

Clerk Selcke: "May I have your attention, please? The Appropriations Committee is still meeting and will not be finished before 1:00. So if you want to go out and eat a little lunch, ah.. why ah.. now's the time to do it. Not before 1:00. What was that? We're still waiting for the Appropriations Committee to adjourn and then we'll start. Appropriations has just announced they'd be here about 2:00."

Speaker Blair: "The House will be in order and the invocation will be by Dr. Johnson."

Dr. Johnson: "We Pray. You have so frequently assured us, Oh God, that when Your people come before You with their cries, You are ready to hear. You assure us that when we ask according to Your will, You are ready according to Your providence. Be pleased to hear us now, Oh Lord, as we begin this Session. We recognize our needs and we are grateful for Your past mercies. Add Your wisdom to our planning, Your strength to our intentions, Your favor to our words, and our benediction upon our decisions. And now let us commit our way to You, that You may lead us in those paths of uprightness, which are well pleasing in Your eyes. We ask this in Your most gracious name, Oh God, to which all honor is to attributed and all glory to be given. Amen."

Speaker Blair: "Roll Call for Attendance. The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, just to settle some of the curiosity that's been going on ah.. and the questions, I want to report to you that I'm still in the same position I was yesterday. I reported to the court at 9:30 by order of the news media, who said that I should be there at 9:30. Except for them, I assure you, I have had no... as of yet... any agency of government say a word to me whatsoever."



Thank you."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Epton."

Epton: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, while we're on the subject of other governmental bodies, although I realize that permission cannot be granted, I would like the Journal to I would like the Journal to record the fact that I just received a subpoena from the United States of America. I figured that would be rather.....(unintelligible)....."

Thank you very much. Did you get that, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Blair: "No, ah.. I didn't get that."

Epton: "I want the record to show that by virtue of this subpoena, I will not be able to be present tomorrow and I'm in effect advising the Journal that I will appear at the request of Chairman Arthur S. Fleming, Chairman of the Commission on Civil Rights. The subpoena has nothing to do with my own personal affairs. Thank you."

Speaker Blair: "All right, the Gentleman's ah... ya, his remarks will be journalized. Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time... there's on the Calendar a motion to ah... to reconsider the vote by which the House..... and I would like at this time to table my motion. I would like to table my motion on House Bill 2851 for reconsideration of the House veto."

Speaker Blair: "Objection? None. Tabled."

Maragos: "Thank you."

Speaker Blair: "All right, Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would request leave of the House that the House would stand in recess for a period of thirty some odd minutes, probably... for the purpose of a Democratic Conference."

Speaker Blair: "All right, the Gentleman has moved that the House be in recess until 1:30 or thereabouts. I



lost one. Until 2:30 or thereabouts ah.. for the purpose of a Democratic Conference in Room M-5."

Choate: "M-5. So if you Democrats will join with me hurriedly, then we can get back here."

Speaker Blair: "All those in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye' and the opposed 'no' and the motion to recess prevails. Back on the floor around 1:30.... 2:30 or so. No Republican Conference... just the Democrats."

Clerk Selcke: "Will you please shut your microphone off upstairs?"

Speaker Blair: "The Democrats are still in the Conference. The Governor has been down there with them for about thirty-five or forty minutes. They'll be back, I guess, when they clear up whatever it is that they're talking about. Committee Reports."

Clerk Selcke: "Mr. Washburn, from Appropriations, to which House Bill 2913 was referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bill do not pass. Mr. Washburn, from Appropriations, to which House Bills 2908, 2909, 2910, 2912 and 2916 were referred, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Bills do pass. Mr. Washburn, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which House Resolution 1192, offered by Mr. Skinner on November 21, 1974, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Resolution.... do adopt. Mr. Washburn, from Appropriations, to which House Bill 2915 was referred, reported the same back with Amendments thereto with the recommendation that the Amendments be adopted and those amended do pass. No further Committee Reports."

Speaker Blair: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook arise.... Mr. Shea?"

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, perhaps I did not hear the Clerk, but was House Bill 2917 reported back on that message?"

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2917 was not reported back yet."

Shea: "Might I inquire of either the Clerk or the Chair why that was not done? I think it's a very important Bill. It was heard at the same time the other ones were heard and I'm wondering if the Speaker might inquire of the Chairman of the Committee if there is going to be a report on that Bill today?"

Speaker Blair: "We'll certainly put that inquiry in the tube and get an answer for you."

Shea: "Thank you."

Speaker Blair: "You're welcome. All right, motions with respect to total vetoes. Mr. Collins, do you want 1900? No. Mr. Choate, wall water intake... structure in Harrisburg? 2341. Mr. Hoffman, do you want that? Mr. Choate, 2383? Mr. Waddell? Ms. Catania? Mr. Jacobs, want to hold 2710? Do you want to hold that? Oh, you want to go on 2710? Whatever your pleasure. Do you want to hold it? Okay, a little while. Mr. Brinkmeier on 2736? Mr. Brinkmeier on 2736? Don't see him. Mr. Beatty. Do you want to go with that? All right, Mr. Beatty has 2778."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2778 is a Bill that, by overriding, will not cost the State of Illinois one penny. This Bill merely gives cities with the population of over 500,000 and we're talking about specifically the Chicago Public Library and the City Council of the City of Chicago, authority to levy an additional three mills... or three cents per \$100.00. At the present time in the State of Illinois everyone else has this authority. They're all at a 15¢ level or higher. If you override this veto, you are giving the city a right only... a right to, if they choose, levy an additional three cents in the future. They

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



have to do this by their own action. I don't see why the Chicago City Library should be treated any differently than all the rest of the libraries in the State of Illinois. The additional part of this Bill is that it allows the city to, with referendum, go from 20¢ to 40¢ in the future sometime. But that would be with referendum. Now, there was the veto and I don't understand the veto measure completely. I don't understand what the Governor's saying. I do not believe that the Chicago Public Library has home rule power. I believe if they were to try to go up over this 12¢ limit that their action would be subject to litigation in the courts. The only clear cut way to give them authority is for it to come right here from the...the Legislature. As you've probably noted in this paper that I circulated, all the Chicago papers recommended initial taxes of this Bill. The Civic Federation in Chicago favors this Bill. I think that it's a good Bill. One additional thing. We've been holding hearings in the State of Illinois. Our Subcommittee that was appointed to study this very problem, the funding of libraries in the State of Illinois and we've held hearings at about three or four places in the State. And the Subcommittee, which is bipartisan and consisting of various Members here, all realize after these hearings that this need does exist. That Chicago should meet this level and that they should have at least the right, in the future, if Chicago so sees fit to levy an additional three cents. So I would appreciate your vote."

Speaker Blair: "Discussion? Mr. Dunn. Mr. Ralph Dunn?"

Dunn: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On?"

Speaker Blair: "Turn Mr. Dunns' mike up."



Dunn: "Thank you, Mr.... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First time I've used this new mike. I would like to speak in behalf of the override of this. Representative Beatty and I were on a Committee. I chaired the Committee and we studied libraries. We spent a lot of time this summer and one of the recommendations we made was that we raise the rates to 15¢ all over the state. The rest of the state has this now. They can levy up to 15¢. But Chicago is limited to 12¢. We thought this was a good Bill and I was the Cosponsor as Representative Beatty and I hope that we'll all vote favorable on the override."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Calvo. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "This is... Mr. Beatty is the Sponsor, is that correct?"

Speaker Blair: "Yes."

Madison: "Well, Jack, I have one question. It seems that, you know, for the last couple years Lee Source has been down before my Committee amending every Bill because the city had homerule powers and I'm wondering why the city don't just use their homerule powers to take care of this problem. Because if we go telling the city now what they can do...ah... you know, where are we going? I mean...this seems to be just the reverse of the homerule power theory."

Speaker Blair: "Yeah...Mr. Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Calvo, there's a question...Constitutional question on this point as to whether or not this is, Chicago Public Library is a special district and that's the only way...the only clear cut way, actually, is for the Legislature is to authorize this thing to allow, if the city wants, then the city council could act. BUT the only clear cut way is here. Other-



wise you've got to litigate the matter."

Calvo: "All right...all right, thank you."

Speaker Blair: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Beatty...ah... Mr. Bluthardt. Mr. Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "I would like to put a question to the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Blair: "All right. He says he'll answer."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Beatty, I understand and noted that this is a ... a tax for the operation and maintenance of the Chicago Public Library is there an additional levy for the operation of the Chicago Public Library other than this tax?"

Beatty: "I don't understand the question, Mr. Bluthardt. Additional, where would that be?"

Bluthardt: "Well, I'm asking you the question. If you know of any? Do you know of an additional tax for the operation of the Chicago Public Library?"

Beatty: "No sir. I don't know of any. No sir."

Bluthardt: "Do they have a tax that downstate libraries do not have, for the operation of the Chicago Public Library?"

Beatty: "No, they have less authority than the entire state...than any other unit of government in the State of Illinois dealing with libraries. They're only allowed to go to 12 mil., everyone else has the right to go to 15. We're trying to bring them to the same level as the rest of the state. All the other libraries in the state."

Bluthardt: "And to your knowledge this is...this is the total tax that the Chicago Public Library would be allowed to levy for the operation, maintenance, the purchase of books and everything that it takes to operate and maintain a library."



Beatty: "That's correct and that's the problem with the cost increase. They're having problems getting the money to keep the library at the level it's at now so they can provide service and they provide service even to your community. I'm sure people in your community use this library and we in the city pay the taxes for it. So we're not..."

Bluthardt: "We don't kick anybody out from Chicago either who comes into our library."

Beatty: "Well, that's fine."

Bluthardt: "My question though, it seems that somewhere in the back of my mind during the debate that... earlier this year, that it came out that the Chicago Public Library had an additional tax. Other and beyond this."

Beatty: "Well, I don't recall it coming out and I know of none. I don't believe there is any. This is it. 12 mil for a \$100.00."

Bluthardt: "Thank you."

Speaker Blair: "All right. Mr. Beatty."

Beatty: "Well, in conclusion, I don't feel that the City of Chicago should be penalized. It needs the authority of the Legislature. It isn't a big thing. It's costing no one here any money. If any, if there's going to be any increase levied it's going to be the City Councils of the City that will provide it but I think we should provide them the right. Libraries are important to communities. This library is used by many communities other than the people in the city. We service people throughout the whole suburban area and sometimes we get out cost back and sometimes we do not. And I think that it's a good Bill and I believe that this override should be successful. I mean, I need your vote and I...



would appreciate your help."

Speaker Blair: "The question is, shall House Bill 2778 pass? The veto of the Governor notwithstanding? All those in favor will vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker and esteemed leader and Members of the House. The...this is not a Bill that's going to cost state government any money. In fact if we don't pass it, it probably will cost state government some money because when the votes come in from Chicago in the next General Assembly, they'll probably just take it out of the general fund. The...this... When you're trying to rationalize the property tax system you've got two variables. One's assessments and the other is tax rates and what the library Subcommittee was equally divided and which... I hope that example will be followed by the other side next time around. What we tried to do was rationalize the library financing system. Now, you gentlemen haven't gotten the report yet because we just signed the letters to make it personalized to you. But what we found out was that downstate library districts, all except for the county districts had a levy, that is had a maximum tax rate that was higher, substantially higher than was Chicagos. Now, that's just not fair. If the City of Chicago wants to tax its people for vital library services as high as we do, it seems to me we shouldn't discriminate against them.. So, I think we ought to vote in favor of it."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Yourell...Mr. Yourell votes 'aye'.

Mr. Lundy."

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



House. I also served on the Library Financing Subcommittee and I think the explanation which we received on that Subcommittee would be of interest to some of the Members. Apparently the discrepancy between the maximum tax rate without referendum, which Chicago presently has that is 12¢ and the rest of the state has, which is 15¢ was based on a typographical error, which existed in that last Bill that raised the maximum levy...the maximum rate without referendum. Now, that's really all this Bill is doing is correcting an error and putting the Chicago Public Library on the same footing as other libraries throughout the state in terms of their maximum permissible tax rate without referendum. I think it's needed, the library certainly needs the money and they made that case convincingly to the sub-committee and I would urge an 'aye' vote. I hope we can put them in the same position as the rest of the library districts in the state."

Speaker Blair: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 111 'ayes', 1 'nay', 23 'present' and House Bill 2778 is passed, the veto of the Governor to...not withstanding. Now, you're going to hold, Mr. Skinner, on 2792? Right? You're going to hold on 2792? Mr. Skinner? Going to hold. Mr. Springer on 2796? No. How about 2797? No. Mr. Neff on 2821? No. Mr. Collins, do you want to try it? Mr. Collins on 2866."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2866 has reference to one of the State of Illinois great assets and I refer to the Chicago Regional Port District. This great port of ours, which is so vital to the economy of the



state has fallen upon somewhat hard times and I'm sure that all of us are aware that tonage is down and so revenues have been decreased in the Chicago Regional Port. As a matter of fact, I learned just today a shocking fact that Caterpillar Tractors, one of our great Illinois corporations is shipping all of their shipping out of the Port of Milwaukee rather than going to the Chicago Regional Port District. And the reason for the effect such as this is obvious that the Chicago Port is not as modern and up to date in facilities as other ports throughout the Great Lakes. The House Bill 2866 which deals with the much needed containerized facilities at the port, as a matter of fact, this board would provide the authority under the Capital Development Bond Act to issue bonds in the amount of \$8,000,000 so that land could be purchased to initiate containerized facilities in the Chicago Regional Port. Now this, as I say, the authorization for the Capital Development Bond, this is not the Appropriation Bill. The Appropriation Bill is being handled in the Senate by Senator Dougherty from our district and who is just as interested as I in the modernization of this port. The port is important, not only to Chicago but to the economy of the entire state and I think that anyone who has looked into the field of shipping and export and import today realizes the impact that has been made by containerized facilities on shipping throughout the world. We have fallen behind some of the other ports on the Great Lakes. Toledo, I understand has initiated containerized facilities and the new harbor in Indiana at Burns Harbor also contemplates such facilities. This is much needed, it's much needed for the entire State of Illinois. It's



an expenditure, but rather than an expenditure I would prefer to look upon it as an investment in the future and in the economy of the State of Illinois. This money will come back to the state manyfold. it will create jobs and of course will produce revenues. The port does need our help and those of us who don't know, Chicagos port is the only great port in the country that doesn't have a tax base. The port does have to rely entirely upon revenues that can be generated in the facilities of the port. I think that this is...Bill is vital to the well being of the economy of the State...of the State of Illinois and I would ask each and every one of you for a favorable vote to override this veto."

Speaker Blair: "All right, Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I too join in overriding the Governor's veto on this particular Legislation because as it's been explained by Mr. Collins, this is an enabling statute and does not in itself appropriate any money at this time. We want to say the power of the Capital Bond Authority is given to them that in due course if we do appropriate a certain additional amount of money over and above what the Governor has vetoed then at that time we will be able to have that statute and authority with the Capital Development Bond Board. More importantly, I'd like to point out is the fact that this not only effects the south side of the city. It effects the whole State of Illinois. Because whether we like it or not, the Chicago Port Authority is the only avenue to the overseas shipping that we have in Illinois from Illinois. Of course, we could go down the Mississippi River and give it to New Orleans or we could go



to many other places and let...pointed out by the previous speaker, my colleague from the 30th District, Mr. Collins, the fact is that we have the Birch Harbor at...Port, in Indiana which is becoming a big competitor. They're right on the lake and also we have the Milwaukee in Wisconsin, which is also competing very strongly with us in this trade. Now, many of you, especially many of the downstaters may or may not know that a lot of the cargo from the downstate, especially their agricultural cargo emanates now in handling by, what we call containers. Even soy beans, I have found out to my surprise are being shipped by containers. And therefore, all we're asking you in this Bill is to give the Capital Bond Authority the authority to give...issue bonds for five and a half million. One other thing we should state to you. In all these appropriation Bills we've passed for this authority, we have stated that they will return the revenue and pay the money back. They're levied, a tax levied is limited at the present time under law and it is the only port district of it's kind in the world that is not subsidized by taxes. All we're asking is the right for it to borrow the money to pay it back to the State of Illinois in due course. So I would ask for your vote on this Bill."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise also to support the motion to override the veto in this case, because I believe it is very important to our port district that this money go through. But, I rise not to add my voice on this as I was going to cast my vote in that direction anyway. I rise rather to correct my



colleague, Mr. Maragos, who has just made the statement that Chicago is the only gate in the State of Illinois to oversee shipping. There is a rather great and yet unforgotten, sometimes forgotten city in this state called Waukegan and it also has a port authority and also takes overseas shipping and we have daily shipping coming in there every day to our port and our port authority. And contrary to popular belief in Springfield, I am not from Wisconsin, I truly am from Illinois and we shouldn't forget that we need that money also for the great port of Waukegan."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Representative... Will Representative Collins yield to a question? Phil, in dollars and cents, what potentially will this generate for the City of Chicago?"

Collins: "You really put me on a spot there, Roman. When we're talking about dollars and cents measured not only as to import and export values but job creation and money that will be pumped into the economy I don't think that I could hazard a guess. Maybe Representative Maragos can but we're talking many millions of dollars."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Thanks for yield... Thank you, Mr. Collins, for yielding the floor. I'd like to express to Representative Kosinski that the potential that we gain, that we can have is between three to four hundred million dollars in revenue for the State of Illinois and income in the form of wages. Because of the fact that if this Bill is allowed to pass and we can obtain the property because we are finding some obstacles in obtaining the property which may cost us a lot more money in the future if we don't get it



right away and that is if we could do that would mean... if we could put the free port there it would mean warehousing, it would mean additional jobs and not only for the 30th district area or the south side of the city, but it will be for the whole State of Illinois. Because, all these shipping and we'll go foreign shipping will come through this port...At the present time...we have the perfect capability to do that at the present time."

Speaker Blair: "All right, Mr. Collins to close. Oh, Mr. Fleck."

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

Speaker Blair: "He indicates he will."

Fleck: "Representative Collins, could you tell me what happened to the appropriated items in House Bill 1424, which was suppose to have appropriated a fund?"

Collins: "I believe that House Bill 1424 was Representative Maragos' Bill that was put in separately to appropriate four and a half million dollars over and above the three and a half million dollar appropriation. Representative Maragos carried that Bill through and didn't push for it's enactment after the funds were put into the Senate Bill that was carried by Senators Rock and Dougherty. We had two Bills going through that would have accomplished the same thing when the Senate Bill passed the House Bill obviously was unnecessary."

Fleck: "Are the funds available?"

Collins: "The...the funds..."

Fleck: "For the appropriation."

Collins: "No, the appropriation is in the Senate. There is a motion filed to override the Governors veto of the appropriation and that motion has been filed

by Senator Dougherty, with whom I spoke just a few minutes ago and he's waiting to have that motion called hopefully today."

Fleck: "Okay, I think that if we're going to be spending money like drunken sailors, there's nothing better than to spend it on a port, I guess."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Collins."

Collins: "I didn't know that Representative Fleck was an enologist but I'm happy to accept his support. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I will just implore you for your favorable consideration and I might add one point that I think we overlooked. The attraction to bring shipping in and out of our port is such that if we are successful in installing this facility, it will result in a saving of \$1,000 a ship. Ships won't have to go up that river anymore, that seven and a half mile trip and obviously this will be a great inducement to bring commerce in and out of the Port of Chicago and certainly will be an urge to the benefit of the entire State of Illinois and indeed the midwest. I think this is a vital Bill. I think it's probably one of the... It's probably the best Bill I have ever handled and implore your support."

Speaker Blair: "All right, the question is... Now, the Gentleman was closing. All right, the question is, shall House Bill 2866 pass? The veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All those in favor will vote 'aye', the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Giglio... Mr. Giglio. He's close to Maragos."

Maragos: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to say a few words to keep this thing going so we can get those 107 votes. But my two colleagues from



the 30th District spoke on it and I'd like to say a few words. I'd like each and every one of you to take into consideration the economic impact we're talking about here. Especially at the times that we're in right now, with loss of jobs and what would it do? Not only for the City of Chicago, the up part of the state, but what it's going to do for the southern part of the state when we get that grain and everything else that my fellow Legislators represent and ship up north. I think it's a very wise investment what we're trying to do here and as Representative Maragos mentioned before, the longer we wait the higher that property's going to go. So I'd ask that you take a very close look and give us some support on this Bill."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I'm going to move to Postponed Consideration on this Bill. I want to take it out of the record, if I could have leave for that."

Speaker Blair: "All right, does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection it will be placed on...his motion will be placed on Postponed Consideration."



Speaker Blair: "Mr. Skinner on 2792 now."

Skinner: "Ah...Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. House Bill 2792 is the Bill that has impact where the taxpayer feels it the most and that's when he drives out of his driveway into that pothole. I would like to speak first to the Republican Members and to inform them that the memo that they have on their desk is well almost totally incorrect. The...ah...the memo is as the Bill was originally drawn before it was amended by Representative John Houlihan and after it was amended by the Senate. The Democratic memo, on the other hand, as far as the distribution of money goes, is correct. This Bill is the authorization Bill to allow 14.4 million dollars of the Motor Fuel Tax to be spent by County Government, Township Road Districts and Cities and Villages. Ah...the thing that is suppose to being passed out to you right now, which apparently hasn't been on the Republican side, at least in my section...ah...is an article that appeared recently...ah...out of Centralia where a gentleman analyzed what's happening to the local roads throughout the state. Basically they're going to hell. The...the roads apparently are...are two year roads in most townships and unless they're, unless they are rebuilt in the...in the second year, you end up with a real problem. I would ask for your affirmative vote on this road so we can get Illinois out of the mud, or at least keep it out.. keep it out of the peanut butter?"

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I support this motion to override the Governor's veto of House Bill 2792. This Bill, as it was amended in the House and further amended in the Senate passed both Houses of this Legislature by a very substantial majority. This Bill has statewide application and it would benefit every city, county and road district in the state by increasing the percentage share of Motor Fuel Tax revenues for these local units of government. That increase is relatively slight. However, this Bill is recognition by this Legislature of the needs of these local units of government. This Bill would in effect emphasize those needs



as a priority in the distribution of Motor Fuel Tax revenues. As respect to the City of Chicago, the increase will be earmarked for residential streets only, for the need there is particularly acute. The Veto Message of the Governor ignores the fact that there is a one year repealer in this Bill. This override would accomodate the Governor's position of an in depth study to determine a permanent formula change and yet still provide funding for this fiscal year. This Legislation is particularly important to my district and I suggest it is also important in each of yours. I solicit and I urge your support of this override motion."

Speaker Blair: "Is there further discussion? I asked...any further discussion? Skinner to close."

Skinner: "I would merely ask for an affirmative vote."

Speaker Blair: "Pardon?"

Skinner: "I would merely ask for an affirmative vote from my colleagues."

Speaker Blair: "All right. The question is, shall House Bill 2792 be passed, the veto, the Governor's veto not withstanding. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. Fleck votes 'aye'. Mr. R. L. Dunn to explain his vote."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker and..ah..Members of the House. Like my colleague from the 28th District, I'd like to point out, there isn't a Member in this entire Chamber that will not be favorably affected in his own district by overriding this veto. This reallocation of Motor Fuel Tax money has an effect on every district in this state. Those of you that are concerned about your townships or your residential streets, in any part of the City of Chicago or the suburban area, it's extremely important and it is no money taken out of the General Fund. This is just a reallocation and it's very important for all of you to go back to your districts and say that you overrode this veto. Put those green lights in."

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

Lechowicz: "Forget it."



Speaker Blair: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Roll. Brian Duff 'aye'. On this question there are 115 'ayes', 29...8 voting 'nay' and 29 'present'. Speaker Blair votes 'aye'. House Bill 2792, having received the required number of votes is hereby declared passed, the ve...the veto of the Governor not withstanding."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Speaker Unknown: "Representative Brinkmeier, are you ready to go with 2736? He says he is. Proceed."

Brinkmeier: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 2736 is the Bill that deals with the increased salary for the County Superintendents of Schools. This Bill passed the House by a substantial margin last spring and also over in the Senate. Now, it was vetoed by the Governor with the explanation that, I think number one, that it would bring the salary of the County Superintendent of Schools higher than any other county officer other than the States Attorney. I'd point out to you that the requirements for this office are almost comparable to those requirements of the States Attorney. None of our other county officers have such requirements. For example, they must not only have a Masters Degree but I think they're required that six year degree now, which means that a great deal of time and effort... They also have to have served as, I believe, as a...at least two years as a classroom teacher. They have to have some experience and administrative experience prior to that time. The...the salary that we're talking about now would mean, if we...if we do not, if we do not override, we are saying to these people that they are going to have to retain the same salary that they had four years ago. In other words they're going to have to go eight years without an increase in salary and with todays rising cost of living, I'm sure all of us agree that their request is justified. Secondly, in addition to that, I would point out that this has nothing to do with the budget for this...this present coming year. This would not be included, of course, until the next years Appropriation Bills



come up. I would certainly answer any questions and I certainly solicit your support for the override."

Speaker Unknown: "Any discussion on House Bill 2736?"

There is no discussion. Does the Gentleman wish to close?"

Brinkmeier: "I would simply reiterate what we have already said. We did pass this last spring. It does not effect the salary...the budget of this year. It means that we must override or else these people will be required to work for the same salary for a period of eight years and I would close with that remark."

Speaker Unknown: "The question is, shall House Bill 2736 pass? The Governors veto notwithstanding. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Brinkmeier to explain his vote."

Brinkmeier: "Well, Mr. Speaker, at this time I'd like to ask for Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Unknown: "What did he say? What was your motion?"

Brinkmeier: "I would like to ask for Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Unknown: "All right, the Bill will be postponed."

Speaker Blair: "All right, Item and Reduction...Item and Reduction Veto Motions. Mr. Philip, do you want 2248? Oh, you don't want it? All right. Now, Mr. Stone on 2274. Mr. Stone. Mr. Stone, do you want 2274? All right, do you want it? 2274."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a motion to override line item reduction in House Bill 2274, which is the Appropriation Bill for the University of Illinois. There are two parts to this motion. One of them would restore the three per cent pay raise, which was added...an



additional three percent pay raise which was added to the Bill for University of Illinois employees. The other part would restore the money that was reduced from the...the, that would reduce the funding of the pension system for the state universities retirement system. The pay at the...at the University... the employees receive is not only lagging far behind the increase and the cost of living but it suffers by comparison with rates of pay which re...which prevail at the market and also for other state employees. The University used extensive surveys that were conducted by nationally known professional organizations to establish a market rate for employees in six cities in the Champaign-Urbana area. These included the principal employers in Champaign-Urbana, in Decatur, Bloomington, Danville and Rantoul and they found that a situation similar to the wages in Chicago prevails. Namely, that after the five percent increase granted at the end of the...at the end of August, that the universities rate for pay for their employees tend to lag ten and a half percent behind the market value and behind the rates received by other employees of the state. This report showed that out of 4,720 employees in the six cities that the rate of pay for a junior clerk typist was \$2.75 an hour. The university starting rate is \$2.47 an hour or a little more than ten percent below the market rate. The entry rate, for example, for a key punch operator is \$2.90 an hour, whereas the university starting rate is \$2.58½ cents an hour. This again is over ten percent behind the market. We found this to be true in many, many other areas. And by being more than ten percent behind the market, they're also behind other state employees. Now, to an increasing percent, the



official pay raise ranges authorized by the merit board have...aren't keeping up with other state rates for several reasons. The...at the lower clerical level, the universities are finding that they must keep people at the lowest pay rate range. They're not able to...to raise their pay. In addition to the annual pay raise, the majority of employees who work for the State of Illinois receive the regular pay raise that the university employees receive but in addition they receive a step rate increase of approximately five percent per year. Now, the \$50.00 a month pay increase that was voted for State employees was equivalent to an average increase of 6.3 percent for the other State employees. While the employees at the University of Illinois received their 5 percent other State employees received their additional step rate increases so that in effect they were receiving, other employees were receiving approximately 11 percent pay increase and the university employees were limited to the 5 percent. Now, yesterday we overrode the item reduction for other State employees and if we do not grant this additional 3 percent for State employees then other State employees, other than those that work for the university will receive approximately a 14 percent increase while the university employees receive only a 5 percent increase. I think it's imperative that we add this, that we override the Governor's reduction veto and...and increase the pay raise to 8 percent. So that they would be a little nearer the amount received by other state employees. The other part of the motion has to do with the line item reduction veto for the retirement system. Now, the General Assembly, in 1967 passed...the Illinois Pension Code, which provided, among other things that



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

the state should fully fund the retirement system each year and since that time we have not lived up to that mandate one single year. Now, the amount that would be added here, if we would fund the system as it was in the original Bill, it would add 1,291,000 plus dollars to the Governors budget. Now, you know, if we continue at the rate we're presently going it seems to me that...that the State of Illinois is going to be in an impossible situation in a few years. In the year 1974, which is the current year, it will take 24.2 million dollars for each yearly benefit payment. By the year 2000 that will...that amount will be approximately twenty times the amount that it is now. It will take \$421,000,000 to, for the yearly benefit payment by the year 2000. Now, the teachers retirement system and the state universities retirement system would take approximately \$2,000,000,000 out of the general revenue for the year 2000 if we do not fund these systems. I think that the state could not have that amount of money unless we have a drastic, drastic increase in taxes. And since this is required under the Constitution, it seems to me that...that we must start now to fund these retirement systems because we're not going to be able to do it later. Now, it's sort of ironic, I suppose that...that we here in this General Assembly fund our own system, our own retirement system but we refuse to do it for the others and I think that the time has come that we must fund these systems. I therefore move that the...these amounts be restored."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Clabaugh."

Clabaugh: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I want



to reiterate what my colleague on the other side of the aisle has just said. After our passing yesterday by a large vote, the increase in the State employees salary it certainly is discriminatory against the University of Illinois people to let them be riding on a 5 percent increase without any step up in their regular order. I would like also to say that more and more, as you know, people are going in to employment in those areas where the pension system seems to be both safe and well funded. It is becoming increasingly difficult to attract capable faculty members to the University of Illinois because of the deteriorated state which we find this pension system in. I think you probably have your mind made up about it but I urge you to not discriminate against the faculty members and the employees at the University of Illinois, after we have done a pretty good job of taking care of other State employees. Thank you."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Craig."

Craig: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on this Bill I feel like that this was one of the Bills in the last Session that kind of went through here before anybody realized what had happened. I also feel that maybe the university didn't keep faith with the Bureau of the Budget and the administration in the faith that they were suppose to be treated the same as the other universities were in the State of Illinois and I would like to ask for some 'present' votes up there because I think they should be kept in the same agreement that we had with the others and I feel like that this time we should vote 'present' on this Bill and keep them in line with the other universities."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Hirschfeld."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Hirschfeld: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to preface my remarks with a couple of statements. First of all, even though I am speaking as one of the Representatives from the University of Illinois area, I want the Members to know that I intend to support all of the efforts of the universities to override this veto. Secondly, I would like to point out that this is not the first time this has happened and my remarks will not be partisan at all. Governor Ogilvie did the same thing. He vetoed a proper amount of budget and cut it for the University of Illinois and other schools and as I remember, I was the only Republican that voted to override that particular veto. So, my vote today is not a partisan vote. Now, all we're asking for these people is a three percent raise. And the Governor has given his own people anywhere from 8 to 14 percent and we just sustained that yesterday. It seems to me that with all due respect - to the second floor that both Republicans and Democrats should hold the Governors nose to the grindstone. When he went through the State of Illinois two years ago and campaigned quite successfully, he promised Higher Education that he would do everything he can to improve their status in life. And part of his promise was that he would go for full funding of the pensions and that he would see to it that the employees at these universities got a fair cost of living increase. What has the Governor done? He's vetoed the fair cost of living increase and he's vetoed the pension. And in the case of the pensions, what's happening at the University of Illinois and I dare say what's happening throughout this state, is we're losing our better teachers to other states and we're failing to attract



the better younger teachers. It seems to me that it is in poor taste for the Members of this General Assembly to stand before the People of the State of Illinois, particularly after we have seen the efforts to turn the rascals out, so to speak, in the last two elections and to continually vote pay raises for the judges in this state, to continually stand and vote pay raises for ourselves in this state and then turn around and tell these teachers and tell these nonacademic people that we can not give them a cost of living increase. It doesn't make good sense. It's not fiscally responsible and while it may not be unethical, it certainly borders on that so far as I am concerned. We have given millions, indeed billions of dollars to welfare recipients and I don't object to that all the way across the board. But it seems to me, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, that after we spend a little more money on education, we'd have fewer people on welfare. And as long as we continue to pour the money down the rathole of welfare and don't put it in education it's the case of the tail wagging the dog. There was no agreement with the Bureau of the Budget or the Governors Office. It's the same old story. The Board of Higher Education was established by the State of Illinois to be an advocate for the universities. Instead of that, they have become an advocate for the 2nd Floor of this building. They are an adversary for the universities and I think it's time that these universities get what they're entitled to. It's time that the teachers get what they're entitled to. It's time that these nonacademic personnel, most of whom are Democrats and that's unimportant to me, but it's time that they get what



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

they're entitled to and that's a decent cost of living increase and I think both Democrats and Republicans alike should stand up and remind the Governor of the promises he made two years ago when he said he would support Higher Education and frankly, Ladies and Gentlemen, as of this very moment he's done a damn poor job of it."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I feel compelled to chastise my good friend, just a wee bit. Because there is a vast difference in these Bills and other Bills that he mentioned as far as overriding is concerned or as far as the amount and the intents are concerned and I want to tell this House and it was said when the others after this one had slipped through, after the other universities come up for the same request. I pointed out repeatedly and it is a fact, that it is a direct violation of the agreement by the universities themselves and the Board of Higher Education and its administration, when these Amendments were adopted, increasing. You know it and I know it. Now, as far as the Governor traveling throughout the state, promising quality Higher Education as well as quality education period, you look at the percentage increases over the last Session of the General Assembly and you'll find that most of these promises have been kept. Not only by the administration but by the actions of this General Assembly. If you'll read some of the editorials in some of the newspapers throughout the State of Illinois and especially in downstate Illinois, you'll find that they are aware of the agreement by the universities and I can tell you right now, that some of the presidents of some of the universities in downstate Illinois have admitted to me that there was



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

an agreement by the universities. By the universities as far as their budget requests were concerned at the original figure before the Amendments were adopted. Nobody, nobody is attempting to, be it the administration or be it this Legislature, is attempting to hinder quality education at all, in the State of Illinois. But if you want to teach the universities in this instance that they've got to keep faith, that they've got to keep the agreement that they made and other agencies as well, then you will not, then you will not override this veto and it's high time that we show that when they come to this Legislature and they come to the Executive and they say this is what we want in our budget, then they should be qualified to speak for their budget and put the amount in it that they desperately need, if they need it. And not come back then and through Amendatory form increase, increase and then when it's vetoed say to us, save us. Nobody can ever, no one will ever, at least truthfully and factually, ever question my interest as far as quality education in this state is concerned. But I'm saying to you, when they prepare their budget and they come in and they say this is the amount we need, then this is the amount that I think we should give them. Because they should be qualified in the first instance. The good Lord only knows, that the staff that they have and the amount of dollars that is paid out of taxpayers pocket to pay that staff, to prepare a quality budget, then they shouldn't come back later on and say we made a mistake, if they are saying that. I don't know that they're saying that, but we should tell them, keep your agreement, keep your budget in line and that's what we will attempt to do if we defeated



attempt to override."

Speaker Blair: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Moultrie, Mr. Stone, to close."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. The fact still remains that the employees for the universities are still being paid more than ten percent less than similar State employees working elsewhere, than for the universities. Because of the fact they got less of a pay raise last year than they...than the State emp...the university employees got and this year they are getting considerably less and especially after we...we granted the additional \$50.00 per month by overriding the Governors reduction yesterday for State employees. Now, if we have any idea of being fair to the employees of the universities, we should definitely vote to override this reduction veto. Now, I am aware of the agreements that were made with the...by the Bureau of the Budget, by the Governor and by the University president. But I was of the opinion that these Amendments were put on in the Senate and passed and sent back over to us and we adopted the Amendments as our Amendments believing that the money was not sufficient for the employees of the university. I would like to reiterate the second part of my motion, which pertains to the pension systems and point out to you that we do have a statutory and a Constitutional obligation to the employees of the State Universities Retirement System, that their pension be funded. Now, we're not asking by the figure we're asking here that it be...that the deficit be made up immediately. I want you to recall the figure that I gave when I was up originally, that this year it's taking \$24,000,000 out of the general revenue to pay the

State Universities Retirement System obligation. By the year 2000, it will take \$421,000,000. Up from 24,000,000 to \$421,000,000 out of the general revenue. 421,000,000 is nearly half a billion dollars to pay this one, the obligation of this one pension system. The obligations of this pension system and the teachers pension system would be \$2,000,000 out of the current revenues to meet the yearly payout by the year 2000. I think it's imperative that we vote 'yes' on my motion to override the Governors reduction vetoes in these two areas."

Speaker Blair: "The question is, shall the appropriation for the items reduced be restored to their original amount over the reduction of the Governor with respect to House Bill 2274? All those in favor will vote 'aye', the opposed 'no'. This requires 89 votes. Mr. Katz. Wait a minute... Turn the mike...the mike on. Take the next mike, Mr. Katz. Try Mr. Merlos. Okay, Mr. Katz, does that work? Mr. Merlos? That doesn't work either? Try Mr. Manns. Turn Mr...."

Katz: "Okay, Mr. Speaker. These appear to be divisible questions as I understood the Gentleman. The first question related to the question of the so called cost of living increase for the university employees. The second question related to the question of the funding of the pension plan and I would like to know which we're voting on."

Speaker Blair: "As is shown on the Calendar, the question was put by the Chair. We're voting on the question of whether or not the appropriations on page 1, line 12 of House Bill 2274 and the appropriation on page 2, line 6 through 7, whether or not both those items, as reduced, be restored to the amount that we're...that they went to the Governor in."

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Katz: "But, Mr. Speaker, as explained by the Gentleman, they were two separate questions and I'd like to ask the Gentleman from Moultrie which question is being put to us."

Speaker Blair: "Well, the Gentleman...the Chair put the question. The Chair put the question on the basis of the motion that was filed. The motion encompassed both of those items."

Katz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we are entitled, if a question is divisible to vote on the separate question. They are not related questions and you can not... You may want to vote 'yes' on one, 'no' on the other or 'present' or otherwise and we're entitled to be able to vote on the issue."

Speaker Blair: "Well, the question of divisibleness is put timely... it one certainly that the Chair would recognize. The fact of the matter is, that the motion was filed, it was with respect to restoring both of these reduced items. The Chair put the question with respect to the motion in that fashion and it's the Chairs ruling that your motion...that your question that you're raising now is not in order."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, it was after you stated the question that I raised the point. I had no way to know how you were going to present the question until you did. It was at that point that I sought your attention and I believe that I have a right to be able to vote on...either way on either issues. They are divisible issues and I would ask the Parliamentarian and ask you to rule on the issue as to whether I am entitled to have my vote recorded on the separate issues that are entirely different issues."

Speaker Blair: "Well. I think that the way the motion is stated on the Calendar is very clear and the way that Mr. Stone stated the motion in the comments that he was



making. Furthermore, the Chair takes notice of the fact that those filings which are made with the Clerk are within the knowledge of the Members of the Assembly and if you had put your question timely, I think we could have considered it. The questions..."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, I am not trying to play games with you, this is a question of substance. I am entitled to be able to record my vote on each issue that is presented to us. Is the Gentleman from Moultrie trying to put the question in such a way that we can not vote separately on those two issues? I had understood that that was a matter that the Chair was doing but not intentionally and I would move that the Chair give us..."

Speaker Blair: "You're out of order. All right, we're on explanation of votes. Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, Parliamentary procedure and I would like to address myself to the question that my colleague from the 1st District has raised, specifically with reference to Article IV of the Constitution. Section 9, paragraph D, which says the Governor may reduce or veto any item of appropriations in a Bill presented to him. Portions of a Bill not reduced or vetoed shall become law. An item vetoed shall be returned to the House in which it originated and may become law in the same manner as a vetoed Bill. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we have here two items and each one should be treated in the wording of the Constitution as a vetoed Bill. Which I would suggest might require a vote as in the nature of a vetoed Bill on each item."

Speaker Blair: "Yeah, I understand. That's the same question that Mr. Katz put and the 1st District is consistent. All right, Mr. Stone, do you want to postpone? You don't. All right..."



Stone: "All right, I'll ask leave to Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Blair: "All right. Any objection? Hearing none, this disposes of the time being of the questions raised by Mr. Katz and Mr. Duff and I suggest they take up their inquiries with Mr. Stone, in the event that he desires to renew the motion which he filed with the Clerk. It will be placed on Postponed Consideration. Now, what about 2286? Mr. Stone, do you want to take that out? Mr. Stone, do you want to take 20..."



Speaker Blair: "All right...Mr. Peters, what do you want to do with yours? Your 2264? Do you want to go? All right."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In regard to House Bill 226, which concerns itself with the appropriation for the State Board of Governor's Colleges, five motions have been filed and with the approval of the Chair, I would like to start with motion number 3 and Representative Katz, I have filed separate motions on each of the items that have been...ah...item reduced by the Governor's veto. Motion 3 restores to the appropriation in House Bill 2264 the original amount over the veto of the Governor as it applies solely, as it applies solely to the funds for the retirement of the individuals operating under the State Board of Governors. The...ah...Pension Plan Commission sometime ago did prepare a plan in which they suggested to the Legislature that we provide for a gradual increase of the funding of the various retirement systems. What occurred in the Governor's item reduction veto of this particular item was a reduction of four hundred and fifty five thousand, one hundred and thirty dollars, which was a recommendation under the plan over and above what the anticipated pay outs for the year would be. So what we are asking here for in an override of this particular...ah...item reduction veto, is the reinstatement of the original amount provided as recommended by the Pension Commission plan. It would bring back, once again, it would bring back the four hundred and fifty five thousand dollars to place this retirement system on a more actuarially sound basis and I ask the favorable consideration of the Members of the House in providing the 89 votes to restore four hundred and fifty five thousand dollars to the retirement fund. This is not salary increase, this is based again on the recommendation of the Pension Commission to put this retirement system on a sound financial footing. Thank you Mr. Speaker and thank you Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I ask for your favorable consideration. I might state that the State Board of Governor's System does cover Northeastern...ah...Northeastern Illinois University, Chicago State, Governor State, Western, Eastern and the Administrative Offices here



in Springfield."

Speaker Blair: "All right. Now so we don't get entangled in that same thing we did before...ah...the Gentleman has filed a motion which would be to restore six...ah...different line items in reductions and unless there is a timely motion made with respect to division, the Chair is going to put the question the way the Member filed his motion. Now is that clear? Good. Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Mr. Katz first."

Speaker Blair: "Yeah, I'll recognize you but I've recognized Mr. Choate now. All right Mr. Katz. Well He's got trouble again...Mr. Mann is not working...for Katz. You got him turned on? Well come down and try Mr. Leon's, maybe it will work. Okay."

Katz: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the motion be divided so that we may be able to vote separately on the matters that involve different issues."

Speaker Blair: "Ah...Mr. Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Representative...If I might address the Representative Katz, hopefully to clarify this. Motion 3 on the Calendar relates only, only to the question of the amount of money that has been reduced from retirement. It does not relate to salaries or to libraries or to anything else. It is a separate item."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Katz withdraws his motion for division. Okay. Now Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Ah...Would the Sponsor, Pete would you yield for a short question?"

Speaker Blair: "He says he will."

Choate: "What...What's the total amount involved and what I think is 2, 4, 6 reduction, isn't it."

Peters: "The 6...You're right Mr. Minority Leader, the 6...reductions apply to each of the...ah...schools in the system and the total amount of money reduced by the Governor was four hundred and fifty five thousand, one hundred and thirty dollars."

Choate: "Okay Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You know basically when you look at the overall budget request for a State as large and sophisticated as is the State of Illinois, one



could say that between four and five hundred thousand dollars is a relatively small sum. But when you multiply and multiply and multiply those relatively small sums, then, then you end up with a huge amount of taxpayers dollars involved. But that's not, the sum in this, involved in this Bill is not what disturbs me as much as the other question that I want to propose. If I understand the Governor's Veto Message correctly and I think I do, the Governor said in his Veto Message that the reductions made makes the appropriation to the Board of Governor's of the State Colleges and Universities for items, makes them consistent with the budget recommendations of the Board of Higher Education, which has been accepted by the Administration and in most instances has been accepted, unless there was a daring example of miscalculation, has been accepted by this General Assembly and it makes it, makes them consistent with the salary and retirement increases that have been approved for other state universities. Now I'm not saying today that the retirement system for these institutions or for any educational institution in the state is perfect and I'm not saying that the retirement system for state employees or any other retirement system in the State of Illinois is perfect. However, if I understand and I think I do, the Veto Message correctly by the Governor, if this portion is overrode, then these institutions will be receiving more money for these specific purposes than has been approved by the Governor for other institutions of Higher Education. I don't think that we want this to happen. I don't think that we want to pick these institutions out and say, 'Yes, we're going to increase you above and beyond the other institutions'. I realize that this is a very, very important question. But we're on the eve of the next Session of this General Assembly, when I hope that there will be reports from various study committees available making recommendations to this General Assembly to the extent that maybe some of these



inequities can be corrected and I'm saying to you that it is not of the urgency but what we can wait until the next Session. I don't think that we at this late hour want to say that we want to place these institutions in a higher position than the other institutions. I would urge a 'no' vote on the motion to override."

Speaker Blair: "Any further discussion? All right, Mr. Peters to close. Mr. Peters, turn Mr. Peters on...You're not on Pete, what's wrong with these things?"

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

The statement made by the distinguished Minority Leader in regard to the fiscal responsibility we as Legislators must undertake is something that I as a Legislator and all of us here in the House can not end up quibbling with. I think what we do have to consider however though, is a question of the priorities that we do end up setting up. All our pension systems are in serious problems in terms of adequate funding over a period of time. It is that kind of problem that we must address ourselves to on a reasonable basis in order to bring some sound and solid solution to it over a period of time. I might indicate to the Members of this body, that the Board of Higher Education had recommended a lump sum ten million dollar appropriation to bring this fund, retirement fund for the State Board of Governors up to some reasonable level. What had happened, rather than the introduction of this recommendation by the Board of Higher Education of a ten million dollar lump sum addition to the retirement system, is the acceptance of a plan proposed by the Pension Laws Commission which would call for gradual increases in the amount of money in the Pension Fund over the amount that is expected to be paid out. That amount this year is approximately four hundred and fifty five thousand and one hundred and thirty dollars and it would appear to me that those of us who are concerned about the future of the system and concerned about our future responsibilities to provide for adequate funding of these systems and whatever that might mean in the future have got to accept our responsibility now to make some sound and



solid effort to bring these pension funds on some solid actuarial footing. We are talking here of four hundred and fifty five thousand, one hundred and thirty dollars, in order to bring that Pension Fund, which is million dollars in the rears as are all of our pension funds into some beginning of some sort of system to bring it on a sound financial footing. I certainly respect ...ah...the statements made by the distinguished Minority Leader and his...ah...statements in terms of fiscal responsibility but I think we also have the responsibility in terms of some long range committment to these funds, to the actuarial soundness of these funds and to what they are going to end up costing in the future to not only ourselves but our children and our childrens children unless we make some effort now to make adequate provisions. I respectfully ask this House to consider...ah...these arguments that I have made to certainly consider what my distinguished Minority Leader has had to say in terms of fiscal responsibility but to keep in mind also the priority decisions that we must end up making. I earnestly solicit your support of 89 votes in this particular matter. Thank you Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House."

Speaker Blair: "All right. The question is, shall the appropriation for the item reduced be restored to their original amounts over the reduction of the Governor, with respect to House Bill 2264? All those in favor will vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. This is Motion #3. Motion #3. Have all voted who wished? Mrs. Dyer?"

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like an opportunity to explain my vote. I think this Bill, this...particularly this item deserves the support of everyone in this Chamber. If you want to be fair and if you want to be consistent in this year when every member of the public, every citizen is looking to see what public officials are doing for themselves and what they're willing to do for others. We fund our own retirement system beautifully. I think we owe it to the Educational System to fund the retirement system in our universities sufficiently, too.- I think we're hypocrites if we're willing to fund our own systems and don't vote fund that, fund that of other public employees. When we had the Gallery full here



yesterday we were willing to grant raises, pay raises to state employees. Unfortunately there are not any...any university people here today to see us cast this vote. But they're going to be reading the papers and people all over the state are going to take note of the fact that we can take care of ourselves but we can't take care of our employees in the state universities. I urge a 'yes' vote on this item."

Speaker Miller: "Okay, Mr. Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would like to remind the Members of some of the work of the Pension Laws Commission which has such distinguished members as Senator Omano and Professor Rupcoen. The Pension Laws, the State of Illinois Public Pension Laws Commission, for those of you who don't really know what it is, it has Representatives and Senators and public members with actuarial services and all the Pension Bills are reviewed in a proposal brought before that Commission which go in great detail in looking over the types of Legislation that are introduced and in trying to establish a solid, sound basis for public employee pensions in the State of Illinois. The Pension Laws Commission is unanimously on record not only once but again recently this year in favor of a full level funding concept. Which is not a pay as you go basis. I believe people in the Governor's Office have misinformed him and misadvised him on equating the public employees pension with the Social Security System of the Federal Government. You can't equate the two because the Federal Social Security has printing presses in the mint and whenever they need inflated dollars to cover the cost of these employees pensions they just run off some green stuff on the machines. We in the State of Illinois don't have that printing press under the Capitol down in the basement and we have to go forward with some type. We were thinking in terms of a two per cent grade in a one and a half per cent grade in or even a one per cent grade in. The amount doesn't really matter as long as we put ourselves on the track of doing something over and above immediate cash payouts needed for the year to put



these systems on a sound basis. I would again remind you that the Constitution of the State of Illinois says that Pensions may not be diminished nor impaired in any manner, shape or form and as long as the General Assembly sees fit to grant salary increases and other things for public employees pensions it has an equal obligation to make sure that the money is in the till to provide the money to be working and earning interest to help pay for these pensions at the time of retirement and I would urge some more green lights on the board in favor of this motion."

Speaker Blair: "Have all voted who wished? All right, Mr. Peters do you want to ask leave for Postponed? You do? All right. Objections? None, the motion...Motion 3 will be placed on the Order of Postponed Consideration. Now do you want to...ah..."



Speaker Blair: "Want to call any other motions? Do you want to take it out? Okay. 2264, for the balance of motions will be taken out. Mr. Deavers, how about your...about 60 some. All right, Mr. Deavers says he'll pass it up now. Mr. McCormick, do you want to take your...do you want to take your out? Mr. Krause, anybody handling for Mr. Krause? Mr. Kriegsman for Mr. Krause on 2416."

Kriegsman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Mr. Krause is home sick, got it in the back and he doesn't think he'll be heretill next week and under the circumstance, with the parties involved and the statutes here, I would like to proceed with this Bill. The 77th General Assembly established the Dirksen Memorial Study Commission to find a sculpturer who would create two heroic memorial statues and one heroic bust of the late Senator Everett M. Dirksen. It is to be cast in bronze and erected on the..."

Speaker Blair: "One moment... one moment please. For what purpose does Mr. Choate rise?"

Choate: "Mr. Speaker only...I'd like to ask the Gentleman a question. I'd like to...I was just talking to Representative Krause today, myself, in person and he did not indicate to me at all that he had asked anybody to handle this Bill for him. Okay."

Speaker Blair: "Ah well..."

Choate: "That's all I have."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Kriegsman. Apparently the motion was filed by Mr. Krause, the motion was filed by Mr. Krause, or who?"

Choate: "No, it couldn't have been filed by Mr. Krause, because he has not been here."

Speaker Blair: "Who filed the motion, Mr. Clerk?"



Speaker Blair: "All right, now just a moment. Well...ah... the motion... A Member made a motion with respect to a Veto Message concerning a Bill...ah... I think in the past the Chair has ruled that any motions that the Chief Sponsor of the Bill desires to put would be considered first and then any other Members motion would be considered. Now, the difficulty here as I understand it is that Mr. Krause is not here and you feel that he ought to have an opportunity to be here. No? Yes... Mr. Choate."

Choate: "Not necessarily be here but I think that his wishes, inasmuch as he is the Chief Sponsor of this Bill, should be known before we make any kind of a motion on it and that's the only thing that I'm talking about at this particular time is courtesy to that Member. I was talking to Representative Kriegsman and Representative Brinkmeier and others about this particular portion of the Bill not even realizing, incidentally, that it was in Bud Krauses Bill when we were talking. The only thing that I would suggest is to take it out of the record until I have the time, this afternoon, to talk to Representative Krause and see what his desires are and then, if he wishes to put any kind of a motion he can have one of his colleagues over here make the motion and then anybody else who wants, desires to make a motion will be privileged to do so. But, I think this is just pure courtesy to Representative Krause."

Speaker Blair: "Let me say this. I don't think that a Member should be precluded from having his motions heard because of the absence of another Member. Although it would appear to me that courtesy would indicate that the Member putting a motion to another Members Bill, if that Member's going to be here or if



another Member can speak the Chief Sponsors thoughts with respect to the motion. It would seem to me that that would be a courtesy that could be extended. Mr. Kriegsman."

Kriegsman: "I'll go along with that. Bud won't be here tomorrow for sure and I think tomorrow's the last day."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Choate."

Choate: "I understand that, Representative Kriegsman and as I said when I was talking about this particular problem with you and Representative Brinkmeier today I did not realize that it was Krauses Bill. The only thing that I'm wanting to do is call Representative Krause. See what his feelings are. Give him the opportunity to denote his feelings as far as his legislation is concerned and then it's within your pervue to do whatever you like."

Kriegsman: "Okay..."

Speaker Blair: "Okay, we'll take that motion out of the record then. All right, Amendatory Veto Motion... 2391, Mr. Skinner. Mr. Skinner, do you want 2391? Amendatory Veto... We have two motions filed here. One is...Motion 1, is to override. Motion 2 is to accept. Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "I have a hand out that will explain it. Could you go to one other one first and then come back to it?"

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Terzich on 2673. Do you want to go on this? Okay. 2673, the Amendatory Veto Motion."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 2673 just cleans up the Bill. It doesn't really change it much in contents other than saying that the state is not liable for investments...investments other than the State of Illinois and I urge acceptance of the Amendatory Veto."



Speaker Blair: "All right, the question is, shall the House adopt the specific recommendations contained in the motion with respect to House Bill 2673? All those in favor will vote 'aye', the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. Lemke 'aye'. On this question there are 113 'ayes', 1 'nay', 2 'present' and the specific recommendations contained in the motion are hereby accepted. Geo-Karis 'aye' and Gibbs 'aye'. Merlo 'aye', Calvo 'aye'. Jaffe 'aye'. Jones 'aye'. Catania 'aye'. Lein...All right, if there are any others, like, why don't you come up here and tell the Clerk. 2861. Mr. Shea, 2861."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd move for the adoption of the Amendatory Veto language of the Governor with regards to House Bill 2861. This would give the Commerce Commission discretionary power with regard to setting rates and taking into consideration purchases between A.T.T. and Western Electric."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Would the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Blair: "He indicates he will."

Kempiners: "Jerry, I've got a Western Electric plan in my district as I'm sure you have and this has created some concern. Could you tell me exactly what the Governors Amendatory Veto does?"

Shea: "What it says...ah... The Bill as passed said, in effect, that when the I.P.C. set rates that it not be required to take into consideration the purchases from Western. This Bill, the Supreme Court said that Western, in effect, couldn't sell at a higher rate than the rate cap. Not at what another manufacturing plant sold at but at whatever the utility made. Western...they'd have to figure the



profit at Western at the same figure. The Bill said the I.P.C. could...would not have to take that into consideration. The Governor's Amendatory language leaves it discretionary with the rate making commission, to take that into consideration. I, like you, are concerned about a plant in my district that effects one out of every six people in my district. But, I'm going to take a half a loaf and run and come January 1, we'll put the Bill back in."

Speaker Blair: "Further questions? Mr. Shea to close."

Shea: "I'd appreciate the support of the House."

Speaker Blair: "The question is, shall the specific recommendations with respect to House Bill 2861 be accepted? All those in favor will vote 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there 140 'ayes', no 'nays' and the specific recommendations with respect to House Bill 2681 are accepted. 2861. Sorry, correct the record."



Speaker Blair: "All right, now, what's . . . oh, you're ready on 2391?"

Okay. House Bill 2391."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, something happened to me on the . . . ah . . . the way home from the General Assembly. Ah . . . The Governor got a Bill that I had allowed Representative Williams and Representative Deuster to tack on two Amendments they needed a vehicle for, and he destroyed the body and left a leg; and that's basically what we're talking about. I . . . I'd like to have the body back. It doesn't cost any money, magic word today. I passed out a memo, which shows you the part he vetoed out. Ah . . . It opens up two options for improving local, non-dedicated streets . . . ah . . . basically subdivisions. There are so many checks and balances in them that I can't see any possible danger. The Highway Commissioner has to agree with the Board of Auditors, has to agree with the subdivision property owners, and it can only take a maximum of 20% of the M.F.T. funds; and it also says you can use revenue sharing money on this. Now, the Governor's only excuse for vetoing it is that the problem's being studied; and, frankly, I've been here long enough to be wary of anyone who says, 'I'm studying the problem as all the rest of you'. I would certainly be willing to answer any questions; and I would hope and ask for an affirmative Roll Call."

Speaker Blair: "Discussion? Ah . . . Mr. McCourt."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, could I ask the . . . ah . . . Gentleman a question on his Bill?"

Skinner: "Certainly."

McCourt: "As I understand it, a few moments . . . a few hours ago we voted . . . ah . . . to override House Bill 2792; and as I remember the explanation on that was that it was redistributing the division made of M.F.T. funds; and at that time I believe it was said that the Townships and Road Districts will receive something like 5.3 million dollars extra this coming year. Now, in reading this Bill in conjunction with House Bill 2792, it would appear that now that the Townships and Road Districts have this extra \$5,000,000 that they will be able to go out and use this



money to improve various roads that at the present time are not dedicated, but at the present time the developers of property in these rural areas have failed to pay. Now, I know in my area the system always has been for the property owners or the developers to pave the roads by special assessment, and, of course, they can use some M. . . . M.F.T. money to kind of sweeten the . . . ah . . . sweeten up the . . . ah . . . process; but it would seem here that this is, well, I hate to use the word rip-off, but if it's not a rip-off, it's whatever is closest to that.. Is that true?"

Skinner: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. . . . Representative McCourt.

I'm glad you brought that up. I'm glad you didn't use the word rip-off because that . . . ah . . . is very far from the truth, I believe. Ah . . . You will note that the . . . the Bill that we just overrode almost has the same language that is involved in this. Ah . . . So the House has already affirmed this part; but what we're trying to do . . . what we're saying is, we have subdivisions in McHenry, and this is the place I know where the problem is the most, about half my population lives unincorporated subdivisions. Now, since the . . . since about 1959, when this Subdivision Act was passed, we have . . . we have forced the subdividers to put roads in; but unlike Lake County, where they almost blanket in all . . . blanketed in the county or the township system almost all the substandard roads, we did not do it in McHenry County. Now, we're trying to find a way to keep these areas from becoming substandard. Now, what we're saying is that even if they don't get the extra, even if the Senate doesn't go along, we want to have some ability, some more flexibility for Township Government in, well, primarily in downstate, as a matter of fact, I don't know of any instance in Cook County, to be able to attack this problem. We're saying, number one, they should be able to use revenue sharing money for it; and number two, that they should be able to use an . . . a small portion of the M.F.T. fund. Now, this is totally responsive to Local Government. You're going to have to have the agreement of the Highway Township . . . the Township Highway Commissioner, with the Township Board of Auditors, with



the subdivision property owners, and they can't spend more than 20% of the total. So I think that . . . I just can't conceive of a Bill that has more safeguards in it than this one does. All we're saying is let the local people spend the money the way they best want to."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I suppose that it's seldom that I agree with my colleague, Mr. Skinner, on the Revenue Committee. We've had a number of arguments on various and sundry issues over the last two years; but I salute him in this very meritorious cause to see this issue passed, even over the Governor's veto. This problem really deals with something that has been created over a long period of time. It gives Local Government the option to cure some of the ills that have taken place in the past. It gives Local Government an opportunity to deal with an issue that they may very well have been negligent in in the past. I can cite for you numerous examples in downstate Illinois where County Boards either having been unwilling to pass the necessary zoning laws or having been unwilling to address themselves to the needs of potential home buyers and potential residents in a development area have refused to do their job over the course of the years, and, thereby, refuse to make developers put in the proper kind of roads to deliver very needed services, such as ambulance and . . . and medical services and so forth, and I can cite to you numerous examples in my area where the County Boards have refused to do their job in the past and hold developers to their contract. This gives us a chance to recoup, it gives Local Government a . . . an opportunity to address itself to peoples' needs. It seems to me that it's a very fair proposition, that Representative Skinner's proposal is well structured, providing all the proper safeguards in giving Local Government the opportunity to recoup some of the mistakes that its made in the past. I salute Cal' on his efforts to bring this about, and I would hope that many people on our side of the aisle would join with me to support this override motion."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Speaker Blair: "Ah . . . Right. Mr. Peters. Do you want to close, Mr. Skinner?"

Skinner: "Yes, I would."

Speaker Blair: "Okay."

Skinner: "I would really solicit an 'aye' vote; and certainly if you voted for the last one, you've already voted for this. Ah . . . This doesn't cost any money. It's not . . . we're not talking about new subdivisions, we're talking about the old subdivisions, that's a finite problem. Once we get it cleaned up, you know, we can take it off the books. There's no sweat. Ah . . . Some of these roads are undedicated because they're just too narrow, they're the size of an alley; and the county rules are just too stringent to bring them in. I certainly would hope that you would give Local Government the chance to prove it's either competent or incompetent,³ and this Bill will do it."

Speaker Blair: "All right, the question is, shall House Bill 2391 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor? All those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed 'no'; this takes 107. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, the magic word I thought today was this costs nothing. Ah . . . This costs nothing. There are so many . . . there are so many checks and balances in this thing. I mean, I don't know whether you've ever tried to deal with the Department of Transportation and to get a problem solved for your district . . . ah . . . Representative Deuster has, Representative Williams has; and they keep saying, 'We're studying this'. Now, and yet they never come up with a solution. Now, part of this language, the part that says, '20% may be used', came right from a D.O.T. representative before the Motor Fuel Tax . . . Motor . . . Motor Vehicle's Committee . . . ah . . . when we were talking about this Bill, and they said, 'Hey, don't make it a contingent on raising the amount of money that goes to townships, just say they can save 20 . . . use 20%'. All right, well, you know, I've got . . . that wasn't an open testimony, that was after they said, 'We're going to go back and spend it'. Now, we tried special assessments and



it's just too expensive. Ah . . . This is an alternative, and if this doesn't work, I'm just afraid that we're going to end up coming back to the General Assembly next year, I am, and I'm going to be beatin' my head against more of a wall than I have now, saying, 'Gee wiz, guys, they're in the mud'. This is really, you know, this is not going to revolutionize Township Government and make them more powerful and let them gobble up the City of Chicago, it's not going to happen. You're all incorporated anyway. Please, please, please."

Speaker Blair: "Ah . . . Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In explaining my vote, I would like to urge your 'aye' vote on this Bill. The rationale of this Bill is identical really to what we have already passed here on an override on House Bill 2792. This is an extremely reasonable proposal, as Mr. Beaupre has indicated. The reason for the necessity of this legislation is the fact that these non-dedicated roads are roads which were in existence prior to 1959. They did not meet the then county standards, they do not meet the now county standards, and in consequence, these streets are in limbo. This Bill is urgently needed. It is extremely reasonable. It equates with the rationale of 2792, and I do urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Will the Gentleman . . . will the Gentleman yield for some questions? Okay, Cal', . . . ah . . . I was with one of the Township Highway Commissioner's in my district last night and he talked about a Bill and I think this may have been it. Right now, is . . . are the developers of the subdivision responsible for the maintenance of the roads and would this be putting that burden onto the Township Highway Commissioner?"

Skinner: "No, right now the property owners are responsible for the maintenance, and what we're trying to do is to get, you know, if the township has the money and they're willing to do it, you know, just remove the snow, some of the coun . . . some of the subdivisions would be satisfied with."



Kempiners: "Okay, well, if I'm not mistaken, this is the Bill that he was talking about, and his problem was that there's not enough money to go around in areas that have a lot of subdivisions, which will put the Highway Commissioner in a position . . . ah . . . a bad position having to decide which subdivisions get taken care of which will . . ."

Skinner: "Okay, if that is the case, then the township . . . Local Government, those who know best about what they . . . what's right and what's wrong will be able to say, 'I'm sorry, we don't have money to take over . . . to do anything for any subdivision. We just don't have it this year'. Now, there is an alternative, you know, the alternative can be on our backs or on the township's back, a monkey, that is."

Kempiners: "No, it wouldn't be on our back. If . . . without this Bill would be on the people living in the subdivision, and they . . . and the . . . and the Township Highway Commissioner wouldn't have to play checkers."

Skinner: "Let me . . . let me suggest to you that of all the meetings that I've held in my district, there are two subjects that have raised hackles among voters, one's R.T.A. and the other is subdivision roads; and if there are not unincorporated subdivision roads in the rest of the metropolitan area of Chicago and downstate where the subdivi . . . where the property owners who bought in, you know, it was plotted before '59, if they haven't figured out that there's no way for them to get roads without going special assessments according to standards that are too stringent for them to meet. Now, we'll be back again next year, only next year there'll be more of you that realize that they're a heck of lot more subdivision township residents than there are Highway Township Road Commissioners."

Speaker Telcser: "Any further discussion on this? Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think a lot of us are just kind of drowsing around right now when we could be helping. I think what you're talking about here, to put



it in the simplest terms, are a bunch of people that cannot help themselves, nor can they get help from their officials because of costs, because of regulations and so forth; and I think in this particular case with no skin coming off of your back at all, all you're doing with this particular situation is giving them a chance . . . giving these people a chance to get help where they couldn't get it otherwise. That's it, just pure and simple. I'd like to see some votes up there, please."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ah . . . I think that Representative Waddell, the Gentleman from Kane, said it right on the button that . . . ah . . . if we would just wake up and move over and vote green, we would've helped some people. We've been spending millions and denying millions. This is a matter of distributing where it is needed the most for those people who happen to live on a little country or a township road, and in the case of the north side of Chicago and some places on the west side of Chicago, those wonderful W.P.A. streets that are about an inch thick and 20 years old; and as C. L. McCormick said last night, in Union County they are 20 feet thick and a mile long. Now, let's get the think straightened around. This is a good opportunity. Give the Gentleman 107 votes."

Speaker Telcser: "Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I would like a . . . I would like a record, but I would like to take it out of the Record after you start going around the drum. Is there a way to do that, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Telcser: "Yeah, take the Record."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, may I ask that it be taken out of the Record?"

Speaker Telcser: "You have Postponed Consideration."

Skinner: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I asked for your advice and . . . ah . . ."

Speaker Telcser: "Well, you're asking the wrong person for advice."

Skinner: ". . . Mr. Speaker, I . . . the esteemed Leader. Knowing that you'll be the 75th person in . . . on the Republican side to announce the Minority Leader, I . . . I asked you how I could do it,



and you've led me astray apparently."

Speaker Telcser: "Let me make an inquiry. I'm told that if you want to save it put it on Postponed Consideration."

Skinner: "Oh, my, may I have this Bill put on Postponed Consideration until people get back from the Clabaugh dinner?"

Speaker Telcser: "Leave?"

Skinner: "Please, pretty please? Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "Where are we at? Does anybody on total veto motions want their motion called?"

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Jacobs."

Jacobs: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The motion to override the Governors veto on House Bill 2710...could we have 2710 on the board please? Thank you. The motion to override the Governors veto on House Bill 2710. A Bill to codify the powers of the Mental Health Department, was prompted by the fact, that this Bill, with bipartisan support passed the House 137 'yeas', 14 'nays'. It passed the Senate 40 to 9 and later was vetoed by the Governor. You will remember that House Bill 2710 was amended and was drafted by a Subcommittee of the House Human Resources Committee and adopted unanimously by the whole Committee and in a letter to Representative Geo-Karis dated June 11, Doctor Levit stated and I quote, 'The Department takes no position on House Bill 2710.' You will remember that the House Bill 2710 requires the Department of Mental Health to do three things before closing down a facility. Or terminating or reducing or phasing out. Number one, is to notify all of the General Assembly of the proposed change at least 240 days in advance. Number two is to hold public hearings before the standing Legislative Committee which deal with Mental Health and receive their recommendation and number three, announce the proposed changes to the news media so the communities and the municipalities will be so notified. The Department of...or this Bill spells out the detailed instructions for the information which must be included in the notification to the General Assembly. The Bill addresses itself to the problem created by the Departments reduction of personnel services and programs and their expectations



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

that local governments and private agencies can take over immediately. Without the necessary planning time or increasing funding. House Bill 2710 would enable the communities to prepare themselves for additional responsibilities. The proponents of this Bill, as you remember, were the Concerned Citizens Association of Illinois, the Illinois State Employees, the Illinois State Employees Association, the Illinois Association for Retarded Citizens, the Illinois Mental Health Association, the Illinois Firefighters Association and the National Mental Health Association, all approved and testified for this Bill and were the prime sponsors of the Committee drawing up such a fine Bill. So, I would ask at this time that you take and give this every consideration. Remembering that a 'yes' vote will provide a well formed Legislature."

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

Douglas: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I was opposed to this Bill in its original form and I'm opposed to the Bill as it stood when it went to the Governor. The Governor made a wise choice in vetoing it and I might say that it's important that every Member of this House realize that at the time this Bill was passed by this House, that there was some question about whether or not another Bill, Senate Bill 1566, which the Governor did approve, which requires the Department to promulgate a five year plan which was a good Bill, which we supported and which was passed. Which makes this Bill unnecessary. Now, in addition to this Bill being unnecessary, it would impose an absolutely unnecessary burden. Maybe a burden that the Department of Mental Health and Developmental



disabilities could not even live with on that Department. It would make it virtually impossible for that Department to move patients out of the facilities. Which many of us have asked them to do, into better facilities for a period of eight months. I would urge the Members of this House not to go along with this attempt to override. It would, even for those of us who have been critical of the Department of Mental Health, it would constitute an absolutely unnecessary on that Department and would do an injustice to the efforts that Department is making to upgrade its program. I ask you to vote against this effort to override."

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

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am inclined to disagree with the last speaker. I am afraid that the Department of Mental Health, without very much input from consumer groups and other interested in the care of the mentally retarded and the mentally ill, is going through an extended program of depopulating state institutions and imposing the burden of care for the mentally retarded and the mentally ill on community and private facilities. Now, this, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, is a dangerous thing to do. Dangerous in that they are doing it too quickly and that the people who are charged with their care in the private sector are just not able to accept and to do a proper job with the patients that are being imposed on. Now, I suggest to you that this is a reasonable suggestion. There's nothing certainly wrong with the Department coming to the Legislature and going to other groups to determine whether there should be these changes. I suggest to you that if it is wrong"



it's not going to take eight months for us to correct the error. It's going to take probably three months to correct the error because we're going to be back here in January. I suggest to you that we should be riding herd, as it were, on the Department of Mental Health. That we should have this kind of...these kind of restrictions on them. This kind of overview of what they are doing and I think this is entirely reasonable and I would urge that you support the override of the veto on House Bill 2710."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any further discussion?"

Representative Katz. Can you move to another microphone, that one doesn't work. Next row down."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the Governor's veto of this Bill and I do not believe that it has to do with the question of whether you may be for or against this Governor. I would think that all of us should agree that whoever is the Governor, whether he be a Republican Governor or a Democratic Governor, he has to be able to move effectively and rapidly in order to have an efficient operation of government. Now, if we do in fact as this Bill does, require that every time they move they give so many months notice before a move takes place, all that we will be doing is making the operation of state government impossible. You know well enough that even the very best head of the Department of Mental Health, if he makes a move to eliminate a facility or to change some operation, you're going to have community pressure brought, even if it is a wise move from the point of view of the Department of Mental Health and the government. You will have a situation that no matter who becomes the head of the Department of



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mental Health, no one will be able to operate that Department efficiently. And I would very much urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to be far sighted with regard to this. To have laws that will enable people who occupy high administrative offices to act with expedition and effectiveness and if the populous does not want that particular Governor, let them vote that particular Governor out. But do not tie the hands of the men who administer government so that no matter who they are or how good they are, they simply will not be able to operate efficiently and accordingly, I would strongly urge us to support the Governor with regard to House Bill 2710."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any further discussion?"

Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill was heard in the Subcommittee, which I chaired, of Human Resources. The main facets of the Bill was the fact that we could not let the helpless out without any notice with the whim of anyone who decides to cease the facility. And that's the essence of the whole Bill. Members of the General Assembly have to be notified at least 240 days in advance of any proposed change. As you know, there are public hearings provided for us and you can not terminate the facility just at whim or just in order to save money and look good. I certainly urge a favorable vote to override the veto on this Bill for the need of those helpless people involved."

Speaker Telcser: "Any further discussion? Representative Washburn."

Washburn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to support Representative Jacobs motion to override the veto on House Bill 2710."



I originally introduced a similar Bill, House Bill 2223. And many of the points incorporated in 2223 were amended into House Bill 2710. It was a compromise Bill and it came out a better Bill than my original one. This Bill is absolutely necessary if we're going to bring some degree of order into the chaotic condition that exists in the Department of Mental Health today and I urge your support of Representative Jacobs motion to override the veto on House Bill 2710."

Speaker Telcser: "Any further discussion? Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Just one small point I'd like to make before we vote and that is that it may be that some people here are under the impression that Mental Health organizations are strongly supporting this Bill. I want you to know that the community health centers, the people where most of our voters are going to go the place where most of our voters are going to go for help are...are asking us to vote to sustain the Governors veto in this matter. They feel that this will have a very disastrous effect on Mental Health centers and Mental Health funding. I agree with them and I hope that you will vote to support the Governors veto in this matter."

Speaker Telcser: "Any further discussion? Representative Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker we've worked hard and laborously on this Bill. The Subcommittee held special sub...held special hearings. We've had testimony from people all throughout the state. The General Assembly in their wisdom voted to support this in the House and also in the Senate and I would appreciate all the support that we could possibly have to override the Governors veto on this Bill."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any further discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 2710 pass? Representative Jacobs to close."

Jacobs: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, it seems very strange that today we get a notice from Doctor Levit saying that he is not in favor of this Bill. When he was asked repeatedly or his staff or anyone he wanted to send to come and testify and he refused but he did send his special assistant. And the letter that we received from Doctor Levit on June 11, said that the Mental Health Department was not going to take any stand on this Bill. Now, all of a sudden Doctor Levit now says he's not in favor of this Bill. Under those circumstances I wouldn't believe that Doctor if he was standing on a stack of bibles. Let's fact the issue. What is the purpose and the reason for this Bill? And I'll tell you what it is. They're phasing out. They're phasing out mind you. The fire departments and your mental institutions. East Moline State Hospital wasn't even funded for a fire department. Turned it over to the City of East Moline who was unable and would not have been able to go out and fight a fire at that facility. If this is good mental health administration and if what Doctor Levit said we would stop here in the Legislature of him and his department of doing any good, I'd like to know when he's going to start doing that good. Because if we was to have a fire at East Moline Hospital, if we were to have a fire at Jacksonville Hospital where they phased it out there or at Kankakee where they phased it out, I think we're going to have some damn red faces when we find out how many patients might perish. I think this is the time right now to take and stand up and be counted and let's say that we want something to say. Whether the



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

facilities are being phased out and whether the patients are being put out with...2000 patients were put out in the past year in the community service. Sixty percent have been returned to the institution because the communities were not ready for them. If this is what a good mental institution or a good mental administration is, by God we ought to take and get some more help, even if we have to get it outside the state again. And another thing that I want to bring out. You've been visited by probably every aide that the Governor has on this Bill. He doesn't want this Bill. He wants the five year plan where he can play around with it. But I want to tell you one thing, at the end of five years, you won't have an institution in the State of Illinois and I ask you to take and give us, in behalf of the 80 odd Sponsors of this Bill and the 137 who voted for it. We urge a 'yes' vote on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Telcser: "The question is, shall House Bill 2710 pass? The Governors veto notwithstanding? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Schraeder to explain his vote."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, needless to say we've had a sad experience in my district. The problem still exists and it can be multiplied unless this Bill is passed into law. We went through a phasing out system of the Peoria State Hospital approximately two years ago, by the Department of Mental Health and it was one of the poorest phasing out programs I have ever seen. They did nothing to find out whether it was a wise move. They didn't consider anybody and certainly most of all they didn't consider the mental patients and their problems and where they would go after the hospital was phased

out. And after they willy-nilly closed it down, they didn't take care of the employees that were reduced or let go. The patients were placed in an overcrowded institution either at Galesburg or Lincoln, where facilities were already overcrowded. And that's one part of the program. But the second one and an equally as important, what happens after a building or a facility is phased out? What becomes of the real property? The property belonging to the State of Illinois and all its citizens? And this certainly effects everybody, certainly everybody in this Legislature who are aware of the cost of government. We have a phased out institution at Peoria, the Bartonville area, where someone...some seven or eight million dollars and would you believe after this ill begotten phasing out program was over, we faced the ultimate in what to do with the facilities and we're still fighting that problem. And lo and behold, just last week the administration, through general services even made an announcement that a facility worth seven or eight million dollars is not even going to have a security force to protect the states investment. Now, if this is planning, then we certainly don't have any Department of General Services nor Department of Mental Health. It seems to me, with a Bill that's of importance of this one and the number of Sponsors that we have and the number of those voting for it, it was so critical such a short time as three or four months ago. It is just as critical today. And it seems to me that we need that 107 votes and if you're interested in the taxpayers money, then we should vote 'aye'. And I would urge an override of the vote and ask for the red light...the green lights."

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



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Peters 'aye'. On this question there are 79 'ayes', 27 'nays'. This motion having failed to receive the necessary votes is declared lost. Any other Members wish a total veto call? Representative Neff? What number?"

Neff: "2021, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Telcser: "Representative Neff, proceed."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2821 was sponsored by Representative McGrew, Representative McMasters and myself. This Bill would appropriate \$200,000 to the Department of Transportation to raise one-quarter of a mile of Illinois state roads bond issue, Route 83A near Keithsburg, Illinois in Mercer County. The road improvement is necessary to raise the road approximately four and one half feet because flooding currently closes the road for almost thirty days each year and this has happened for the last ten years. The State of Illinois is responsible for the maintenance of the highway. The road closing causes severe problems for the residents of Keithsburg. It prevents fire trucks, ambulances from reaching the area just north of the City of Keithsburg when the road is closed. Detours of up to twenty miles must be made for ambulances and fire department trucks when something occurs within a mile of Keithsburg when this road is closed. The road passes over a flood control levy. Because of the low level of the road, the levy at the point where the road crosses, it is not high enough to keep out the flood waters. That makes it necessary to sandbag the area of the road where it crosses the levy. And therefore, this makes it necessary to close the road. This Bill will solve this situation and will guarantee that the people of Keithsburg do not face this problem in the future.



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

I'm sure that this was a...the Governors Office possibly made an error and I think they feel they do when they vetoed this. I was contacted by Dave Cavilla and after the veto was made he said he tried to get a hold of me before and if I could get him more answers to it, it probably wouldn't have not been vetoed. So, I don't think it was intentionally that they intended to veto this."

Speaker Telcser: "Any further discussion? Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would simply like to concur with Representative Neff and point out that this road does lie parallel to the Mississippi River and as it is, when it becomes necessary to be closed the residents of the area are sometimes required to go thirty miles around to get to ambulance services, hospitals and so...fires and so on and so forth. And I think that's an absurd situation and this Bill would serve to correct that. So, I urge a green light."

Speaker Telcser: "Is there any further discussion? Representative McMasters."

McMasters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want to concur with the two previous speakers. Certainly this does cause a very serious problem to the residents of that area. As the two previous speakers said, the road parallels the Mississippi River at a point where a creek crosses under the road. The road itself acts as a dam that causes the water to back up in such a way that a levy must be built, sandbags must be put across the road in order to keep the water out of the town. It's a very dangerous situation during the spring of the year and something that we feel should be corrected in our area. I would certainly urge a 'yes!'"



vote on this override."

Speaker Telcser: "Any further discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 2821 pass, the Governors veto notwithstanding? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Neff?"

Neff: "Mr. Speaker, may I ask permission to take this out of the record?"

Speaker Telcser: "Postponed Consideration?"

Neff: "Just take it out of the record."

Speaker Telcser: "Take it out of the record. Do you wish to take it out of the record, Representative Neff? Take it out of the record. It's on Postponed Consideration. House Bills, Second Reading. The Chair recognizes Speaker Blair. "

Blair: "All right, thank you Mr. Speaker. Now, if you'll notice on Supplemental Calendar #1, we have about two...four...six House Bills that are on Second Reading, First Legislative Day. These are the Bills that we discussed yesterday, that in the main involve administration proposals for transfers or deficiencies or supplemental on appropriations. And they were all heard this morning in the House Appropriations Committee and we need to suspend, first, the appropriate rule so that these Bills may be read a Second time today. They're on First Legislative Day and in order to get to Second, we have to suspend the rules. So, I'd ask for unanimous consent to suspend the appropriate rule to have these Bills called on Second Reading."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Cook, has moved on the provisions of Rule 33a. To...do what? Moves to suspend Rule 33A so these Bills can be read a Second Legislative Day. Does he have leave? Leave. The Clerk will read the Bill."

Clerk-O'Brien: "House Bill 2908. A Bill for an Act to amend



an Act providing an expense for certain agencies.

Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Telcser: "Any Amendments from the Floor? Third Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2909. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for expense of State Government. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Telcser: "Any Amendments from the Floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1. Hart. Amends House Bill 2909 on page 2, by deleting all of lines 8 and 9 of Section 4 and inserting in lieu thereof the following, and so forth."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Representative Hart."

Hart: "Mugalian... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an Amendment to appropriate \$10,000 to the Commission on Economic Development. For some reason during the Session ending in June, the...ah...Commission money was divided by \$10,000 and they need this money to continue operations. The Bureau of the Budget has no position on this and I don't know of any opposition to it. It is necessary to complete the Commissions operation and I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Telcser: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 2909. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments? Third Reading."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2910. Barry. An Act to amend an Act relating to State Finance. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Telcser: "Any Amendments from the Floor? Third Reading."



Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2912. Redmond. An Act to provide funds for the expenses of the Department of the Ageing. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Telcser: "Any Amendments from the Floor? Third Reading."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2915. Krause. An Appropriation to the Department of General Services. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Telcser: "Any Amendments from the Floor? Third Reading. Wait... Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Fred, there's a Committee Amendment on 2915."

Clerk Selcke: "Yeah, there is. I'm looking for that."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Chairman... Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Committee Amendment #1 to House Bill 2915 is a reduction of \$10,800. It's an agreed Committee Amendment and I move for it's adoption."

Clerk Selcke: "Committee Amendment #1."

Lechowicz: "I explained the Amendment, Mr. Speaker. I move its adoption."

Speaker Telcser: "The question is, shall Amendment #1 to House Bill 2915 pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. Any further Amendments? Third Reading."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 2916. DiPrima. Amends an Act providing expenses for the Illinois Veterans Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Telcser: "Any Amendments from the Floor? Third Reading. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Juckett."

Juckett: "Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding because Mr. Krause was not here, we could not hear a motion. I would like to know how you could advance Mr. Krauses Bill if he was not here to make a motion to advance it to Third Reading."



Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman from Will, Speaker Blair."

Blair: "Well, I think that the Gentleman's question is properly raised, certainly. In Committee this morning Mr. Lechowicz handled the Bill for Mr. Krause and there's no problem. We'll be happy to read the Bill a Second time today and hold it on Second and so Mr. Krause will be here tomorrow and if there are any questions then that want to be raised to the Gentleman why they can be properly raised. I think it's only fair. There's no problem about the three days because we'll read it a Second time. It's been, you know...read. Just hold it on Second. Okay, you want to hold it on Second? All right, just... why don't you just hold it on Second. It's been read a Second time, so it can be called tomorrow and passed on Third Reading. The Amendment... Well, was the Amendment adopted?"

Speaker Telcser: "House Bill 2916 we'll hold on Second Reading."

Blair: "All right."

Speaker Telcser: "2915...will be held on Second Reading. On the Order of nonconcurrence, Representative C. L. McCormick is recognized for House Bill 2897."

McCormick: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to move for nonconcurrence with the Senate Amendment to 28...House Bill 2897. There's some clarification and we're going to ask for a Conference Committee Report further down the line and I'd appreciate if you'd support me in that motion."

Speaker Telcser: "The Gentleman has moved to nonconcur. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, the Gentlemans motion carries."



Speaker Blair: "All right, what we're going to do now is to go to the Order of Motions. We're looking at an adjournment sometime around 6:30 or 15 till 7. We intend to get every piece of business that needs to be addressed tonight that anybody on the Floor wants. There is that reception and dinner for Mr. Clabaugh. But the reception...there is a reception from 6:30 till 8:00 and the dinners at 8:00. So I think, you know, we're within the framework of carrying out our responsibilities here and also being able to be there to honor the Dean of the House. So, Mr. McAuliffe, as all the boys in Chicago is doing an excellent job up here now. So, Roger, come on back here now."

Speaker McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the Order of Motions. The Gentle...the Lady from Cook, Representative Catania. House Bill 1368."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I think that my motion has to be read. Does my motion have to be read or..."

Clerk Selcke: "I move to suspend the rule...the provisions of Rule 31.1 to move House Bill 1368 from Consideration by the Rules Committee and place House Bill 1368 on the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 1368 has been held procedurally in the Rules Committee because all the Bills were sent there last spring. This is a motion to remove it from the Rules Committee and place it on Second Reading. It is not in any way an attack on the Rules Committee because the Rules Committee has never voted on it. It is simply the most expedient way to move this so that the people who are concerned with the problem can be served by the Illinois Legislature."



The people who are involved in this problem are the supermarkets, the butchers union, the consumers and the farmers. The supermarkets and the butchers union have just renegotiated a contract for three years in a Chicago area, which says that meat can not be sold after 6:00 p.m. in the Chicago supermarkets. Now, here and there through the Chicago area up to the Wisconsin border, over to the Indiana border, you can find a store or two that does sell meat after 6:00 and this is something that is occasionally overlooked by the union. However, in most cases, consumers are not able to purchase meat after 6:00 p.m. or before 9:00 a.m. in the morning or on Sundays. And this is a situation which has been addressed by several consumers..."

Speaker McAuliffe: "Just a moment... The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan. Point of Order."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, I believe she's talking about the Bill and she has a motion. I think she should address herself to the motion that's before the Body."

Catania: "Thank you, I will..."

Speaker McAuliffe: "Please confine your remarks to the motion."

Catania: "I will try to confine my remarks to the motion. The motion is, as I began to say, are to remove the Bill from the Rules Committee. It is in no way an attack on the Rules Committee. It is simply an attempt to move this Bill procedurally in behalf of the many, many, hundreds of thousands of people who are concerned about the ability to be able to purchase meat after 6:00. As I said it is not an attack on the Rules Committee. It is not an attack on Labor Unions either. I am in favor of the principal of collective bargaining and this Bill does



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

not attack that principal. It establishes a public health policy in the State of Illinois, which says that if a supermarket is opened, the meat department should also be opened and I ask for your support of this motion to put this Bill before this body so it can have free discussion in this Session of the General Assembly."

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

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I wish to assist Susan Catania in this motion. So I can remove the sign from my jewelry store, which says that I do not serve butchers after 6:00."

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

Douglas: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ordinarily at this stage of the Session, it might seem to some that it would be inappropriate to go digging into the Rules Committee to bring out a long lost Bill. But I would urge the Members of this House to support this very important effort to bring a Bill out which deserves consideration of this House. This Bill deals with an issue that affects a large number of people, including even those of us who work all day long and go home at night and wish to have what is a democratic opportunity and that's to go shopping. And the fact that we cannot go to the supermarket to purchase meat and the fact that we cannot get cooperation from those who have control over the sale of meat at that time, I think justifies the time of this House at this time in the Session and I would urge that the efforts to bring this Bill out and to the consideration of the House on the Floor be sustained and I ask you to give Representative Catania an 'aye' vote."



Speaker McAuliffe: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I've heard of a lot of excuses to bring out a Bill out of a Rules Committee but none have been less evident of a need of an emergency. No support has been brought before this House at this time to say in November of 1974, at the end of a Session, all of a sudden there's a great need to bring a piece of Legislation before this General Assembly that because there's such a dire emergency in the area of the City of Chicago. There's a few questions that some people ought to ask themselves before they vote on this motion. One is, who's behind this Bill? Number two, if Roman Kosinski doesn't want to serve butchers after 6:00 o'clock, I have no objection, Roman, nor do the butchers probably, because ..."

Speaker McAuliffe: "Point of Order. The Chair recognizes Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On a Point of Order, I would like to observe that the Gentleman from McHenry is not confining himself to the motion."

Hanahan: "I think I am."

Speaker McAuliffe: "Will the Gentleman kindly confine himself to the motion?"

Hanahan: "The motion to discharge, I am continually going to confine myself to because the motion is completely wrong. Some special privilege may be sought by people for consideration of a Bill at this late hour. I think we ought to get to the issue of whether or not a Bill should be discharged from a Rules Committee based on some emotion conjured up by news media...conjured up by nobody in particular, except a few people. Other organizations such as the

Status of Women have not asked this General Assembly to take a Bill from the Rules Committee. Trade Union Movement hasn't asked for the Bill to be moved from the Rules Committee. The but...the supermarkets that agreed to Legislation...or to a labor contract haven't asked to have this Bill moved from the Rules Committee. I don't know anyone outside of a few Representatives that seem somehow to want to negate free collective bargaining outside of those few individuals. I don't know of anyone that wants to move this Bill from the Rules Committee. And I suggest to the Members of the House, we're talking about a home rule city. A home rule city is going to be effected. I don't even think the Bill's in proper order to even meet that question on home rule, Because it's only going to effect one city. I'd suggest also that if the Sponsor of the Bill wanted a fair hearing in an atmosphere of judicious thinking it should have been brought up during the regular Session. There's no more emergency today than there was last spring. I think that in all fairness to the Lady, if she wants special privilege she shouldn't be for the Equal Rights Amendment, maybe. Because the Equal Rights Amendment certainly wouldn't get the Bill out of the Rules Committee. I suggest that is we want to talk about fairness and equal justice, this Bill should remain in the Rules Committee and die a very peaceful death. There will be a lot of butchers, a lot of housewives that will be very thankful that it died. I think everyone understands at this time that the trade union movement is opposed to this kind of intervention into it's system of collective bargaining. We don't want people to remove Bills from the Rules Committee in order to Legislate hours of business or wages. Whether you're a



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

jeweler, or a supermarket or any other kind of business enterprise. Where does it stop? So those of you who have made some sort of commitment to vote a Bill out of a Rules Committee saying that you're not going to vote for the Bill, I'd suggest that you think very...put your head on very straight and think very sharply that before you vote to discharge the Rules Committee on this Bill, I think there's a greater priority on a lot of other Bills that should be addressed to by the Members of the General Assembly before some sort of meat cutter Bill is brought before our attention."

Speaker McAuliffe: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was especially interested to hear my friend from McHenry County make comment about the need for people to buy meat after 6:00. My friend and I across the aisle worked together on the subject of R.T.A. and we're very close. But one of the interesting things is that the people of McHenry County can go in and they can buy meat after 6:00. The people in my county...Lake County, cannot. And I think, one thing we want to do is end discrimination. We're talking about equal rights. You can go to the Jewel store in Mundeline if you're a working man or woman and if you get there after 6:00 you're discriminated against... You can't buy meat. But you can go to the Jewel store in Crystal Lake, in the Gentlemans district and buy meat. So I can understand why he might be very happy with the status quo. But I think...I think if we're talking about fair play and equal treatment and what's right for the consumers, what's right for McHenry County is right for..."

Speaker McAuliffe: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Hanahan, on a Point of Order."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, he's not talking about the discharge of a Bill out of the Rules Committee, he's talking about the merits of the Bill."

Speaker McAuliffe: "Your point is well taken."

Deuster: "The point is very well taken. I'll confine myself to the motion. I think that we should support this so that we can bring equal treatment under the law to all the consumers in McHenry, Lake and throughout all of the United States for that matter, because this peculiar rule only operates against the consumers in the Chicago metropolitan area and I urge your support of this motion to bring this Bill out so we can vote it up or down."

Speaker McAuliffe: "Any further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Catania, to close."

Catania: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. In closing I would like to say that there has been not only a request from the people who are in the community all the way to the Wisconsin border and over to the Indiana border, but an outcry from those people for this Legislation. The Chicago area press has requested this happen and I'd say the Chicago area press, not just the Chicago press. This is not a homerule matter for the City of Chicago. It effects a couple of million people outside the City of Chicago. When WMAQ asked for responses from people of the area, they had more than 22,000 mail responses in support of this concept. This is more than they've had for everything all together in the last year. In closing I would like to say that I don't want to keep us here any longer than we've been here already. It's now 6:30 and I do ask for your support for this measure which says that we can buy meat after 6:00 p.m. in the Chicago area. Thank you."



Speaker McAuliffe: "The question is, shall... The question is, shall a motion in regard to House Bill 1368 prevail? It takes 107 votes to pass. Representative Rigney, to explain his vote."

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, my good friend from McHenry County has said this is not emergency Legislation. I would disagree with him rather violently on this. I would like to point out to you, as a producer of this product that it takes eight pounds of grain to produce a pound of beef. That grain is costing seven cents a pound. Simply arithmetic tells us that 56 cents a pound to produce beef that we in turn sell on the hoof for 38 cents. That's a negative margin of 18 cents per pound. I want to talk to you very briefly, my good friend, about what that minus 18 cents is not buying. First of all, it's not buying that new Chrysler that's produced in Belvidere, Illinois, which I think happens to be in the 33rd Legislative District. It's not buying that new \$30,000 combine that John Deere is producing in Moline. It's not buying that new cattle shed from Morton, Illinois. I could go on and on with that kind of a list, but I think you see the point that I'm driving at. I know that a lot of you like to stand up with your union record you're proud of our unions. I'm proud of our unions too. But just like our own children, at times we have to take them out behind the wood shed, when they're acting up and I think those of you who are proud of your union record should be thinking about what you're doing to the economy of the State of Illinois and I would respectfully suggest that if you want to cast a good union vote on this motion, you will be supporting the Lady from Cook County."

Speaker McAuliffe: "The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative



Rose. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I haven't put my button on, but I'm glad to speak on the Bill. I would only say that there is a lady in my neighborhood whose wife... whose husband, well, that was very funny. There is a lady in my neighborhood whose husband has had a severe brain damage, not too many...not too long ago and that lady has eight children from ages of five to nineteen and she has to work all day long and when she comes home she has to take care of those children and she can't go to the store at any reasonable period of time to shop for her beef. It seems to me that if the stores were allowed to package their meat before the 6:00 time and sell it afterwards, it would total...be totally reasonable for that kind of person, who had to work to stay off public aid and to be a honest participant in society to have the privilege of buying meat after 6:00 when she could get home."

Speaker McAuliffe: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm rather perplexed as I stand here this afternoon. I was in an Appropriations Committee meeting this morning and because of labors influence and Tommy Hanahan's comments today, because he was concerned about the consumer, the State of Illinois lost \$57,000,000 in Federal Housing funds, mortgage money. And that was in the interest of the consumer. And now here we are with special interest Legislation and all we ask for is 107 votes to put this thing out and then vote on the Bill. That's all this is. This has been called the peoples chambers, then let's let the people decide how they want this thing resolved. I can't understand it; we're seven votes short and if



you fella's want to be fair with yourselves and fair with the people of the State of Illinois and the consumer, then there will be 107 up here in a minute and we'll get this Bill passed. And I think it's imperative that we do that. You're going to get another shot to defeat it, if that's what you want. But give us the chance to debate the merits of the Bill here today or tomorrow. Thank you."

Speaker McAuliffe: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Catania, to explain her vote."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I am sorry that we are keeping you here working after 6:00 p.m. But I do ask for a fair hearing for this Legislation. That's all that I'm requesting with this motion. It does need 107 votes and I would ask Judge Barry and all those who said they'd be the 109th and 110th to come on. Thank you."

Speaker McAuliffe: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan, to explain his vote."

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to also have fairness and I would suggest those who have pressed buttons of Members of the General Assembly that are not present and I can see three up on the board right now, that are not present that if they remain on green we will take the time and in all deference to Charlie Clabaugh, I would not like to have to wait here for a verification. But, I will respectfully request a verification if those lights are not changed to 'present' or any other method. Number two, I would like to point out the ills in the meat packing industry and farming to my good friend, Harlan, is not the cause of the City of Chicago not selling meat after 6:00. That the ills in Kansas City and Los Angeles and New York and the failure of people to buy meat in those areas are just as severe and they



don't have any restrictions. I think we're talking about a union proposition here. An A.F.L.-C.I.O. proposition and I might point out to some Members here, the A.F.L.-C.I.O. had a Resolution against E.R.A. and the meatcutters union happened to come out against. So, there's nobody here on this Floor who has less real desire to protect a union that votes an issue than I do right now. In fact, this is the thank you that the meat cutters union got from the females that are supporting this Bill for bolting the A.F.L.-C.I.O. and coming out in favor of E.R.A. when they were opposed to the E.R.A. This is the thank you. And I say to those of you Legislators that want to maintain good labor relations with the various trade union movements that they should think before they vote, not emotionally but on a realistic proposal that this is a bad piece of Legislation to bring out of a Rules Committee."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, being from the 33rd District and not thinking that this problem affected my district until this past Saturday, when a constituent of mine who walked into a new Dominic store and tried to buy a live lobster at a store where the butchers had been on duty since 7:00 in the morning but the contract said they couldn't sell until after 9:00 in the morning. I suddenly feel a desire to get this Bill passed. Now, the next time that Gentleman calls me, and there were five or six of them there, Representative Hanahan, I will give them your number and you can explain why they made the trip from Woodstock or McHenry to Crystal Lake to buy the meat that they wanted at 8:00 in the morning and had to wait until 9:00."



Speaker McAuliffe: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, first I want... In explaining my vote I want to speak on a Point of Personal Privilege first, because the Gentleman from McHenry referred to this as a 'Dyer' problem and I thought perhaps I...I should have a chance to speak. I also wanted to point out that I did get an endorsement and was very grateful for my endorsement from the A.F.L.-C.I.O. I have constantly supported genuine legitimate demands of labor. What we have here is a selfish grab for power, a power play in the Chicago metropolitan area, whereby every other...every consumer in every other line of business suffers because of the contract negotiated for one union. There are people in hospitals, there are people in all kinds of businesses who work around the clock. There are people in steel mills who work shifts and there are people who simply can not get into their supermarket until after 6:00 at night. I think you should give the Lady three more bonafide votes up there, real fast, so we can all get to the Clabaugh dinner and let's vote to discharge this thing from Committee. Thank you."

Speaker McAuliffe: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "From...from this point, I'm saying that there are three votes on that board, on that side of the aisle that the Gentlemen are not here and I'd request that their labor record votes are not placed in their absence. And I'll name Representative Pappas, Representative North names should be removed. Representative Murphy's name should be removed on that board right now and if you want me to keep going down the line without asking for a verification, I would



request those names be taken off."

Speaker McAuliffe: "Will whoever is sitting around those Gentlemen turn off their switches if they're not here. Tell them to vote 'present'. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. The Lady from Cook, Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to put this on Postponed Consideration, please. Oh, I'm sorry, I think I'd rather poll the absentees. If I could do that instead?"

Speaker McAuliffe: "Clerk, please poll the absentees."

Clerk Selcke: "Alsup, Barnes, Berman, Brummet, Calvo, Capuzi, Carter, Choate, Doc votes 'no'. Clabaugh, Craig, Davis, Dee, DiPrima, Flinn, Garmisa, Getty, Gibbs, Giorgi, Hill, Gene Hoffman, Jacobs, Emil Jones, Katz."

Speaker McAuliffe: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I wish to be recorded as 'present'. I think that the Bill is a Bill that would be fine, but it is not constitutionally within the State of Illinois to pass the law, in my opinion, under a United States Supreme Court decision."

Clerk Selcke: "Keller, Kennedy, Krause, Lemke, Londrigan, Macdonald, Mann, Martin, McAvoy, McLendon, McPartlin, Merlo, Molloy, Peters, Schlickman, Schraeder... Schraeder 'present'."

Speaker McAuliffe: "Representative Choate, 'present'. Representative Boyle 'present'. Representative Garmisa 'present'."

Clerk Selcke: "Stedelin, Stiehl, Taylor, Tipsword, Tipsword 'present'. Totten, Tuerk, Wall, Washington."

Speaker McAuliffe: "On this question there are 105 'yeas', 13 'nays' 18 'present'. This motion, having failed to receive 107 votes, is hereby declared lost."



Speaker McAuliffe: "Does the Lady have leave to put it on Postponed Consideration? Postponed Consideration. Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Selcke: "House Resolution 1202, Deavers. House Resolution 1203, Kelly. House Resolution 1205, Deavers. House Resolution 1206, Fary. House Resolution 1207, Tip sword. House Resolution 1208, Lechowicz. House Resolution 1209, Dunn. House Resolution 1210, Hyde. House Resolution 1211, Lauer. House Resolution 1212, Giglio. House Resolution 1213, Pierce."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, we've looked these Agreed Resolutions over very carefully and they are all indeed non-controversial and I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Blair: "Any discussion?"

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker... Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "That wasn't entirely accurate. There is one on which someone may have some question and that is House Resolution 1205 and that urges that the Insurance Laws Study Commission undertake a full, complete and thorough study of the cost, sales practices, dividend policies, payment practices, financial structure and the responsibility and duties of management of life insurance companies authorized to do business in the State of Illinois. That is the only one that is anything but congratulatory."

Speaker Blair: "No... Right."

Walsh: "One's enough, but your Leader said it's all right."

Speaker Blair: "No, the Majority Leaders point is well taken. It takes the Minority Leaders objection."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker."



Speaker Blair: "Who's that? Well, why don't we have an agreement on all those except that number? Is that a problem?"

Walsh: "That...that's fine, Mr. Speaker. I would move then, for the adoption of the Resolutions read by the Clerk except for House Resolution 1205."

Speaker Blair: "Okay. Those are all apparently agreed by the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader. So, all those in favor of the adoption of those Resolutions say 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and those Resolutions are adopted. Okay, now we've got one more. All right, that Resolution will be put on the Speaker's Table and shown on the Calendar tomorrow, I take it. Okay?"

Clerk Selcke: "Further Resolutions. House Resolution 1204. Palmer."

Speaker Blair: "Mr. Palmer."

Palmer: "Mr. Speaker, would you hold that until tomorrow?"

Speaker Blair: "Okay. Death Resolution."

Clerk Selcke: "House Resolution 1208. Hudson et al. In respect to the memory of Frank Potempt."

Speaker Blair: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh, moves the adoption of the Death Resolution. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Resolution is adopted. Okay. Now, are there any... Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, is it fair to ask the Majority Leader who the Sponsor of that Resolution 1205 is? I think I understood that you said it would appear on the Calendar tomorrow?"

Speaker Blair: "Well, what I...the understanding was it was going to be left on the Speaker's Table and I suggested that on the Order of Speaker's Table tomorrow, that Resolution be shown. That's where it is really anyway. In other words, there's not..."



Bradley: "Who is the Sponsor of the Resolution?"

Speaker Blair: "Deavers."

Bradley: "Thank you."

Speaker Blair: "Deavers is, your colleague. Okay, now are there any other matters on the Calendar that anybody wants to have called tonight? I think we've read all the Bills that need to be read a Second time already. And so we're ready to adjourn. Okay. All right, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. William Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House stand adjourned until 10:00 tomorrow morning."

Speaker Blair: "All right. The Gentlemans motion is that the House stand adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow. All those in favor of the Gentlemans motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House will be adjourned then until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning."



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
1.		Clerk Selcke	Announcement
		Speaker Blair	House to Order
		Dr. Johnson	Invocation
		Speaker Blair	Roll Call for Attendance
		Borchers	
2.		Speaker Blair	
		Epton	
		Speaker Blair	
		Epton	
		Speaker Blair	
		Maragos	Asks Table Motion HB-2851
		Speaker Blair	Tabled
		Choate	Asks leave for Demo Conf.
3.		Speaker Blair	Leave granted...Recess
		Clerk Selcke	
		Speaker Blair	
		Clerk Selcke	Committee Reports
		Speaker Blair	
4.		Shea	
		Speaker Blair	
5.		Beatty	HB-2778
		Speaker Blair	
6.		Dunn, Ralph)	
)	
		Speaker Blair)	
7.		Calvo)	
)	
		Beatty)	
)	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Blair	
		Bluthardt	Question Sponsor
		Speaker Blair	
8.		Bluthardt)) Beatty)	Question
		Speaker Blair	
		Beatty	To close
9.		Speaker Blair	
		Skinner	Explains vote
		Speaker Blair	
10.		Lundy	
		Speaker Blair	HB-2778..passed..veto notwithstanding
11.		Collins	HB-2866..Veto Motion
12.		Speaker Blair	
13.		Maragos	
		Speaker Blair	
14.		Griesheimer	
		Speaker Blair	
		Kosinski)) Collins)	Question
		Speaker Blair	
15.		Maragos	
		Speaker Blair	
		Fleck	Sponsor Yield?
		Speaker Blair	
		Fleck)) Collins)	Question
16.		Collins	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Blair	
		Collins	To close
		Speaker Blair	HB-2866...Vote on veto
17.		Maragos	
		Speaker Blair	
		Collins	Moves Postponed
18.		Speaker Blair	
		Skinner	HB-2792
		Speaker Blair	
		Houlihan	
		Speaker Blair	
19.		Skinner	To close
		Speaker Blair	HB-2792
		Dunne. R. L.	Explains Vote
		Speaker Blair	
20.		Lechowi�cz	
21.		Speaker McAuliffe	HB-2792 passed..veto notwithstanding
22.		Brinkmeier	HB-2736
		Speaker McAuliffe	
		Brinkmeier	To close
		Speaker McAuliffe	HB-2736 veto
		Brinkmeier	
		Speaker McAuliffe	
		<u>Brinkmeier</u>	Postponed HB-2736
		Speaker Blair	
23.			
24.		Stone	HB-2274
25.			



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Blair	
26.		Clabaugh	
		Speaker Blair	
		Craig	
27.		Speaker Blair	
28.		Hirschfeld	
29.		Speaker Blair	
30.		Choate	
31.		Speaker Blair	
32.		Stone	
		Speaker Blair)	
)	
33.		Katz)	
)	
34.		Speaker Blair	
		Duff	
35.		Speaker Blair	
		Stone	Postponed Cons.
		Speaker Blair	
36.		Peters	HB-2264...Motion #3
37.		Speaker Blair	
		Choate	
		Speaker Blair	
		Katz	
		Speaker Blair	
		Peters	
		Speaker Blair	
		Choate	Sponsor Yield?
		Speaker Blair	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
38.		Choate)	Question
)	
39.		Peters)	
		Speaker Blair	
		Peters	To close
		Speaker Blair	Vote on HB-2264, Veto Motion 3
40.		Dyer	
		Speaker Blair	
41.		Wolf	
42.			
43.		Speaker Blair	HB-2264 TOOR
		Kriegsman	HB-2416
44.		Speaker Blair	
		Choate)	
)	
45.		Speaker Blair)	
		Kriegsman	
		Speaker Blair	
		Choate	
		Speaker Blair	TOOR
		Terzich	HB-2673
46.		Speaker Blair	HB-2673 Motion Vote
		Shea	HB-2861..Moves adopt veto
		Speaker Blair	
		Kempiners	Sponsor Yield?
		Speaker Blair)	Discussion
)	
		Kempiners)	
)	
47.		Shea)	
48.		Speaker Blair	HB-2861..Adopted Gov. Changes HB-2391.....



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
48.		Speaker Blair	HB-2391.....
		Skinner	
		Speaker Blair	
49.		McCourt)	Ask Sponsor question
)	
50.		Skinner)	
		Speaker Blair	
		Beaupre	
51.		Speaker Blair	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Blair	
52.		Skinner	
		Speaker Blair	
		Houlihan	Explains vote
		Speaker Blair	
53.		Kempiners)	Question
)	
		Skinner)	
		TELCSEK IN CHAIR	
		Speaker Telcser	
54.		Waddell	
		Speaker Telcser	
		Grotberg	
		Speaker Telcser	
55.		Skinner)	TOOR...Postponed
)	
		Speaker Telcser)	
56.		Jacobs	HB-2710
57.		Speaker Telcser	
		Douglas	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Telcser	
58.		Walsh	
59.		Speaker Telcser	
		Katz	
60.		Speaker Telcser	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Telcser	
61.		Washburn	
		Speaker Telcser	
		Chapman	
		Speaker Telcser	
		Polk	
62.		Speaker Telcser	
		Jacobs	To close
63.		Speaker Telcser	HB-2710...Vote
64.		Schraeder	Explains Vote
		Speaker Telcser	HB-2710...lost
65.		Neff	HB-2821
		Speaker Telcser	
		Neff	
		Speaker Telcser	
		McGrew	
66.		Speaker Telcser	
		McMaster	
67.		Speaker Telcser	HB-2821..Vote on Gov. veto
		Neff	
		Speaker Telcser	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Neff	Asks TOOR
		Speaker Telcser	
		Blair	Asks suspend Rules
		Speaker Telcser	Leave granted
		Clerk O'Brien	HB-2908...Third Reading
		Speaker Telcser	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB-2909...Am. #1
68.		Speaker Telcser	
		Hart	Explains Am. #1
		Speaker Telcser	Am. #1 adopted, Third
		Clerk Selcke	HB-2910...Third
		Speaker Telcser	
		Clerk Selcke	HB-2912
		Speaker Telcser	
		Clerk Selcke	HB-2915
69.		Speaker Telcser	
		Lechowicz	Explains Am #1 Moves adopt
		Speaker Telcser	
		Lechowicz	
		Speaker Telcser	Am. #1 adopted
		Clerk Selcke	HB-2916...Third
		Speaker Telcser	
		Juckett	
70.		Speaker Telcser	
		Blair	
		Speaker Telcser	HB-2915...Hold on Second
		McCormick	HB-2897..Moves noncon.



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
71.		Speaker Telcser	Motion carries
		BLAIR IN CHAIR	
		Speaker Blair	
72.		Catania	HB-1368
73.		Speaker McAuliffe	
		Hanahan	Point of Order
		Speaker McAuliffe	
		Catania	
		Speaker McAuliffe	
		Kpsenski	
		Speaker McAuliffe	
		Douglas	
74.		Speaker McAuliffe	
75.		Hanahan	
		Speaker McAuliffe	
		Catania	Point of Order
		Hanahan	
		Speaker McAuliffe	
76.		Hanahan	
		Speaker McAuliffe	
		Deuster	
		Speaker McAuliffe	
		Hanahan	Point of Order
77.		Speaker McAuliffe	
		Deuster	
		Speaker McAuliffe	
		Catania	To close



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
78.		Speaker McAuliffe	Vote on Motion
		Rigney	Explains Vote
		Speaker McAuliffe	
79.		Duff	
		Speaker McAuliffe	
80.		Ryan	
		Speaker McAuliffe	
		Catania	Explains Vote
		Speaker McAuliffe	
81.		Hanahan	
		Speaker McAuliffe	
82.		Skinner	
		Speaker McAuliffe	
		Dyer	Pers. Priv. Explains vote
		Speaker McAuliffe	
83.		Hanahan	
		Speaker McAuliffe	
		Catania	Asks Postponed ..Poll absentees
		Speaker McAuliffe	
		Clerk Selcke	Reads absentees
		Speaker McAuliffe	
		Katz	"Present"
84.		Clerk Selcke	
		Speaker McAuliffe	"Choate present"
		Clerk Selcke	
		Speaker McAuliffe	Motion Post..PPC



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk Selcke	HR- 1202, 1203, 1205, 1206, 1207, 1208, 1209, 1210, 1211, 1212, 1213
		Blair in Chair	
85.		Speaker Blair	
		Walsh	Moves adoption
		Speaker Blair	
		Walsh	HR-1205
		Speaker Blair	
		Walsh	Moves adopt all but HR-1205
		Speaker Blair	HR's adopted...HR-1205 Sp.Tabled
		Clerk Selcke	HR-1204
		Speaker Blair	
		Palmer	Hold
		Speaker Blair	Toor
		Clerk Selcke	HR-1208
		Speaker Blair	HR-1208...adopted
86.		Bradley	
		Speaker Blair	
		Walsh, W.	Moves House adjourn
		Speaker Blair	House adjourn

