

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

182ND LEGISLATIVE DAY

DECEMBER 2, 1976



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DEC 2 1976

1.

Doorkeeper: "All persons not entitled to the House floor, please retire to the gallery."

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

Rev. Krueger: "In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen. O Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. John Fitzgerald Kennedy said, 'With good conscience our only reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love asking His blessing and His help, but knowing that here on earth, God's work must truly be our own.' Let us pray. Eternal Father, strong to save, O Christ the Lord of hill and plain, O Spirit whom the Father sent, O Trinity of love and power, O hear us when we cry to Thee. Shield our brethern, protect them by Thy guarding hand, so all may share this beautiful land, make laws, we would, in harmony, pleasing alone to Thee; that when our service here is spent, our state will profit by our talent which was Thine alone to give. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Representative Vitek suggests that we stand in recess till 10:30 so that we can send the skirmishers out to the libraries or the museums again. House will come to order. Members please be in their seats. Senate Bills, Second Reading. On Senate Bills, Second Reading appears Senate Bill 2029. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2029. A Bill for an Act to make a supplemental appropriation to the Department of Insurance for certain ordinary and contingent expenses. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. House Bills, Third Reading. House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 721. Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. 4008. Out of the record. 4009, out of the record. 4010, Representative McMaster. Out of the record. 4012, out of the record. 4017, out of the record. 4018, out of the record. 4019, out of the record. 4020, Representative



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DEC 2 1976

2.

Washington. Out of the record. 4024, out of the record. 4021, out of the record. Well, you want to try 4021? Okay, read 4021."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 4021. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Coal Mining Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In order to try to move the House along, I'll be glad to try to move this Bill if we possibly can. This is a Bill that simply amends a date, an effective date in one portion of the Coal Mines Safety Act that we passed. There was a revision that we passed a year ago that provides in it in one specific area that those who are hired as Superintendents in surface mining operations, have to have two years of experience, pass an examination prepared by the Department of Mines and Minerals on the Coal Mine Safety Act and particularly referring to the kinds of work that they must supervise and the kind of work that they must do. However, the effective date for obtaining those licenses is January 1, 1977. The Bill was signed on August the 17th of 1975. There were people hired in those capacities before we passed this Bill and by virtue of the date we have in it, January 1, 1977, they can't get in one of the essential requirements. That is, two years of experience. So, this Bill merely moves the date for the requirement for that license back to September 1, '77, so that those who were hired can meet that one qualification of having two years of experience without losing their jobs and they still will have to take a test and have to qualify to obtain their license. But they can meet the two year minimum requirement of experience so they can take that test. So, I would urge the adoption of House Bill 4021 and we need this done before the first of January, 1977."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "Do you know of any opposition to this Bill?"

Tipsword: "I know of none, sir and it would effect about 40 people."

Schlickman: "Thank you."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Younge 'aye'. Clerk will take the record. Representative Davis 'aye'. Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 115 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Bill having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. That your first Bill, Representative? 4011. Representative Matijevich."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 4011. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Chain-of-Lakes, Fox River Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm going to need some long arms and gentle people on this one. House Bill 4011 is an appropriation of \$94,000 for the Chain-of Lakes, Fox River Commission and it's an emergency. It was a complete oversight that on the Senate Omnibus Commission Bill that this and one other appropriation were left off. Representative Lechowicz has helped to restore this matter and it came out of the Appropriations Committee unanimously. I've not been a fan of Commissions as you know, but this has been a working type of Commission. And you who were at the Chain-of-Lakes remember that we started a dredging program the first time since 1960. So, I urge the Membership to give this the three-fifths majority necessary. And, Mr. Speaker, if there's no questions, like a Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "You indicate that there was no dissenting vote in Committee. I have a report that there was."

Matijevich: "I think... I just realized somebody told me there was. I think Doug Kane, who always opposes all Commission Bills, voted 'no'."

Schlickman: "My report is that there were two dissenting votes."

Matijevich: "I wasn't aware of that, Representative Schlickman."



Schlickman: "How much was appropriated to this Commission in the prior fiscal year?"

Matijevich: "The prior fiscal year was \$94,000 and we expended all but, I think, about \$300 of that in the prior fiscal year."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further, Representative Schlickman?"

Schlickman: "Approximately \$94,000 was spent during the prior fiscal year. Why are you asking for \$94,000 for this fiscal year when approximately one half the fiscal year is already behind us. Shouldn't that be reduced?"

Matijevich: "Well no, Representative Schlickman, because what has happened, we have been meeting, we've taken no mileage. We've got some expenses. I think you remember John Galue, who was with the head of the Division of Water Resources. He's been our consultant since we started. We haven't been able to enter into a contract, but John Galue has provided some services for the Commission that when we pay for these engineering services, we're going to expend them when we get the funds. So, actually it's been through the good graces of John Galue, who's done an outstanding job for them. In fact, I think if Governor Thompson is smart, Governor-elect Thompson is smart, he would pick that gentleman to head the Division of Water Resources again. In fact, probably make a Department out of it. So, that's the services we've had from John Galue and we need all those funds to pay for the services."

Schlickman: "May I ask one more question, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Schlickman: "You're asking for an appropriation of \$94,000. Could you advise us as to how this will be broken down with respect to personal services, contractual services, et cetera?"

Matijevich: "I wonder if I could yield, Representative Lechowicz, you... Could you break that down? Oh, he's... he wanted to break down the Commission Bill as to personal services and engineering services, contractual. As I recall, the contractual is around sixty-some thousand. I don't have the... my brief on it is on my desk across the street because I didn't believe there was any controversy over this Bill. But as I recall, the engineering



services amounts to something over sixty thousand dollars."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis. Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, neither the one Sponsor, I live in the district of this Bill, but this is a very important Bill for the whole county. I urge your favorable consideration because if anyone knows the Chain-of-Lakes area, I think the CoSponsor and myself and the other Sponsors know it well. It is in badly need of these services and this expense and I urge a favorable consideration on it."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 114 'aye' and 11 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Oh yeah, three-fifths. The Clerk reminds me that it's the extraordinary majority, 107 votes. I don't recall what I did on the first Bill, but... which one was that? 4021 also received the extraordinary majority. Representative Shea, which Bill was it you wanted called?"

Shea: "4008."

Speaker Redmond: "4008."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 4008. A Bill for an Act to amend the State Printing Contracts Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 4008 is an Amendment to the State Purchasing Contract. It allows contract, for the contract for printing of the General Assembly to run concurrent with the term of the State Representative and not run for two fiscal years, the same as we are presently doing. This would allow the officers elected by the Members of the General Assembly to enter into the printing contracts for the term of that General Assembly. And I would move, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill do pass and I'd certainly try to answer any questions anybody has on it."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is shall this Bill pass."



Those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question 124 'aye' and no 'nay' and the Bill having received the Constitutional three-fifths Majority is hereby declared passed. 4009."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 4009. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Department of Transportation for expenditures by the Division of Water Resources. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I was just wondering if we might not hear 4009 and 4010 together."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection to hearing them in tandem? Hearing none, read 4010."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 4010. A Bill for an Act to amend Section 3 of the Capital Development Bond Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Williams: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 4009 and 4010 is similar to the House Bill 3417 with the exception that... of three projects. The Addison Creek Watershed, North Branch Chicago River Watershed, and Bensenville Ditch George Street Reservoir are appropriated at a higher amount than originally contained in the 3417 because of the deletion of a project in there. I cannot emphasize really too strongly the urgent need for your approval of this appropriation and bonding authority. As we all are aware, the division requires that local entities which would be counties, townships, municipalities, other political subdivisions be an active participant in the implementation of water resources improvement projects. The major method of participation by the locals is through acquisition, a project rights-of-way, and assumption of operation and maintenance, you know, of the project after it, you know, has been completed. I have here in my desk a fully executed agreement between the cities of North Lake, Elmhurst; villages of Melrose Park, Stone Park, Broadview, Bellewood, and Westchester; Addison and Leyden Townships, the Addison Creek River Conservancy District and the State of Illinois



DEC 2 1976 7.

for the Addison Creek Watershed Flood Control Project. All of these projects, I would like to point out, have an overall benefit cost ratio of from 5.1 to 1, all the way to 10 to 1. Allow me to elaborate a little bit and... on how the locals do participate in this. The early action program of the watershed incorporates the construction of four detention reservoirs and an outlet storm sewer system. The estimated cost of this phase, actually for lands and damages and construction would be seven million and seventy-five thousand dollars. The local sponsors who will benefit and operate and maintain the works, will be contributing seven hundred and fifteen thousand dollars or 10% of the cost over the three year period. Of the North Branch Chicago River Watershed which is a flood reduction plan for the watershed located in Cook and Lake Counties which covers a drainage area of one hundred and two square miles. And this plan will reduce the flood damages by installation of seven floodwater retarding structures and flood plains and land use regulations. The project costs would be \$36.2 million which includes \$12.8 million of nonfederal costs. And this latter amount is for land rights for the construction of seven reservoir areas. And there is a cooperative cost sharing agreement that has been worked out among the states and the Metropolitan Sanitary District and Lake County and the state's share is only five million or 39% with the other two parties providing the remaining \$7.8 million. To date, there have been two sites that have been acquired; one in Deerfield and one in Techney. And the third is just about to be acquired and that would be in Lake Forest. The Bensenville Ditch, George Street Reservoir, the flood reduction plan for the village and surrounding flat land incorporates a whole series of small detention ponds and associated improvements. The cooperative arrangements have placed a land acquisition and operation and maintenance upon the village worth an estimated cost of a million dollars. The construction cost will be \$3.2 over a period of five years. As indicated here, actually the village will be providing about 24% of the total plan cost. These are just three of the examples



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

of where we have the locals participating and I would like to point out that in the twelve of the projects that are contained in House Bill 4009, that now have the bonding authorization, the cost sharing in fiscal year 1977, Division of Water Resources Capital Development Budget, and get this, is only a 38% state and 62% actually from local and federal sources. Further, I'd like to point out that every one of the projects, actually fulfills the requirement that we would like to see that have a life anywhere from 25 to 50 years. The annual repayment from General Revenue Fund based on a current interest rate of 5.25% would be a principle payment of \$320,000 plus interest of \$261,296 or a total of \$581,926. Indeed, I feel this is a very small price, certainly within the revenue estimates to pay, actually for the millions of dollars of annual damages that will be saved by the elimination of these... of actually the lack of flood control and actually by the construction of these necessary projects that are already now for winter bid letting. A point I would also like to make that this is the ideal time to do this type of construction. Actually, when the ground is frozen and you don't have to worry about the water coming in. So, at this time, I would urge all of my colleagues to support me in the passage of House Bill 4009 and 4010."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is shall these Bills pass. Representative Totten, pardon me."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Totten: "Representative Williams, what has been done about the difference between the authorization total and the authorization that adds up by the different categories the C.D.B. bonds are issued under?"

Williams: "The difference, are you talking about, in the authorization from the... that the statute allows the Capital Development Board or... It is our understanding from just conversations yesterday, that the figures that we show here are the figures that the Comptroller has given us. Actually, the seven hundred



and fifty two billion for the bonding authorization which has been increased now to seven hundred and sixty by the addition of eight million dollars. I do feel that the 80th General Assembly and I feel they are getting some legislation ready for us to look at, but from the information we have now, these are the figures that we have to use. Over the years with Amendments and different things that have been put on there, I believe some statutory changes will have to be made but not by this General Assembly. It'll have to be by the 80th General Assembly."

Totten: "Well, could it not be said that in the various categories for which we issue C.D.B. bonds that should any one of those categories spend up to its limit or should all but one spend up to its limit, then the other would be without authority to issue any bonds because the figure that the Comptroller is using is considerably less than in the individual special categories."

Williams: "I would think that possibility certainly exists. We don't foresee that happening at least with this. I, you know, do feel that the 80th General Assembly has to address itself to that, but from our understanding, we do have the specific appropriation for these projects that are line items and the bonding authority, actually, would be there for these projects now."

Totten: "Yeah, but as I remember when we addressed that question in Committee, it was... you considered it a problem as did we and that there was going to be an attempt to change that. I mean, I could perceive that if Education, Corrections, Conservation, and Health Services, for example, expended all their authorization, there would be nothing that Water Resources could do because they couldn't issue any bonds."

Williams: "As I say, that is a remote possibility, but I don't foresee that happening. And I think at this time, it would be just, at this point, be theoretical. I mean, your guess is as good as mine, but we have to assume that for this fiscal year we won't be running into that problem."

Totten: "All right, I don't necessarily agree with you on that. Let



DEC 2 1976 10.

me ask you one other question, if I may. And that is, what is, what will be the total indebtedness for this increase in the Water Resources Bonding Authority over the life of the bonds?"

Williams: "The information that I have is that on the amount of eight million dollars that we are talking about, based on, let's see, the last bond sale was at 5.23%, so I'm either basing on 5.25 although it may even be lower with the bond market now the way it is. But based on 5.25, the debt retirement, the annual principle and interest would be \$581,926. The interest on that would be \$261,926 with a principle of \$320,000. The total principle and interest over the 25 years would be fourteen million, five hundred and ninety-eight thousand, one hundred and fifty dollars."

Totten: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is shall these Bills pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative LaFleur. Representative LaFleur."

LaFleur: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

LaFleur: "Representative Williams, yesterday you did not oppose an Amendment that was placed upon this Bill under conservation projects for \$200,000 for a road. Could you explain that?"

Williams: "That road was one that goes into a lake. I was told that that could conceivably be considered part of Water Resources. I can't say at this time whether that will remain or not, but..."

LaFleur: "Why did you support it yesterday then?"

Williams: "It was apparently something that could be done within this fiscal year."

LaFleur: "With what?"

Williams: "Actually, it is apparently a project that could be done within this fiscal year. I... personal opposition actually from the department, so..."

LaFleur: "Was this a road that goes into Fern Clyffe Park that the Director of Conservation, Tony Dean, ordered torn up and taken out?"



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Williams: "I understand and I will take your word for it, it is indeed, yes."

LaFleur: "Is this the same road that the people in the village there sued Tony Dean and have gotten a judgement against Tony Dean?"

Williams: "May I defer that answer to Representative Hart?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "Yes, it's my Amendment, so I'd like to answer the questions of the Gentleman. It is, in fact, the road that was closed illegally by then Director of Conservation and the Circuit Court of Johnson County in a suit filed by the taxpayers or the citizens down there, declared that the closing of the road was illegal because it was, in fact, a public road and there had not been the procedure necessary to close it."

LaFleur: "Who was that suit against, Representative Hart?"

Hart: "The Director of Conservation, Tony Dean."

LaFleur: "Was there a judgement rendered against Tony Dean?"

Hart: "Yes, and it was appealed to the Appellate Court and during the time that the appeal was pending, the Governor's Office changed the directions on us and declared that they wanted the road reopened. And so, because of that, continuations have been granted in the Appellate Court pending decisions by the Legislature on funding. The Governor's Office takes the position now that they will build it but they don't have the money."

LaFleur: "Then, what we're faced with is a Director under the past administration what ordered a road torn up; the people sued him; got a judgement against him; the administration changed its course and now wants to rebuild the road with an appeal existing on the administration decision of tearing up. Is that right?"

Hart: "Well, the appeal is on the decision of the Circuit Court of Johnson County that the road was illegally closed. That's the issue in the Appellate Court."

LaFleur: "I did not hear that."

Hart: "I say, the new Minority Leader of the Senate there, my former colleague, had your ear and I congratulate him while I have this chance. But, the issue in the Appellate Court is whether



or not the decision of the Circuit Court was proper."

LaFleur: "Well, what I'm getting at is really that and what I bring to light, there's \$200,000 to build a road. Somebody ordered it torn up and I gather it was Tony Dean. And then, it went to court and in the meantime, the state said, 'We'll put it back in now'. Is that right?"

Hart: "Yes, it was, it took several months or even a year for that to happen but that is actually what happened."

LaFleur: "Well, if we're in a good mood, we should pull the chestnuts out of the fire and give them \$200,000 to build the road and make everybody happy."

Hart: "It will make everybody happy, that's true."

LaFleur: "Except the taxpayers."

Hart: "Even the taxpayers want this road."

LaFleur: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall these Bills pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there's 114 'aye' and 21 'no' and the Bills having received the... Representative Yourell 'aye', received the Constitutional three-fifths Majority is, are hereby declared passed. 4016. Representative Taylor. 4012. No, I don't see him back there. Take 4016 out of the record: 4012."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 4012. An Act to amend Sections 3, 4, 5 and 5(b) in the title of an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission and the Office of the Governor. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 4012 is an Appropriation Bill which adds \$640,000 in federal appropriations and really allocates both federal and state General Revenue Funds, matched within and among state agency grants in the existing fiscal year '77 I.L.E.C. appropriation. The Bill also deletes certain language and corrects, makes some corrections in technical areas. It correlates a corrections



grant and it also combines the Sangamon State University grant for training of probation officers. In addition, there is a federal discretionary grant funds which have been awarded since June, since we passed the original legislation for a corrections industry grant and an organized crime project for the Department of Law Enforcement. And I would move for the adoption of this legislation. I know of no opposition to it."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. Representative Davis, do you seek recognition? Representative Davis. Representative Madison 'aye'. Representative Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise on a point of personal privilege. And they say that I do not presume to take it upon myself to say what I think ought to be done, but I was in the Committee this morning, in the Legislative Audit Committee this morning, and it was brought to my attention that a Member of that Commission, Representative Kenny Boyle, had been sworn in as State's Attorney and if he's sworn in as State's Attorney, another Member of this House has been appointed to set in on that Commission instead. Now, the reason I'm arising is because I'm desperately interested in the history of my race. I think all of you know that and the reason for that is, a race of people is known by their known accomplishments. If you haven't accomplished anything, then you're not known. And I see here an opportunity, this is the reason I'm raising this question. I see here an opportunity to make history for my people. And I hope it will be your prerogative to make history for my people. If he has been sworn in and I'm sure he has been sworn in as State's Attorney, then we have a Vice-Chairman of the Appropriations Committee and that Vice-Chairman is my seatmate here, Eugene M. Barnes. Since already Kenny Boyle has been replaced on the Legislative Audit Committee, I'm wondering if it would be possible for the Democratic Party to make history and make the first black Democrat, Chairman of the powerful Appropriations Committee. I simply raise this



as a point of personal privilege. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I'd like to see you do it because you've been a most gracious Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "We declared that passed. Didn't we? Well, this Bill having received the Constitutional three-fifths majority is hereby declared passed. When I saw it off the bull board here, I thought maybe, Corneal flustered me a little bit there. 4017."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 4017. An Act making a reappropriation to the Capital Development Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd ask the leave of the House to have this heard in conjunction with 4018."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there objections? Hearing none, read 4018."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 4018. A Bill for an Act to amend Section 3 of the Captial Development Bond Act of 1972. Third Reading of the Bill."

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 4017 is a reappropriation of the amount of thirteen million dollars. House Bill 4018 is the Capital Development Bond authorization for the construction of specialized living centers throughout the State of Illinois. This Bill will be, if passed into law and cleared the Senate and signed, will construct six centers throughout the State of Illinois in various parts of the state. I think that it's a most worthwhile project and the cost studies have indicated that service of this nature will provide the citizens of the State of Illinois with approximately a six thousand dollar savings per patient for this type of care on an annual operating basis. And I would ask for your affirmative vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is shall these Bills pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Daniels 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Campbell 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there's 119 'aye' and 20 'no'. The Bills having



received the Constitutional Majority, Constitutional three-fifths Majority are hereby declared passed. 4019."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 4019. An Act making an appropriation to the Law Revision Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich. Representative Terzich, 4019. Would you... Representative Terzich wants to be turned on."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 4019 appropriates twenty-three thousand, five hundred dollars for the Illinois Law Revision Commission. This Commission was set up in the 79th General Assembly and for some reason, the appropriation was not included in the Omnibus Bill. There was a good number of Members on the Law Revision Commission that have been working without any pay and we can't even buy any stamps at the present time and it is, of course, one of the lowest funded Commissions that the state has. And I appreciate your support of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 115 'aye' and 2 'no'. The Bill having received the Constitutional three-fifths Majority is hereby declared passed. 4020."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 4020. An Act making an appropriation to the Department of Public Health. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 4020 appropriates fourteen million, eight hundred and twenty-eight some-odd thousand dollars to the Department of Public Health for a grant to Provident Hospital and Training School Association for partial financing for hospital construction projects. This Bill passed out of the Appropriations II Committee by, with a vote of 16 votes. Just a bit of a background on this Bill, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Provident Hospital is an 85-year-old hospital which sits on the south side of Chicago and is in the vortex between three different districts--the 22nd



DEC 2 1976 16.

District, the 26th District and the 24th District and is more or less the hub of the south side health delivery services and has been for 85 some-odd years in that location. The hospital has come on hard times as some of the hospitals have in the inner-city of Chicago. And the Department of Public Health has decertified the hospital and provided and declared that they must rebuild because the hospital in its present condition is nonconforming. This has presented a serious financial problem obviously because we're talking about fifty to sixty-some odd millions of dollars. The hospital has succeeded in qualifying itself for an aid, a H.U.D. grant to the tune of approximately thirty million dollars which represents a two-thirds which must be matched by one-third from the hospital in order to make it fully qualifiable for that amount of money. Now, we have in this state, the Illinois Hospital Construction Act and it's been on the books of this state since 1947. And for some few years thereafter, some hundreds of thousands, close to several millions of dollars were appropriated for new construction of hospitals within this state and for the rehabilitation of others. The precedent has been set. This hospital cannot find the funds, the additional funds, in any other direction. It has gone public and it's been unsuccessful. It supplies and you have on your desks over my signature, I think, a fact sheet which sets out the plight, the fiscal plight, of that hospital and some of the tremendous services it renders for the community in the City of Chicago and specifically in the inner-city. There is no other direction for this hospital to go in. We have made it abundantly clear in terms of public policy that the state looks upon it as its responsibility to make certain that we have adequate hospital facilities throughout the entire state. The Provident Hospital and thousands of people who have witnessed to their support on a petition I have here plus many, many organizations within the City of Chicago, Congressmen, State's Attorneys, State Representatives, Deans of various hospitals, have all come forward and given some support to this project. I repeat, there is no place else to go. If this hospital is not



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DEC 2 1976 17.

funded, if it goes down, the health delivery services in the City of Chicago and inner-city will be in a sorry plight. There is a question, of course, obviously of the ability of the state to finance this. I think we have no immediate problems, aside from the fact that this Bill should be in the hopper, it should be processed so that in the event the funds are available, it will be in a position to pass. But aside from that, it is my understanding that there will be no immediate outlay of funds in fiscal year '77 or '78. But in order for this project to be financially feasible, in order for the federal government to be in a position to release those funds, in order for Provident Hospital to look down the road, sign his contracts and break ground, it must have the whole financial picture, a fiscal picture, in one package. So, it's imperative that we move today, although there will be no drain immediately on the coffers of this state. I solicit your support. It is a worthy project. I think we should support it and I ask for your help."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield for three questions?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "In this morning's Chicago Tribune, it's reported that House Bill 4020 would provide for a loan to the hospital. Isn't it true that the Bill actually provides for a grant?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washington."

Washington: "The Bill, pursuant to the Illinois Hospital Construction Act, would be a flat grant to the Department of Public Health for the benefit of construction of Provident Hospital."

Schlickman: "Okay."

Washington: "...to that extent."

Schlickman: "Question #2. You didn't indicate from which fund the appropriation would be made. Isn't it true that that will come from the General Revenue Fund?"

Washington: "Absolutely true."

Schlickman: "Number 3. Sometime previously, the General Assembly passed a Bill which became law to take care of exactly this kind of situation. And what we did was to establish the Illinois Health



Facility Authority. With the authority to assist hospitals in need by the issuance of revenue bonds. Did Provident make an application to the Illinois Health Facility Authority?

And if so, what was the response by the Authority?"

Washington: "The Provident Hospital is in a position where it cannot incur any additional financial responsibilities or it will lose its qualification for the H.U.D. fund. That's why we could not in that direction, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "May I speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill would appropriate approximately fifteen million dollars from the state's General Revenue Fund as a grant to a private hospital. The state placed, despite the fact that we are in a financial crisis and there is existing authority by which the state can give assistance through the Illinois Facilities Authority. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we've got to be fiscally responsible. And when I read the Tribune article, I'm struck by the fact that Joseph Mann, the Executive Director of the Hospital said, 'With a new hospital, I think', he says, 'I think we could turn our financial situation around.' Well, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in appropriating money, we've got to rely more on the thought or conjecture of an Executive Director of a private hospital. We should be satisfied, we should be convinced that any money that is appropriated will be well spent and will solve the problem. It's for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that I reluctantly oppose this Bill and I urge its defeat."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Washington, to close. Pardon me, Representative Davis seeks recognition."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just a short comment on this Bill. It might be interesting to know the black themselves, they raised more than two hundred thousand dollars, still, in the process of raising money for Provident Hospital. I knew the distinguished founder of this hospital. I've heard him tell from his own mouth when I was just a little fellow, driving him around, how he came to operate



DEC 2 1976

19.

on a man, a human heart. He had no alternative except if he was going to make effort to save the man's life, but to operate on that heart. And you know the story. He was the first to operate on a human heart and his operation was a success. Of course, being a preacher and knowing Dr. Danny as I did, a young boy, I always said that he had his hand in the hand of the Lord. And when we used to, when I used to drive him around, when he'd say, 'Now, don't go too fast', I'd say, 'Well, just keep your hand in the hand of the man upstairs'. But what am I saying here now? Out in our district, there's Mercy Hospital and actually if you go to Mercy Hospital, you'll see Sister Leadmeuller and the nuns; in that clinic, it might be a block long. And then if you go up to Michael Reese Hospital and see that clinic, it probably will be a block long. The point is, there has been distributed to you this morning, a little fact sheet on Provident Hospital. And the fact sheet says that Provident Hospital treated 21,351 in its emergency room in 1975. 50% of these patients were unable to pay for their own treatment. This is just 1975. Year after year, this is what Provident Hospital is being done and taking over the responsibilities of the county, if you please, in treating people who are unable to pay for treatment. And I say to you that the exact amount, my distinguished friend said fifteen and it's not fifteen, but the exact amount is fourteen million, eight hundred and twenty-eight thousand. Not fifteen, it's close to it. And I say that this is a small amount. I say to you if you go back to the poor people that Provident Hospital has treated, it has saved the county and state far more money than they're asking for now. And I'm going to tell you if there ever was a place where a hospital is needed, it's needed on the south side of Chicago where millions of unfortunate people, a lot of them without jobs, a lot of them forced to go on public aid, have no other avenue except the clinics open their doors to them. And Provident Hospital has continued to open its doors to poor people and it's performing a duty that the State of Illinois ought to be performing itself. You're



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

not really giving in anything. You're paying back some of the money you owe Provident Hospital for the poor people they've treated. And I ask you now, you know that famous verse the preacher quotes. You know it, you can see it now 'cause I quoted so many times. I'm going to quote it here now. 'Though I speak with the tongue of men and of angels and have not charity, I've become a sounding brass and tinkling symbols.' Make your charity this morning as broad as the needs of the poor people of this state. And I ask you to give us a vote for Provident Hospital and the four million, eight hundred and twenty-eight thousand. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washington, to close. Representative Yourell, pardon me. Ewell, Ewell, Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, long before medicare, Provident Hospital was in existence. This hospital was born of necessity. It was born of the fact that other hospitals simply did not, would not treat black patients. It was the only hospital for a long time that would provide any medical training for black physicians. You had to do your course in gynecology and other classes, you had to depart from Northwestern for the clinics. You had to depart from the University of Chicago and their clinics and you did a separate residency in Provident Hospital. It was spawned out of the need of a community. It was spawned because the aspirations of people would not die and they will not let it die now. We are going to contribute eight hundred and sixty-eight million dollars to the medicaid program; eight hundred and sixty-eight million dollars for one million people. That is an average of eight hundred and sixty-eight dollars per person. What we're talking about for Provident Hospital is fourteen million dollars with a matching grant from the federal government of thirty-one million dollars to again establish a first-class place in which we can teach, train and develop black health facilities. I was born in the shadows of Provident Hospital and I say to you that there is no other need any greater than the need for this hospital. We have turned an ear to every plea that you have



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

made from us and we rarely make pleas from you. But when the rains come and your bridges are washed away, your houses flood, your creeks overflow, we support every single effort that you have to help your community. And we're now asking you for the same consideration from ours. And again, the cities have grown old and the cities have carried the burden of developing and caring for the state and now, we must turn to the state and in our old age ask of you, please help us as we have helped the entire state for year after year after year. Provident Hospital is not just a frivolty but an actual need and it does more than care for half of the people on the south side of the City of Chicago and it is a necessity. And so, we plead with you in the name of justice that you allow Provident Hospital this small, meager grant and remember, it's not just one legislative district, but it's approximately seven or eight legislative districts that dump their burden on Provident Hospital. And again, we would appreciate your support."

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

Mugalian: "Will the Sponsor yield to one question? Representative Washington, is this hospital presently a proprietary hospital?"

Washington: "It's a not-for-profit corporation, Mr. Mugalian. A not-for-profit corporation."

Mugalian: "It is presently a not-for-profit."

Washington: "That's correct and so far as I know it always has been in that category."

Mugalian: "Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I have heard it said that there is some reluctance to support this Bill because we would be establishing a precedent. I want you to know, Ladies and Gentlemen, that the precedent was established long ago. The Hospital Construction Act was enacted in 1947 so that the states could participate in a program which is commonly referred to as the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction



Program. In the 1950's, the State of Illinois contributed approximately \$8.5 million from the General Revenue Fund as part of this Hill-Burton Program. Federal support over the years has been almost one billion dollars in grants and loans. Now, I have the distinct impression that my colleagues on this side of the aisle are not in favor of federalizing all of our health care in the United States, but this is precisely the trend that we have been seeing developing since enactment of the Hill-Burton Act. That we are letting the Federal government take care of all of our hospital and health care needs in the State of Illinois. What we are asking for here today is some return to the original concept that states would participate in this program. We're asking for your help for Provident Hospital which was, as you have heard, the place where the first successful open-heart surgery was performed by one of the black founders of Provident Hospital. Provident Hospital was also the birthplace of many noted Americans, including people like Alice Roosevelt Longworth. Today, Provident Hospital needs help because the community it serves now consists totally of poor people. Thousands, hundreds of thousands of contributions have come in to save Provident Hospital, but those contributions are two dollar contributions, one dollar contributions, fifty cent contributions, and they simply can't make it with those kinds of contributions. We need your help if this hospital is to be saved."

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

Washington: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Schlickman asked a good question and I answered him very briefly, but let me expand that answer if I may, Mr. Schlickman. You asked the question, 'Why can't the Illinois Health Facilities Authority provide assistance to Provident Hospital?' The answer is, because of its inner-city status, its dependence upon Medicaid and Medicare reimbursements is tenuous, tenuous financial help and the conditions of the fellow funding, but studies have indicated that Provident may not incur any additional liability or it will lose the financial support. The I.H.S.A.



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

has determined that it is inherently a bad risk and unmarketable in the private sector. So, we couldn't go in that direction. Mrs. Catania has indicated that we could not go in the public direction to raise these kinds of funds. They're simply not available. Provident Hospital caters to and has catered to for 85 years, to poor people within the inner-city. Poor people. We passed out a poop sheet so I won't elaborate on that. But the emergency care load in that hospital is fantastic. To a certain extent, the State of Illinois is responsible for the financial plight of that hospital because of its poor payout in Medicaid and Medicare cases. This hospital is directly, fundamentally and intrically involved in the public interests of the people of the State of Illinois. And that is why the Illinois Hospital Construction Act was passed. Now, I have it on good authority that if this appropriation passes, there will be no payout from the General Revenue Fund for fiscal year '77 and '78, but that makes a lot of sense. But what will happen is they must go on record, they must finish the fiscal package in order for the Federal government to move. What would happen is that the appropriation would, no doubt, elapse this year, would have to be refunded in the next two years. I will not hold out the false promise or proposition that we may not need the full amount of this appropriation, but I say it is highly likely, highly likely that under the aegis of men like Mr. Mann, who was quoted in the wrong context by Mr. Schlickman, that it might well be that we can cut in two that fourteen million by raising some of those funds in some other direction. The situation is imperative, the need is manifest, the dollars can be gainsaid by this state. We voted out other areas as Mr. Ewell has pointed out and we're not dogging the major kind of people but we feel if we can give a plus vote to some of the other projects which have passed out of here today and yesterday and which are also in the paper, certainly we can lend a hand to an institution which has been serving the people of this state for 85 years. I urge your support on House Bill 4020."



DEC 2 1976

24.

Speaker Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 4020 pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Shea 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk.
Mr. Gaines, did you seek recognition for something?"

Gaines: "Well, don't need it right now."

Speaker Shea: "On this question there are 115 'ayes', 21 'nays', 5 Members voting 'present'. Brinkmeier 'aye'. 116 'ayes', 21 'nays', 5 Members voting 'present'. This Bill having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

(con't on next page)



DEC 2 1976 25.

Speaker Shea: "On the Order of House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 3024. The Gentleman from Cook... 3204."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3204 . A Bill for an Act to authorize imposition of the death penalty for the commission of certain crimes involving murder. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am aware the debate will not change a single vote on this issue. So, I must just say that life is too cheap in Illinois. Murder is almost condoned by a small penalty. We, in the Legislature in expression of our district's opinion, must change that. On behalf of its Republican and Democratic Sponsors, I ask for a 'yes' vote on House Bill 3204."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I, of course, respect Roman Kosinski's position and that of others. But I think we should recognize one thing today. And what we should recognize is that when you push your green light today, you're putting Illinois back into the business of killing. And I want to know what the big rush is. The ink is barely dry on the Supreme Court decision. Are we a pack of bloodthirsty wolves? No. Maybe we're trying to beat Utah to the punch. Maybe we ought to make killing an Olympic event. That would certainly act to display it as deterrents. Couldn't we at least wait for Lincoln's birthday? Couldn't we at least wait for the new Justices of the Illinois Supreme Court to be sworn in and there is now pending before the United States Supreme Court, some cases dealing with capital punishment. Ladies and Gentlemen, this issue is full of paradoxes. On the one hand, we say that killing is wrong. On the other hand, we legitimize it by putting the state into the business of killing. We authorize killing and yet we get squeamish and refuse to kill. No one's been killed in Illinois since 1962. We have approved gun control and yet the very, very people who oppose gun control are the same people that champion capital punishment. Now, as far as the deterrent is concerned, let me say this. There is not a shred of evidence that capital punishment



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DEC 2 1976 26.

deters killing. John F. Kennedy, Robert Kennedy, Martin Luther King were all killed in capital punishment states. And the multiple killings of Speck and Whitman were also in multiple, in the capital punishment states. Let me very quickly give you some statistics, Ladies and Gentlemen. In 1975, without a capital punishment law on the books and before the Supreme Court issued it's opinion, the national figures of the F.B.I. show that homicide was down 2%. In 1975, the figures of the Chicago Police Department show that homicide was down 18%. In each case, with no capital punishment on the books. And those of you who are worried about the mandates in the Illinois Constitution of 1970, should know that only one-third of the people who voted, voted on the separate issue of capital punishment and one-third of those, voted 'no' and two-ninths 'yes'. Fully, two-thirds of the citizens of the State of Illinois did not vote on capital punishment. Finally, let me just say this and I appreciate your attendance. A rich person has never been killed in the United States, never. Since 1929, 54% of the executions have been of nonwhite people. Although those people only constitute 12% of the population. All I ask you is, let's act like a deliberative Body. We've got the whole Session in front of us in which to make this decision. And to all of the people who will, unfortunately, due to retirement and whatever they mean that we miss, who will not be back, do not saddle a new General Assembly with a vote on this. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. And I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham. And before you start, sir, may I ask those people not entitled to the floor of the House of Representatives, to please remove themselves; ask the Members to be in their seat so that we may carry on this debate in a very deliberative manner: Proceed, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the legislative system has marvelous ways its wonders to perform. For five months, Judiciary II has carefully, thoughtfully, deeply probed the minds and hearts of the citizens of the State of Illinois to seek their guidance on the momentous decision that we're about



to make here today. And now, at the conclusion of that period of long and thoughtful study, we are moving with commendable dispatch to furnish a remedy for an undeniable, indisputable need for public safety. Really, we have no alternative to the course that we advocate here today because we have, as a matter of historical record, had fourteen years of de facto moratorium on executions in Illinois. And these statistics that have been quoted a moment ago notwithstanding, they are in comparison with the years that already... that the murder rate had jumped and spiralled so. The fact is that during this fourteen years, the number of wanton murders in the State of Illinois has spiralled at a sickening, threatening rate and the terror in the hearts of the law-abiding, God-fearing citizens has similarly mounted. There are those among the opponents of this proposition who hold out the wistful hope that somehow a society that lacks the moral fiber to eliminate and exterminate those menaces to its existence, would find the courage to have a second-best remedy by locking forever those who would destroy it. But history unmaskes the futility of that particular remedy. Every Leopold that was ever sentenced in this nation and this State of Illinois, there was some indignant judge who sought earnestly to reflect the outrage of the frightened public by telling, loudly admonishing future Parole and Pardon Boards, never, ever, ever to release the convicted. And yet, you know and I know that within ten years, twelve years at the most, they were back on the streets and more than 50% of those people that were turned loose but to prey again on society, did exactly that and were guilty of committing very serious crimes against the public existence. Now, I say to you in all sincerity, Ladies and Gentlemen, that the time is past for acrimonious name-calling. The spirit of reconciliation must move us and we must march forward together, we citizens of Illinois, as we return to the faith of our fathers. We are going to return to that faith. We're going to extract a life for a life in these specialized cases in the hope and in the belief and in the firm faith that by so doing...(microphone turned off)..."

Speaker Shea: "Would you bring your remarks to a close, sir?"



DEC 2 1976 28.

Cunningham: "I am not unmindful of how serious and momentous the decision is made, but I firmly believe that if you'll vote 'aye' on this Bill, that tomorrow will be safer for every citizen of Illinois, regardless of his race and creed and color. And I pray that it'll be so."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, my seatmate and colleague, Representative Mann, has spoken more eloquently than I could about the moral imperatives that are involved in capital punishment. And I wanted to talk a second about not the question of why it is morally a step backwards for us to institute capital punishment, but why from the point of view of effective law enforcement it is a step backwards to reintroduce capital punishment in Illinois. In that regard, I might point out that it is very interesting that the State's Attorney of Cook County, the largest county in Illinois by far, the chief law enforcement officer of that county strongly opposes the death penalty. Now, there's several reasons for that. It is not that he is different than other law enforcement officials. I recently heard the head of Scotland Yard speak in the same way, against the death penalty because from the point of view of effective law enforcement, it is definitely...(microphone turned off)..."

Speaker Shea: "Proceed, Mr. Katz, but would you bring your remarks to a close?"

Katz: "Yeah. The reason that it is a step backwards is that when a jury is being sworn in today, you can't ask them whether they believe in or don't believe in capital punishment. A jury can only, a juror can only if he is opposed to the death penalty, vote 'no' and that way he has no stain of blood upon him. Now, the State's Attorney thus loses a case in that situation. He loses cases in other situations because reviewing courts reviewing death penalty cases lean over backwards until they hit their head on the floor finding error in the record in order to keep from sending someone to the electric chair. Yet, that bad law, that skewing of the laws of evidence to keep people from going to the electric chair, haunt and confronts State's Attorneys in



all other criminal prosecutions from that point on. In that regard, I hear a good deal about how downstaters supposedly feel that this is important for effective law enforcement. And I'd like to look at some facts here with regard to that subject. Between 1949 and 1972, a seven... a twenty-three year period, the death penalty was in effect in Illinois. In not a single incident, not one time in that twenty-three year period did any court in any one of the hundred and one counties in Illinois ever return a death penalty and actually execute any individual. All that it does is create a circus atmosphere in which people vie for headlines in which the law is made and warped into a way that prevents effective law enforcement in which there is no deterrent to crime, in which we make political issues of something that should not be a political issue--effective law enforcement. There is nothing that can be done with someone who has been executed. It is an irreversible step. For that reason, the law leans over backwards and evolves principles of law that you complain about. And yet, if you push forward as you seem intent to do, we are taking a step backwards not only morally, but against effective law enforcement. And I would like to see you vote for effective law enforcement and oppose the reinstitution of capital punishment in Illinois."

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

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think the question before us is very simple. I was always taught that Legislators were sent down here to represent the people and express their views on the floor of this House. If that's true, then you have no choice but to vote for this Bill because I can assure you that time after time, I have been convinced that at least two-thirds and probably four-fifths of the people in Illinois favor capital punishment. Certainly was demonstrated in 1970 when the Constitution was adopted and since that time, many of us, I know Representative Deuster and I and many others have put out questionnaires on questions of policy. Out of 2,000 responses that I got on this question, 86% were for capital punishment. If you want to take the time to poll the people in your district, you'll



DEC 2 1976 30.

find that's true there. It is a deterrent to crime. I served for ten years on the Committee to examine prisons and I've been up and down death row and also in the Cook County jail. I remember one time Ross Randolph expressed opposition to the death penalty. Not long later, there was a riot in which a guard was killed and immediately Ross Randolph saw the error of his ways and now he's an advocate of the death penalty. It just has to happen once. When you've got a man in prison on a life sentence, what has he got to lose for killing a guard or getting out and holding your family as hostage? There has to be some other penalty. So if you want to vote the wishes of the people in your district, then you vote 'aye' on this Bill."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. VonBoeckman."

VonBoeckman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you know, we've heard a lot of rhetoric about the death penalty and we've had time and time again, many, many people come to this House floor for money for education and what have you. I'd just like to point out the tremendous cost of keeping these vicious killers in prison. If we wouldn't have to keep them and we execute them, I'm sure that we can spend a lot more money to educate the children of the State of Illinois and the United States. Therefore, I urge everybody to vote for this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. R. Hoffman."

R. Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move the previous question."

Speaker Shea: "The question is shall the main question be put. All those in favor will say 'aye', those opposed will say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski, to close and he yields to the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Sangmeister."

Sangmeister: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would like to point out to many of you who have asked me and have come because you are very concerned about a very crucial issue as we all should be as to whether or not, in my opinion, this Bill is a Constitutional Bill. I have told all of you that there is no way that I can guarantee that to you. All I can tell you that



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

contrary to some of the rhetoric you've heard, that there's been an awful lot of work put into this Bill. No one went to staff or to the Legislative Reference Bureau and said, 'Quickly draft me up a Bill because I want a P.R. Death Penalty Bill.' This Bill was introduced back in November of 1975. It was carefully drafted than. We awaited the outcome of the United States Supreme Court's recent decision. All of the input from those decisions have been worked into this Bill. This thing has not been rushed by any reason of circumstance and it is as best a Bill as I can tell you we could possibly put together. And I want you to know I say that in all sincerity. We worked very hard on it. You should also be aware of the fact that a lot of people think that there's going to be some retroactive operation of this Bill. There is no one sitting on death row in Illinois and all this Bill is going to be is we're going to say to people, 'Here it is. It's now the law of the State of Illinois. Conduct your life accordingly. If you don't conduct it accordingly, you might lose your own.' There was reference made by Representative Katz that the State's Attorney of Cook County did not, does not back the imposition of the death penalty. I would say to you that in the hearings we had, one that was conducted by Representative Katz in Chicago, that the State's Attorney of Cook County was invited to appear there and declined to appear. For what reason, we know not. I say to you now is the time to think of the victim and his family and also to realize that in my opinion and I know, in many of you, the death penalty, yes, in fact, is a deterrent. And let it ring out clear in Illinois and let's have an 'aye' vote for 3204."

Speaker Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 3204 pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lundy, to explain his vote."

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think it is too bad that debate was cut off because while I agree with the maker of the motion that few opinions will be changed by debate, there is a significant purpose to be served by questions



and answers directed to the Sponsors of the Bill regarding their intentions as to when the death penalty should be applicable. We don't have a system in Illinois of Committee Reports so that it is not possible through that means to clarify ambiguities in the Bill and there are many, despite what I acknowledge to be a very careful and extended effort by the Sponsors to make the Bill as clear as possible. Just as an example or as several examples, the Bill says that a defendent must have attained the age of 18 before the death penalty may be applied. Does that mean that he must have been 18 when the offense was committed or when he is convicted or when he is sentenced or when execution of sentence occurs. One of the aggravating circumstances in the Bill is that the murdered individual was a peace officer or fireman. Does that mean that the defendent must have known that the murdered individual was a peace officer or fireman or that the death applies whether he knew it or not? What is a peace officer? Does it include a Forest Ranger, a Park Ranger? Does it include a lifeguard on a beach? The definition in the Criminal Code of peace officer is a very broad one. It is anyone who by law has the authority or duty to maintain order. That's a terrifically broad definition. We now have forfeited the opportunity to know exactly what the Sponsors intended. There are many such ambiguities. I had hoped we might have a chance here to make a little legislative history to clarify some of these ambiguities to assist the judges in this state who will be faced with the difficult task of determining when the death penalty shall apply and when it shall not. Unfortunately, we have forfeited those opportunities. Perhaps the Senate will be wiser in it's consideration of this Bill.

I vote 'no'."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow, to explain his vote. Now, Gentlemen, I have the debate timer on."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we heard today people stating that we should do the wishes of the people. Well, let me tell you less than six weeks ago, I stated that I was opposed to capital punishment. My running mate, Representative Polk, stated that he had not seen a Death



Penalty Bill that he could vote for. And Representative Jacobs stated that he opposed the Death Bill because it discriminated against blacks. I feel that we came down here today and our vote 'no' is a promise we made to the people that elected us. I might add the candidate who lost was in favor of the death penalty. We also heard the throw-away philosophy, the philosophy that says, 'It costs money to keep people.' We shouldn't spend our money keeping people in jail. We should execute them. The same philosophy that they applied to the unborn child and the older American. We should move away from this throw-away philosophy. We should look toward rehabilitation. I proudly cast a 'no' vote."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg, to explain his vote. Sir, before you start, I want to inform the Membership that there are several Members that want to explain their vote and they're all going to have the opportunity. Proceed, sir. Mr. Berman, would you come up here please?"

Grotberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I will only take a moment to explain my vote but I felt that someone from the 38th Legislative District that encompasses six of the major prisons in the State of Illinois should address an affirmative vote on this issue. I, for one, surveyed the whole district in the 38th Legislative District from Kane County through Livingston and found that the highest order of interest is the subject matter of today--enforcement, stern and cruel if necessary; but for God's sake, protect those people that are trying to protect us from society. And that is the issue involved here today, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, and I can hardly subscribe to sending us home knowing that the next time all of the state employees come down asking for more money, if we can't give them money, perhaps we can give them their lives and they are entitled to life as much as anybody else. And I have heard nobody talk about the dead victims in society today, only the criminals whom we're trying to save. And I'm telling you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that society has had it up to their ears with that kind of approach. And I proudly vote 'aye'."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, the Assistant Majority Leader,



Mr. Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've listened to these distinguished men and especially those who are learned in the law and I heard one of my distinguished colleagues use the word 'ambiguous' and I'm sure he was correct. The man now is begging, he's begging that they take him out of his misery and that a firing squad be committed to kill him. Let me tell you this, one thing you forget and that is that a man's conscience is God's F.B.I. A man's conscience is God's F.B.I. You don't know how it feels to sit and rot in a prison. I don't know how it feels to sit and rot in a prison, but I can imagine if you have committed an act and your conscience begins to work on you which it will because my Bible says, 'Be sure...(microphone turned off)..."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Davis, let me get some order here. I'm sorry. Proceed, sir."

Davis: "I just made the statement that my Bible says, 'Be sure your sins will find you out.' How do you know how it feels to sit in prison when your own sins are convicting you before you go to sleep, before you can close your eyes and convict you when you wake up in the morning. That's God's F.B.I. And to be sure, these learned lawyers have said that there's a great chance of making a mistake. There's a great chance you will convict an innocent man and I heard one law professor say and I think he was right, 'I'll be far better for a guilty man to go free, than to convict one innocent man', and especially to take one innocent man's life. Oh yeah, I know some people was telling me about what the Bible says. They're telling me this morning, one man brought a Bible from the hotel, reading it to me this morning. And it said all those things. But it also says, 'Thou shalt not kill'. It also says that, 'I am the Lord God who brought thee out of the land of Egypt and out of the house of bondage and thou shalt have no other God before me.'"

Speaker Shea: "Would you bring your remarks to a close, sir?"

Davis: "And I bring my remarks to a close with this, that the first and great Commandment says, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself'.



DEC 2 1976 35.

And then it winds up by saying, 'On these two Commandments, hang all the love and the prophet'. The love of God and the love of your neighbor hangs all of our law and for the fear that we will convict one innocent man, I know that there's a man in prison now...(microphone turned off)..."

Speaker Shea: "Would you bring your remarks to a close, sir?"

Davis: "...vote for a Bill like this when I know that he's in prison and we didn't hang him and we didn't kill him."

Speaker Shea: "The Lady from Lake, Ms. Geo-Karis. Turn Ms. Geo-Karis on."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad they will turn me on.

Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I never thought, I never thought I would vote for a Bill permitting the death penalty, but I think that we have a more paramount consideration. Today, we have public defenders available which we didn't have many years ago. Today, we have appeals, endless appeals if there should be an injustice done to an innocent person. I, too, do not want to see any innocent person go by the death penalty, but let's not fool ourselves. We have not been able to have a deterrent to violent murders. I can remember interviewing a man in Stateville with the Rape Study Committee who had raped one woman, got four years. Then he raped and murdered another woman and strangled a twelve-month old baby and he was telling me he would be eligible for parole in 1980. I think it's high time that we serve notice that the victims have...(microphoned turned off)..."

Speaker Shea: "Would you bring your remarks to a close, please?"

Geo-Karis: "I think it's high time that the victims have to have some consideration because even the fellow in Utah killed two people without cause and I am afraid I am going to have to support the death penalty at this time."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Downs."

Downs: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, a few months ago in Kansas City, the National Conference of State Legislatures met and a speaker there noted to a very receptive audience, conscientious Legislators from all over the United States, that a Legislature and such public service is not like running a Burger King restaurant



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

in which you run out and find out what the cheapest political emotion is and then pander to it. We have heard far too much in the way of apparent surveys and the expressions that this is what the people want when the facts really don't indicate that. In one state in the United States, there has been responsible surveys in which people were polled, controls were set up, and in the course of that, people were educated as to the nature of capital punishment, who suffers from it, and whether or not it really has had a deterrent effect. 38% of the people in that poll, the only scientific analysis of the question that exists and its reported in the recent Wisconsin University Law Journal, only 38% favored capital punishment."

Speaker Shea: "Will you bring your remarks to a close, sir?"

Downs: "In this action taken by this Body, we fly in the face of what we should know as responsible leaders as to what the facts are. The Judiciary Committee held extensive meetings, the full Committee. And we heard from the Attorney General of the United States, the State's Attorney of Cook County, the Attorney General of Illinois, judges, lawyers and not a one advocated capital punishment as a solution to these problems. If you care about the victims and the unfortunate people in our society that are shot, you could ban the handgun and do far more good in helping those people. But here in this action, we act as a Burger King and we're holding back everything in the way of a calm determination of what the facts are and a preservation of higher values that a society should be proud of. And above all, we pander to the cheapest and most personal vendettas that we may have that it can only be called, 'revenge'. It's wrong, I regret to have to put these remarks so strongly...(microphone turned off)..."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies..."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Ewell, excuse me for a minute. Mr. Downs, for what purpose do you arise, sir?"

Downs: "I would like to conclude with just the closing, if you please, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Shea: "Sir, I understand that, Mr. Downs. But the debate timer's



DEC 2 1976

37.

been on. I ran it a second time."

Downs: "I understand that, Mr. Speaker, and I ask that you reconsider and vote 'no' on this question. Thank you."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, many a time we're forced to ask, 'Please take the chalice from my lips and let someone else drink from the cup'. I do not shirk my responsibilities, nor do I seek the approval of the press, the I.B.I. or my fellow Legislators. I examine only my conscience in making a decision that I make. I should like to point out many speakers have stood up and pointed out that the number of people who would possibly be executed are black and they are poor and they are from impoverished circumstances. I would also point out to the Body that the vast majority of the victims in this instance are black, poor, and oppressed. They, too, cry out for some measure of justice. I am a criminal lawyer and I have, perhaps, defended more capital cases than anyone on this floor. But I say again, that you must examine your conscience...(microphone turned off)..."

Speaker Shea: "Will you bring your remarks to a close, sir?"

Ewell: "...pay some heed to the dictates of the people of your community. And in this instance, Ladies and Gentlemen, I have sat on the Committee, I have examined the evidence and I must vote 'aye'."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Mr. Speaker, as I watch that board and I see the vote count there and I reflect on the vote count for the Anti-abortion Bill, it becomes rather paradoxical to me in the sense that it almost boils down to a point of whether we kill them now or kill them later. My point is this, Mr. Speaker. It just seems to me that this is not the way. If we're concerned about the present system of parole and several Legislators have alluded to that, then let's change the system. Let's bring up a Bill dealing with mandatory sentences without benefit of parole and let's discuss the merits or the demerits of that approach. If we're concerned about the wanton use of handguns in the commission



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DEC 2 1976 38.

of murders, then let's develop and pass some effective handgun control legislation. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is not the way. And I heard one Representative talk about representing the wishes of our constituents and about polling our constituents. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will never assent the results of a poll in my district on a matter of which I have a moral conviction. I campaigned on my convictions and I will vote my convictions. I will state my case on the campaign trail and I will let the people decide my fate. This is not the way and I'll probably vote 'no'."

Speaker Shea: "So that the Members of the Body understand, the Chair's intention is to go straight on through and try to wrap up business of the House as early as possible today so that the Members may try to get home while it's still light out. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, to explain his vote."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, as I opposed abortion which is murder, I oppose capital punishment, likewise murder, because of: one, the sanctity of life; two, no deterrent value; three, no way of correcting a mistake. The only excuse of capital punishment is to satisfy the desire of some for vengeance, but that isn't legal justification. Let's uphold the sanctity of life. Let's not debase ourselves. Let's oppose capital punishment for what it is--murder."

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

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't believe that I can offer any arguments or marshal any facts that will add to the debate on this Bill. The reimposition of the death penalty in Illinois will not be hastened or delayed by what is said on this floor. So I do not propose to proper reasons why my colleagues should vote 'no', rather I should like to explain why some of us must vote 'no'; more particularly, why I am voting 'no'. Mr. Speaker, I believe that some day assuming continuing advancement of civilization, that capital punishment will be the relic of a barbaric past, just as human progress has seen mankind discard the institution of slavery, I will vote 'no' because I should like Illinois to be remembered by our descendants as the first American state to have rejected killing as a solution. Not much more than a



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DEC 2 1976^{39.}

generation ago, civilized Americans abandoned the notion that mental illness is a kind of moral turpitude. We shed ourselves of the concept of the insane asylum, but it took time. It is my belief that the ethical or, if you will, religious basis for the abolition of capital punishment was given to us two thousand years ago. I also believe that criminalologists and psychologists have given us the practical and scientific basis, but real understanding and public acceptance come exceedingly slow. Mr. Speaker, I'd...(microphone turned off)..."

Speaker Shea: "Bring your remarks to a close, sir."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not claim that my position is right and that the Sponsors of this Bill are wrong. I should not impose my belief and my faith on my colleagues. I only testify to my own version of humanity and of human progress. I shall cast my 'no' vote in the strongly-held conviction that my children or my children's children will not be ashamed of my vote; that indeed, they will be proud of it. I do hope that thirty or fifty or a hundred years from now that society will regard today's 'yes' vote as unthinkable. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise out of a constraint of conscience to vote for this Bill because I feel that the people in my district from which I come from want this. I, too, have taken a poll and have taken it in many, many funeral parlors and I've listened to the sounds and the wailings of those who were the victims of that member of our society who couldn't give a damn about the rights of God-fearing citizens. And for that reasons, I'm going to vote 'aye'. We have to start somewhere."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rayson."

Rayson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am constrained to speak on what I consider a conscience Bill. I've done this before, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I recall in 1965, my first Session here, the distinguished Republican State's Attorney and great Legislator, Bob Canfield, had a Bill to abolish capital punishment. That Bill was passed out of the House. So it seems that in reflection from that date



DEC 2 1976 40.

to now, we have come full circle in the Illinois General Assembly. But I don't think the Illinois or I don't think the United States Supreme Court has come full circle cause they are just reviewing again certain aspects of this whole problem of capital punishment by state enactment. I also recall, Mr. Speaker, that in those days when we did pass abolishing Bill that it, in part, was based on the compelling publication of the distinguished Hans Monick who very, very carefully and factually put down in all of the states that abolished capital punishment that their incidences of murder were almost, almost 50% less than those states that had capital punishment. But we're here now, today, and we're talking about many things. One thing I heard was, not enough time has been spent upon the victims of crime. And I, for one, want to say that I spent six laborious years helping to get passed the Illinois Victims Crimes Compensation Act. So to bring us up to date, Mr. Speaker, I also heard reference to the people's will. When we passed our Constitution in 1970, I wish to reiterate, that in our Bill of Rights, Article I, Section 11...(microphone turned off)..."

Speaker Shea: "Bring your remarks to a close, sir."

Rayson: "Yes, Section 11, Article I says, 'All penalties shall be determined both according to the seriousness of the offense and with the objection of restoring the offender to useful citizenship. Let's not sully our Illinois Constitution. I appreciate a 'no' vote."

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

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I view this piece of legislation as a carefully-drawn Bill attempting to meet within the Supreme Court guidelines. However, I share with Representative Lundy, some of the concerns which he expressed. However, I believe serious consideration of the terms of the death penalty statute is really premature at this time. I think there are important things we should do first. I suggest that hearings be conducted to learn whether the death penalty, in fact, deters the crime of murder. I don't mean we should collect opinions from people like myself or yourself, but rather from



those people around the country who have expertise in this specific matter. Their knowledge should be special and their credentials established. The hearings I suggest could be models for the entire country. I further suggest that only after those hearings are held if we can say clearly and without a reasonable doubt that the death penalty deters, we should approve the statute. Anything less than that is, in my view, bloodletting and a fraudulent answer to the legitimate public outcry for personal security. Unless and until deterrents is found to be a factor, we should have a natural life. That is, without the possibility of paroled sentence. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there is in the Illinois Revised Statutes a rather obscure provision that provides that the Court of Claims may reimburse a defendent wrongfully convicted and wrongfully incarcerated for a period of years in our penal institutions. Think of that. A legislative admission, an admission by this Body, an admission I suppose by the Executive that our system of justice is capable of error. And in being capable of error, is willing and anxious to compensate a wrongfully convicted defendent. There are guidelines as to how much the Court of Claims should pay that defendent. What kind of reimbursement do we give to a wrongfully convicted defendent who has received the death penalty? We admit our system is not perfect. We admit that it is subject to error and yet we do that from which there is no return, from which there can be no point of return, no reimbursement for wrongful conviction, no redress of error. I hear from my constituents. I hear them. I hear their frustration and their sense of longing, perhaps, for an order gone in this country. But this is not the answer for them. This will not bring them what they want. I think it is for us not to merely look and see what's the count out there, but for us to exercise moral, yes, moral leadership on this issue and on every issue. I vote 'no'."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

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



DEC 2 1976 42.

I would just like to state that I have a lot of faith in the people of the State of Illinois and I believe that the people who support the imposition of the death penalty do so not because of any sense of vengeance, but I believe they do that because they are frustrated and frustrated with the failure of their government not only to solve the problem of crime in the streets, but the failure of their government to really, seriously attack that problem. I feel that with the passage of this Bill, the people of this state are going to be lulled into a sense of security, a feeling that things are going to be better. I feel that's a false sense of security and I think that when the people feel that sense of security, the pressure will be off us, of our attacking the problem of crime in the streets, to get to the bottom line to find out what really causes all these things that give rise to these criminals. With the pressure off, I think that we will not attack the problems that we should and I believe that in a generation or so, the conditions will be much worse. I see this as a very dark day in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Choate, would you vote Shea 'aye', please? Have all those voted who wished? Have all those voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 122 'ayes', 45 'nays', 3 Members voting 'present'. House Bill 3204 having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Order of House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 4012. Mr. Getty. On the Order of House Bills, Third Reading... Oh... House Bill 4014. Mr. McMasters."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 4014. An Act in relation to Township Government Laws Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Giorgi. Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMasters."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 4014 is a clean-up Bill. We did pass legislation in June that would reestablish the or extend the reporting date of the Township Government Laws Commission. However, due to a ruling that that Bill was signed after the expiration date of the Commission, that we would have to put in new legislation to reenact the Commission and extend the reporting date to October 1 of 1977.



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

This is all the Bill is. I would ask your support with a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any discussion? The question is shall House Bill 4012 pass. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question there are 121 'ayes', 5 'nays', and 6 voting 'present'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Received a three-fifths majority. Schneider 'aye'. House Bill 4016."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 4016. An Act to make appropriation for certain claims against the State of Illinois in conformity with claims made by the Court of Claims. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "House Bill 4016, Representative Taylor on House Bill 4016."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have leave of the House to return House Bill 4016 back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Does the Gentleman have leave? No objection, leave has been granted."

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #4, Shea. Amends House Bill 4016 as amended on page 12 by deleting line 16 and 17 and so forth."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this will add sixty thousand dollars to this Bill for the appropriation to pay salaries of Members of the General Assembly. At the present time, there are three or four Members of the House that have been appointed within the last few weeks, there are two or three Members of the Senate that have been appointed and we anticipate because a number of our colleagues are going to be resigning the next few days to take office in the Judiciary, that there'll be additional Members appointed. It's my understanding that the Comptroller prorates on a monthly basis, these salaries so that if anybody... I want to clear it up that nobody's going to get a full salary under this Bill."



So, I would now move for the adoption of Amendment #4 to House Bill 4016."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman moves that Amendment #4 be adopted. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Is there another Amendment, Mr. Shea?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #5, Shea. Amends House Bill 4016 as amended on page 1, line 1 and so forth."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "This is a technical Amendment because of the additional language in 4, on line 1, page 1 by inserting immediately after the word, appropriations, 'to the Comptroller for various purpose including appropriations'. And I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Further discussion? The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #5. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #5 is adopted. Any further Amendments? Third Reading, again. Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I would now move that the House waive the appropriate rule so that this Bill could be heard immediately and ask that the Attendance Roll Call be used for that purpose."

Speaker Giorgi: "Does the Gentleman have leave? No objection, leave has been granted. The Bill is on Third Reading with the Attendance Roll Call showing the vote."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 4016. An Act making an appropriation to certain claims against the State of Illinois, conforming with awards made by the Court of Claims. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Taylor. Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 4016 is the Court of Claims Award Bill, award that has been made by the Court of Claims and has been approved and the additional salary increase and I move for the adoption of House Bill 4016."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any further discussion? All those in favor of House Bill 4016 being placed on final passage will signify by voting



'aye' and those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question there are 121 'ayes', 17 'nays', and 9 voting 'present'. And this Bill having received the three-fifths majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Mann 'aye'. On the Order of Item Veto Motions appears House Bill 3344. Representative Shea. An Act to provide... Clerk, would you read House Bill 3340?"

Shea: "44."

Speaker Giorgi: "3344. Item Veto Motions. Representative Jaffe, for what reason do you rise?"

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, I think you changed the order of business without leave of the House and I would object to that. I've been sitting here waiting for some Bills to be heard for a long period of time and I don't see any reason for changing the order of business at this time."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, it's House Bill 3344 and my motion is to restore the amount on pages 6 and 7, lines 33 and thirty... to 35 on page 6 and lines 1 to 5 on page 7..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Mr. Shea, just a moment. Mr. Jaffe persists with his objection. And I'm not sure that I have authority to... I think I do have authority to change the order of business, Mr. Jaffe, and I don't want to persist in this argument. Mr. Jaffe, please. Put, turn Mr. Jaffe on."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, in order to change the order of business, I think you have to ask for leave of the House. I'm objecting to that. This House is being run for the people of the State of Illinois and for this General Assembly and not for Mr. Shea. And I strongly object to that."

Speaker Giorgi: "Time out for a couple of seconds. Mr. Jaffe, I call your attention to Rule 10(a), page 311. Mr. Shea, will you continue with your dissertation? Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, my motion on House Bill 3344 is on, to restore the amount enacted on page 6, lines 33, 34 and 35; and on page 7, lines 1 through 5. An



amount of three hundred and eighty-nine thousand dollars to the Secretary of State to utilize this money to complete a school or a library for the handicapped and blind at the corner of Blue Island and Roosevelt Road in the City of Chicago. I would appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? The question is shall the item on page 6, line 33 and 35 and on page 7, lines 1 through 5, the amount of three hundred, eighty-nine of House Bill 3344 be restored to original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor. That's the question. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', and those opposed by voting 'nay'. Takes 89 votes. Representative Houlihan."

D. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this is another question which we deal with where these funds should come from. I don't believe in the veto message of the Governor, there was any question of the merits of this program, but he did point out that this is another attempt to appropriate general revenue dollars for capital projects. It is his contention in the veto and I believe an accurate one, that such projects should be funded exclusively from bond funds. And to the extent that bond funds are authorized and appropriated for these projects, the Governor indicated his support for this kind of project. And it's my feeling that we have already appropriated and overridden a number of vetoes from General Revenue Funds and we will leave the state without sufficient revenues to fund projects like this or future projects."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I'd just like... I want to explain my vote, but you stated this needed 89 votes. Doesn't it need 107?"

Speaker Giorgi: "The Chair will restate the question. This is an item veto. And the question is shall this item pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. It'll take 107 votes. Chair stands corrected."

Shea: "All right, then may I explain my vote, Mr. Speaker?"



Speaker Giorgi: "Explain your vote, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "All right, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill was originally vetoed in the amount of three hundred and eighty-nine thousand dollars under the assumption that this money would come out of capital appropriation and bond funds be used for it. That Bill was also vetoed by the Governor. We have a building to be used for a library for the handicapped and the blind sitting at the corner of Blue Island Avenue and Roosevelt Road in the City of Chicago that cannot be completed unless we get some funds for it. Where those funds are coming from, I don't know; but we've got a substantial investment in that piece of property now. Without the additional funds, that building and that investment will not be able to be utilized for the people and I would appreciate it if there would be some more green votes up there."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yeah, I was absolutely, almost struck dumb when I heard the representative of the Governor said that he believed that all capital projects should be financed out of bond funds. Now, if he really believes that, that's even a better reason we should of elected Paul Simon four years ago in the Democratic primary."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question, there are 85 'ayes', 46 'nays', 4 voting 'present'. And this Bill fails to receive the necessary majority and declared lost. House will be at ease for ten seconds. A Message from the Senate for a moment."

Clerk Selcke: "Message from the Senate by Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed Bills of the following title and the passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House, to wit. Senate Bill 2022, 2023, 2024, 2026, 2027, 2030, 2032. Passed the Senate December 1, 1976 by a three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House the Senate has passed Bills of the following title and passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House."



DEC 2 1976 48.

Senate Bill 2031, 2033, 2034, 2035, 2036, 2041, 2043, 2044.
Passed by the Senate December 1, 1976 by a three-fifths vote.
Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform
the House the Senate's concurred with the House to accept
the Governor's specific recommendation for change which are
attached to the Bill of the following title. House Bill 1080,
concurred in by the Senate December 1, 1976. Kenneth Wright,
Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House the
Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of a Bill
of the following title. House Bill 3197 together with the fol-
lowing Amendment and the adoption of which I'm instructed to
ask concurrence of the House. Action taken by the Senate
December 2, 1976, by a three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright,
Secretary."

Speaker Shea: "Senate Bills, First Reading."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bills, First Reading. Senate Bill 2031. A
Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent
expense the Department of Children and Family Services. First
Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2033. A Bill for an Act
to amend Sections 1 and 1(a) of an Act to provide for the
ordinary and contingent expense Fair Employment Practices
Commission. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2034.
A Bill for an Act relating to appropriation to the Depart-
ment of Agriculture. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill
2035. A Bill for an Act making a supplemental appropriation
to certain Federal funds, the Department of Aging. First
Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2036. A Bill for an Act
to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate
Bill 2041. An Act making a supplemental appropriation to the
ordinary and contingent expense to the Dangerous Drugs Com-
mission. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2043. A
Bill for an Act making a certain appropriation to the Capital
Development Board for further improvements. First Reading
of the Bill. Senate Bill 2044. A Bill for an Act to amend
Section 3 of the Capital Development Bond Act, '72. First
Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2022. A Bill for an Act



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

making supplemental appropriation to the Department of Conservation. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2023. A Bill for an Act making supplemental appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense the Bureau of the Budget. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2024. A Bill for an Act to amend Section 3 of an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Public Health. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2026. A Bill for an Act making an additional appropriation to the Department of Mental Health. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2027. A Bill for an Act to amend Section 8 and a half and to add Section 5.68 and 6(b) to an Act in relation to state finance. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2030. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections 3, 4, 5 and 5(b) and the title of an Act to provide the ordinary and contingent expense of the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2032. A Bill for an Act to amend Section 1 of an Act to provide the ordinary and contingent expense, the Department of Transportation. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Shea: "On the order of House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 70 or 721. And on that, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hoffman."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 721. A Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code and the Unified Code of Corrections. Third Reading of the Bill."

R. Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 721 has been debated at length and it addresses itself to mandatory sentencing. Much of the dialogue that we experienced in the previous legislation by Representative Kosinski would be certainly applicable to the philosophy that our people, our constituents need the peace of mind to know that the Criminal Code is such that it will work in their behalf. They want to know that if they are a witness to a crime, a crime of violence, and they do that which they should do and testify against this person, that he will be properly tried and appropriately convicted and incarcerated for a good period



of time. They don't want to feel that if they do bear witness against a person, that he will be back out on the streets six months later with a gun. We want to make sure with House Bill 721 that the Criminal Code and our constituents has the peace of mind that those that do commit crimes, crimes of violence with firearms, will then be incarcerated for a minimum, non-reducible term under a Class 1 felony. I would ask favorable consideration at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is shall this Bill pass. All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there's 113 'aye' and 20 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 4025."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 4025. A Bill for an Act to direct the transfer of money between the funds in the State Treasury. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 4025 provides for the transfer between funds in the State Treasury as follows. From the General Revenue Fund, four million dollars, four hundred thousand; from the Road Fund, two hundred and fifty thousand dollars to transfer funds to the Local Governmental Law Enforcement Officers Fund to the Fire Protection Personnel Fund and to the Court of Claims Fund. I urge the necessary votes to pass these measures so these transfers can be effective."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 133 'aye' and no 'nay'. The Bill having received the Constitutional three-fifths Majority is hereby declared passed. 4027."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill..."

Speaker Redmond: "4027."



DEC 2 1976 51.

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 4027. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Department of General Services. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Appropriation Bill passed out of the Appropriations Committee without a dissenting vote. Now, what it is, it's an appropriation of thirty-one thousand, two hundred and fifty dollars to the Department of General Services for the final payment to the sculptor for the two statues and bust of the Honorable Everett McKinley Dirksen. Now, this amount was inadvertently omitted from the Department's current budget and, therefore, the necessity for this particular Bill. And I discussed this with the leadership on both sides of the aisle and to the best of my knowledge, there's no opposition and I certainly would appreciate your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Did we have the Roll Call taken on this last Bill? Did we dump the... Clear the board, Mr. Clerk. The question is shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 120 'aye' and no 'nay'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional three-fifths Majority is hereby declared passed."

(con't on next page)



Speaker Redmond: "4030."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 4030. A Bill for an Act increasing the compensation of certain state officers. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, this is the Bill for compensation of the Governor and other state officers. This is not the legislative pay increase and Representative Fleck will handle this particular Bill. I will handle the next Bill which will be the legislative pay raise."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Fleck."

Fleck: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 4030 as every Member, I'm sure, knows what it contains. It increases the salary of the Governor from fifty thousand dollars to a level of seventy thousand dollars; the Lieutenant Governor from thirty-seven thousand, five hundred dollars to forty-five thousand dollars; the Secretary of State and the Attorney General from forth-two thousand, five hundred dollars to sixty thousand dollars; and the Comptroller and Treasurer of the state from forty thousand to fifty thousand dollars. Also included by way of the Amendment as I explained yesterday, are the directors for the state agencies and those statutory assistants whose salaries are set by the statutes and can only be set by the General Assembly and not by the directors or the Executive Branch of government. Those salary increases reflect a 25% raise over the last adjustment which was made by the General Assembly. The Bill also, and a second Amendment includes the Auditor General who is not included in the Amendment #1 to the Bill which was the directors pay increase Bill. Now, when we get to the area of pay increases for governmental officials, I think one of the greatest problems is that the anomalies that we have in our society. We look at the President of the United States which is the most difficult, life-ebbing job that man could imagine and he gets paid two hundred and fifty thousand dollars. But yet, all the people of this country sit before their T.V. sets and they hear Barbara Walters read



them the news at six o'clock and she gets a million dollars. The following would be that Barbara Walters must be four times more valuable to the people of this country than their own President. So too, would it be with the Governor of this state and the state-elected officials and directors of these agencies. Their salaries are nothing compared to what they are in private industries. The problem with our society is that we reward glamor, not deeds. We praise the performers, not the doers. And we elevate the indecisive, but we do not elevate the decision-makers. I think this is true for the state-elected officials right on through to the Members of the General Assembly. Since the last adjustment was made for the state-elected officials, the Comptroller's Office has advised me there has been a 35% inflation bite in their salaries. This means if you do not act now, the state-elected official's salaries will be representative of 50% of what they were at their last adjustment when they go out of office. So, in real dollars, your Governor will be making a mere \$25,000 or less as it was based on the adjustment of the 1972 \$50,000 figure and so on down the line. I just simply ask that the Members set the compensation for your state-elected officials and your directors to match the challenge of the office. To set the compensation to match the responsibility of the office and to set the compensation to match the importance of the office. And in so doing, I'm sure you'll vote favorable on House Bill 4030."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's with some reluctance that I stand up to oppose my roommate of six years, since both of us are leaving the Legislature at the same time. He, maybe for a higher paying job, depending on what happens on a subsequent Bill; but I would say to you and to the Members of this House of Representatives, that the most dishonest thing we can do and perhaps the most dishonest thing we've done in the six years I've been down here, is to constantly wait until the third or fourth or fifth of November is past and the people of the State of Illinois have heard once again the promises from the state



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DEC 2 1976 54.

officers and the legislative candidates that we're going to hold the line on spending and the first Bill that seems to roll in in the lame duck Session, almost without fail, is a Pay Raise Bill. And I will limit my remarks today because I want to speak more than once to this particular one and not to the one on judges which I find more appalling than this, frankly, or to the one on Legislators. But you tell me how you can possibly go before the public, the state officers in particular and the Governor in particular, who happens to be from this side of the aisle, and tell these people that we're going to hold the line and then come out for a pay raise of 40% for his own office. Now, I say to the Governor, the new Governor of the State of Illinois and to the other state officers that ran this time, nobody twisted their arm, nobody made them run. If Mr. Thompson hadn't run, we could have found another candidate who could also have won because I frankly think that the vote was more anti-Daley than it was pro-Republican. And how could you come into office then and tell the people that 'there's going to be belt-tightening all right, but it's not going to apply to me.' This is the same gentleman who went through my district and said, 'I am going to be for higher education during my two years in Springfield.' And as soon as we get a chance to override these vetoes, he comes out publicly and states, 'I cannot support an override for education. We've got to tighten our belts.' And the next thing I see, he's supporting a pay raise across the board and his justification is, 'Well, it's not going to affect as many people, only 177 Legislators, 59 Senators, and of course, a few of us in the Executive Branch of government! Now, I say to the Governor-elect, he knew what he was running for. He knew what the office paid. And if it wasn't satisfactory, he shouldn't have run. It's just that simple. And now that he has run for it and he's won and I'm glad that he won, we ought to compensate him in exactly the same level he would have been compensated if this Bill was not introduced. I find it appalling that the Governor-elect can come out and say, for example, at



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

the Governor's meeting of Republican Governors, 'We've got to make sacrifices in Illinois'. At the same time, he's taking a staff of eleven or fourteen people to Washington with him. What kind of a sacrifice is that? If you're going to tell the people of the State of Illinois we're going to make cuts, then let's make cuts and let's start at home. We've had four years of a Governor who said one thing and did another and I don't intend to sit by as a Republican and see a Republican Governor make the same mistake. This is a lousy Bill. It shouldn't even have been introduced. It definitely shouldn't come in in a lame duck Session and it ought to be soundly defeated. I don't see how any of us can support a pay raise Bill of this or any other magnitude and then go back and tell the people who are laborers, 'We can't give you 4%, we can't give you 3%, we might be able to give you two and a half percent.' I don't care what Barbara Walters or anyone else is making. Everybody knows how screwed up the media is in this country. That's just one more example of it. But just because the media makes mistakes and professional athletics makes mistakes, doesn't mean that the Legislature has to make the same mistake. I would truly hope that my good friend, the new Judge, Representative Fleck, would not get the necessary votes to pass this or any other of the Bills that are coming up in the near future."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Duff."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I didn't have any intention of speaking today but I don't know what John's running for next time, but I think it's entirely inappropriate at this stage in time for any one of us to foul our own nets. It seems to me that one of the big problems the government has is that those members of government today who have to live on their income, are having trouble. I think it's absolutely fair, manifestly appropriate that the officials of our government be adequately paid. I'm going to vote for any decent pay raise for any executive person who gives up his lifestyle and takes the risks at the ballot box, who can be destroyed in four years on the vagaries of the people's attitudes



and emotions. And I don't think that anybody that should come down here and say, for example, that the inequities presently found where the Attorney General of Illinois, for instance, is paid less than the State's Attorney in Illinois, there are inequities in our system and it's entirely appropriate for us to try to remedy them."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Fleck, to close. Pardon me, Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Satterthwaite: "Can you give us an estimate of what the total cost of this Bill will be on an annual basis? I notice that the original Bill had only the state-wide elected officials and it was fairly easy to calculate at that point what the increased expenditure would be. But with the multi-page Amendment that went on yesterday, I have not had time to calculate what the fiscal impact will be."

Fleck: "I'd be happy to, Representative Satterthwaite. The Amendment increased the annual appropriation, Amendment 1 and 2 would be eight hundred and sixty-two thousand dollars."

Satterthwaite: "The Amendment increased it by eight hundred and some thousand dollars?"

Fleck: "Yes, that's what I've been advised by the staff figures that were computed on this."

Satterthwaite: "And would you tell me then now, as a total of the original Bill with the Amendments, what the fiscal impact is?"

Fleck: "Fiscal impact would probably be somewhere in the area of about nine hundred and sixty thousand, nine hundred, seventy thousand dollars. I don't have the exact figure, whatever the add-on for the state-elected officials."

Satterthwaite: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Fleck."

Fleck: "Just in closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to a few remarks of my roommate of six years. Although John is a Republican State Representative, I don't think I could ever accuse him of having the memory of an elephant. He said that every



time he's come down here, the Pay Raise Bills have been introduced in a lame duck Session. John's memory is awful short because I think he remembers that I did sponsor the pay raise measures in the last Session. And I think he also remembers that I introduced those Bills, especially the Legislative Pay Raise Bill before the election, in the Spring Session. And I made it quite clear to the Members of the House and to the Members of the press that I intended to call that Bill before the election or I would table it. And to the ever-loving Members of that General Assembly who had the courage, the integrity to vote for that Bill, they did. So, to say that the General Assembly has a habit of introducing Bills in lame duck Session is not true. And I don't think the press should be reporting that. I also should like to say that my roommate of six years indicated that when you run for an office, you know what the salary is and you shouldn't be voting to increase salaries. That's true. Now, if he felt that way, he shouldn't have voted to increase his salary the last time the Pay Raise Bill was up for Legislators in the House. Once again, I can't accuse him of having a very good memory. But I do think that Representative Duff has stated the issue quite clear. Because there are errors and anomalies in society and compensation, I think that we should adjust the salaries for the state-wide officers and pay them according to the importance of the office. Illinois pays their Governors, the salary is... along with sixteen other states are either at the same rate or higher than Illinois. And it so goes down the scale for the other officials. I don't think this is a proper rate for a size a State of Illinois and I think that the Members here, of course they're on the griddle as they always are, should now make the hard decision whether or not they should support this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye'. Representative Lechowicz, state your point."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I'd like to have your interpretation of Amendment #1, if it's in order and was adopted properly. Well, maybe it's untimely, but just... then I'll



explain my vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Lechowicz, to explain his vote."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #1 which was adopted by this House made salary adjustments for various members of the Governor's Cabinet. And this Amendment and I was hoping that all of these Bills would have gone through the Appropriations Committee after being passed out the Executive Committee, so we could have caught some of these mistakes. I just want to point out to this Body that the Department of Law Enforcement, the State Fire Marshall is paid from the Fire Prevention Fund. The Department of Law Enforcement, Superintendent of State Police is paid from the Road Fund. The State Fair Agency Superintendent is paid out of Agricultural Premium Fund. The Department of Revenue Director and Assistant Director is paid out of the State Lottery Fund. The Department of Registration, Superintendent of Registration is paid out of the State Lottery Fund. Department of Conservation, Assistant, the Director and Assistant is paid out of the Game and Fish Fund. The Department of Transportation's Secretary and Assistant Secretary is paid out of the Road Fund. This Bill as amended is taking it all out of General Revenue Funds. And Ladies and Gentlemen, this entire package, these four Bills amount to approximately eleven million dollars-- all out of General Revenue Funds and I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 65 'aye' and 76 'no'. The Bill having failed to received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. 4031."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 4031. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to compensation of Members of the General Assembly. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, 4031 changes the compensation for the Members of the General Assembly. And it changes it from twenty thousand dollars, which is now the annual salary,



to twenty-seven, five. It also changes to per diem from thirty-six dollars to forty-four dollars. In addition to what Representative Fleck has said about the state officials, I would just like to point out one thing. That Illinois is now the fifth largest state in the Union. The job of a Legislator has really changed since 1970 as you all know. Let me say to you that we're one of only fourteen states that happens to be in continuous Session. Most states in this Union are only in Session for perhaps two months or three months--tops, if you go through the list of states. In addition to that, let me point out that the cost of living has really inflated. We now have had double-digit inflation for the last several years since our last salary. Basically what we're doing is if we keep the salary at this... at the level that it is at the present time, what you are doing is you're really chasing good people out of government. I think you're going to make the Legislature a haven for the rich or for the people who are retired or for the people who have nothing else to do. This year as I look over the House, I see that we're losing something like forty Members. I've talked to other Members of the House. I think next time out we're going to lose another forty. It's sort of amazing to me to find that after six years, next year I will be somewhere around fifty in seniority. I think that's just preposterous. I think it just shows that people are running from government and they are not staying in the General Assembly because it's just become too great of a sacrifice. Let me point out to you that the pay raise has been endorsed by many individuals. As an example, NBC has endorsed a pay raise. I gave you a Channel 5 editorial just a couple of days ago and they came out for the pay raise that we're actually asking for. They say, you know, they compare us to other states and they, not so here in the General Assembly where we are in Session for 120 days a year plus the time that Legislators spend back home on related work items. And they point out the fact that Legislators have retired this year at an enormous rate because of the fact that we are just not paying



DEC 2 1976 60.

the prices that we should for good Legislators. I go to a study, a study made by the Citizens Conference on Legislators and they also say that the Legislature is vastly underpaid. I would like to point out to you, we've talked about fiscal responsibility and other things, I have voted for money for education and I have voted for money for the mentally retarded. And I find it sort of ironic that those people who get up here and say, 'Well, we don't have money for the mentally retarded and so on and so forth', they don't vote for those Bills anyway. So, I think it's a little bit hypocritical of them to actually do so. Let me just close by saying this. You want to know what it's going to cost for the General Assembly. I've seen us pass out a Bill today for fourteen million dollars for Provident Hospital and I voted for that Bill. and I have no qualms about voting for that Bill and I'm proud of that vote. Well, let me tell you that the cost of this package for the General Assembly is nine hundred and seventy-four thousand dollars. I've seen us spend twenty million dollars, fifty million dollars for creeks, dams and all sorts of crazy things. For Pork Barrel Bills, I've seen the good Representative, Roscoe Cunningham, trying to lay concrete, you know, where you shouldn't lay anything. But honestly, I really feel that the time has come for us to really realistically look at this thing, understand it. It's only going to cost us nine hundred and seventy-four thousand dollars that the General Assembly is entitled to it. And I would encourage you not to be squeamish. There have been many Members who've come up to me and said, 'Well, I think I could go for twenty-five thousand or go for twenty-six or I think I can go for twenty-four'. You know, everybody has his own rate at which he wants to duck out at. And let me tell you that I know that there are many Members who are sitting in this General Assembly who've said to me, 'You know, we certainly hope that it passes, but we're going to vote against it'. And I don't really like that type of hypocrisy and I really must rise against it. And I've never talked like this on the floor of the House. I've never criticized



the Members, but I say, 'If you want the money and you deserve the money, then I think you ought to have the guts to vote for it'. And I would encourage and 'aye' vote."

Speaker Washington: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Speaker. He's sitting at Representative Garmisa's desk."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as you may recall, this is but the second time since my tenure of Speaker that I have seen fit to address the Members of this House. There are few issues that arouse more public interest than that of legislative pay. And the reason is quite simple. It is because the Legislators themselves vote on their proposed raises. This outrages a general feeling of what is appropriate. Judges shouldn't rule on their own cases. Legislators shouldn't vote on their pay increases. I would be very happy to have the business community, to have the labor community and to have the media determine the right level of compensation for Members of the General Assembly. Unfortunately, there is no alternative to the duty that is imposed upon us. We have that constitutional responsibility. We vote on all salaries, not only our own salary. I believe most of us would simply prefer not to have the responsibility and that is probably the reason why the salaries have been below the proper level. It is true not just for Illinois, but for Legislatures all over the country. We, of course, know the reason. Legislators who vote themselves an increase face increased hostility at the next election. There isn't any question that the media, both printed, radio and television, have sought to unleash criticism on the Members of this General Assembly if they have the courage to vote themselves an increase in pay. The problem is that most people do not realize how much work is involved in being a Legislator. How much time it takes, the unreimbursed expenses they face and the fact that even so-called part-time Legislators find it very difficult and often impossible to carry on their former profession or business. This is particularly true in the case of Legislators who spend more than 50% of their time on legislative business, a situation true of Illinois State



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Legislators. A good example is the practice of law, which would seem to be particularly well suited to being combined with a Legislator. All of us in the practice of law know that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to maintain a practice. And this is as true for other fields as teaching, medicine, insurance, farming, real estate, or other business. It is no accident that more and more Representatives list being a Legislator as their full-time profession. About one-third of the Representatives have so described themselves. In fact, a very much higher proportion, really, are full-time Legislators because their own businesses have so dwindled that they earn almost nothing from them. There is great emphasis on us making full disclosure of our financial assets and our earnings. And I have always been quite reluctant to do that, not because I was ashamed to let the people know that I earned a very large income, but because I was ashamed to let them know how little I earned. And I would like to go back to 1969 which was the first year when we began to spend a great deal of time in the General Assembly. At that time I believe our salary was twelve thousand dollars and I think it probably had been raised to that level over the opposition of our critics. The take-home pay was nine thousand dollars. The expense of maintaining my law office for six months, the first six months, was roughly a thousand dollars a month. And there was virtually no income from the practice of law. So my entire compensation for six months in the calendar year 1969 was three thousand dollars. And at that time, we didn't receive very much assistance from the state for maintaining our offices. The first time we had any help at all, we got two thousand dollars. And there were times when I maintained my office, I had at least two girls, I had the telephone and the stationery. There was a time that we got the magnanimous sum of fifty dollars for all of our stationery and our stamps. There was a time when we got forty dollars for coming to Springfield and that was for your mileage, it was for meals, it was for your lodging. And every time that we sought in any way to put ourselves on a halfway decent basis,



DEC 2 1976

63.

we had the same level of criticism. There is a Member of this House now, I will not name him, who told me that one reason he was unable to return to the General Assembly is that because of the dwindling resources in his own private law practice, that he was forced to live on the sum of \$4,500 for one year. Now twenty thousand dollars a year is poor pay for a job requiring 60% of the time of the kind of people the General Assembly needs. State Legislators, and particularly industrial State Legislators, now have to deal with a host of increasingly complex problems. Take, for example, the medical malpractice suits that this House addressed itself to in the last term. The problems that arose because of these suits and because of the astronomical increase in the cost of maintaining a medical practice, caused withdrawal of medical services to many segments of society and a sharp reduction and introduction of innovative techniques and the actual withdrawal from practice of badly needed doctors. May I suggest to you that the first heart pacemaker, the first organ transplant, anytime that we were going to introduce any artificial assistance to the functions of the body, by the terms of a court of law, probably would have been malpractice and might very easily have resulted in frightful cost to the practicing doctor. And the real part of it, aside from the economic difficulties, the real tragedy is the fact that this kind of medical experiment would not have been available to the members of the general public and lives might have been shortened and people would have certainly suffered. Now the General Assembly, on its own initiative, started a study of the problems and after a great deal of work, including holding many hearings and the study of all relevant statistics, appropriate Bills were developed and passed. And may I say that is the reason that Representative Washington is in the Chair now. He was the Chair of the Committee, Chairman of the Committee that considered these Bills. I don't recall all of the Members, but I do know that Representative Houlihan and Representative Daniels were on that Committee. And as a result of the work, Bills were passed and



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

CLERK OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

adopted and signed into law. Shortly thereafter, the medical malpractice problem in Illinois has diminished significantly. The problem certainly has not been licked, but it is now containable. And we have every reason to think that because of the industry and because of the hard work and because of the dedication of the Members of this General Assembly, the very significant contribution has been made to the well-being of the people of the State of Illinois, not to mention the cost involved. We think we have developed a way to protect the individual's rights and at the same time, preventing the serious loss to society. Now, this is just one kind of a difficult decision that Legislators are called upon to make. The kind of a decision that involves a great deal of study, of attending hearings and developing effective compromises. I don't have to call your attention to the fact that this General Assembly, this 79th General Assembly has worked hard and diligently in the hearings of the Standing Committees in Springfield, all over the State of Illinois and certainly at great sacrifice to themselves, sacrifice to their family and the diminution of their earning capacity. We're going to have to concern ourselves and we're getting to be a very complex society and the decisions that are going to be made by the General Assembly are difficult and complex and require time and they require the assistance of staff and I may say here that we have had an absolutely superb staff. And whatever success we've made in these areas, I think it's in no small measure because of their dedication. The problems that we're being confronted with, the problems of properly funding education, both higher and secondary and elementary; the problems involving public transportation; the problems involving the highway system, the proper allocation of funds to mass transportation of the highways; to delivery of health services and local governments to name but a few. And increasing number of major areas, legislative decisions are the major determinant of the development of a given service. Legislators will determine whether it operates effectively or ineffectively; whether it provides the maximum



benefit to society or allows unfair and damaging conditions to continue and whether it will promote or handicap the state's economic development. Serving as a Legislator, is a job with uncertain future, with no assurance of continued employment and with serious health hazards. There are high tensions connected with the job, long hours, many times sixteen hour days, seven days a week. I will never forget in one of my early Sessions, my seatmate, Leo Bartoline, a resident of the Village of Franklin Park, died of a heart attack sitting at his desk on the floor of this House. We all well remember Elmo McClain, who was stricken on the floor of this House. I can think of others. I can think of W. Russell Arrington, who I saw wheeled out of the Senate chambers many times. Bill Horsley, O.D. Miller, any of them who, because of the tension and the time and the stress and the strain of this job, and many times, I think, sacrificed their life. I don't recite this as a special pleading for Legislators but rather to briefly summarize the case for providing Legislators with a salary appropriate to their demanding office and heavy responsibility. Recent salary studies show the average income for lawyers and salary in the private sector is thirty-five thousand dollars a year and that's with no office expenses, all expenses paid. This is take home after the deduction of retirement and social security withholding. Those with the same years of experience as the average Legislator has in the House of Representatives, are getting considerably more than forty thousand dollars a year. The problem, as I indicated before, lies in the fact that the Legislators themselves are reluctant to raise their own salaries because they know of the inevitable unpleasant publicity attached to it. What is badly needed is a blue ribbon Committee with no Legislators on it which would have the permanent function of considering the salary of all elected officials. I, for one, guaranteed that I would go along wholeheartedly with whatever they recommended. My guess is that most Legislators and other elected officers would be delighted to have this whole question put in the hands of such a Committee. But



until then, the Legislators are in the inevitable, unenviable position of being decried if they do and deprived if they don't. In the long term interest of the State, I suggest that elected officials, including the Members of the General Assembly, be given appropriate salaries. I believe it was the good book that said, a laborer is worthy of his hire. And so are the Members of the General Assembly. I don't think, I'm not here to suggest that I have any great talent whatsoever, but my services and my judgement were sufficiently important so that the school district that I represent was able to sell a million and a half dollars worth of tax anticipation warrants to a bank on the basis of the opinion which I rendered. My judgement, I believe, has to be worth something. And therefore, I don't hesitate one bit to suggest that the level that is sought in House Bill 4031 is appropriate. It is not excessive and I support it and I encourage you to do likewise. Thank you."

Speaker Washington: "The Gentleman from Logan, Mr. Lauer."

Lauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it is always extremely difficult to follow the distinguished Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Speaker, especially if you're in opposition to his point of view. There are many things the Speaker said with which I fully agree. There are only a couple of points that I would like to make, Ladies and Gentlemen, and I'll make them quite quickly. First off, while we may be worth the additional salary, we also may not be worth the additional salary. It's also a situation, Mr. Speaker, that we represent constituencies and I know in my constituency that I would probably make angry every constituent I have with three exceptions. And those three are my bankers. We work down here and we know when we start the work what it will be, what the compensation will be. I turned out to be a full-time Legislator. I didn't plan it that way, but I do as does every other Member of this House, give it the time that I think it has to have in order to try to get the job done. But nonetheless, and this is my final point, Mr. Speaker, if the fiscal condition of the state is as bad as I think most of us believe it is, if we're calling



for belt-tightening, we have to exert a moral leadership upon all branches of the state, whether it be the Judiciary, the Executive, any kind of state employee. And until we are prepared to compensate them more justly in light of the inflationary situation in which we find ourselves, I don't think that we can justify increasing our own compensation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Washington: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Downs."

Downs: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If I recall correctly, all of the speakers on either side of this issue will be returning in January. And perhaps it can be too easily said of them that there is some kind of conflict of interest. But I think that it demeans this Body to not look at the individual integrity of every person who rises and speaks on a subject. Well, I won't be returning in January, so at least I don't have that conflict of interest. And I say to those people out there, those masses that we poll, that we study, that we try and politically perceive as to what the people want, I say to you who will blanketly indict all Legislators or public officials with scorn over this or other issues because of what you see on the part of some, that your task is to demand of your individual Legislators and office holders, a higher standard than apparently you have. And I say to you people out there that you participate in the election process so that you are happy and that you can have the respect for the integrity and competence of those people that represent you and that you demand of those who serve in this Body the passage of ethics and disclosure legislation that will help you have that confidence in all. To those of you who serve in this legislature and hold other jobs, I say to you that perhaps you are not going to earn the money that would be contained in this pay increase. At least not to the extent that those who give this job all of their efforts and all of their personal emotions and resources and individual integrity free of any other kind of influence or control as much as they earn it. And I will not be party to lowering this Body to



the lowest common denominator of perception of the kind of people who serve here. Were I returning to this Body, there is not an individual who supports me or who worked for me in my election who would say to me that I have not earned the money that I have been paid or that I would be paid if a pay increase takes place. I will not return, but I will support this pay increase for those of you and I would hope that includes every one who truly takes this job seriously and will give it your every possible effort and you deserve the respect of the people. Thank you."

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

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

I, personally myself, I'm real sorry that we introduced the package of pay raises at this time. I think it's a very inopportune time to do so and it's been difficult to me to recall any proposal that has been, that's introduced by this Legislative Body that has been looked upon with more disfavor than has been looked upon by this piece of legislation. I believe one of the reasons that the people or the public are so disturbed is the way we are going about doing it. Now, we've waited until after we were all elected and all the other state officials were elected and then we turned around and decided to vote ourselves a pay raise. I don't think that this is acting as responsible Legislators to do such a thing. If we sincerely feel that we should deserve a pay raise, we should have the guts to vote these pay raises before we are elected, not afterwards and... before... when we're running for office. And then we can let the people, if we can't sell the people on the idea that we need a pay raise, then I question very much whether we deserve it. Everyone that's ran for office and it's been brought out here before, knew what the salaries of all of these elected offices were before they run. Nobody told them they had to run. None of us were forced to run and therefore, it's a decision we made and I'm sure at the time we got our petition papers and decided we wanted to run that we were well aware of what the salary was and that was the salary we



should expect to serve on for the next two years. And then also as it's been brought out here, we should take a hard look at the financial conditions of the State of Illinois. I think most of us are aware of the financial crisis that the state is in right now. And I truly believe that every elected officer, if it's necessary, should make some sacrifice to set examples to the rest of the people in the State of Illinois and also the thousands of state employees that we do have. I think that if we would do this, why, we would be doing a great service to the people of the state. And then I think also we're talking about pay raises for ourselves and elected officers, most of these are fairly high pay when we consider the thousands of state employees we have here in the state that we're not talking about pay raises. And keep in mind we have many people in the state that are drawing salaries of less than six thousand dollars a year. And this covers a multitude of people and do you think it's right for us to start talking about pay raises at the salaries we are getting and also the other state officials are getting and say, no, we can't give you people a pay raise? I think that's just rather ridiculous and I think we should be ashamed of ourselves. I think each and every one of us should look at this proposal before us very sincerely and strongly and I do think the people are fed up with the raising of our salaries and I think the next election when we come around, I don't think we want to kid ourselves and think the people are going to forget it because I believe this is one time they are not. And therefore, I would hope that we would all oppose all of the pay raises at this time. Thank you."

Speaker Washington: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And, Harold, since this is your last terms, I feel honored calling you, Mr. Speaker. Since this is your last term in the House, rather. Mr. Speaker, the only reason under which I would even remotely consider voting against this Bill is because it's not enough. Now, I've



listened to a lot of proponents talk about the problems related to the Legislature voting for pay increase and it is true that my salary in the private sector before I was elected far exceeded the salary that I receive now and I am a full-time Legislator. And it is also true that I knew at the time that I was running for office what the salary was, but I also knew that one of the things that I was going to be committed to when I came down here, was bringing about parity as far as the salary levels of Legislators are concerned because I knew before I came here that the salary that they were receiving at that time was not sufficient for the commitment that's involved in being a Legislator. And I can tell you very convincingly that at least 25% of my district consists of welfare recipients or persons that had a subsistence level in terms of their income. And I have received not one letter, not one phone call, not one indication of those people in my district that a salary increase for Legislators was not appropriate or at an inopportune time. And I'm proudly going to vote for this pay increase because I know that my constituents recognize the fact that even if we were talking about an increased salary to thirty-five thousand dollars a year, it wouldn't be enough for the commitment, the dedication on the part of those of us who serve in this General Assembly. I will proudly vote for this pay increase because I'm worth every bit of it."

Speaker Washington: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson."

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

Speaker Washington: "The question is shall the main question now be put. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'no'. Motion carries. Mr. Jaffe, to close."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, I think everything that could be said has been said. I think that the Speaker was very eloquent in his speech and all I would do is ask for an affirmative vote."

Speaker Washington: "The question is shall House Bill 4031 pass. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell."



Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, very briefly, there are those of us who sit on this floor and relish the wine. But again, we pray that the cup of bitterness never touch our lips. It is hypocritical and I suggest we do some reflection. I suggest you remember this reflection when the lawyers who sit on this Body, piously vote for raises for the judges before whom they will then try cases and insist to the rest of the Body that, 'Oh, no, I have no interest whatsoever.' And I suggest that we reflect in these moments because now is the time for decision. Now is the time for your conscience to speak."

Speaker Washington: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Not yet, Mr. Speaker. Still Champaign, maybe someday."

Speaker Washington: "I apologize."

Hirschfeld: "Very briefly, I would... I hesitated to say anything after the Speaker spoke, but I would just like to say to this General Assembly that I truly believe there is another alternative. I have thought it for six years. I think that the Constitution of 1970 has done a great disservice to the Legislators and I will be sad to leave this group, but I think that the 1970 Constitution is killing the General Assembly, both physically and under the pressure of business. And I would just like to suggest to all of you that there are a lot of people who would not be leaving if we would revert to the limited annual Sessions, if we would go back to not spending so much time because I truly believe that as hard as we work, there is a great, great deal of time wasted. And I would just respectfully suggest that the reason that I'm voting 'no' is not because I don't think you're worth what you spend down here because I think you are, but I truly believe that we ought to change the Constitution and go back to where you spend much less time. I still think you could get the job done and done admirably and I would respectfully also suggest that we could keep our citizen Legislators because I see no halo to be placed above a man or woman by calling them a full-time Legislature. I prefer the citizen type and that is the reason for my vote."

Speaker Washington: "The Gentleman from Cook, the Majority Leader,



Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I fully not intended to vote on this issue. And I heard the Speaker and I've heard Mr. Hirschfeld and I started to reflect and I'm going to vote 'aye'. And I don't imagine that there's any way in God's green earth there'll be another 37 votes up there. But I will tell you I have spent a good portion of my adult life in this Body. And I don't think there's a finer Body of men and women anyplace in the United States. And I will say to you as Mr. Hirschfeld, perhaps it's the 1970 Constitution but I'll go back further than that when we started annual Sessions. And I will tell you in my opinion that at twenty thousand dollars a year, the people of the State get more than they're due from every Member of this Body. And at twenty-seven, five, they would get more than that due. And all I can do is ask you to take some heat for a change and pay yourself what I think you're worth and I proudly vote 'aye'."

Speaker Washington: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, I find it rather strange that so many Members feel that one unpopular vote will cause them to be defeated. It's been my experience over the years in observing, my father said it in this Assembly, so I'm not a stranger to the machinations and the problems here and to campaigning, that very seldom do people in the district turn a good Legislator out for one bad vote. Nor do they keep a bad one for one good vote. So, if those of you who feel you're really representing your people down here, they should understand and they will. I don't feel that a Legislator should be the puppet of the newspapers whose publishers make millions, whose editorial writers make thousands, many more than what any of us here do. Certain television commentators who go from station to station to the highest bidder, say we shouldn't get any money, but they do. They shop around. All the people who've complained are those who earn much more than we're asking for. Most of those who say there should be no double dipping



don't want you to raise your salaries. Those who say that they want you to be cleaner than God, don't want to raise your salaries. You're voting not to raise your salaries is not going to stop them from calling you all kind of dirty names. If they're against you, they're still going to be against you. They say the news media was against me and I won by a bigger margin than I did the time before 'cause I told my people the truth. And I'm saying this, that the Legislature is not going to get the honor that the Legislature deserves unless you stand up and be counted for what is right. And Senator Dirksen used to always say, 'Don't let the possibility of defeat deter you from the right'. Thank you."

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

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

I voted for previous salary increases and I'll vote for them in the future. The people sent me back here to represent them here in Springfield. But I think we have to be fair. We have to be fair with all the state employees. We've got, we should be fair with every public official. Unfortunately, in the 1976 budget, there was not a provision for a cost of living increase in that budget. And supposedly the reason for not having a cost of living increase for the state employees was that the state could not afford it. And looking into the matter, a 5% cost of living factor for the state employees would amount to approximately forty-two million dollars of General Revenue Funds. We did not pass a cost of living increase for any state employees in 1976. There was a Bill introduced, Representative VonBoeckman's Bill, to provide a 5% cost of living increase to the state employees. Because of the monetary situation as far as the general revenues that were available, it did not come out of Committee. There was a motion to discharge the Committee, did not prevail. Until we have the resources available for everyone, for the state employees, for the state officers, and, yes, ourselves, at that time, I will vote 'aye'. But unfortunately this is not the case, we put the cart before the horse. Each and every one of you



received from the Speaker a graph that portrays it quite vividly as far as what's the amount in appropriations and revenue. And in turn, if you would read it, you'd know the fiscal position of this state. Each and every one of you received a report, both from the Bureau of the Budget and from the Economic and Fiscal Commission. You can't have it both ways. If you want to put in a Bill for a tax increase, do so. But you can't have it this way and I have to vote 'no'."

Speaker Washington: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Well, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, for one, will be saddened if you don't vote yourselves a legislative pay increase. I'm serious. You know, I happen to be very fortunate. I've represented a wonderful district for the last six years and it happens to be one of the more affluent districts in the state. I know that the medium income in the town I live in is some ten thousand dollars a year more than the legislative salary. I know that there are other districts in the state where a person who wants to live in legislature with the demands from his constituency, the monies he has to spend, both the extra things that are involved in every one of your campaigns, are costs. I suspect that most of you net after deductions from your paycheck, someplace in the vicinity of thirteen or fourteen thousand dollars a year. If you have one child in college, just one, that's going to cost you about six thousand dollars a year. That will leave you a net out of that check of about eight thousand dollars a year. Now, isn't it reasonable that the Members of this Body should be able to have the same hopes and aspirations for their wives and their kids that their constituents do. I don't really think that they're, your constituents will begrudge you a normal life and if you don't want to vote for a pay raise for yourself, then vote for your family. Vote for your kids because you don't know if you're going to be defeated two years from now or four years from now. You don't know how hard it's going to be to get a job when that occurs. And that may be the time your kid is just ready to go to college. I really don't under-



stand why. I have voted for pay raises down here before the elections and after the elections. I think it should be before, but I really don't understand why you can't have 89 votes up there. I know many of us who are leaving the General Assembly, are very concerned about the sacrifices that are involved in other people's lives because of the income that we have to accept. To be sure, we sought the job. To be sure, we want to be Legislators. But the simple fact is, this Body deserves on the ability and the level of decision making that it has, a decent income."

Speaker Washington: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, rather, and the great Senator-to-be, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there's an old saying that you should never judge another fellow until you've walked in his moccasins. And I wonder how many of the people in our respective districts would take a job that takes them two hundred miles away, four days and nights a week and requires on weekends that they be away a good part of the time when they're not answering telephone calls. And how many of the people in our district would assume the responsibility of trying to sift out and vote on a budget of the size of eleven billion dollars and to make up their minds for a hundred and seventy-five thousand people back in the district whom we can't poll? How we should vote on taxes and questions of life and death? When I came here fourteen years ago, we were making six thousand dollars a year and our briefcases were our offices and we met out on the rotunda and that's where we talked to constituents. And then, they said the six thousand dollars was too much. And ever since then, every time we've had a vote for an increase in salary, we've been made to feel as if we were engaging in treason and travesty. That's nonsense. I found in my own particular district that I never apologize for an increase in salary. And when I don't apologize, I don't get asked too much why I voted that way. I think it's a question of self-respect and I think that we ought to have the self-respect to recognize and realize what the responsibilities



are that we have. And twenty thousand dollars is not near enough to compensate us for those responsibilities. And I hope we get some additional green lights on the board."

Speaker Washington: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have sat here through these debates, the former Bill and the present Bill, and I have to say I am a bit surprised that no one has recognized what we are. I'm not a representative of Ron Griesheimer down here, nor are any one of you a representative of yourself. You are representative of the people, the people you have just told them, a few weeks ago, you will represent. Now, the Speaker of this House made an eloquent speech, one of the finest speeches I've ever heard. And I agree with him. I know in my heart that we're worth one heck of a lot more money than we're paid. I knew that before I came down here, but we were asked to sacrifice something when we came down here. And God knows every one of us are sacrificing. Yes, we're sacrificing financially; we're sacrificing socially; we're sacrificing our lives, our health and our families. And it would be nice for a change, if this vote turns out as I anticipate it will, that the press give us a little credit for that, instead of doing as the Springfield radio station has for four days, maligning a Legislator for his Bill for the sake of getting something on the radio. As representatives of the people and not of ourselves, we know in our hearts that the people do not want us to have a pay raise. And there is no conscionable way at the present time that any one of us can vote for a pay raise. We can rationalize it, but it wouldn't be correct. In the final analysis, as I look at the vote on that board, I would ask only two things. First thing, I would ask that those Legislators that are returning that are now opposing this Pay Raise Bill, use the same conscience to turn down the avarice of so many areas of our society when they demand their money, whether it be business, labor, local interests or et cetera. We must turn off the spending faucet of this state. And if we don't, the entire



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

state will go down the drain. The second thing and maybe more personal and I hope I'm not placing myself in the same position as my colleague, John Hirschfeld, and he can do it because he's leaving this Body, I'm somewhat personally disturbed as I look at the board up there to think that the two leading contenders for the leadership of my party are not taking a position on this issue. They must vote on this issue. This is the dynamics of leadership that our party needs in this House. And I say that not because I'm with or against either one or both, but they must make their position known. And to that end, I would certainly commend those Legislators that are doing as the people want and not because of the word, the way that it has been used by our present Governor, but because we are, in fact, representatives of those people. And it's truly a meaningful position."

Speaker Washington: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. How many votes does this take to pass?"

Speaker Washington: "The Bill in its present posture would take 107 votes to be effective immediately."

Caldwell: "Suppose we get 89 votes?"

Speaker Washington: "And to be declared passed."

Caldwell: "What happens if it gets 89?"

Speaker Washington: "The Sponsor would then have the right to call it back, of course, and amend it to take off the effective date."

Caldwell: "Thank you."

Speaker Washington: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Giglio. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Jaffe. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to take a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Washington: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. The Gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees. Mr. Clerk, will you poll the absentees? Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, I would request that we put this on Consideration



DEC 2 1976

78.

Postponed."

Speaker Washington: "You withdraw your request for a poll of the absentees?"

Jaffe: "Yes. And let me say the reason I'm putting it on Consideration Postponed is because I don't want the people who were brave enough to vote for it, to be penalized by having a published Roll Call. Somehow, we're rewarding the cowards, but I don't know what else to do."

Speaker Washington: "Does the Gentlemen have leave to put it on Postponed Consideration? Granted. The Order is of Consideration... will be... 4031. The next Bill is House Bill 4032. Mr. Jaffe. Take it out of the record. House Bill 4033, Mr. Jaffe. Out of the record. On the Order of Total Veto Motions, House Bill 1914. Mr. J.D. Jones. Put Mr. Jones on."

J. Jones: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1914 is an override situation. House Bill 1914 is the, was an Amendment to the private colleges, Public Assistance Act or the Financial Assistance Act for Nonpublic Institutions of Higher Learning, the proper title. The private colleges, as you know, receive from the state a hundred dollars per student each year in the freshman and sophomore years and two hundred dollars in the junior and senior years. This Bill simply amended that to instead of full-time students, to full-time equivalent students to accommodate the many part-time students that are enrolled in the various private colleges. The, this aid would be based, then, on the full-time equivalent of, so that those part-time students that are taking up a large section of the enrollment in many of our colleges, receives the state aid based on that formula. There is no money involved in the, in the present formula because that was vetoed out and there was... this is sponsored by the Private Colleges Association. And they have an understanding that no school would lose from its reallocation. The schools that would gain, have agreed to pool their resources and to provide any amount over their last years allocation among any schools that might show slight losses. Now, this is sponsored



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

by the private colleges themselves and we would appreciate consideration for the override in this instance because the only veto reason that the Governor gave was that the Board of Higher Education had advised them that the approved appropriation which changed the former, reduces funding for a number of institutions below the available in fiscal year '76. And as the Board of Higher Education advised him of this, I would think that he also should have received the advice of the colleges that are affected through their association. And they have agreed that they will work this out among themselves and there's no additional money appropriated. And it just changes the formula, appreciate your consideration for approval of the override on House Bill 1914. I might add that this is of particular interest to those of you in Chicagoland, Roosevelt University, the Central Y. College, and as well as, of course, down throughout the state, the private colleges that are affected and have... that's what I'm asking."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is shall House Bill 1914 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Members of the General Assembly were listening carefully and could hear the fact that this is not going to appropriate any more money. This is just changing the formula by which funds are distributed in financial assistance to students at the non-public schools. The schools have agreed simply to divide what is appropriated to them under this new formula, to divide it among them. It is a fairer way of allocating these funds. You are not, I repeat, not committing any more money. I would appeal to you for a 'yes' vote. It's just a reasonable, fair way of dividing the money that is there for financial assistance to students at private colleges. If we let our private colleges in Illinois go under for lack of students, think of the money that we'd have to pay in capital development to replace those facilities. If you are a fiscal conservative, this is a Bill that you absolutely



should vote 'yes', 'aye'. Representative Jones described it beautifully but I wasn't sure everyone could hear the fact that this is a good fiscally conservative Bill. It will help students in the non-public schools."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Representative Stone. Representative Hill, state your point."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker, we're in Session here. There's reporters on the floor. I'm sure that the rules haven't been changed and I would suggest that they be escorted off of this floor immediately."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stone."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, we have just been in debate in this House on a piece of legislation that is a lot more glamorous than this. I notice that there are sixty-nine people that are not voting. I would hope that some of those sixty-nine people would hark back and try to recall what Representative Jones said about his Bill. I think it should be passed. All those, I believe, most of those who are specifically involved here are in favor of this Bill. Admiral Webber, who is the Executive Secretary of the Independent Colleges and Universities of the State of Illinois, has asked that this veto be overridden. I think that the people that it would take care of would be those who are least able to pay their way. It merely changes a little wording so that you don't have full-time students, but full-time equivalent. Now, there's no additional money required. This would just change the formula and would make very, very little difference in the long run except those independent colleges and universities that are affected would certainly appreciate a 'yes' vote. And so would I and I'm sure Representative Jones would, too."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 114, 15 'aye' and 13 'no'. And House Bill 1914 passes, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. 3729. 3721. Representative Miller."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise to ask your support of the override of Governor Walker's total



DEC 2 1976

81.

veto of House Bill 3721. This Bill addresses itself to very severe financial problems imposed on many of our schools throughout the State of Illinois caused primarily by reassessment of property values. To correct this problem, House Bill 3721 permits the school districts to use either their 1973 or 1974 operating tax rates, whichever is higher. Now, I'd like to give you a brief background of the problem that we are facing. In Cook County, there are four quadrants that were reassessed and it was anticipated that they would be reassessed within a one year period. And this General Assembly in the 78th General Assembly passed a Bill that would permit the school districts in that area to use either their '73 or '74 tax rates. Well, three of the four quadrants got their work done in the given year. The fourth quadrant in south suburban Cook County did not have its property reassessed in that time period. And consequently, were not benefactors of that Bill. And as a result, there are thirty school districts in south suburban Cook County that stand to lose a million and a half dollars. And that is the way I originally introduced the Bill, to correct that one problem. And we got it before our House Education Committee, I found that there were other school districts throughout our state also severely hampered by the problem. In Dundee, for example, in Kane County, there are several school districts that have lost about a million dollars. And down in Joe Lucco's area and Don Brummet's area, in Highland, Illinois, there is one school district that lost about three hundred thousand dollars. I'm talking about the loss of money, but really it's basically, if they're going to make it up, they're going to have to start cutting teachers and other personnel. And I'm concerned about the effect it's going to have upon the quality of education in these school districts. I received a printout from the Illinois Office of Education that said, 'Overall, the cost of this Bill is about six million dollars', but I want to impress upon you that we are not talking about an appropriation of an additional six million. All we're doing, is redistributing six million dollars out of the one billion,



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

two hundred and fifty million dollar school aid budget. And this is a small fraction of one percent of the overall budget. We are not talking about additional money. This Bill when it came out of the Education Committee, had a unanimous vote. This Bill, when you considered it, received a 114 to 1 vote on this floor and I come back to you today to ask for your continued support to help the school districts throughout our state. There are about 75 counties that benefit from it and I ask your support once more. If there are any questions, I'll try to answer them."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, since you mention that district, school district in my legislative district, my understanding of why they lost a million dollars or at least, they perceive they lost a million dollars is different from your own. I wonder if I could ask a question and that question would be, are you contending that Dundee has the million dollars less because the tax rate went down as a result of the assessment going up?"

Miller: "Yes, Cal, that is correct. And now, that million dollar figure is one that was represented to me via a computer printout from I.O.E. It applied to, I can recall, Cal, seeing one... a printout from one school district that amounted to about, as I recall, about a third of a million. And it seems to me that there were a number of other school districts in Kane County that were less severely impacted. But, I believe the total for Kane County in total approached a million dollars. In south suburban Cook, it was one and a half million. In all of the downstate counties, it was four and a half million and I recall Kane County as being the most severely impacted by it. Apparently, you did have a reassessment going on here in the last two or three years."

Skinner: "Well, of course everyone in the state did."

Miller: "Well, that's true. Obviously went on in other areas of the state, but where you had a drastic increase in property values is where the school districts were particularly hard hit. The school boards would submit their requests for financial aid



to the state and along comes the reassessment later with drastically higher property valuation and they were caught in the trick bag and we're trying to bail them out."

Skinner: "I guess, my question is, is the trick bag they're caught in is they didn't ask for enough money? They didn't think the assessments were going to go up as much as they did? And if that's the case, I'm not sure whether I care. Their levy is supposed to be what they think they can spend, not how much they can get from the taxpayers. And if their tax rate went down because the assessments went up and they still got the same amount of money they asked for, I am less than apathetic. You know if that's the case?"

Miller: "No, I can't speak for the local school boards or the assessors, but I think you'll recognize, too, that the property tax or the property valuation is only one part of the total school aid formula and not the whole package. Obviously, it did have an impact on it...total responsibility for it."

Skinner: "All right, my last question would be, is this a one shot thing?"

Miller: "Yes, it is."

Skinner: "I mean, if I'm wrong and I vote the wrong way and this thing passes, it's not going to spread like measles throughout the whole state?"

Miller: "Cal, we're doing it for one year and people have said to me, 'Well, why don't we permanently solve the problem?'. And I don't have the answer, but I have, I think, the answer for this year."

Skinner: "You can't permanently solve the problem unless there is a... unless our state revenue sources looks like Niagara Falls rather than the kitchen sink spigot. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Ready for the question? The question is shall House Bill 3721 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Yourell, will you come to the Speaker's podium, please? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question



there's 43 'aye' and 32 'no'. The Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. Representative Mann. Representative Mann 'aye' on House Bill 3721. 3973. 3973, Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to yield to Representative Younge for the discussion on House Bill 3973."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge."

Younge: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move that the Governor's veto to 3973 be overridden. This is the Bill, if you'll remember, to establish the Depressed Areas Land Use and Redevelopment Authority. This Authority would have the responsibility for coming up with a long-term economic growth plan for depressed areas of Illinois. Those areas tend to be the southern and western counties of Illinois and in a smaller area, the inner city of Chicago. The Bill as presently written, would require the Authority to present to the General Assembly a plan as to what to do about those areas that are tax drain areas. I want to go into very briefly the reasons the Governor gave for vetoing this Bill. First of all, he said, 'Although the Bill specifically indicates that the approval of county governments and municipal governments has to be obtained before the new Authority could proceed, but this approval was left out in reference to special districts. I would call the General Assembly's attention to page 5, line 23 through 30 which specifically says that this Authority would not act in reference to assisting special districts. It would act only if requested to do so by those districts. And, therefore, it would not have the power to act unless it was specifically requested to do so.' He further said that, 'There was not a clearly defined relationship between the new Authority and existing departments of government.' I think that this relationship is clearly defined as being a cooperative one. The Constitution of the State of Illinois provides for inter-governmental cooperation. You, in the General Assembly, have further enacted ennobling legislation requiring inter-governmental cooperation. The Bill says, in the purpose, that its purpose is to create a cooperative



framework for the relationship between the Authority and the existing state and federal departments. Further, it says that it looks at one reason for the breakdown in those depressed areas to be a lack of coordination between the institutions and entities in departments that are presently working there. This new Authority as spelled out in this Bill, would have the responsibility for coordinating the planning activity in those areas that are draining the tax resources of this state. And lastly, I think that the relationship between the new Authority and the existing federal and state agencies is clearly laid out in that the Bill would give the, this new Authority, a job of evaluating the progress and effectiveness of federal, state, and local programs in reference to how they are being effective and in creating economically sound environments there. The last, I think, major objection of the Governor was that perhaps the revenue bonds authorized if the plan is approved would somehow obligate the state. In the drafting of this legislation, I have gone to the great extent to specify, first of all, that the only authority that this new Authority would have would be to issue revenue bonds if approved by this Body. Secondly, the very definition of revenue bonds is that the bonds would come out of the proposed bond issue. Thirdly, it is specifically stated in the Bill that the Authority shall have no power at any time or any manner to pledge the credit or tax power of this state. And fourthly, it is said that the officials executing the revenue bonds would not be personally liable. There was some inference to the fact that personnel code would perhaps make the state liable. Under the inherent definition of revenue bonds, there is not one iota of relevancy or accurateness in that the least or that allegation. And lastly, the veto message suggested because the General Assembly would require the Authority to report to it annually and to have its plans approved here, that there was a constitutional objection that could be raised and based on the constitutional requirement of separation of power. The very nature of planning requires that each entity that has some responsibility for a plan, be a part of the planning



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

process. I think that it is the duty of this General Assembly to not set vehicles into motion and leave them out there unattended without checking and without there being legislative oversights. And I believe that the, if this matter is challenged in court, that the argument would be sustained that it is an appropriate exercise of power for the General Assembly to require a special, a new authority created by it to bring its plans and bring its projects before the General Assembly and have then specifically approved. And because of the lack of foundation and basis of the reasons given for the veto, I herewith ask the General Assembly to override the veto and enact this very needed instrument to help us figure out what needs to be done to turn those areas that are now tax drain areas into economically viable areas. The last very important thing is how will this agency be funded? I have gone to great lengths in talking with the economic development administration and the people at H.U.D. at the federal level and I am convinced that there is adequate federal funding for this legislation. And so, therefore, I will not ask for state funds out of present state revenues to be used to fund this agency. And for those reasons, I solicit your support to override this veto."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Earlier today I was thinking whether we ought to give the hardest working Legislator for one Bill award to Representative Williams or not and I'm not sure that maybe Representative Younge has better claim to it. This Bill has gone through a Committee I've been in at least four times and I'm sick to death of hearing it discussed. The opponents on those Committees have put every safeguard they can think of in it, every Catch-22 that everyone thought of after they wrote the last version has been stuck in here. And if the concept is going to work, I don't think it's going to get much better than what it is now. So, I'm, you know, if for no other reason than an A for a stupendous first-term effort, I'm going to vote in favor of this Bill. But that wasn't really the reason I got up. The reason I got up is there are an awful



lot of empty seats here. I'd like to point out which is no surprise to anyone in the General Assembly that the press is totally uninterested in what we're doing now that we've finished the least significant Bill of the Session. And I'd also like to point out with a little bit of personal disturbance that some of the loudest and most vocal opponents of that Bill, some of the part-time Legislators, are no longer in their seats to vote on this Bill. And if their lights come on, I want a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones, do you seek to... Anyone else? Representative Younge, to close. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, with respect to House Bill 973, I rise to oppose it as I have done previously with others. And I do think it is unfortunate that the Bill comes up at this time when the attention of the Membership isn't what it generally is. This Bill would create a super agency with authority encompassing certain functions of these state agencies. Illinois Housing Development Authority, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Illinois Capital Development Board, the Illinois Department of Local Government Affairs, the State Planning Clearing House, as well as townships, park districts, other special purpose districts, the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Federal Department of Interior and any other planning agency operating in an area chosen for consideration by the authority. And the Bill makes no specific definition with respect to the relationship between this super agency and these other agencies. Another thing, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this agency, another authority to issue bonds can, as the Governor pointed out in his message and as our staff pointed out in its analysis, can impose financial obligation, responsibility upon the state. You can't just take the language in the Bill at face value. You got to consider the structure that's contained in this Bill for this authority and how akin that structure is to an ordinary state agency. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, once again, we're called upon to pass something because of a good



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

objective. But I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that we constantly and constantly consider that the end does not justify the means. The means here is not an appropriate one. If we accept it, we are just going to compound the problem, the problems that do exist financially and otherwise. And it's on that basis, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, with all due deference to the Sponsor of this Bill, that I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the prior speaker is once again in his usual eloquence, wrong. Mr. Speaker, the prior speaker indicated that this so-called super agency would choose areas for its activities. That is the furthest thing from the truth. I think Representative Younge has indicated very specifically that this agency would act upon request from areas and that it did not have the authority to make those kinds of choices. This Bill passed out of this House with only 39 dissenting votes, Mr. Speaker. This Bill, we have seen time and time again and I think that through the efforts of the Sponsor and through the efforts of the Committees and various other activities related to this Bill, that it is now in the form that it is passable. It's unfortunate that the Governor saw fit to veto this Bill. I think it's a good vehicle. It's one that's needed and I would hope that each and every one of us would cast an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge, do you want to close again? Representative Barnes. We'll give you another close. Everybody didn't know that that's what we did. They don't want to explain their votes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to extend on my elegant colleague from the County of Cook and reading the statement of the Governor's veto of this particular message, he tends to point out that such activities as stated in this legislation, could possibly be attended to by the Capital Development Board and/or the Illinois Housing Development Authority. But let me point out to the Members of



DEC 2 1976 89.

the House that in the case of the areas as represented by Representative Younge, both the Capital Development Board and the Illinois Housing Authority has not saw fit to address itself to a real and a serious problem as it relates to the southern part of our great State of Illinois. Representative Younge has worked hard and worked very dilligently on this project in trying to represent her constituency and give them an alternative to a serious economic problem that has them in the throes of utter chaos in the East St. Louis area. I think she should be commended for it. I think the Governor was very short-sighted and the information that he received from the people that had analyzed this Bill, I think that in his message in itself to suggest that we have agencies that could or should have properly addressed themselves to the problem there, but for whatever reason, had not did so. I think that in itself was the reason for insuring that this legislation be passed. I think now we have the opportunity to correct that inequity. We have an opportunity to correct the wrong that has been perpetrated toward the piece of legislation that would go a long way in stemming the tide of economic deprivation, deprivement of that area of the state and I think that we should. This is the case where one Representative has worked extremely hard to do what all of us, all of us should be here, in the Illinois House, attempting to do--respond to the needs of the people that have sought fit to have her represent them in this Body. I think that we should give her the necessary votes to override this veto and we should move toward insuring a proper economic and fiscal base for that portion of the state that needs our help so sorely bad. I believe, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am imploring you to give her the necessary votes to insure that this project at least gets started in the current fiscal year."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes having explained his vote, the question is shall House Bill 3973 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Ray Ewell."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, very briefly, the only objection that the Governor had to this Bill is that two other agencies could have done it, but they have not done it. And that's the reason Mrs. Younge is here. She's been here on this Bill before. The agencies were here before and they have not chosen to act. We no longer require state funds and so they give her a Catch-22 and say, 'Since you don't require state funds, you ought to and, therefore, we suggest that the Bill ought to be vetoed.' Any reading of the Governor's statement and the veto analysis, ought to convince everyone that this is a good Bill at this stage and it ought to be overridden, the Governor's veto notwithstanding. And we implore you to give Mrs. Younge a little support on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "All voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Caldwell, do you seek recognition?"

Caldwell: "Merely, Mr. Speaker, to indicate that I believe that during my ten years here, early in the first year I was here, 1967, it came to the attention of the Illinois General Assembly that East St. Louis which is a part of the State of Illinois, should have the attention from an economic and development standpoint and many Committees have been formed. We've interviewed people from that Section, told us of their problems. Committees have visited and we're still, ten years later, doing nothing to relieve that situation. East St. Louis is a part of the State of Illinois and no chain can be any stronger than its weakest link. What Mrs. Younge has been doing since she was elected by the people of East St. Louis is to try to and address herself to the problems of that area. She has worked hard, Committees have heard her various schemes to bring relief to that area and she has gone back with suggestions as to the objections and have corrected them. And she finally got a Bill in the position where the State of Illinois was not asked to spend any money, but to give the authority to enable her to get the money from the Federal government. And she comes to us in the close of this Veto Session as she has come to us in other Regular Sessions, and she's getting the same type of treatment.



I believe that it is our responsibility to respond to this plea and to override this veto and let's get the show on the road. I certainly would hope that we could see fit to give her the necessary number of votes to override this Bill so that this program which she has worked so hard upon can be initiated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, simply to mention that at the appropriate time, if necessary, I request a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Representative James Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think the Governor in his veto message has clearly outlined some of the problems that might be connected with this Bill. I remember when this has come through a couple of other times in earlier Sessions and I mention to Representative Washington that I felt that a Bill which could not or would not be structured to accomplish its purpose, would really be a very serious breach of faith. What we would do is promise people something we knew we couldn't deliver. I think there's something else connected with this and that is that we've seen this Bill bobbing up and down more times and more often and connected with more other Bills than probably any other Bill in the Legislature. But Representative Younge has indicated that there is no state dollars included in this. She has certainly had a great deal of diligence, but Representative Emil Jones has probably made the most telling argument. He has probably spoken most eloquently about the need for this Bill, even though it doesn't directly effect his district. And in that light, I'd say that Wyvetter Younge, I surrender."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. Representative Younge, pardon me."

Younge: "I want to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker. The thing is, I think there might be another reason for anyone who has voted 'no' to vote 'yes', I think that perhaps I'm entitled to a day in court. In other words, there have been certain objections



which have been raised against the Bill and I don't think that those objections are valid. And I'd like an opportunity to, you know, if there is review of this matter, to have that... give me the chance to be reviewed. I think that the basic bottom line of this Bill has to do with whether or not we are going to come up with a plan as to what is to be done about those areas that are tax drain areas. Those areas that have high aid to dependent children, those areas that have declining population, where industry has left. We're in a fiscal crisis in the state and I think that the very conservative move of this Body to have an entity plan, what to do about. None of us in our individual capacities have the skill or the time to do this, but at least the people of this state are entitled to a plan of action as to what to do. I think that the position of the General Assembly at this time is whether or not we will exercise the leadership necessary to correct our conditions. And so, I hope that six more of the Members here in the House will vote to set into motion an authority that would work full-time in those areas that are in trouble in this state, that would come up with a plan as to what to do about those troubled areas. We only need six more votes and I would hope that there would be six more of us..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sangmeister. What a minute now. We, I thought that everybody had voted who desired to vote and I've been advised by some of the peripatetic Members of the floor that there are others that wish to vote. So, we were going to, we'll dump this Roll Call and ask everybody who wants to vote and don't vote anybody else's switch because I can see verification gleaming in the eyes of some of the Members. So, if you want to get out of here, please don't vote for anybody else's switch. All those who desire to vote 'aye', vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? All voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Schlickman says, 'R-E-K-O-R-D' Representative Younge. Representative Younge."

Younge: "Would we poll the absentees?"



Speaker Redmond: "Lay has requested a poll of the absentees. The Clerk will poll the absentees."

Clerk Selcke: "Arnell, Beatty, Bluthardt, Boyle, B. Bradley, G. Bradley, Brummer, Capparelli, Capuzi, Carroll, Collins, Craig, Cunningham, Deavers, Domico, Epton, Flinn, Friedrich, Griesheimer, Hanahan, Hill, Hirschfeld, Gene Hoffman, Ron Hoffman, Jacobs, Kane, Katz, Kelly, Klosak, Kosinski, Kozubowski, LaFleur, Laurino, Leverenz, Lundy, McAuliffe, McAvoy, McCourt, McGrew, Mulcahey, Nardulli, Palmer, Pierce, Polk, Rayson, Rose, Ryan, Schraeder, Sevcik, Sharp, Stearney, Telcser, Tipword, Waddell, Wall, Washburn, Washington, Williams, Winchester."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hill 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? On this question there's 91 'aye'... Representative Brinkmeier 'aye'. All voted who wish? Representative Mulcahey, are you about ready... Have all voted who wish? McGrew 'aye'. Representative Emery 'aye'. 94? Representative Tipword 'aye'. 95. Have all voted who wish? Representative Mulcahey 'no'. Representative Jones. Only vote once. Have all voted who wish?"

Jones: "There's still time to explain the vote."

Speaker Redmond: "No, that passed."

Jones: "Oh, all right, okay."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question, there's 95 'aye', 24 'nay'. The Lady's motion is lost and the veto is sustained. On the Order of Amendatory Veto Motions appears House Bill 3486. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "It appears that we're not going to do anything for the assessors of the State of Illinois except raise their salaries which is probably what they wanted all along. But nevertheless, because in the hopes that there may be a surge of reform and a hastening of returnees to the chamber, I would ask that we sustain the Governor's veto, the amendatory veto, and accept his changes on this Bill, House Bill 3486. What it does is basically make township assessors outside of Cook County, if there's any way I can underline the word, outside of Cook County, the words, I would do so. It will make them a true profession for the first time in the history of real assessments in Illinois. It



will make them parallel to the professions which are licensed by the Department of Registration and Education and the other of the hundred and eighty-one professions that we license and regulate in the State of Illinois. The Governor has said that he doesn't trust a private organization to give a test. Well, I would trust a private organization to give a test for an assessor when that private organization test results in approximately 50% of the people taking the test, failing the test. Now, if the Department of Local Government Affairs conducted a test that had that failure rate, there would be all sorts of people running through the barricades saying they're trying to kill assessors. Well, most of us are smart enough to figure out somebody's got to do that kind of work, but some of us would like to make sure that they are at least technically qualified to do it. You know, be able to read and write, add and subtract, multiply and divide, and maybe know something about the approaches to value. If there are any questions with regard to the Bill, I would be perfectly happy to attempt to answer them. If not, I would ask for an affirmative Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative 'Buz' Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I know again that this Bill is no better today than it was yesterday when it required 107 votes to override the Governor's veto and a motion today to sustain the veto simply does not take into consideration the fact that the Bill does have the fatal defect that I mentioned yesterday, that I don't know how that you can possibly set into legislation qualifications and requisites to hold public office after the fact. Some of these assessors have already run in the primary. That's already done and now if they haven't qualified according to the provisions of the Bill, the Town Board of Auditors can replace those people who have been elected or will be elected shortly with a selection that doesn't reflect the elective process. And I just think that flies in the face of the Constitution of the State of Illinois. And so, for the same reasons that



we talked about yesterday, I would suggest to you that those reasons exist today as they did yesterday and the Bill is no better after 24 hours and I would suggest that you vote 'no' against the motion to sustain the Governor's veto."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Skinner, to close."

Skinner: "Yes, well, I would merely point out that the Representative has made one small mistake. And that is that no assessors for whom this Bill would apply have been selected either through primary or through caucus. I do not dispute the fact that assessors who are incompetent would be removed from office were this Bill to be passed if we were to accept the Governor's amendatory veto. But I think there are approximate... Well, there may be two or three jobs that may be very important in the local governmental sphere. People you don't want being paid off. One of them is the assessor, but before you get paid off, it seems to me you at least ought to be able to be technically competent and that's all we're asking here. We're not going to eliminate crooks who are assessors. What we're going to do is say that if they're going to be crooks, at least they've got to be smart enough to do it well."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 3486 by adoption of the Amendment. All in favor will vote 'aye', opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. Representative McMasters 'no'. Representative Skinner. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I would ask for a poll of the absentees if you're going to close it that fast. I think we ought to at least have a majority of the people here or else we ought to adjourn."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk 'aye'. Representative Polk changed his mind, 'no'. Schuneman 'no'. Hudson... just a minute. Hudson 'no'. Molloy 'no'. Dyer 'no'. Reed 'aye'. No, Kempiners 'no'. Marshall? Wallace. Dawson 'no'. Dawson. Kempiners seeks recognition."



Kempiners: "I think, Mr. Speaker, that you closed the switches before a number of people could have gotten on and there's some confusion as to what the vote was on. Maybe you might want to take another Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk advises me we have them all. Now, has everybody voted who desires to?"

Kempiners: "Okay, I want mine changed from 'yes' as it is recorded on the board to 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners changes from 'yes' to 'no'. Representative Willer to 'no'. Representative Winchester 'no'. Sangmeister 'no'. Anderson 'no'. Porter 'no'. Collins 'no'. Schneider 'no'. Brandt 'no'. Mann 'no'. Representative Barnes 'no'. You're going to get a record here, Cal. Representative... Madison 'no'. Schoeberlein 'no'. Neff 'no'. Deuster 'no'. Barnes from 'yes' to 'no'. You may leave the room. Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, may I have the right to change from 'yes' to 'no'?"

Speaker Redmond: "From 'yes' to 'no'. Mahar 'no'. What's the score here? On this question... I've been advised by Mr. Selcke, that there are 873 'no' and 1 'yes'. The Gentleman's motion is lost. On Item Reduction Veto Motions, House Bill 3816. Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what this motion does is restore four hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars to the appropriation for downstate mass transit districts. I've been informed by the, Joe Liggus from the Department of Transportation, Mass Transit Division, that by the Department's projection based on first-quarter allotments in fiscal '77, that the Department will be short by approximately four hundred thousand dollars in fiscal '77. This money is earmarked for downstate mass transit districts. Last year, we had to give them a supplemental appropriation of five hundred thousand at the end of the year. This, I would respectfully ask for an 'aye' vote on this restoration."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Representative Madigan."



Madigan. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Madigan: "Cause I apologize, but my attention was misdirected.

Could you repeat your explanation?"

Kane: "What this appropriation or what this restoration does is restore four hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars to downstate mass transit districts that were cut by the Governor. The Governor cut the amount passed by the Legislature by four hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars, saying that the money would not be needed in fiscal 1977. Since that action which was taken in the first part of July, the Department of Transportation based on first quarter allotments to downstate mass transit districts, now say that the appropriation level passed by the General Assembly is accurate and if we leave it at the level set by the Governor after his action, we will have to come in for a supplemental appropriation next year to cover the deficit and this would be a simple way of doing it."

Madigan: "Representative, I'm very happy to see that you're supporting appropriations for mass transit..."

Kane: "I have always in the past, sir."

Madigan: "...glad to support your motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is shall the item on page 26, Representative Madison, pardon me."

Madison: "Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "Indicates he will."

Madison: "Representative Kane, this restoration would come out of what fund?"

Kane: "The Downstate Mass Transit Fund."

Madison: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is a very important Bill and I think that we should give it a great deal of attention. This Bill is going to provide some of the funds that help mass transit districts throughout downstate Illinois to operate. I think all these mass transit districts have



passed their own tax bills to operate and they're subsidized by an appropriation from the state which has a private fund for that reason, for that special purpose. The people that are served by mass transit throughout downstate are those people who can't afford private modes of transportation and I think that this is a very worthwhile piece of legislation. I think that we should go along with it and support Representative Kane's efforts on behalf of these, really, hundreds of thousands of people who use this transportation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "You know, the problem with some people in the General Assembly is that they agree to trade their votes from one thing to another for far too low a price. This is obviously a worthy Bill and certainly should be passed. But if anybody from outside of the Chicago Transit Authority area has been hoodwinked into thinking it won't pass unless they vote for a twenty-four million dollar appropriation for the R.T.A., I think their political judgement's lacking."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane, to close."

Kane: "I'm asking for a vote on this on its merits. I'd appreciate... no hoodwinking... I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote on this restoration."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall the item on page 26, lines 18 to 22 of House Bill 3816 be restored to the original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to explain my vote in favor of the restoration of these funds. To give you briefly an idea of the problems existing around the campus of the University of Illinois, we find that parking is at a premium on the university campus and one way that we can help to alleviate the problems there is by providing bus transportation for people who need to get to campus so that we do not have to provide additional parking space. I think that it's a short-sighted view for us to deprive these local downstate



communities of the funds they need for mass transit. And then, compound the problems that we find in having to subsidize other kinds of services such as parking on the University of Illinois campus. I urge all of you who are within earshot, if you are not here physically to vote at your desk, get here now and place your vote."

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

J. Jones: "I want to add to what has been said, that I think if those that are listening that are here that understand that this is what the downstate... fair play for mass transit. That those of us who supported the funding for the R.T.A., there's a change here for reciprocal vote to help out the downstate mass transit districts and we need about eight more and we welcome you all to put on the green lights in response to that consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea. Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this money comes out of a special fund. It can now be used for the purpose that it was intended to to help mass transportation downstate and I get a little resentful of hearing a Member from across the aisle on every Bill, get up and say somebody's trading his vote or you're trading your vote too small or you're doing something of that nature. I think that every Member on this floor votes the way he wants to on these Bills. Let 'em go up or down, but I think it's time we stopped calling each other names and act like elected Members of this Body. Perhaps, that's why that pay raise didn't go through because we don't treat each other as elected Members who stood up and went to the electorate and were elected and sent down here to represent the people in his or her district. This is a good piece of legislation. The people in downstate Illinois need mass transportation. You can't pave every piece of land in this state. I think it should pass."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there's 96 'aye', 35 'no'. The Gentleman's motion prevails and the item is restored."



Representative... 96, 35. I think we have gone through substantially everything that's on the Calendar. Is there anybody with any motions? Representative Schisler."

Schisler: "Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk on House Bill 3389."

Speaker Redmond: "Is it on the Calendar?"

Schisler: "No, sir, but I filed the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "You have it, Mr. Clerk? We'll check and get back to you, Representative Schisler. Representative Jones, a point of personal privilege."

J. Jones: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise on a point of personal privilege because of a personal matter that I think concerns, will be of interest to everybody in this chamber. This morning on WTAX, the local radio station, I heard an interview with our great nurse friend, Lucille Ramshaw, who has been looking after our health for the last fourteen years and she's retiring. In this interview, she said some real nice things about we Legislators and I thought you might, like to share this with you; Thom Serafin, who covers our proceedings for the Capital Information Bureau, and I would like to turn on the tape to hear the program that I mentioned."

Thom Serafin: "The statehouse dome, for the past fourteen years, has been Lucille Ramshaw, a nurse for 45 years. She's been stationed in the Capitol Building caring for the state's employees, Legislators and elected officials. This is her last year. Mrs. Ramshaw will retire December 30 of this year. What has she been doing for fourteen years in the State Capitol Building?"

Nurse Ramshaw: "Just a little bit of everything. You never know from one minute to the next what's going to come in the door or what you're going to get called out the door to, you know, on an emergency call -- heart attacks, broken limbs."

Thom Serafin: "Do you have any insights into the Illinois Legislature that the average citizen might not have as far as maybe lawmakers getting ill during the legislative process?"

Nurse Ramshaw: "Well, sometimes they do get sick, but I think a lot of times it's from exhaustion because what the people don't really know is they go all day long. You know, there's Committee



meetings from eight o'clock in the morning until nine and ten and eleven o'clock at night plus being on the floor in debates. And some of them get a little excited, you know, and then I think they're more prone to pick up colds and things like that because they are so tired."

Thom Serafin: "Mrs. Ramshaw sees the state's elected officials as very few people do. She has been summoned to the Senate and House chambers many times to care for Legislators."

Nurse Ramshaw: "Usually when you're called to the House or the Senate floor, it's because someone thinks they're having a heart attack. Not necessarily the individual, but the people around them, you know. I remember on man, I thought he was having a heart attack and I called an ambulance and he said, 'I'm not going to go to the hospital in an ambulance. I'm going home.' And I said, 'Well, just do it for me, just do it for me.' So he sat up on the stretcher, protesting, but he said, 'I'll go to the hospital. I'll go to suit you.' Got him out at the hospital; they examined him and said, 'We can't find anything wrong.' So, they waited for his wife to come and before they got him off the, before he left the emergency, he had a cardiac arrest and was dead before midnight."

Thom Serafin: "She says that's why she's quitting."

Nurse Ramshaw: "Some of them that I thought really were having a heart attack didn't have a heart attack, you know. It was just something minor, you know, but it had the symptoms of a heart attack. And this is where you, inside you, you just, you just get so upset, you know. And it's one of the main reasons why I'm leaving. I just don't want to go through it, worrying any more about them because you do worry. You do get to know them. And they're really good guys, all of them."

Thom Serafin: "Lobbyists will also miss her. They can always be found in her office. She says she allows them to use the office as a privilege."

Nurse Ramshaw: "I like them and they're nice to me and don't bother me. If it gets too noisy up there, I just say, 'There's the door. Now, go boys.' And they're gone, you know. And they



are, they're very, very nice."

Thom Serafin: "Everyone in state government will miss Nurse Ramshaw, lawmakers, lobbyists, government employees, all humbly attended to by Lucille, the gentle nurse on the third floor of the Illinois State Capitol."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Mr. Speaker, I think after that beautiful speech, this would be a good time to call the Pay Raise Bill again."

Speaker Redmond: "I went to the Bears one Sunday and they were going to sack the quarterback, Representative, that means quarterback Avaline called an audible known as the 'Chicken Reverse'. Representative Duff, point of personal privilege. I understand that this is your coronation. Is there any truth to that?"

Duff: "I didn't know I had my light on, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "You cornered me last night and this morning to be sure and call on you."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, of all the imps in the world, the most pleasant are the Irish imps. I do appreciate an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege, if I may. Like others, this day has arrived too quickly in many senses for me. It will be my last day on the floor and I would like to say that it has been a very happy chapter in my life. These last six years have been both a learning experience and a very humbling experience for me. I know that there's been a lot of battles and a lot of alliances, a lot of good times and tough times. There isn't a person on this floor that I cannot remember with happy feelings. I suppose there have been times in my time here where I might have seemed a little intense. If I have on occasion in those battles in any way, offended anybody, I want you to know that it was not a personal intent. But I also want you to know that I feel there is no Body in the world like this Body of the people's people. I'm going to a different branch of government and I'm going with the greatest and fondest recollections that I could have of you, my colleagues, the men and women of this House. I've been fortunate to have talented colleagues from my district, like Senator Glass,



Representative Porter, Representative Katz. I have been fortunate, I feel, to have very many dear friends on both sides of the aisle. I am very frankly, not sure how I feel about leaving. Somebody asked me if I wouldn't miss it, and I said, 'Well, it's like the little old Irish lady who raised eleven children and they were all grown up and gone away. And the pastor came over to visit one night and he said, 'Mary, don't you miss your children?' And she was in her rocking chair and she says, 'Well, father,' she says, 'I loves 'em and I misses 'em, but I loves 'em a hell of a lot more than I misses them.' I want to thank you all who have been so intense and sincere and have worked with me for this period of time. I've never approached any chapter of my life with quite the same feeling of humility as I will experience next Monday. It's a long-time aspiration and a hope and I thank every blessed one of you for the time I've been able to spend with you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Londrigan."

Londrigan: "I didn't plan to make any farewell address, Mr. Speaker, but after eight years in the House and being from Springfield and knowing so many of you so very well, I very much enjoyed my eight years. They were all too short. They seem like about four. I enjoyed the fights tremendously, but overall as everyone who comes back says, most of all it's a fraternity and a friendship that you build up throughout the years. I will be back. I will only be down the street a few blocks. I want to say, 'Thank you very much to all of you and the best to you and your families.'"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am concluding four terms in this Body. I'm impressed by the comparative few that have served in this General Assembly since the date of its incorporation as a state in 1818. We are an exclusive Body. We have been and we will be. I'm proud that I was one, as you all are, one of the ones chosen to serve here. I've been impressed by the greatest of Illinois. I don't think that objectively, we could say anything less but



that Illinois is the greatest state in the union for all of its resources, for all of its greatness. And it has and has produced many great people over a period of time, many of whom we've served with here today; not only in this Body but in the rotunda, across the rotunda and in the Executive and the Judicial Branches. I have learned from the cultural differences the ways that various people from southern Illinois, central Illinois, and northern Illinois look upon their problems. And I agree with one previous, great speaker who addressed this Assembly in that there's no north or south, east or west. We're one state. We've had great Speakers. I've come down here, I came down here at a time when we had John Touhy, Ralph Smith, those subsequent from that time to you, Mr. Speaker; and I've learned, I've learned the processes. I've been a better human being as a result of my association. I've been a better Legislator as a result of my association and I do think that we've got one hell of a good General Assembly. I voted for that pay raise today because of the sacrifices that we make. So, I want to bid all adieu, good-bye. I've given it what I've got, maybe a little more, sometimes less, but I shall always remember it, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Harold Washington. He went to the Senate, they sent him back. Representative Washington."

Washington: "Why am I on the floor, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, you sought recognition a while ago."

Washington: "Oh, yes. I have a Resolution and I just wonder if it was in order to hear it at this time, House Resolution 1044, which addresses itself to the question of Mr. Duff leaving."

Speaker Redmond: "Why, surely. Resolutions, 1044."

Washington: "Can we have the Clerk read it, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed. Read the Resolution, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1044. Whereas, the extreme dedication of a man to a field of human enterprise in an effort to improve in its rare and laudable thing; and Whereas, Brian B. Duff in his six years of being a Representative of the Illinois House of Representatives has gained state-wide recognition for



his work in improving the judicial system, especially in the area of criminal justice; and Whereas, Brian Duff, soon to be Judge Brian Duff of the Circuit Court of Cook County, has deeply concerned himself with all facets of criminal law - substantive rules, procedure, corrections, and assuring the smooth running of the institutions administering the rules of criminal law; and Whereas, Representative Duff's interest has been balanced, his concern being for the protection of the public and the victims of crime as well as for fairness and due process of defendants; and Whereas, he was Chairman of the House Judiciary II Committee in the 78th General Assembly and aggressively sought to utilize that position to generate progressive reforms in legislation; and Whereas, as a Legislator vitally interested in stimulating this reform, he also served actively on Committees outside the House which were involved in criminal justice issues, specifically the Judicial Advisory Council and the Council for the Diagnosis and Evaluation of Criminal Defendants; and Whereas, the list of measures sponsored by Representative Duff in the criminal justice area is long and worthy of our recollection; and Whereas, Representative Duff has been a leader in the fight for a merit system for selecting Members of our judiciary independently of political factors; and Whereas, Representative Duff led the fight for reform of the archaic grand jury system in Illinois, pushing for abolition of the useless grand jury indictment requirement so as to speed up the process of trials and provide fairer treatment for people called before grand juries without counsel during investigations; and Whereas, Representative Duff made the 120-day speedy trial rule a meaningful reality in Illinois by his sponsorship of a Bill to give that rule some real teeth; and Whereas, Representative Duff showed his concern with the behavior of those out on bail by sponsoring a Bill which provided a constitutional procedure to permit revocation of bail for those charged with further violations while on bail; and Whereas, Representative Duff has concerned himself with the diversion of juveniles charged with delinquent acts away from formal court adjudication where



this would be unnecessary for the protection of society or useless in true rehabilitation; and Whereas, Representative Duff has been a leader in the fight to create a state-wide probation services program and to set up a more professional system of full-time probation officers with reasonable case-loads; and Whereas, Representative Duff has sought to aid in the development of full-time professional trial level defender services in Illinois; and Whereas, he has sought to make the actual process of criminal prosecutions flow more smoothly by granting more reasonable compensation to both witnesses and jurors in criminal cases; and Whereas, he sought a greater assistance for victims of crimes and those injured while helping others in emergencies; and Whereas, the efforts and contributions made by Brian B. Duff to the Illinois criminal justice system as a State Representative should not only be realized and appreciated now, but remember long after he has left this House, therefore, be it Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the 79th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that we congratulate our retiring colleague, Brian B. Duff, on his efforts to improve our judicial system, especially in the field of criminal justice, and express our appreciation for his contributions to the work of this Body; be it further Resolved, that a suitable engrossed copy of this Resolution be presented to Brian Duff."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Resolution is long and so I will be brief. But as you noted, the Resolution deals specifically with Representative Duff and his contribution to the administration of criminal justice in the State of Illinois. I have not discussed what I'm going to say with Representative Duff, but I would think that if I could categorize him and his actions in that field, they would be with a question which perhaps motivates him in his efforts in this field. And the question which he labors with and one which I labor with and men like Rommie Palmer and Harold Katz and all the other Members on the Judiciary Committee, and Joe Lundy and



not meant to exclude others, but the question which we labor with is, 'How best can society deal with prescribed social deviate behavior which is dangerous to the safety of people and repugnant to our sensitivities?' It seems to me that some people take this question too lightly. They are inclined to deal with it on a sensational basis. They approach it on an ad hoc, with an ad hoc attitude. They're here today and gone tomorrow, not realizing that this is one of the fundamental issues facing our society which if we do not resolve, we're going to have a jungle in which we live. And Brian Duff has assiduously directed himself to this kind of question and has attempted with more success than anyone that I know of in my experience here to come up with some answers. You've heard the Resolution and things he's done -- working on the Criminal Diagnostic Committee, addressing himself to the Code of Corrections which I was happy to be the Chief Cosponsor with Joe Sevcik in this House, dealing with speedy trials, dealing with the archaic grand juries, dealing with the whole phantasmagoria, muddy, medical, messy business called the administration of criminal justice in this state and dealing with it on an intensive and extensive, dedicated basis which made what he said in this field, have meaning and substance, notwithstanding Brian Duff's admitted, sometimes, abrasive attitude. I think his conduct in this House in this field has been exemplary. I think in his leaving, he's creating a void which is going to be hard to fill. I suggest to you that if we're going to ever do anything for the safety and health of people in this state, we're going to have to have some men like Brian Duff in the Judiciary Committee dealing with the day-to-day problems of criminal law. He can carry on that work on the bench, but knowing how they place them, they'll probably put him in the civil courts and not the criminal. But notwithstanding that, we need more Brian Duffs. We need more Rommie Palmers. We need more Jim Londrigans. We need more Joe Lundys because these men are dedicated to trying to find an answer to the question which I opened this discussion



with. I didn't mean to go this long, but I think I would be remiss in my responsibilities to a first rate Legislator if I didn't make it very clear that I think his contribution has been tremendous, I wish him well; and if he's half as good a judge as he is an authority and a repository of knowledge and decency and good policy as he has been here in this House, then the bench has got a tremendously fine judge. Good-bye, Brian. You've done a tremendous job here. I move the immediate consideration and adoption of House Resolution 1044, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the Gentleman's motion. All in favor of the adoption of the Resolution indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Resolution's adopted. Representative Washington has consented to come back to us from the Senate and pronounce the invocation some day. Are there any comparable Resolutions? Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I think 1043 is sponsored by the Minority Leader, Representative Washburn, and there's also 1051 by Farley in behalf of our good friend and colleague and a man we're going to miss, Charlie Fleck. So, I think we should call on the Minority Leader in regard to Representative Charles Fleck and I want to add my personal good wishes to Charlie. I surely will miss him. He's a man of his word, he's a loyal man, and the bench is surely the winner and the people are the winner when Charlie enters the Judiciary."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washburn."

Washburn: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 1043 does pertain to Representative or Judge Fleck but there are two similar Resolutions in addition to this one for Brian Duff and for Rommie Palmer. And certainly, I know I speak for every Member of this House, on behalf of every Member of this House, directing my remarks to these three distinguished Gentlemen who have served so well in this House and wishing them the very best and best wishes for a long tenure on the bench. We're certain they will be just as distinguished there as just another stage in a career



which is already noteworthy and is destined to obtain still further heights. So, I would ask that the names of all the Members of this Body be added to these three Resolutions.

Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I concur with the prior remarks and I'd like to say that the man who praised all the others, I'd like to praise him. And that's Harold Washington and I would like to thank him particularly for the courtesty and the understanding and the help he gave to freshmen, even if they were Republican and he was a Democrat and I wish him well in the Senate."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Fleck."

Fleck: "Well, I really didn't want to speak and give a speech, a swan song. I thought the last Bill I handled was a swan song. But all I would simply say to be as brief as I can and as humble as I can, to say from my heart that the six years I've spent down here I wouldn't exchange for anything. And the friendships I've made down here, I would never exchange those for anything, even going on the bench. And for the enemies I might have made at times for being my cantankerous, fusty self as I can be, I know I've made friends of those along the way. I want to say that I will remember them all my life as friends and I want to thank each and every one of you for offering to me and I'm sure, to the rest of us who are leaving, the fine and wonderful opportunity and experience to be a part of this very, very pleasurable fraternity. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washburn has moved the adoption of the Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolutions are adopted. Similar Resolution for Judge Londrigan? Oh, we adopted... he's now legitimate. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed Bills of the following titles and the passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the



DEC 2 1976 110.

House of Representatives, to wit. Senate Bills #2037 and 2046.
Passed by the Senate December 2, 1976 by a three-fifths vote.
Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Senate Bills, First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2037, Madigan. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Illinois State Scholarship Commission. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2046, Byers. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections for the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schisler, do you have a motion? Is that correct?"

Schisler: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I move to override the Governor's item veto on House Bill 3389 on page 12, lines 1 through 6 and on page 12, lines 7 through 8. It would be for the new agricultural building at the state fairgrounds and... it's also for the durable, movable equipment that'll be in that building. And I move for the override."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bill 3389 on Supplemental Calendar #1. Any discussion? Representative Ryan."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Ryan: "Representative Schisler, how much money are we talking about?"

Schisler: "Oh, not very much, Representative Ryan, 7.8 million."

Ryan: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is shall the item on page 12, lines 1 through 6 and page 12, lines 7 through 8 of House Bill 3389 be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. 89 votes. Have all voted who wished? All voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? I've been advised that this is an item veto which requires 107 votes instead of the 89. And the question is shall the item on page 12, lines 1 through 7 and 7 through 8 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there's



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

39 'aye' and 52 'no'. The Gentlemen's motion fails. Adjournment Resolution. Who's moving it? Representative Tipword's moving it. The Adjournment Resolution. Well, we're not doing it yet, Representative Madigan."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 111. Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 79th General Assembly, the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, December 2, 1976, they stand adjourned until Tuesday, December 14, 1976, at four o'clock p.m."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipword."

Tipword: "Why am I called on, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "To move the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution."

Tipword: "Why, sir? I disagree with it. I think we ought to stay here. I'll move the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution despite the fact that I think we ought to stay here and work."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Resolution is adopted. Representative... are there more Resolutions? Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan... Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, before you go to Agreed Resolutions, a point of information. There seems to be some discrepancy as to whether or not we have to sign a little yellow form for mileage for this Session and I wonder if you could straighten that out for us."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, the problem arose because we used to take from a printed form and show everybody entitled to mileage and through inadvertence, some people were shown that they were entitled to mileage when in point of fact, they weren't in attendance at that time. And to spare them and the House and the Comptroller and everybody the embarrassment, it was suggested that the Member affirmatively indicate he was entitled to mileage."

Madison: "Are you saying then that we must sign this yellow slip before we leave in order to be entitled to it?"



Speaker Redmond: "Well, I've been advised by the War Department that the answer is 'no'."

Madison: "The answer is 'no'. We do not have to sign."

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct."

Madison: "Since we didn't get the pay raise, I wouldn't want us to miss the mileage, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I don't want to go into any great detail as to why it was decided that it was a very advisable thing, but we had gremlins once in a while, they threw switches and sometimes we had people shown as voting on measures which embarrassed them."

Madison: "Well, if you say it's not necessary, Mr. Speaker, that's certainly..."

Speaker Redmond: "I just saying that that's the reason for the thing, to avoid embarrassment of somebody being shown as having voted on something when in point of fact, they weren't even here."

Madison: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1045, Kempiners. House Resolution 1048, Mulcahey. House Resolution 1049, Mann. House Resolution 1050, Holewinski."

Speaker Redmond: "Would you read House Resolution 1049, Representative Mann. For Representative Mann, we call on him. He wanted it read, I understand. 1049."

Mann: "Yes, if you don't mind, Mr. Speaker, and it's not too long."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1049. Whereas, the heroic actions of Russel Ewing, a WMAQ-TV and NBC news reporter in Chicago, on Tuesday, November 30, 1976, resulted in saving the lives of two hostages and the peaceful surrender of two gunmen to police; and Whereas, following the armed robbery of the currency exchange at 51st and Halsted Street which was interrupted by police, the gunmen were both wounded in an exchange of gunfire with police and after seizing two hostages from the currency exchange fled next door to an apartment; and Whereas, during the siege of the apartment, where unknown to the gunmen the tenant lay hidden on a shelf of a bedroom closet, there was talk of



murdering the hostages and committing suicide; and Whereas, the police, under Captain John Haberkörn, Deering District Commander, attempted to negotiate a surrender but refused the gunmen's demands for freedom in exchange for the release of the hostages; and Whereas, the gunmen asked to talk with Mr. Russel Ewing, who came to the scene from his own home and entered the tension-filled apartment where he remained for three hours talking to the wounded and desperate men, finally persuading them to lay down their pistols and surrender peacefully; therefore, be it Resolved, by the House of Representatives, the 79th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that we express our sincere appreciation to Mr. Russel Ewing for negotiating the release of the hostages and the surrender of the gunmen at 51st and Halsted, which resulted in saving the lives of five, and perhaps more, persons, all at great risk to himself, and that in an era often marked by citizen apathy we commend his deeds on November 30th as a model of personal sacrifice and dedicated involvement in his community; and be it further Resolved, that a suitable copy of this preamble and Resolution be presented to Mr. Russel Ewing of Chicago."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, if all the Members of the House care to join in the sponsorship of this Resolution, why, I'm sure that would be a deeply appreciated and revered act by Mr. Ewing."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I don't want to interrupt that leadership caucus over in the Republican side of the aisle, but House Resolution 1045 by Kempiners commends the retirement of Will County Coroner, Willard Blood. House Resolution 1048, Mulcahey, congratulates the Durand Football Team. House Resolution 1050, Holewinski, congratulates the Honorable Althea Kroger on becoming a Representative in the Vermont House. I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Is leave granted for all Members to be added to 1049? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor indicate by saying



'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolutions are adopted. Death Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1046, Satterthwaite. Respect to the memory of Mr. Finfgeld. House Resolution 1047, Terzich. Respect to the memory of Walter Watroba."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, may I have House Resolution 1047. I think it would be very appropriate."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will read it, please."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1047. Whereas, Members of the House were saddened to learn of the tragic death of firefighter Walter Watroba in the line of duty on November 22, 1976; and Whereas, Mr. Watroba had been a member of the Chicago Fire Department since 1969, assigned to Engine Company 13, located at 219 South Dearborn Street; and Whereas, at approximately 9:00 o'clock in the evening of November 21, 1976, Engine Company 13 was dispatched to the Commonwealth Edison installation at 1111 West Cermak where a fire, which ultimately caused property damage estimated at \$8,000,000, raged out of control; and Whereas, the fire had started in the underground coal conveyor tunnel, extending from the coal storage bin on Troop Street to a distance of some three blocks to the turbine building, and had spread into the turbine building by way of the conveyor belt carrying coal from the tunnel to the roof of the building; and Whereas, with his characteristic dedication to duty, Walter Watroba was on the roof of the turbine building valiantly fighting the fire beneath the coal conveyor belt when the conveyor suddenly collapsed, and Mr. Watroba was pinioned on the blazing roof; and Whereas, for eight desperate hours Chicago Fire Department personnel, including other firefighters, a medical doctor and a paramedic, struggled ceaselessly in an heroic rescue operation which eventually culminated in the early morning of November 22, 1976 in the extrication of Mr. Watroba from the fiery trap, while other firefighters continued to battle the inferno raging inside the turbine building and coal conveyor tunnel; and Whereas the fireman Walter Watroba died the same



day as a result of his long and painful ordeal; and Whereas, Mr. Watroba leaves a proud heritage to mourn his passage, in the persons of his wife and three children; therefore, be it Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the 79th General Assembly, the State of Illinois, that we express our profound sorrow upon the tragic death of the brave and dedicated firefighter, Walter Watroba, who gave up his life in behalf of his fellowman; that we extend our heartfelt sympathy to members of his bereaved family who have suffered the loss of a devoted husband and father; and that a suitable copy of this preamble and Resolution be forwarded to his wife, Mrs. Walter Watroba."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Walter Watroba was a young man of 41 years old. And Walter happened to also be in the same battalion of which I'm associated with Engine Company 42 and this was one of the largest fires the City of Chicago had. And I've known Walter for approximately six years and even though his acts were something that a firefighter is exposed to every day, Walter was a gentleman, well respected by his fellow firefighters who stayed up on that roof while the fire was blazing out of control. And unfortunately, he was at the wrong place at the wrong time. When that conveyor collapsed and he was trapped by steel beams, he was trapped for approximately eight hours and there was a frantic, desperate try to free Walter. And in conclusion, the first thing that Walter happened to say when he was trapped is how was his buddies on the roof that were fighting the fire with him. At that time while he stayed there, he was up in the air approximately 80 feet. A dramatic attempt was to free Walter and subsequently, they had to amputate his leg to free him. And an hour after this amputation occurred, Walter passed away. And he was a hell of a firefighter and this is a fine tribute to him. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of the Resolution 1047. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution's adopted. Anything further,



Mr. Clerk? Any further Resolutions? Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, could we ask the Clerk to read House Resolution 1046 which is a Resolution for a former Member of the House?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1046. Whereas, this House was deeply saddened to learn of the passing of Edward Mulliken Finfgeld, the distinguished former mayor of Arcola and a former Member of this House of Representatives; and Whereas, the tragic accident which claimed Edward Finfgeld's life ended a lifetime of worthy contribution of this state and to his community, during which, in addition to 18 years in public office, Mr. Finfgeld served as president of the Arcola Chamber of Commerce and as a respected member of the Masonic Lodge and Arcola Christian Church; and Whereas, a native of Arcola, Mr. Finfgeld was a graduate of local schools and the University of Illinois, and for many years owned and successfully managed a shoe store in Arcola which had been founded by his grandfather more than a century before; and Whereas, he leaves a proud heritage to mourn his passing in the persons of his wife, Jane, a daughter, Mrs. William Simpkins, a grandson and his brother, Charles; therefore, be it Resolved, by the House of Representatives, the 79th General Assembly, the State of Illinois, that we express our profound sorrow on the passing of Edward Mulliken Finfgeld; that we extend our sincere condolences to his bereaved family, and that a suitable copy of this preamble and Resolution be forwarded to Mrs. Finfgeld."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Mr. Finfgeld lives in Arcola... lived in Arcola which is a part of my district now. When he served in this House, it was a different district. But I think it is a tribute to him and to his family to realize that a man from a small, rural community could be known and respected enough to be able to build up support to run for an office as large as a legislative office and be successful at it. We were saddened to learn in newspaper articles



DEC 2 1976 117.

of a fire in his home that took his life and I felt that we ought to recognize his passing here and ask that the other Members of the House might join me in Cosponsorship of this Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Is leave granted to have all the Members names added as Sponsors? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. Representative Satterthwaite has moved the adoption of the Death Resolution. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Resolution's adopted. Anything further, Mr. Clerk? Representative Macdonald has moved that we stand in Perfunctory Session to permit reading in some Messages from the Senate and that we then adjourn to December the 14th at four o'clock. All in favor of Representative Macdonald's motion indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. We're in recess for perfunct and then adjourn and may I call your attention to the fact that we have finished eight hours early."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has accepted the Governor's specific recommendations for change which are attached to Bills of the following title, the acceptance of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House, to wit. Senate Bills # 1679, 1945, and 2015. I'm further directed to transmit to the House of Representatives a copy of the Governor's specific recommendations for change. Action taken by the Senate, December 1, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed a Bill of the following title, the Governor's specific recommendations for change to the contrary notwithstanding, and the passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit. Senate Bill 2010 and Senate Bill 2011. I'm further directed to transmit to the House of Representatives a copy of the Governor's specific recommendation for change. Passed by the Senate by a three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

DEC 2 1976 118.

A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed a Bill of the following title, the veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding and the passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House, to wit. Senate Bill 1676. 1750 and 1791. I'm further directed to transmit to the House of Representatives the Governor's veto message to the Senate. Passed by the Senate by a three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has restored items reduced by the Governor which are attached in a Bill of the following title and restoration of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House, to wit. Senate Bills #1628, 1742, 1932, 1936, and 1650. I'm further directed to transmit to the House of Representatives the Governor's item reduction message to the Senate. Action taken by the Senate. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. That's action taken by the Senate by a three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has restored the items reduced by the Governor which are attached and the Bill of the following titles and the restoration of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House, to wit. Senate Bill 1742, 1637, 1935, 1650, 1646, 1627, 1744, 1646, 1606, 1626, and 1623. I'm further directed to transmit to the House of Representatives a copy of the Governor's item reduction message to the Senate. Action taken by the Senate. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has restored items reduced by the Governor which are attached and the Bill of the following title and the restoration of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House, to wit. Senate Bill 1935. I'm further directed to transmit to the House of Representatives a copy of the Governor's item reduction message to the Senate. Action



taken by the Senate December 2, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. House stands in recess until call of the Chair. The House will be in Perfunctory Session. Messages from the Senate. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed a Bill of the following title. Passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit. Senate Bill 2045. Passed by the Senate December 2, 1976 by a three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Senate Bills, First Reading. Senate Bill 2045, Tipsword. A Bill for an Act to amend the Coal Mining Act. First Reading of the Bill. No further business. The House does now stand adjourned."

