicit the support of members on both sides of the



aisle, this is not a partisan matter. I solicit the membership on both sides of the aisle to amend the Governor's amendatory veto and support this bill."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hyde."

Henry J. Hyde: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, consistent with the ruling of the Speaker yesterday, I must object to consideration of this motion. In not on the merits of the motions, but procedurally the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Cook, who is Chief Sponsor of this bill and diametrically opposed to the amendments suggested by the Governor in his specific recommendations, and because that is so, this is out of order and I would request the Chair to so rule and not entertain this motion because a comprehensive substantive change is made in the amendment offered by the distinguished sponsor as distinguished from the specific recommendation of the Governor."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, before I rule on that, does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Harold Washington desire to comment?"

Harold Washington: "Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, I think I have said all I want to say. Just two points in responding specifically to the Majority Leader's motion. One, I do not think the purpose of my amendment is in counter-distinction to the Governor's message. It simply extends it to state that if the Congress does not act and I am defining that as if they do not act by the first of



January next year, this law shall go into effect. I think as a matter of interpretation one can not say that there has been a substantive change made in the Governor's amendatory veto and for that reason I would like the Speaker to overrule the distinguished Majority Leader's motion in my favor."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "I have compared the specific recommendations of the Governor with the amendment which you have offered in each instance and find that those amendments are not do not differ from the Governor's specific recommendations in typographical content or as a matter of form, and a they do in fact do vary as a matter of substance, therefore they're not the specific recommendations of the Governor, and for that reason, the objections of the Majority Leader are found to be in order and that is my ruling. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Harold Washington.

Harold Washington: "I ask leave to take House Bills 1163 and 1164 out of the record."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, take them out of the record. Take them out of the record, both of them. All right, with leave of the House, we'll go to Total Veto Motions, on which there appears a motion with regard to House Bill 1677."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Motion to override veto. I move that engrossed House Bill 1677 do pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding dated October 13, 1971. . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Wait, wait, wait. . .for what purpose



does the Lady from Cook rise, Mrs. Chapman?"

Eugenia S. Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I have filed four motions and I would prefer to proceed first, if I may, with my motion on House Bill 1677, -76."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "We're on 1677, and that's. . ."

Eugenia S. Chapman: "I'm sorry, I got my numbers mixed, 1676 was what I would like to ask permission to proceed with, sir."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, I called 1677 and now if you don't want me to consider that, we'll take it out of the record."

Eugenia S. Chapman: "Okay."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, take it out of the record. For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hyde rise?"

Henry J. Hyde: "Well, Mr. Speaker, yesterday House Joint Resolution 10 was filed and this is a constitutional amendment, I believe, to change the constitution and strike the amendatory veto power of the Governor and I would direct the House's attention to the Joint Rules Number 4 and this rule says no resolution providing for a constitutional amendment shall be introduced in the House or Senate after April 1st in any regular session. Now, Mr. Speaker, that being the rule, I think the filing of House Joint Resolution 10 was inappropriate and contrary to the rules and I would ask that that filing of that be expunged from the records of the House and that the matter stand as



though House Joint Resolution 10 were not filed."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

Clyde L. Choate: "Would the Majority Leader explain just what House Joint Resolution 10 is to the membership?"

Henry J. Hyde: "I would prefer that the Chief Sponsor do that, Mr. Matijevich, although an explanation of it is somewhat beside the point. The question is is it a constitutional amendment and if it is does it is it in opposition to the rules, the joint rule."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

John S. Matijevich: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, first of all because I had been asked, I will explain the resolution for the constitutional amendment which I I think ought to go before the voters of the State of Illinois. Now what my resolution does, it calls for the repeal of 9 (e) that we've been talking about so much here in the last couple days and the last week also. It takes away this Governor's power, this amendatory power, wherein he proposes specific recommendations to the legislature. I think if I may explain why I think it's so important at this time, because I think we have seen. . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, well just a moment. We're not, a point has been raised under the joint rules and the the discussion will be limited to that particular point, not the merits of the proposal. Now, what purpose does the



gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea rise?"

Gerald W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Joint Resolution 4 in the last paragraph says no resolutions providing for constitutional amendment shall be introduced in the House or Senate after April the 1st in any regular session. This bill or resolution is introduced prior to April the 1st of 1972. We are in regular session next year. There's no date whether it's the April the 1st of an even or odd numbered year, and certainly the bill was timely filed before April 1, 1972."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, that's a stretch construction and I won't buy it. A, furthermore, the House Rules themselves provide that March 31 is the last day for introduction of House Joint Resolutions proposing constitutional amendment. Now, there'll be no problem if next year before April 1 there would be a filing, but in this calendar year, I think that the Majority Leader's point is well taken. And, that it's not in compliance with either, the Joint Rule to which the Majority Leader referred or to Rule 32, 32d. What purpose does the gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich rise?"

John S. Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I guess I'm asking for a ruling right now, but as I read the House Joint Rule 4, and I think it is very specific as to mentioning regular sessions. I think all of us know that a regular session is from January to June 30th. . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "No, that's not correct. We're in





regular session right now."

John S. Matijevecich: "Well, I think then we're in regular session every year, and it's it's surely before April of '72 if that's the case."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "It says not after April 1 of any year, and this is after April 1 of 1971."

John S. Matijevecich: "Well, I'm sure I'd get I'd get the wrong ruling, I was aware of that, Mr. Speaker, but could I ask a parliamentary inquiry then?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "You can try."

John S. Matijevecich: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, by what means can a man suspend a Joint Rule on a matter that he feels. . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well I suggest you make a motion. I'm not going to tell you how to do something. You make a motion and I'll rule on whether it's in order. Right now, I'm ruling that the Majority Leader's point is well taken and that that constitutional amendment will be stricken because the Joint Rule provides that it can not be introduced after April 4, April 1."

John S. Matijevecich: "One, One more parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Can a matter be expunged from the record only by a Majority Leader asking for a ruling, can't we as the membership vote on whether something is expunged from the record. After all this is in the record. . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Well, I've already ruled on it and there are methods by which you can concern yourself with my rulings if you care to."



John S. Matijevec: "Will do."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, with leave of the House, we'll go over to Reduction Vetoes Motions, on which there appears a motion concerning House Bill 2221."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Motion to restore reduced item of appropriation. I move that items on page 2, line 11 of engrossed House Bill 2221 be restored. The item reduction of the Governor notwithstanding, dated October 13, 1971, Representative Berman."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman."

Arthur L. Berman: "Ah, . . ."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "Now, we're for the first time on consideration of reduction vetoes motion and I would ask the members to direct their attention to the matter."

Arthur L. Berman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I call your attention to House Bill 2221 which dealt with the appropriations for the Illinois State Scholarship Commission for fiscal year 1972. I believe this is a bill which is important to every member of this House. I know that it is a commission which has filled a very dire need in our higher education scheme by providing thousands of scholarships representing millions of dollars to young people to attend institutions of higher learning in the State of Illinois. As we pass House Bill 2221, there was appropriations of \$48,400,000.00. The Governor by certain line item reduction has reduced the appropriation for the Illinois State Scholarship Commission by \$3,243,000.00.



Personal services were reduced by \$34,000.00, the retirement system by \$2,300.00, social security by \$5,800.00, so Ladies and Gentlemen the main gist of the cut by the Governor was in the grant award, a cut of \$3,200,000.00. Let me outline for you very briefly what this \$3,200,000.00 cut in the appropriations of the Illinois State Scholarship Commission means as far as the young people in your district and my district. As a result of the reduction, the Scholarship Commission had to deny processing of all applications that were submitted after April 1, 1971. 9,800 students made application to the Scholarship Commission after April 1, 1971. Of this 9,800 applications, 5,500 young people would have been eligible for some type of monetary grant under the requested appropriations from the Scholarship Commission. All 9,800 applications had to be denied. In addition to that, all applications that were granted money before April 1, 1971 had to be reduced by four per cent as a result of the Governor's recommended reduction. Now, what this means is that there have been a large number of young people who had contemplated making requests for scholarships and 5,500 of them who had come within the deadline that had been established back in 1970 found themselves without receiving any money, even though they would have qualified for money, if the grant that were predicated on applications before April 1 had been processed in the same manner after April 1, 1971. We are faced with the situation where the number of applications



in 1972 were 20,000 over that processed the previous year and the students are faced with a higher cost of education, with a greater awareness by high school students of the availability of these funds and an increased awareness by all segments of society and especially by the lower income segments of the availability of funds through the Illinois State Scholarship Commission. And what has happened as a result of these reductions is that we, I wish to correct that, not we, but the Governor has broken a promise to these young people that based upon their need there would be monies made available to them to start their college careers. By sustaining this motion to restore the reduction, which is only \$3,200,000.00 and the overall expenditures of a state budget, is a rather small amount, we can guarantee that the four per cent across the board cuts can be restored, that the 5,500 applications that were turned down can be reconsidered and that we will not be faced next year with accumulation of applications that were both turned down this year and that will be requested next year, because we will find ourselves, if this cut is not restored, in the position of having to expend even greater sums in our next budget to take care of the young people who were denied assistance as a result of the Governor's cut this year. In summation, Ladies and Gentlemen, I appeal to you to restore these cuts in a very crucial area. The State Scholarship Commission has attempted in a sincere method to allocate money to people that but for their grants of



money would not be going to college and there are thousands of these young people in our state today who we can say, by voting green on that board on this motion, that we will not go back on our promise, that we will give them the kind of money that will assist them in obtaining a higher education that we consider this an important part of our commitment to the young people of the state and to the future of the State of Illinois. I urge your affirmative vote on this motion to restore the cut to the Illinois State Scholarship Commission."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Lee, Mr. Shapiro."

David C. Shapiro: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in rebuttal to the distinguished gentleman from Cook, you would think there were no increases in the scholarship commission appropriation this year, that there were no increases in the number of recipients and that there were no increases in the amount of the monetary award. I want to point to this House that for this next fiscal year that there is an increase of approximately \$6,500,000.00 for the scholarship commission. This amount of money will be awarded to approximately 68,000 recipients which is an increase of 11,000 over the previous year. 58,000 of those recipients are non-veterans, 10,000 are veterans. Now just what does this 3.2 million dollar cut in the appropriation mean? It just means that there is not a reduction in the amount of money appropriated last year, but there is an actual increase of \$6,000,000.00. It's



just not as much as some people think there should have been. This 3.2 million dollars will not provide any additional scholarships this year for the following reasons: the figure that the gentleman from Cook used, 5,500 of those eligible, it has been determined of that number by the scholarship commission that 4,200 would now be eligible for scholarships. Of that 4,200 in number, a 1,500 attend institutions a private institutions of higher education. Now, the four per cent reduction was only done on those recipients who received more than \$125.00, so a per cent reduction on the recipient who receive higher amounts, meant that there dollar reduction was greater. Of those 1,500 students who attend institutions of private institutions 1.9 million dollars of the reduction would go to them, approximately two-thirds. 1.2 million dollars would go to public institutions. The Illinois State Scholarship Commission at this present stage of the game would not, because of administrative difficulties, would not be able to go back and give those recipients scholarships. More than likely, if the money was restored, all they would be able to do would be to restore the four per cent cut. I want to point out to you that the Scholarship Commission was told in April not to send out any more letters or to move the deadline up to June 1st. I want to point out to you that all of those recipients who were told that they would receive scholarships would receive them. The amount was reduced by four per cent. In closing, I want to say to



the House that the Governor's veto on House Bill 2221 be sustained."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Matijevich, ah; I'm sorry, Mr. Maragos."

Samuel C. Maragos: "As long as the mistake is made with such a distinguished name at Matijevich, this speaker does not mind. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I arise in support of the motion of Representative Berman because we may have all the fancy statistics what this will or will not do, except that I know that it is a life blood situation in my district, where four applicants who would have qualified, normally would have qualified to receive these awards, were not did not receive them because of the specific lack of money. We could say all we can, the fact that they would not had not been notified to receive them, but the Director of the Illinois State Scholarship Commission wrote to them specifically and said you are qualified in every other aspect, except that our funds have run dry, and therefore, we can not in good conscience promise you that you would be qualified and receive these awards next September. Here are four outstanding students who monetary and economic backgrounds do not allow them to go to any school, who are bright students, on the upper twenty-five per cent of their class and have qualified in every other respect, like has been done in the past. Yet, these are four in my own district who I know as a person from personal experience who I tried to help but was unable to do so



because of a lack of funds. Now this excuse of saying that if we did pass this legislation that the commission could not properly administer does not hold water either, because when we mandate something, I am sure that the commission and the commissioners will find the time and the ability to do so if the Governor so mandates them to do so. And now, this other excuse that no one was notified who was supposed to receive it and did not receive it, and this is also another way of saying that they did not notify them that they were going to receive it because they were unable to do so. I think it's a heart breaking experience when you see especially high school graduates who are ready to go to college and have been semi-promised and anticipated this and then find out around July of last, the summer time that they can not go to school because these funds have run dry. I think we should restore whatever we can, and for instance, using the four students from my district as an example, if only one of them could be, if that four per cent would even restore one of them, it may still suffice, and therefore I ask that you override this veto."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Stark, Mr. Nowlan."

James D. Nowlan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion of the gentleman from across the aisle, out of basic concern for equity and justice, the practical matter of the fact is that throughout last year, students were receiving letters explaining that they have until June 1 to file





applications for assistance from us and then retroactively we told 9,000 of those students that they had missed the deadline, a deadline which had to be reset after the fact. The larger question is that of priority. Shall we as the legislature, allow the Governor, this Governor and future Governors, to set all the priorities of services in government? For example, in this past year we embarked upon a new \$6,000,000.00 program of direct aid to private colleges and universities. It's been pointed out that most of these scholarship reduction money would end up with private colleges and yet, the Governor chose not to reduce the amount available in the direct subsidy to private colleges, money which does not assist students, but the colleges, instead, he reduced that money which would have gone to the students. Had he reversed himself and reduced the amount going directly to the private colleges and retained the money for the state scholarships, most of that scholarship money would have still reposed with the private colleges and universities, but it also would have helped those students. I have the greatest respect for the Governor, and yet today I am taking that simple prerogative available to any legislator of formally disagreeing with him. I believe that neither should the Governor be supreme in our realm, nor should we as a legislature be supine. And therefore, I ask that we in this instance vote to override the reduction veto of the Governor."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."



Clyde L. Choate: "Mr. Speaker, could we attempt to get a wee bit of order because I think this is an important question."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "A wee bit, hea?"

Clyde L. Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's my understanding at least that the scholarship commission is to attempt to award scholarships primarily on the basis of need. Now the facts show that in the State of Illinois, public education is getting higher and higher every day and it's being priced right out of the range of the average family. Now, if these scholarships are going to be awarded on the basis of need, then we're going to have to talk about the moderate and low income family. In 1955 if you will listen to the fact, the average family income in Illinois was \$5,000.00 and the average family income of students enrolled at the University of Illinois was \$5,100.00. Now, in 1970 in 1970 when the average family income in Illinois was \$9,000.00, the average family income of a University of Illinois student was \$14,200.00. So what are we doing when we reduce the budget of the scholarship commission? We are penalizing these off-springs of the moderate and low income families of the State of Illinois, and we are saying to them, yes, we are not going to give you the opportunity to have a quality education. If in deed the scholarship commission, if in deed the scholarship commission is going to award the scholarships on the basis of needs, then the Governor's



cut in the scholarships funds has denied approximately 5,500 applicants, 5,500 applicants the opportunity of entering an institution of higher education. And at the same time this administration is insisting on increasing tuition. Now, who are we kidding? When you increase tuition and you cut scholarships to the moderate and low income, the result is simply this. Higher education is becoming more and more for the elite, for the rich, for the wealthy, and Mr. Speaker I say that we should sustain Representative Berman's motion if we're going to pay attention to the youngsters of this state who need and deserve an education."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Henss."

Donald A. Henss: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this discussion about the problem of need may be somewhat misleading, depending upon what your formula or definition of need may be. I want to point out to all of the members, that we're not talking about the poverty level here, we're not talking about any line of \$3,900.00 of family income as you might find under the federal legislation, we're talking about a formula which was developed by the Scholarship Commission. Depending upon the number of children in the family, depending upon other circumstances of the family, it's possible for scholarships to be given in a family which has an excess of \$20,000.00 a year in family income. Now, that is need under the definition



of the State Scholarship Commission. With all of this talk about reduction, I think we should not overlook the fact that this was an increase in the amount of money available for scholarships in Illinois, an increase of about \$6,000,000.00. Over 9,000 more students were helped this year than last year. I believe that Illinois still leads the nation with it's scholarship program. The cuts were made by the Governor after consultation with staff of the Scholarship Commission, and this, Ladies and Gentlemen, was an increase, not a reduction, in amounts which were previously available. We can not be in a position of letting the Scholarship Commission bind us by the number of letters which it sends out. The appropriation must be within the control of the legislative process, if the scholarship commission can bind us by any action, bind us to any particular action, by simply sending out more letters, then we might as well turn over the entire legislative process and the appropriation process to the scholarship commission and we certainly would then be in a sorry shape. I ask the legislature to sustain this \$6,000,000.00 increase instead of the \$9,000,000.00 increase which the legislature had previously passed and vote 'no' on this motion. I would like to point out further to you that in the midwest the State of Illinois is number one in the per capita of higher education among all of the industrial states, the State of Illinois is number one in the per capita cost of higher education. We are a leader in our



scholarship fund. The state financial support of higher education has gone up by about 72 per cent in the past three years, to increase this still more by overriding a veto and getting a budget out of balance is, in my opinion, simply ridiculous. We're too far along in the school year to for this money to be used effectively. Let us consider this as a matter for next Spring, a new legislation, and defeat this override at this time."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The, ah, what, all right, we'll have no displays of emotion from the members. Its, the lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman."

Eugenia S. Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman, Members of the House, it's great to talk percentages and figures, but let's talk people for just one moment. Let's talk students. Students are caught in a three way squeeze. On the one hand, every single legislator in this body has had letters from student after student telling us of cuts in jobs. We're all great for talking about letting kids work their way through college. But there are fewer college jobs available because of slashes in university budgetary requests. Secondly, we're faced with possible increases in tuition, and then on top of this we make fewer scholarships available to the eligible. Now, let's talk for a moment, not about total amounts that are granted, but total students who are eligible. The Scholarship Commission has an excellent way of deciding that needy students get scholarships, when they have more apply than there is money for,



they just change their formula and decide that a needy student isn't a needy student anymore. So in addition to the hardships that have already been mentioned, we have the change in a formula to make it harder to qualify, we have students who are otherwise eligible who apply before the deadline, who are not having an opportunity to receive scholarships, and many letters were sent out indicating this just because the money had run out and then in addition to this, the squeeze in the economy. So, the students are getting it in every direction, fewer jobs, higher tuition, scholarships not available to those who are eligible. Do we support providing an education for those who are capable or don't we? My vote will be yes to override the veto."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hyde."

Henry J. Hyde: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it's interesting to listen to the verbal portraits of this administration as opposing higher education and as opposing scholarships for needy students. It's all depends on how you look at the situation, a bottle is either half full or it's half empty. The facts are simply that the appropriation which will become law as the Governor's veto is the same provides \$6,600,000.00 more than last year. I don't look upon that as a reduction, I look upon that as an increase. I'd like to point out that as of January 1, 1971, Illinois has guaranteed student loans approximating \$152,000,000.00 and this year another \$42,000,000.00 will be guaranteed. So I don't see how any



student should be denied an education who is truly needy and who truly wants an education. I also think it should be made a matter of record that the increases every year have been substantial in this program. In '69, it was \$18,400,000.00; '69-70 it was \$26,900,000.00; '70-71, it was \$34,800,000.00, and this year if we sustain the Governor, \$41,400,000.00, a 19 per cent increase and I simply say it isn't a question of being too kind to the Governor, but being sensible to the people, to the students, and to the tax-payers. And I hope that the gentleman's motion will be defeated. Thank you."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Boone, Mr. Cunningham."

Lester Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All those in favor say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No'. The 'Yeas' have it. The previous question is moved. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman to close."

Arthur L. Berman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think most of the speakers have covered most of the points concerning this appropriation. I do think, however, that we have to remind ourselves, as many of us are familiar, the scholarship commission issues its form in October. Last year they issued their form in October, and it showed on the form that many of you sent out to your constituents that these people have certain deadlines, the ultimate deadline being June 1, 1971, that many students prospective students sought other avenues of obtaining financial assistance through



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

other types of awards and grants and loans, and they knew according to the commitment that was made by the Scholarship Commission, by the Government of the State of Illinois, that they had until June 1st to submit their application; not until April 1st, did these people who wanted to go to college, 4,500 of whom would have qualified for assistance and awards under formula adopted by the Scholarship Commission, not until April 1st did they find out that they were out in the cold, that their applications could not even be considered. Now, I think this is a breach of faith with these young people, based upon our commitment to them, and the legislature has tried to fulfill that commitment with the passage of this appropriation bill in our regular session. I am asking you today to reform that commitment to these young people and don't go back on our word or let some other branch of this government force us to go back on our word. We said to these people that there would be money for them, there are 4,500 students that would have received money, but for this cut, they can still get this money, and I urge your support to reinstate the reduction in the appropriation to the State Scholarship Commission."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right the question is shall the item on page 2, line 11 of engrossed House Bill 2221 reduced be restored to its original amount over the reduction of the Governor. All those in favor will vote 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', and this requires 89 votes to pass. The





gentleman from Cook, Mr. B. B. Wolfe."

Bernard B. Wolfe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Briefly in explaining my vote. The major concern that I have in connection with these scholarships is in connection with an add which appeared in the Sun-Times this morning. The caption is 'Employers. The job crisis in our community is now desperate' and it lists at least 100 or 150 names of men, which the add says 'these men are not asking for handouts, they want to work. If you would like to interview them, please contact Father George Clements, The Holy Angels Church'. Now, this is a desperate situation throughout the State of Illinois, and I'm very fearful that returning veterans who are going to seek a higher education through the use of scholarship funds will be denied what I consider to be a right, not a privilege, for a returning veterans, and I would respectfully ask this House to consider that aspect of it, and to vote green to override the Governor's veto."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Douglas."

Bruce L. Douglas: "Mr. Speaker, in support of my vote, I would like to say in response to those who have given statistics which indicate that the money is not available to provide education for this large number of people who are eligible for education on every grounds, that while this may seem to be a fiscally sound move on the part of the administration, it is a humanely unsound move and I would urge those who are concerned about the fiscal integrity of this



State to recognize that this is a good investment, that the education of these thousands of young eligible people who otherwise would not be able to get a college education will bring more in return to this State in years to come than we could possibly save by cutting back in this one area."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."

Eugene M. Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in explaining my vote in support of this motion, in working with a group of veterans back in in Chicago during the summer, who was depending on help from the area, The Illinois Scholarship Commission, to help bridge the gap, if you will, of returning to civilian life, to improve their life for employment in our ever growing competitive market. It seems to me that in trying to do things of that type, the group that are striving to improve their lives, for us to stand here and talk about statistics and it's hard when you sit down to an individual man returning from the wars of our country and tell him that he can not get financial support to help in his education because of some statistics that you are citing here today. I think you should think about it on that basis and on that basis I wish we could get additional four or five green lights up there to help to put this money where the need is the greatest."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Gerald W. Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm somewhat shocked, but not too surprised to look



at the board and see where the green lights and the red lights are. I go to a budgetary meeting and I watch Director McCarter of the Bureau of the Budget with his fiscal hocus pocus tell me that we're going to have \$274,000,000.00 in lapsed money this year. I listen and watch with wonderment when we can spend \$3,000,000.00 to build a garage. We're spending over a billion dollars on construction of roads and we can't spend \$3,000,000.00 more on the most precious commodity we have, our children. We saddle them with debt but we don't give them an opportunity to go to school and get an education. Gentlemen, think what you're doing."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. J. J. Wolfe, 'No'. What purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman rise?"

Arthur L. Berman: "I would request a poll of the absentees, please."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, the Clerk will poll the absentees."

Fredric B. Selcke: "Bradley, Campbell, Capuzi, William Cunningham, Downes, Duff, Gardner, Garmisa, Gibbs, Graham, Granata, Harpstrite, Houde, Janczak, Jones, Karmazyn, Klosak, McCormick, McDevitt, Moore, O'Brien, Rose, Schisler, Jack Thompson, Tuerk, Wall, Washburn, Genoa Washington, Williams, Zlatnik."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman rise?"



Arthur L. Berman: "Mr. Speaker, I'd ask that this be put on postponed consideration."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, if there's not objection, why we'll place the matter on the order of postponed consideration. What purpose the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Granata rise?"

Peter C. Granata: "Did the committee, did the Rules Committee adopt a new rule on postponed consideration?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "yes."

Peter C. Granata: "But it was never placed on the floor, is that correct?"

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "No, we adopted the rule."

Peter C. Granata: "But the House has not adopted it."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "No, the House has adopted it, the House has adopted it. So, he would under that rule have one one more try, if we go to the order of postponed consideration on that item again. Resolutions."

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Resolution 415, Juckett, et.al. House Resolution 417, Douglas, et.al. House Resolution 418, Laurino. House Resolution 419, Randolph, et.al. House Resolution 420, Lechowicz, et.al."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hyde."

Henry J. Hyde: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, these are the agreed resolutions. House Resolution 415 congratulates Herman Herzog upon his selection of the Illinois Press Association. House Resolution 417 commends the Louis A. Weiss Memorial Hospital of Chicago for its



## GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

fine service. House Resolution 418 commends and congratulates Miss Anita Pankratz upon her winning the title of Miss Illinois. The sponsor of that, as far as I can see, is only Representative Laurino. House Resolution 419 commends and wishes to express the confidence in this House in Bobby Douglas as the only healthy quarterback the Bears have for this Sunday. And House Resolution 420 congratulates Gildo Mazzolin upon his receipt of the Decoration of Cavaliere, Order of the Star of Italian Solidarity. I think the sponsor of that should be noted, Mr. Lechowicz. I move that adoption of the agreed resolutions."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All those in favor of adoption of the agreed resolutions say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No', the 'Yeas' have it and the agreed resolutions are adopted. Further resolutions?"

Fredric B. Selcke: "House Resolution 416, Douglas, et.al."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hyde."

Henry J. Hyde: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and gentlemen of the House, I would like to remind the membership that today is the last day for filing motions in connection with the vetoes concerning House Bills. I now move, first of all another announcement, the Republican Committee Chairman will meet at 9:30 A.M. in the Speaker's office tomorrow morning, and now, Mr. Speaker, I move this House do stand in recess until the hour of 10:00 A.M. tomorrow morning."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, we'll hold that for just a moment for an announcement or two. The gentleman from



Cook, Mr. Regner."

David J. Regner: "Ah, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, realizing that various other committees will be rereferring bills to the Appropriation Committee on Thursday and Friday, I would like to ask for unanimous consent for the suspension of Rule 17 which is the posting notice for bills so that appropriations can post the bills that have been rereferred on Friday to be heard on Tuesday of next week immediately following the session. I've cleared this with the Minority Leader and the Minority Spokesman on the Appropriation Committee."

Hon. W. Robert Blair: "All right, if there be no objection, then we'll suspend the rule for the purpose requested. In order to accommodate any of those persons desiring to file motions concerning the vetoes, the Clerk's office will be open until, right here until the hour of 5:00 P.M. this evening and we will, unless there's objection, accept those motions up until 5:00 P.M. concerning any of these vetoes. All right, the adjournment motion is for 10:00 A.M. tomorrow morning. All those in favor say 'Yeas', the opposed 'No'. The House stands adjourned now until the hour of 10:00 A.M. tomorrow morning."

Adjourn at 3:12 O'Clock P.M.

10/19/71  
skn.

