

Doorkeeper Koehler: "Attention, Members of the House of Representatives, the House will convene in fifteen minutes.

Attention, Members of the House of Representatives, the House will convene in five minutes. 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. Be led in prayer by the Reverend Krueger, the House Chaplain."

Reverend Krueger: "In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Amen. O Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. Albert Einstein once wrote to a friend, 'Try not to become a man of success, but rather try to become a man of value'. Let us pray. Almighty God, Invincible Creator of the Universe and Author of all things, past, present and to come, we express our gratitude for all the blessings which Thou hast bestowed upon us in our generation. We ask Thee this day for strength and courage to make proper use of Thy gifts to us. As Members of this Illinois House of Representatives help us to realize Thy care and concern in all that we do that we may effect in the hearts of all men an understanding of Thy Divine purpose. Through Christ our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Representative Geo-Karis is in the chamber. Introduction and First Reading. Constitutional Amendment."

Clerk Hall: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #38. Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 80th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein. There is to be submitted to the electorate of this state for adoption or rejection at the General Election next occurring at least six months after the adoption of this Resolution, a proposition to amend Section 4, Article IV of the Constitution to read as follows: Article IV. Revenue. Section 4, Real Property Taxation. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this Section, taxes upon real property shall be levied uniformly by valuation ascertained as the General Assembly shall provide by



law.

(b) Subject to such limitations as the General Assembly may hereafter prescribe by law, counties with a population of more than 200,000 may classify or continue to classify real property for purposes of taxation. Any such classification shall be reasonable and assessments shall be uniform within each class. The level of assessment or rate of tax of the highest class in a county shall not exceed two and one-half times the level of assessment or rate of tax of the lowest class in that county. Real property used in farming in a county shall not be assessed at a higher level of assessment than single family residential real property in that county.

(c) Any depreciation in the value of real estate occasioned by a public easement may be deducted in assessing such property.

(d) Any home rule municipality may provide a growth incentive by designating certain specific areas within its boundaries to be taxed on the basis of site value, without regard to the value of improvements. Immediately after the designation of such an area, each taxing district involved shall fix its tax rate on improvements in the designated area at zero and fix its tax rate on land in the designated area equal to the product of the real property tax rate of the taxing district times a conversion factor, which will thereafter remain constant, equal to the ratio of the aggregate assessed value of all taxable real property in the designated area designated divided by the aggregate assessed value of all taxable land in the designated area. Taxation of designated areas under this option shall continue for 12 years, but may be extended without limit as long as any such extensions are for no less than 12 year periods. First Reading of the Constitutional Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peggy Smith Martin. Told us she was here. Representative Tipword moves that the Regular Session in recess until the call of the chair. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion carries.



Speaker Redmond: "The First Special Session will come to order.

Representative Tipsword moves that the Roll Call of the Regular Session be used as a Roll Call for the First Special Session. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion carries and the Roll Call will be used. Anything else, Mr. Clerk, of the First Special Session? Representative Tipsword moves that the First Special Session stand in recess until the Adjournment of the....to the call of the chair."

Speaker Redmond: "The hour of 12:20 having arrived the Second Special Session comes to order. Representative Tipsword moves that the Roll Call of the Regular Session be used as a Roll Call of the Second Special Session. All in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. The Roll Call of the Regular Session will be used as the Roll Call of the Second Special Session. Anything else, Mr. Clerk? Representative Tipsword moves that the Second Special Session stand in recess to the call of the chair. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. Second Special Session stand in recess till the call of the chair.

Speaker Redmond: "The Regular Session is back in order. Introduction, First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill....House Bill 2533. Macdonald. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to revise the law in relation to counties. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh is in the chamber.....Geo-Karis.Geo-Karis. Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, I have heard all kinds of wild rumors today that we might be back Monday instead of Tuesday and Wednesday. Could you please elaborate on those....."

Speaker Redmond: "I'll be very happy to advise you that the Adjournment



Resolution, when it's adopted, will indicate when we're returning. And if you stay in place until we adopt the Adjournment Resolution that you have as much knowledge about that as anybody in the chamber."

Geo-Karis: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I have been staying in my place, you've been putting me in my place and I don't mind really. But the only thing that bothers me is that I have to make certain plans and arrangements because according to your last edict that you issued, a copy which I received so graciously from you in the mail, it says that we will be in Tuesday and Wednesday of next week. I...that's all right with me but if it's Monday and Tuesday and Wednesday it plays a little havoc on my schedule. That's all, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I think that schedule said that was tentative. And I think one of the curses of this whole thing is that since we've got our salaries up at such munificent figures that we have all decided we're going to be fulltime Legislators. So I have difficulty in restraining, they are many people who want to be in Session this coming Thursday. And I don't really want to do that but we may have to if 89 Members decide that that's what we should do."

Geo-Karis: "So I don't mind being here Tuesday and Wednesday because I want to sing you happy birthday. You're going to need it till we get through with you Wednesday."

Speaker Redmond: "I understand that's Yom Kippur. Committee Report."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Chapman, Chairman of the Committee on Human Resources to which the following Bill was referred. Action taken November 16, 1977, reported the same back with the following recommendation: do pass House Bill 2506."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendatory Motion Vetoes. On the Calendar Amendatory Motion Vetoes and a motion to accept the Governor's changes, Senate Bill 23. Representative Emil Jones, Senate Bill 40. Representative Telcser. Representative Telcser, do you want to call Senate Bill 40 on Amendatory Veto Motion? Representative Telcser."



Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave of the House, all of these Bills 40 through 60, I think, deal with the Condominium Act which we passed during the Session on one Roll Call. The Governor's Amendatory Veto was similar on every single one of the Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have no objections to that except I would like to have Senate Bill 60 taken out of the leave and have that one voted separately. So it'd be actually Senate Bills 40 to 59."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser, do you realize that the motions that you filed were 40 through 51, 53, 54 and 56. Is that correct?"

Telcser: "What about...."

Speaker Redmond: "56 through 60."

Telcser: "Yeah, through 60, right."

Speaker Redmond: "And 60 is to be eliminated, is that right?"

Telcser: "...Right."

Speaker Redmond: "So then the Gentleman's motion with respect...with respect to Senate Bills 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 53, 54,.....51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58 and 59."

Telcser: "Right."

Speaker Redmond: "Is that correct? Does the Gentleman have leave to consider these motions all together? Hearing no objection leave is granted. Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in the Governor's Amendatory Veto relative to these Bills deals with one, the effective date... the Governor made the effective date on all Bills, January 1st. The Governor also specified that these Bills would not impair any existing contract or affect any condominiums whose separations already have been filed. Another of the changes was in Senate Bill 43 which dealt with escrow payments, what we said in the original Bill was that if the....closing was to take place a year after....the contract was signed the escrow wasn't necessary. We eliminated that provision and said that escrow has to be established on all deals unless the condominium was completely



finished and that buyers would be coming in and buying units that were ready to be occupied. Another change the Governor made was in Senate Bill, under liens, which was Senate Bill 40 of..... Senate Bill 55 provided that the developer has to give to the buyer an insurance policy guaranteeing that there be no liens on the buyer's apartment which they purchased. And also said that after conveyance of title, liens could not be encumbrances on the apartment which an individual buys. Mr. Speaker, I believe that that covers the Amendatory Veto from the Governor's Office on these Bills. And I now move, Mr. Speaker, the House do adopt the Governor's Amendatory Veto relative to these Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bills...Senate Bills 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 56, 57, 58 and 59. All those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 147 'aye' and no 'nay' and the motion having received three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation. You want to call 60, Representative Telcser, individually? Senate Bill 60."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 60 deals with the home rule question. When these Bills were first introduced home rule units were reluctant to support the Bills because they felt that they wanted to be sure that they would preserve their home rule powers in relation to regulating condominiums. Senator Merlo introduced Senate Bill 60 which as I, my recollection is, which provided that home rule units could act in the area of condominium legislation providing that their ordinances would be more stringent or more restrictive, if that's the right word, regarding condominiums. But they could not, they could not, they could not act to dilute the effect of the state law. And that is the essence of what Senate Bill 60 was. What the Governor did in his Amendatory Veto is to take out that language. The Governor did not put in the Amendatory Veto that home rule....



he did not make the Amendatory Veto such that would take away your preempt home rule powers but the Governor, in my opinion, just left it the way it was before. No home rule...home rule provision whatsoever is now in Senate Bill 60. It is my opinion that the courts may have to someday decide if a...whether or not a home rule unit could enact into ordinance. I think perhaps they still could, in my opinion. But there are those who look at this question from both sides. However, the Governor's Amendatory Veto does not have language to prevent home rule units from enacting their own ordinances. And so, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe Senate Bill 60 jeopardizes home rule unit's power, that's my personal opinion, but that may be for others to decide. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do adopt the Governor's Amendatory Veto relative to Senate Bill 60."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Lechowicz: "Representative Telcser, is it true that whatever powers home rule units have over condominiums are not impaired by this Bill or by the Amendatory Veto?"

Telcser: "That...that's the opinion I have from our staff."

Lechowicz: "That it does not impair the home rule powers?"

Telcser: "That is our staff's opinion. Correct."

Lechowicz: "Is it your opinion as well?"

Telcser: "Based upon what the staff tells me, I'm not a lawyer, Ted, I...I'm depending on my staff people."

Lechowicz: "Then your answer is 'yes' then?"

Telcser: "I would say 'yes' based on what the staff tells me."

Lechowicz: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 60 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor indicate by voting 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 148 'aye' and no 'nay' and



our motion having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation. Representative Lucco, for what purpose do you arise?"

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Seated in the balcony are a group of students from the high school from which one of our Representatives, Representative Brummer, is graduated. These are students of Teutopolis High School and they have with them their teacher, Mr. Henry, and the Representatives from this district besides Representative Brummer are Bob Walsh and Roscoe Cunningham. Welcome you students from Teutopolis."

Speaker Redmond: "Senate Bill 66, Representative Skinner. Representative Skinner, 66. You're up to it."

Skinner: "It's a real tuffy but I feel up to it. Apparently when we passed this Bill which is attempting to give news...local newspapers thirty days, or local government thirty days in which to publish ordinances in local newspapers, on one line it said ten instead of thirty. Somebody blew it someplace. All the Governor's Amendatory Veto does is change that ten to a thirty. I would ask for your concurrence with the Governor's nitpickers."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 66 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 150 'aye' and 1 'no'. Motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 66 by adoption of the Amendment."

Skinner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Senate Bill 110. Representative Terzich. Terzich, 110."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 110 was part of the dilatory language based on sex Bills. And what it was is the Governor recommended that Amendments 2 and 3 and 6.22 of the Election Code shall be included in Senate Bill 110



because these Sections were already amended in regard to prohibit discrimination on account of sex by House Bill 667 which became law in September 14, 1977. And so with these specific changes Senate Bill 110 will have the Governor's approval and I move that we adopt the Governor's Amendatory Veto."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's....Representative Darrow, pardon me."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield? Under this legislation would the Democrats be able to elect the delegates to their miniconvention during this upcoming March Primary?"

Terzich: "I...I would assume so, Representative, this...he already signed the Bill, House Bill 667, which already did this and this simply would include in this one."

Darrow: "But the Bill as it is now has no effective date?"

Terzich: "No. Yeah, well here, it says that House Bill 667 which became law September 14, 1977, with the Governor's approval. I don't...I don't believe so, I don't believe there's an effective date on the Bill."

Darrow: "I have no further questions, thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? Mr. Terzich, you wish to close?"

Terzich: "Oh, I just move adoption of the Governor's Veto Message."

Speaker Bradley: "...Tape difficulty.... Well, the question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 110? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'.(Tape)....Have all voted who wish? Have voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. This question we have 154 'ayes', 1 'nay', none voting 'present'. And this motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding Senate Bill 110 by the adoption of the Amendment. Senate Bill 280. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 280 is a Bill that provided that nonresidents, 65 years and over would be charged the same fees for hunting, fishing or camping privileges as their states charge Illinois senior citizens.



The Governor applied the Amendatory Veto with regard the campsite fees. It is his claim that because of the complicated fee structures in the various states that we could not implement that part of the Bill. And I'll take his word for it. I...I therefore move to accept these specific recommendations of the Governor as pertained in his Amendatory Veto, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I presume that the...if the Gentleman... maybe the Gentleman could tell us, is this very similar to the language that was in the Bill that Representative Dunn and I sponsored with regard to senior citizens camping that if the other state did not give senior citizens free camping privileges that then they would be charged when they came to Illinois?"

Matijevich: "No, what the Governor's Amendatory Veto did, he took out the reciprocity as to camping but left it in as to hunting... hunting and fishing. That's your Governor, Cal."

Skinner: "He didn't...he didn't cut senior citizens out of weekend camping privileges in this thing, did he?"

Matijevich: "No."

Skinner: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Yes, a question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he'll yield."

Schuneman: "Representative, my question runs along the same line. I've had complaints from people in my district about campers from other states coming into Illinois and practically living in our state, moving from one free campground to another. Do I understand now that the Governor's Veto continues to make that possible? That... that campers from other states, if they are senior citizens, can continue to camp in Illinois parks without fee?"

Matijevich: "According to the Bill as I read it, the Bill would permit nonresidents to camp at the lower camping fee while other states would continue to require Illinois residents to pay both the entry fee and the camping fee."

Schuneman: "Okay. So in...in effect then the same situation will continue to prevail."



Matijevich: "That's right. And evidently there...there are two reasons for the Amendatory Veto. The...the financial burden and the administrative burdens that it...we would face if we did apply this to the campsite. I'm not too happy about that but I'll go along with the Governor."

Schuneman: "Okay, thank you."

Matijevich: "I might say also that I...I think this is in excess of the Governor's Amendatory Veto powers. I've always claimed that but we...we've done this right along. I...I've always been one who thinks that the Amendatory Veto power should be used strictly for matters pertaining to language et cetera and not to change law which this does and many others that we've been changing. I don't agree with it but everybody else is going along with it."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question please?"

Matijevich: "Yes, Representative...."

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Tipsword: "Representative Matijevich, if I understand this, the Governor's Message, correctly. If in what he's saying is that other states apply the entry fee against the camp fee and consequently lower the camp fee to local residents as well as to out of state people and so consequently when we just talk in this Bill about the camping fee, then really a lower fee would be applying to people in this state than they pay in their home state. Is that correct?"

Matijevich: "That's right."

Tipsword: "That's what he's talking about and I don't really understand how he's really correcting this with the Amendment nevertheless because I'm just like Representative Schuneman. I keep getting all of these complaints from Illinois residents that out of state residents are camping in Illinois at far lower fees than they pay at home and consequently they come over here and take up all the camping space and that residents in this state unless they are able to get out and stay the whole week so they can get the campsites just simply can't get into camp for a weekend, a three day weekend or anything like that, because they're all taken up



with nonresidents."

Matijevich: "The Governor, Representative Tipsword, only changed the law regarding nonresidents. And the part that is taken out reads thusly, 'Nonresidents of age 65 or more shall be charged the same fee for tents and trailer camping units as that charged Illinois residents of the same age but...state of which nonresident is a legal resident'."

Tipsword: "So we're just going to have the same situation we've had here...heretofore with regard to the....."

Matijevich: "Well, we...we still have within the Bill that no...no fee authorized by this Section shall be charged any resident of Illinois age 65 or more or any person who's buying et cetera, et cetera. In other words the, the law before we passed this Bill had read that the fees shall not be charged any person 65 or over but we changed that to resident. So there the...there is an improvement. However, I think the Amendatory Veto is not an improvement."

Tipsword: "I...I don't think the Bill then touches one of the problems that I've received...."

Matijevich: "I agree...."

Tipsword: "...I received is just not our senior citizens. It's our other camping people in this state who have to work during the week and can't get in on the weekends and on the long weekends because nonresidents are there taking up all the spaces 'cause they can stay all week. But I guess this doesn't touch that, does it?"

Matijevich: "No, it doesn't, Representative Tipsword, and I thought I made myself clear that I'm going along with the Governor because he claims that the administrative burdens would be such that it would be very difficult to implement this. I'll go along with him. I'm not sure of that but I'll go along with him."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think this discussion is much ado about nothing. I can't imagine that there will be many nonresidents, or that there are many nonresidents, that are attracted to our relatively inferior camp grounds. I would concurrence with the...or acceptance with the Governor's



Amendatory Veto."

Matijevich: "I think you're right about that."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion?. If not, Mr. Matijevich to close."

Matijevich: "I move to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall 280 or should the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 280 by adoption of the Amendment. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 156 'ayes', 2 'nays', none voting 'present'. This motion having received a Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding Senate Bill 280 by adoption of the Amendment. Senate Bill....what purpose does the Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich, arise?"

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to acknowledge the presence in the House today of my distinguished predecessor, Harold Stedlin."

Speaker Bradley: "Where's Harold? We note he's on the wrong side of the aisle though. Senate Bill 301. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to accept the Governor's recommended changes in Senate Bill 301. Senate Bill 301 requires the Department of Children and Family Services to create an individualized plan for any ward who cannot be served by an existing program. Now the Governor states that he does agree with the intent, specific intent, of this legislation but asks that we defer the effective date until July 1, 1978. He asked for that deferred period because he has a subcabinet team working on recommendations that deal with these individuals and they will be reporting back in January. The Commission on Children from which this legislation came and the Sponsors are all in agreement and I would move for accepting the Amendatory Veto."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 301 by adoption of the Amendment. All in favor



signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Tipsword, would you please push my button back there? Thank you....have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have a 162 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present'. The motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding Senate Bill 301 by adoption of the Amendment. On the Calendar appears Senate Bill 368. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 368 provides among other things for initial financing of a revolving account by a transfer of funds from the General Revenue Fund for the stage for the Board of Governors. The Governor made it...made the process in the technique of the transfer of that funds more clearly set out in the statute by an Amendatory Veto. And I think it's a sensible and good Amendatory Veto and I ask for that it be adopted."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 368 by the adoption of the Amendment? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. This question we have a 152 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present'. The motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding Senate Bill 368 by adoption of the Amendment. On the Calendar appears Senate Bill 421. Mr. Marovitz, the Gentleman from Cook."

Marovitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move that the House accept the recommendations of the Governor."

Speaker Bradley: "The....discussion? Discussion? Hearing none, the question...."

Unknown: "Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."



Schlickman: "Well, I think we're entitled to the courtesy of an explanation if he knows it."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Marovitz...wish to explain?"

Marovitz: "I sure will...in a minute. I think...I think that the Governor corrected a technical error in the Bill.'cause we had discussed this Bill with him and his people prior to introducing it, Senator Merlo, who introduced the Bill. And in discussions with...subsequent discussions with the Governor, Representative, he found a technical error in the Bill and it said...Representative Schlickman, I think it was..... The Amendment said that an insured cannot renew except for one more of the following reasons and had improper language in and that was the only thing that the Governor did that, corrected the...the technical language in a Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 421 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 155 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present'. And this motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding Senate Bill 421 by the adoption of the Amendment. For an announcement, the Gentleman from DuPage, at Mrs. Martin's desk the....Speaker Redmond."

Redmond: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, having stood on the rostrum ever since the first of January I realize that it was most unfortunate that the identification cards that were issued to Members of the General Assembly didn't contain the pictures."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, just a minute. We have some attention? Some order? Proceed, Mr....."

Redmond: "I say, it is having been on the rostrum since the early part of the Session I realize what a terrible thing it was that...that the pictures of the Members were not on the identification cards. So when the Secretary of State went to a new format for driver's license which included the pictures we made an arrangement with



the Secretary of State's Office to make new identification cards for the Members and we have the forms and everything are in the Speaker's Office if you'll go in there you'll...there'll be a little instruction there as to where you go to make your own arrangements to have your picture taken. And I think that not only you, the motion picture and posterity will be very happy that...that we have this. It's just another kind of service that the Speaker's Office is always willing to render to the Members."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion on the Speaker's motion? On the Calendar appears Senate Bill 526, Mr. Marovitz. Oh, I'm sorry. Pardon me, we'll back up...what purpose does the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman, arise?"

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Human Resources Committee met last night on the Senate Welfare Bill, Special Session to Senate Bill 1, and gave it such careful consideration that we were not able to finalize our action on this proposal. I ask that we suspend the appropriate Bill so that we may have a very brief meeting of the House Committee on Human Resources on Senate Bill 1 while the House is in Session."

Speaker Bradley: "Where will that meeting take place?"

Chapman: "In the Speaker's Office."

Speaker Bradley: "...Right. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "I certainly object, Mr. Speaker, that Bill was given extremely sterile consideration. It was defeated by a coalition of people that thought it was a welfare fraud loophole Bill and those who felt that the only people to provide Medicaid services to the poor are those that are crooks. It had adequate consideration. If the Members had not gone to work to...left early it certainly would have failed by a larger majority."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman."

Chapman: "For the information of the House on a do pass motion by Representative Keats and seconded by Representative Marovitz there were 11 voting 'yes', only two persons voting 'no' and three voting 'present'. This is a Committee of twenty-six Members and had a number of Members not had previous commitments there would



have been no difficulty at all in, I believe, in securing approval for this measure which we discussed for a period of over two hours with similar but not identical to Senate Bill 4 which this House approved by 170 votes last week."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to join Representative Skinner in expressing a strong and vehement objection to this request. As I understand it, the request is for one Committee to meet while the House is in Session. We had a very thorough discussion of that Bill. We had many Amendments considered, discussed and debated. There was plenty of opportunity to put phone calls out if somebody wanted to gather some votes. I...I thought that it was fairly considered and I must join in expressing a strong objection to this procedure which is unusual and which I think is unwarranted."

Speaker Bradley: "The...the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman, has moved the suspension of House Rule 22 so that she might call a meeting of that Human Resource Committee while the House is in Session. All in favor of the Lady's motion will signify by...will signify by voting 'aye' and opposed by voting 'no'. Will take 89 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman, to explain her vote."

Chapman: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, possibly I didn't make myself clear. What we are asking for is an opportunity for the full Committee to meet. There are 26 Members of this Committee and when we voted on this measure last night there were only 16 present. I'd like to ask for an opportunity for the full Committee to vote this Bill 'yes' or 'no' or 'present' or whatever the individual Member of this Committee desire. I would urge you to give the same fair kind of consideration for Senate Bill 1 that the Senate has provided for House Bill 4 which is sponsored by Representative Daniels and Representative Chapman."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, what purpose do you rise, Sir?"



Skinner: "Just to express my extreme displeasure at being forced to leave the House floor."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Deuster, the Gentleman from Lake, what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Deuster: "Well, I think this request is so unusual and I'm...so unnecessary that I hate on a day when a lots of Members are thinking of leaving and getting onto more important business to do this but I request a verification of that vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters, what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I don't know that you have announced the vote yet, if I might just explain it...my vote for a second? I am in concurrence with the request made by Representative Chapman not because I am necessarily in total agreement what's being proposed in the Committee but it is part of the effort on the part of the administration to meet the problems of welfare fraud and certainly also part of the effort on the part of the people in the Committee to reach some kind of agreement in regard to how we attack the problem of welfare fraud. So those Members, at least on this side of the aisle who are voting 'no', I would respectfully request that they consider the fact that the Bill under discussion is one of those Bills that is part of the Governor's package and should deserve a hearing in the Human Resource Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "The...Miss Macdonald, the Lady from Cook."

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

Speaker Bradley: "How is the Lady recorded?"

Macdonald: "Change my vote to 'aye' please."

Speaker Bradley: "Please have her recorded as voting 'aye'. The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I...I don't know...it seems like an unusual procedure here when we had a...a Committee meeting in which she said there's 26 Members and 16 of whom either voted 'aye' or 'no' or 'present' and they had a quorum. Now here we are, are we establishing a precedent here when we have some piece of legislation that did not



receive the necessary number of votes to...to get out of that Committee we're going to start having Committee meetings of all Committees leaving the House floor. How are we going to operate the House floor? It seems to me it's a very bad and dangerous precedent to be established and I think that the verification certainly is in order. I'm like Representative Deuster, I hate to see us take the time of the House but I think it's a poor move on the part of the motion, the Sponsor of this motion."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, the only reason I'm voting for this motion is because my ex-seatmate makes the motion. I don't like the procedure, I never have liked the procedure, Appropriations Committee used to do this and I thought it was wrong when they did it because I think you should never take the right of a person to be on the floor to vote on issues. I would...I would rather support this if we went into a ten minute recess for the purpose of the Human Resources Committee meeting and then I could be wholeheartedly for it. But actually I'm only voting for it because my ex-seatmate is making the motion."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Deuster, you persist in a...your request for a verification? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman, for what purpose..."

Chapman: "I request a poll of the absentees, please."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I like to be a loyal Republican and support my Governor although I think this is an abominable procedure and I do not want to be obstreperous and take up unduly the time of the House. If Representative Peters is telling me it's the Republican thing to do is to let Mrs. Chapman have her hearing on this Bill, fine, I'll go along with that. I think it's a horrible Bill. We went over it carefully. I can't imagine unless... could the Lady advise me, has the staff redrawn that Bill? Do we have a new....do we have some new Amendments or.... It's a good one now?"

Chapman: "It's a good Bill and we gave careful consideration and voted on 7 or 8 Amendments last night."

Deuster: "Well out of respect to the time of the House and my own



Leadership I'll withdraw my request...."

Speaker Bradley: "Thank you. We appreciate that. On this question there are 92 'ayes', 61 'nays' and 8 voting 'present'. And the motion prevails, the rule is suspended for a quick meeting of the Human Resources Committee. On the Calendar appears.... Mr. Katz, are you seeking attention? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, if I might make an announcement, I'm doing it at this point rather than later in the day so that everyone will be advised. There will be a meeting of the Rules Committee next Tuesday to consider Bills being handled by House Members that could...that are coming over from the Senate. If any Member in the House is handling a Senate Bill and would like a meeting of the Rules Committee at which to urge that it is an emergency matter, that person should proceed to the Speaker's Office and see Nancy Frisbee and fill out the necessary form. If it is not done by four o'clock today it will not be posted. So that everyone is advised and forewarned, that they have until four o'clock today to file the necessary motion for the advancement of Bills to the....be considered by the House next week, Senate Bills. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "We'd like to announce that that meeting of the Human Resources Committee is taking place right now in the Speaker's Office. On the Calendar under Senate Bills Amendatory Veto Motion appears 526, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz,"

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would move that the House do accept the Governor's recommendations in his Amendatory Veto. What this Amendatory Veto does is, it adds that where a cancellation is for nonpayment of premium, at least ten days' notice of cancellation should be given. This brings the Bill into conformity with other Senate Bills that we have passed in other Sections of the Insurance Code that we have passed so that there is no conflict and I would ask the Governor's recommendation for change be accepted."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding



Senate Bill 526? All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Joe McGah, would you push my green light there, please? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 150 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present'. And the... this motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding Senate Bill 526 by adoption of the motion. On the Calendar appears Senate Bill 598. The Lady from Adams, Mrs. Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Senate Bill 598, the Governor saw a technical defect. The word 'land' was not in the portion that was needed to be and that is the only correction in this Bill. I would approve his Amendatory Veto."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none the question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 598 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 145 'ayes', no 'nays' and the motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding Senate Bill 598 by adoption of the motion. On the Calendar appears Senate Bill 606, the Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This legislation authorizes the boards of school districts and community colleges to select sites for capital projects subject to the approval of the Capital Development Board and require that final payment for any project be approved by both the school district or the community college and CDB. The Governor amendatorily vetoed the second part of the Bill which requires the final payment for any project be approved by both the school district or the community college and CDB. I would move that we accept the Governor's amendatory changes."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The question is, shall the House accept



the Governor's specific recommendations for changes with respect to Senate Bill 606 by adoption of the Amendment. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question we have a 104 'ayes', 1 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. And this motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding Senate Bill 606 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 624, Senate Bill 624. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur with the Governor's Amendatory Veto to Senate Bill 624. It's a veto...it's an Amendatory Veto in terms of language. On page 2, line 4, it deletes the word 'pistol, revolver, shotgun' and inserts therein 'knife, explosive or firearm'. I concur with the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 624 by adoption of the Amendment. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 149 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present'. And the motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding Senate Bill 624 by adoption of the Amendment. On the Calendar appears Senate Bill 6, the Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. Luft. 708, I'm sorry, Mr. Luft."

Luft: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would move to concur with the Governor's Amendatory Veto of Senate Bill 708. The intention of the Bill was to prohibit the Department of Revenue from recovering monies, interest or penalties, in the event that a municipal utility failed to separately itemize its pass through on the Gas Revenue Tax to its customers. The Governor felt that the language in the Bill did not specifically do this and they just put in the language that they thought accomplished the intent of Senate Bill 708."



Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 708? All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have...have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 150 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 voting 'present'. And the motion, having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding Senate Bill 708 by adoption of the Amendment. Senate Bill 745, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I accept the Amendatory Veto on House Bill...Senate Bill 745, notwithstanding."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 745 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 149 'ayes', no 'nays', 2 voting 'present'. And this motion, having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding Senate Bill 745 by the adoption of the Amendment. On the Calendar appears Senate Bill 803, the Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I move to concur in the Governor's Amendatory Veto. This Bill originally gave the Auditor General the right to audit the Department of Revenue but develops that there's a problem involved if individual income tax returns are involved because we have an agreement with the Federal Government to use copies of the federal returns and this merely exempts income tax returns from the audit...Department of Revenue. So I move that we do concur in the Governor's Amendatory Veto."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The question is ...and the question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 803 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all



voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have a 151 'ayes', 1 'no', 1 voting 'present'. This motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding House... Senate Bill 803 by the adoption of the motion. On the Calendar appears Senate Bill 964....the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Laurino."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to nonconcur with the Governor's motion on the Amendatory Veto on Senate Bill 964....notwithstanding the Governor's motion."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Could we have an explanation of the Governor's Amendatory Veto and the reason for moving to nonaccept?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Speaker Redmond...yes, Miss Peggy...Peggy Martin, please."

Redmond: "Representative Laurino, I believe, has yielded to me and ...respond to that question. The Amendment was one that only affected the DuPage County Board of Election Commissions and it provided that the Amendment was put on in the House provided that the Election Commission could be abolished by referendum rather than by ordinance of the County Board. The Chairman of the DuPage County Board is in support of the override. I don't believe that there's any real significant opposition that came out of the Senate with 43 affirmative votes. And I encourage an override of the veto. It doesn't involve the state government, it doesn't involve any money, it only concerns our county and... the Chairman of the County Board....in favor of it."

Schlickman: "Would the Speaker yield?"

Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "Would you explain the Amendment that you object to? Oh, that you want to support and that the Governor....."

Redmond: "The Amend...there was an Amendment put on that provided to abolish the County Board of Election Commissions, that it would be done by a referendum of the people. And I believe that there was a slip up in signals and for some reason or other the Governor's office excised that part of it from the Bill. And I don't know



of any significant opposition to overriding the Governor's Veto....only our...."

Schlickman: "The Governor says, doesn't he, that...pardon me, doesn't the Governor say that if we create it then we should be the ones to abolish it and not delegate that authority to a county board?"

Redmond: "If...no, I don't know. We don't create the county board, it's created in two ways. It's created by ordinance of the County Board or by referendum of the people and it provides that when the County Board or when an Election Commission has been created and has been in existence for any period of time that then in order to abolish it, a referendum of the people is required. And I...you'll just have to take my word for it that I think there was a mixup in the signals that resulted in the Governor's Veto."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "I wonder if the Gentleman would take this out of the record so we can look into just exactly what it does, it...it...oh, he'd be glad to do that."

Redmond: "You know, I tell you what the Amendment that was taken out, it provides to abolish the County Board of Elections Commission; that you have to do it by referendum, that's all it does."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What Speaker Redmond has said is completely accurate. Right now under the existing law, there is two ways that a County Board of Elections can be abolished. One is by referendum and the other is by ordinance of the County Board. And what this Bill does is take out the provision that would allow ... for the County Board to do so by ordinance so that's it's done by the voters in that area. There's only one County Board of Election Commissioners, that's in DuPage County, and I see no harm whatsoever in supporting of the Speaker's motion to override in this case. And I certainly would do so myself."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, we...the language in the Bill that we passed out of here and sent to the Governor. The Governor simply took it out. We've already seen the active language, voted on it



once before. I think the Gentlemen who are opposing it voted on it before. I would urge them to approve it again by voting to override. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMasters."

McMaster: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, ordinarily if a county board or legislative body has the power to create by ordinance, it also follows that they have the right to abolish by ordinance. Is that not so in most cases?"

Redmond: "I don't think that's true in every case. This is the creation of the Board of Election Commissions - and I may say that the original Bill authorizes the creation of the Board of the Election Commissions was sponsored by Senator 'Pate' Phillips and myself - and a Special Session of the General Assembly was called by Speaker Blair and President of the Senate Bill Harris. So there was complete accord for the only county that had an Election Commission at the time of the creation and the County Board did by ordinance create it. And it's been in existence two or three years now and I don't know whether it's customary. The Chairman of the Board is in favor of overriding this veto. You just have to take my word for it that there was some kind of a mixup in the signals on it has resulted in the Governor's veto in the first place. So it doesn't affect anyone other than DuPage County."

McMaster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I certainly respect the right of the electorate to abolish by referendum and so I'm not going to oppose your Bill. But ordinarily if the power to create is given by ordinance the power to abolish is also given. If such a thing is aborted, the Election Commissioners or whatever board it might be, is created by referendum then, of course, to abolish would have to be by referendum. But in this case, Mr. Speaker, I will support you...motion since it is a referendum of the people."



Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just had this thing explained to me and as the Speaker had said, DuPage County is the only place that's affected. I have part of DuPage County in my District and contrary to the thinking of other people who had spoken and think this is a good idea, that is, to support the motion to override, I think it is not. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the County Board ought to have the authority to abolish this Election Commission. They, indeed, created it. They should have the authority to abolish it. I don't...I don't understand for the life of me how anybody would feel that a matter like this should be submitted to the electorate. The electorate really doesn't give a damn about Election Commissions. They have no knowledge of it. They'd have no information on it and they wouldn't about to be educated in it. There's no reason on earth in my view why the county board if they establish an Election Commission should not have the authority to abolish it. What the Speaker suggests is that that should not be the case and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Speaker Redmond to close the debate."

Redmond: "Well, I, again, reiterate my position that I think that the ...that the Governor's veto was inadvertent. I think it should be overridden and I've been advised by the Parliamentarian who is more expert in Election Commissions than I am that the Municipal Commissions are abolished by referendum only. So this will bring it into conformity and meet the requirement of uniform election laws throughout the state. And I urge your support."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 964 pass notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendation for change? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Laurino, to explain his vote."

Laurino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In response to some of the questions that were provided ...all this does is bring the County Board of Election Commissioner



into conformity with the same reasoning that we have with the Municipal Board of Election Commissioners and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted...who wish? Mrs. Dyer, do you wish to explain your vote?"

Dyer: "It isn't necessary, thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 137 'ayes', 7 'nays', 8 voting 'present'. And the motion, having received three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails. Senate Bill 964 is declared passed notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendation for change. On the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1129, the Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to accept the Governor's specific recommendation for four changes in the...Senate Bill 1129. Three of the changes are technical in nature and for clarification purposes, the fourth is for making an immediate effective date. So I would ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 1129 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question, 153 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present'. And the motion, having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor'sbeg pardon, the Constitutional...having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding House Bill... Senate Bill 1129 by the adoption of the Amendment. Senate Bill 1208, the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Macdonald. ... What purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dan Houlihan, arise?"

Houlihan, D: "To request if Representative Macdonald could take this out of the record for just a moment, we have a question here from the staff, if we can..... Thank you."



Speaker Bradley: "She graciously accedes to your request and takes it out of the record. On the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1298, the Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. Luft."

Luft: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move to accept the Governor's specific recommendations for changes in Senate Bill 1298. They are technical in nature and eliminates the requirement for information in the budget that is impossible to get for past fiscal years."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 1298? All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Danny. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. This question, we have 154 'ayes', 1 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. This motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding Senate Bill 1298 by the adoption of the Amendment. Senate Bill 1308, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1308 establishes the cost-related reimbursement system of payment by the Department of Public Aid in determining standards and rates of payment for skilled nursing and intermediate care facilities. The Governor made two substantive changes. A couple of these items were controversial as it was passed off the floor in the first place. But in his recommended changes, in the definition of profit the following language was renewed. 'The amount shall be sufficient to attract the needed capital for expansion of nursing homes industry deemed necessary by the appropriate planning agency and to maintain the general financial integrity of the industry'. The nursing homes can still make a profit but ^{it} is not the state's duty to guarantee that they do so. The other major change that he made was under the standards of payment, the Department of Public Aid the following provision was removed. 'The Department of Public Aid shall develop standards of payment which shall provide for a payment rate which does not result in the subsidizing of a cost of care of medical



assistance recipients by non...by nonrecipient patients. Actually, the Department of Public Aid is to prospectively establish rates, annually based on data and budgets submitted by the nursing home. And this also has to be approved by HEW before it can go into effect, and of course as you know, it's mandated on January the 1st 1978. And I would move that the House concur with the Senate in the acceptance of the Governor's specific recommendation....hello...."

Speaker Bradley: "The...the Gentleman...Mr. Campbell...all right...

Stand at ease....we'll stand at ease....Is this on? We'll stand at ...we'll stand at ease for a second until we get the paper in the ...in the machine here so we can take the Roll Call. The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 1308 by adoption of the Amendment. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 142 'ayes', 3 'nays', 3 voting 'present'. This motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding Bill...Senate Bill 1308 by the adoption of the Amendment. On...we can move ahead, we're having technical difficulties but we can move ahead...On the Calendar appears Senate Bill 203, the Gentleman from DuPage, Speaker Redmond, at Mrs. Macdonald's desk."

Redmond: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 203 provides for the levy of a real estate tax for county purposes, general county purposes. It passed out of here and passed out of the Senate with an adequate majority and the Governor made a technical Amendment that would remove some of administration problem employees by the original language of the Bill and therefore I move to accept the Governor's recommendation...."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion?...."

Redmond: "Senate Bill 203."

Speaker Bradley: "20...well, I'll tell you what, we've got a little... we'll have some discussion on there if there is any, we're....got the paper jammed up in the machine, so while we're waiting to get that taken care of and straightened out, the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."



Skinner: "Would the...would the...would the....want to try again? I wonder if the Sponsor would confirm for me that this is a...a property tax increase Bill without a referendum. Is that correct?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr....what was the inquiry?"

Skinner: "Is this not a property tax increase without a referendum?"

Redmond: "That is correct."

Skinner: "What...excuse me, I thought you said that is correct."

Redmond: "Your inquiry, it is....is an increase without a referendum."

Skinner: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? We'll stand at ease for a minute or two until we get the machinery working. The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House...to Senate Bill 203 by adoption of Amendment? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. This question, we have a 108...108 'ayes', 35 'nays', 8 voting 'present'. This motion...this motion having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding Senate Bill 203 by the adoption of the Amendment. Now on the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1208, the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that we do accept the Governor's recommendation on House Bill 1208. The recommendation is that the House Amendment was not germane to the original Bill. The original Bill provides for procedures in consolidation of dual districts in allowing those voting in a referendum affected in whole in part to vote on the issue and also sets up other procedures. The Amendment that is deemed to be germane is an Amendment that allows handicapped children to be in private or special ed facilities. where those facilities are not provided for in public schools. The Governor said that that Amendment is not germane and I would concur with that evaluation. I urge your vote on this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow,"

Darrow: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm going to support this legislation, if we don't, we aren't going



to have a Bill but I would like to point out that the Governor amendatorily vetoed this Bill, this Amendment, stating that it was not germane. I'd further point out that the original Bill dealt with the School Code, and the Amendment also dealt with the School Code. And it's very clear that when the Bill dealt with the School Code that opened the entire area for Amendments dealing with that School Code. Now the law in germaneness is clear. The Governor is wrong here. The Presidents in the Senate in the past have ruled along the same lines as have the Speakers of the House of Representatives. On the evening when the Speaker of the House of Representatives ruled on the germaneness of Class X he was correct and proper and at that time it was evident that our Governor did not know what the meaning of germaneness was. This Bill and this Amendatory Veto further shows us that our Governor did not understand germaneness when we discussed X Felony Bills and he didn't understand it now. But I would suggest an 'aye' vote in this matter so that at least we felt...have this Bill and we have some legislation in this area."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I concur with the nonpolitical part of what the previous speaker has stated. The Bill is needed for its original intent, so is the amendatory language very much needed. We must make very clear that we do need private school education for handicapped children where public schools cannot perform the service directly. I will support the motion to accept the Amendatory Veto but only with deep regret because I recognize the need for the original part of the Bill, and only for that reason."

Speaker Bradley: "The TV light is on. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, will the Lady yield? Will she yield?"

Macdonald: "Yes."

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, she indicates she will."

Kempiners: "Is the intent of the Bill, as it was presented, in the case of a consolidation of several districts that everybody affected, for example...let me give you an example, my home area, Joliet Township High School District - if the Minooka School District wanted to



create a unit district, would the...all of the local units...the elementary units in the Joliet Township High School District be voting on this Bill and would they be able to prohibit Channahon, for example, from going with Minooka if they so desire?"

Macdonald: "Mr. Kempiners, that is correct. All people affected in whole or in part by the consolidation of dual districts and dual unit districts will be allowed to vote on the referendum."

Kempiners: "So that people will be able to prevent other people from choosing the school districts of their choice?"

Macdonald: "That is true. If you remember, Mr. Kempiners, we also passed out - and it has been passed into law-- House Bill 434 which does essentially the same thing that this Bill does."

Kempiners: "Thank you. I voted against that one too."

Macdonald: "I would also like to answer Representative Pullen. In Section 14-702 & 703 in the Statutes, we already do provide for these same services that this Amendment refers to - and there was some discussion on this - when this Bill originally passed in the House. Unfortunately Representative Gene Hoffman is not on the floor and he pointed out that the provisions in this Amendment were already in the Statute."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? Mr. Deuster, the Gentleman from Lake."

Deuster: "If the Sponsor would yield for a question."

Speaker Bradley: "She indicates she will."

Deuster: "Do I understand that you're telling us that what the Governor has struck out is already somewhere else in the Statutes?"

Macdonald: "Yes, Sir."

Deuster: "And what is it that the Governor struck out, just so we know?"

Macdonald: "Well, I can read you that Amendment. It says, 'The General Assembly recognizes that nonpublic schools or special education facilities provide an important service in the educational system in Illinois. It is the intent of the General Assembly that there be no change in the state policy which authorizes the placement of children with handicaps in nonpublic schools or special education facilities where no special education program offered by the public schools can be adequately or appropriately met...that meets the children's needs'.



Now that Section is all...or that provision is already found in the Statutes in Section 14-702 and 703. I do not have the Statute Book here but that provision is provided in that Section. But that is not the issue of the Amendatory Veto, it...it is germaneness of this Amendment to the consolidation into unit district."

Deuster: "Well, who offered that Amendment. I...that was...do you remember? The Sponsor...."

Macdonald: "Yes, Representative Levin."

Deuster: "And he...he's agreeable to having that struck out, is he? I wonder if the Sponsor...."

Macdonald: "He would have to answer that."

Deuster: "...Representative Levin respond, if the Speaker could recognize him."

Speaker Bradley: "Well...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin, what purpose do you rise?"

Levin: "If I can respond to the question, it was that...that question in terms of what my position is on it....my Amendment. We had discussions with Senator Glass and Senator Glass was quite concerned about the basic Bill and what the future of that would be. The agreement we reached is...I think the Governor is wrong on this germaneness issue. I think what we really have here is an attempt to get at Speaker Redmond as far as the action of this House with respect to the Class X Felony 'cause I think that the Governor was wrong in saying this wasn't germane. But putting that aside, I... we did reach an agreement with Senator Glass where we would, you know, not jeopardize the basic part of this Bill by attempting to go with a...an override 'cause my understanding that it would, you know, it would at this point if we defeat this motion the Bill is dead. I think the basic Bill is something that's needed as well. What we are going to do, though, I hope that, John, that you would join us as with others, is to reintroduce next week the text of the Amendment which was included in Senate Bill 1208. And hopefully we can get pretty quick action on that and it will be law in the spring. That's what we've agreed to do with respect to this."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Would the Lady yield for a question?"



Speaker Bradley: "Sorry, I'm sorry, Mr. Pierce, Mr. Deuster has not completed evidently and Mr. Levin was responding to his question. Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, I'm still confused. Representative Macdonald says there's no need for what the Governor struck out 'cause it's already in the Statutes. Representative Levin says he's graciously, as a Gentleman, agreed to let this be struck out but he's going to reintroduce it and if it's already in the Statute why is he going to reintroduce it? I think...that's what I'm trying to find out. Is it in the Statute or is it not 'cause I think I concur with the language that's being struck out and I don't like it being struck out."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, first, I'll answer Mr. Deuster's question because I'm the Sponsor of the legislation. But first I'd like to ask Mrs. Macdonald a question if I may, if we go in some orderly...."

Speaker Bradley: "She indicates she'll yield."

Pierce: "...Now I put an Amendment on requested by the Lake County Superintendent of Schools and some Lake County School Boards on this Bill which agreed to have him put on on Second Reading in the House. That was the Amendment to Senate Bill 1208 that provided where a unit district was being created, this Bill would not affect the procedure if the...if they were already under way in creating the unit district, if they'd already commenced to create the unit district. Is that still in the Bill?"

Macdonald: "I have not read the conference report that came out, Representative Pierce, I'm not sure whether it is or not."

Pierce: "Well, the Conference Committee had a different form, they maintained, they maintained it in a different form and it doesn't look to me like the Governor struck that language out. The Conference Committee did take care of my problem in a little different way than we did by the Amendment in the House. And I believe the Conference Committee did that by...."

Macdonald: "I....."

Pierce: "By providing that it didn't affect unit districts, creation of unit districts where the action had already commenced the time the Bill became effective. Is that still in there?"



Macdonald: "I think that's still in there, Mr. Pierce. It says, 'This Amendatory Act takes effect July 1, 1977, or upon its becoming a law whichever is later'. The changes in Section 11, 6 to the School Code by this Amendatory Act shall not apply to organizations proceedings commenced before July 1, 1977'."

Pierce: "Oh, I see. That's the right. That's the way the Conference Committee changed it and that was acceptable to me....."

Macdonald: "That's right."

Pierce: "Because that took care of our Lake County situation of the Grayslake Unit District. Now, and so...thank you, that...that's what I thought. Now to answer Mr. Deuster's question, and Representative Pullen might want to hear this, too. Back in 1968, I introduced House Bill 2671 which passed into law with Governor Shapiro's signature. It provided, in Article XIV of the School Code, that...that a child may attend, and the state would reimburse tuition and transportation for a nonpublic school where the nature of child's handicap required that he attend that nonpublic school in order to obtain a sufficient education. And under that Section which is still in the Statute, children attending nonpublic schools have had their tuition and transportation up to a limit of twenty-five hundred dollars (\$2500) reimbursed. However, the concern was that led Representative Levin to introduce his Bill- and Representative Deuster, I'm trying to answer your question-the concern of Representative Levin was the..new OSPI....excuse me, the new Superintendent of Education and an assistant that he brought in from Wisconsin who I understand is no longer there, he appeared to be hostile to the private school reimbursements, were beginning to turn them down, were beginning to discourage school districts from approving the placement in the private special education schools and facilities. And the philosophy was such as we felt the whole program that I introduced back in 1968 was being quietly but clearly eliminated. And because of that concern several private special education schools and facilities came to Representative Levin, to myself, Representative Walsh and others, Collins and others, and asked that we make it clear in the Statute-the legislative intent-that we believe there was a role for these private institutions in the education of severely



multiple handicapped children. And with that in mind, Representative Levin, late in the Session, tacked an Amendment onto a Bill that may be germane or may not be germane, the Governor says it's not, and Representative Levin is not fighting that today and will introduce it as a separate Bill. So that's really the answer, both...both are right. Representative Macdonald is right in that there's a provision in Article XIV now providing for attendance at a nonpublic school by handicapped children who cannot be educated properly in the public school and for reimbursement of that child. And Representative Levin is right in that the Office of Education had not been approving those placements recently, had been seemed to be turning against the private special education schools and have caused great concern among them. Now I know Representatives Collins, Levin and myself are working during late in the Session to do something about this and that was the genesis, I believe you've talked once already Representative Levin—that was the genesis of your Amendment which the Governor, perhaps in retaliation to the Speaker's ruling, held not to be germane. And therefore in order to save this excellent Bill I suggest that we approve the Governor's Amendatory Veto and then get one hundred percent behind Representative Levin, Collins and whoever else wants to put in a proposal to make it clear, a Bill to make it clear that the Legislature supports the private special education schools for the multiple and severely handicapped. And I urge that we accept the Amendatory Veto."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Macdonald, to close."

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

I certainly concur with the last speaker to say that I am very, very much in favor of reemphasizing or any other action that has to be accomplished to certainly take care of the placement of handicapped children where there are no facilities in our public schools. However, the issue is here whether or not this Amendment was germane. And this is an excellent Bill. I would urge your acceptance of the Governor's Veto on this and I ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 1208, all in...by the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor of the



motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 141 'ayes', 7 'nays'. The motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding Senate Bill 1208 by the adoption of the Amendment. On the Calendar under Amendatory Vetoes appears Senate Bill 23 and Representative Mann...or Madison, the Gentleman from Cook, will handle that Bill for Mr. Jones."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House, I move that the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 23 by adoption of the Governor's Amendment. Mr. Speaker, Senate Bill 23 was a part of a package of three Bills, Senate Bill 440, Senate Bill 23 and House Bill 783, that went to the Governor's desk which empowered the Director of Financial Institutions to establish rates for certain services rendered by currency exchanges. The Governor's action with respect to these three Bills was as follows. He signed the Senate Bill 440. He vetoed House Bill 783. And he made specific recommendations in this Bill, Senate Bill 23. He...his specific recommendation for change in this Bill are threefold. First, to strike those portions of Senate Bill 23 that are duplicated in Senate Bill 440 which he signed. Secondly, to recommend striking the... both portions of Senate Bill 23 which allow an objector to a grant of a currency exchange license the right to a hearing upon his objections. Thirdly, he recommend...strikes some certain language which provides for the conduct of public hearings prior to the issuance or amendment of the Department's regulation. As amended, Senate Bill 23 would do two things now. It would authorize the Director to fine or suspend the currency exchange for statutory or regulatory violations. And two, it would empower the Director to authorize currency exchanges to render additional services to the public if the services are consistent with the provisions of this Act and are in the best interest of the public."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none the question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change



with respect to Senate Bill 23 by the adoption of the Amendment? All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 151 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present'. The motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding Senate Bill 23 by the adoption of the Amendment. On the Calendar under Total Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 3, the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich. Out...out of the record? On Total Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 24, the Gentleman from...what? All right. Pardon me, we're going to back up. Mr. Matijevich, the Gentleman from Lake, has decided to put it back in the record. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, on Senate Bill 3 on the Total Veto Motion."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 3 would have required that a member of the Waukegan Port Authority be a resident of the district. The Governor vetoed that Bill and the Senate in their wisdom overrode that veto by a substantial number, I understand. As you remember when we debated this matter on the House floor. It is my contention because the Enabling Act that creates the Waukegan Port Authority does provide that authority with the power to tax. Since it does provide that power I feel very strongly that a member of that Port Authority should live within the boundaries of that district. So I would respectfully ask the Members to support my motion to override Senate Bill 3."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm rising on this Bill to support the Governor's veto of this Bill. I think this House should be aware of the origination of this Bill and I want in no way to this...for my comments or remarks to reflect on Representative Matijevich, who is strictly the House Sponsor of this matter. This Bill originated in the Senate by Senator Morris when he was still a Senator. And at that time, this was a Bill being used as a political weapon in the City of Waukegan. The Waukegan Port Authority is made



up of a number of individuals who served without any salary whatsoever. To the many of you that joined us in our outings up there you know this is a monumental effort. The Port Authority runs the entire harbor, runs the entire airport and it's a very, very complex operation. For really no good purpose, Senator Morris decided that he wanted to kick off two individuals on that board who had been longtime residents of Waukegan but happened to move to Lake Forest. One of these individuals was the President of Dexter-'Midland' Corporation, one of the largest corporations on the lakefront in Waukegan. And the other individual was Chairman of the Board of Outboard Marine Corporation. To those of you who are outdoor enthusiasts, this is Johnson Motors our largest corporation in Waukegan who gave of his free time and effort to make this Port Authority viable. In fact, he was one of the originators of the concept. What Morris wanted to do is kick these people off the board because they didn't live in Waukegan. So let's take this into consideration. First of all, the Waukegan Port Authority is not just a Waukegan-oriented governmental entities. It is a Regional Port Authority and is there to do those things which would be usable by all of the people in the State of Illinois. All the original Enabling Act provided for is that two members of the Port Authority could live outside the district, and these people were appointed outside the district. There was still a number of other members, I believe it's five other members on the Port Authority, who had to be from the City of Waukegan. Thus, what Senator Morris was attempting to do is take a cheap shot at some rather hard-working individuals who had never drawn a salary and had worked diligently to perpetuate a fine Port Authority in the City of Waukegan. Now most importantly, the Governor has reviewed this Bill and he realizes that we have a Regional Port Authority in Waukegan. It's not something limited solely to the City of Waukegan. Insofar as the argument that this has...this body has taxing authority, which is true, the tax authority has never been used and I do not believe it ever will be used. If we could have taxing authority up there it would have been done to expand the harbor which it did not do. I would suggest that the Governor is exactly right in this case. We have no business whatsoever



limiting the two members who are from outside the district to the... to the district itself. There are in fact people representing interests outside the Waukegan Port Authority. And as a resident of Waukegan, and as the only resident of Waukegan in this House, I would request you to sustain the Governor's Veto."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I...I totally concur with the prior speaker. The Governor's Veto should be sustained because although there are thirteen port districts and three of them do require, permit members of the board of trustees to be from areas outside the boundaries of the port district and Joliet, Waukegan and Chicago are such reasonable...regional, rather, and significant and greatly affect far more area than just that within their boundaries. And therefore, there's a justification to include outside representation. One of the best justifications I can tell you about is the very reason that the Sponsor of this Senate Bill in the House said earlier. They do have the power to tax. Well, if you restricted this to people living in Waukegan, you're denying the right of the people who own the various plants who have great interest in the City of Waukegan and who provide so many thousands of jobs to the people of Waukegan and the rest of Lake County, to prohibiting them to say anything...how their tax money is being spent. They spend an awful lot of tax money in Waukegan and I certainly think that this restriction of membership is a political ploy to make it just for the City of Waukegan, a...if they're living there. And I think that we should allow it to remain as is which means we can have others from the county. This Port Authority does not represent just Waukegan, it represents the whole of Lake County. And I therefore ask you respectfully to sustain the Governor's Veto on this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor of the motion would yield for one question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Mudd: "All right. Are....did he indicate that all the appointments on the board are made by the...the Mayor of Waukegan?"



Matijevich: "No, Representative Mudd, appointments are made by the Governor and the Mayor of Waukegan."

Mudd: "Oh. Okay, then, the question I've got to ask, the two members that they refer to that we're asking to be taken off, were they the Mayor's appointments or were they the Governor's appointments?"

Matijevich: "I really don't know, Representative Mudd. I might tell you that both of those gentlemen are personal friends of mine but it's just a matter of conviction with me. Now let me tell you also that when they were appointed to the board they were residents in fact of Waukegan. They then moved out of Waukegan and they could have been my best friend. And I really think out of conviction, no matter where anyone of you live, if you follow the theory, follow the logic of Representative Greisheimer and Representative Geo-Karis, you could be a member of that board. Now I don't think any of you would like to see somebody from outside the corporate limits of a district be able to give...be given the power to tax. I in fact think it's probably...is unconstitutional. Further, it isn't a matter of politics with me, both of those gentlemen are no longer on the board. I doubt if they will ever pick anybody from outside the corporate limits of Waukegan but this...this puts it into law and that's where it really belongs!"

Mudd: "Well, I agree...I agree with you, John, I was just trying.... I know that when it's set up that the Governor probably makes some appointments and the Mayor makes some appointments. And if in fact the people who are...who the Mayor is trying to take off were the Mayor's appointments to begin with, I think he's within his right, and for good reason."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I represent the 32nd District which is right next to Waukegan. I have many, many of my constituents who work in Waukegan who keep boats in the Waukegan Harbor. Some of them are leaders of industry, and as Representative Greisheimer has already pointed out, some of them even though they did not live in Waukegan they worked in Waukegan and they gave devotedly of their time to service on the Waukegan Port Board. I think that it would be unwise, ignoring the politics



that might have been involved, or not involved with Representative or Senator Morris' idea of restricting membership, I don't think for Waukegan it is wise to limit and deprive themselves of the possible talent that might be available. And, as I say, many of my citizens work in that town, love that town, are devoted to it and keep boats at the harbor and spend a lot of time offshore in Lake Michigan, and to arbitrarily deny the Governor the opportunity to consider someone in that Waukegan industrial area, who might happen to live outside the city limits, for service on the board I think is very unwise and I would encourage you to follow the advice of the two Representatives from that particular district, Representatives Geo-Karis and Greisheimer and my own feeling as a neighboring district that this legislation is unwise and the Governor's Veto should be sustained."

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

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, to close the debate."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill probably is much ado about nothing because I'd be very disappointed, very disappointed, if either the Governor or the Mayor of the City of Waukegan ever appoints somebody outside of the district. I...I think it would be unconstitutional as long as the Enabling Act has that power to tax. As long as we have this Bill, though, I think that we ought to write it into the law. And, by the way, it hasn't been mentioned that they call it a Regional Port Authority. However, the corporate boundaries of the City of Waukegan is the Waukegan Port Authority. Now those boundaries can be extended and then I would support totally that the....appointments be made from within that district. But I strongly feel you cannot give someone the power to tax who does not live within the corporate boundaries. And, therefore, I ask for your vote to override Senate Bill 3."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 3 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor? All in favor signify by voting



'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz, to explain his vote."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as I understand the facts with regard to this, the taxing authority in the Port of Waukegan like the taxing authority in the Port of Chicago has never been utilized. I am concerned, frankly, because I represent constituents in suburban Cook County. The Port of Chicago is our port, it is not simply the port of the City of Chicago and I would object to the principles being applied that no constituent of mine would be able to be...to participate in the Port of Chicago. It's the only port we have for that area. Similarly, it would seem to me that if I'm going to be consistent I have to apply the same rule to Waukegan that I would personally feel with regard to Chicago and hence I have to vote 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 78 'ayes' and 70 'nays'. The motion, having failed to receive a Constitutional three-fifths majority, is declared lost. On the Calendar appears Senate Bill 24, the Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 24 would change the Illinois Securities Law to make it easier for individuals to investigate private capital in their own community as far as renewal programs are concerned and it would also reduce the amount of a small corporation formed to rebuild these blighted that they have...what they have to pay for registering as an Illinois corporation. Now the legislation is very restrictive and because it provides that only persons with a total interest in their community can participate. And when the Governor vetoed this he was advised by his staff that they felt that there were already some existing exemptions available for some transactions but in reality, in reality, the legislation itself...it was intended to ...these exemptions, to provide for this broad base community support for these downtown development with local money, private money, is really impossible under the existing exemptions. And I'd like to add that the Securities Commission Office aided in the drafting of the Bill. And it's a Bill, to sum it up, is a Bill that is in



the interest of private money in as a corporation, and you must be a resident for three years within the particular district, particular community, and it's something for private capital to get in and to renovate some of these blighted areas. And I think it's a good Bill and I would certainly ask all of you to join with me in the overriding of this particular proposal of the Governor's Veto on Senate Bill 24. Be glad to respond to any questions."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 24 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor? All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have a 114 'ayes', 18 'nays'. And the motion having received the Constitutional three-fifths majority prevails and House...Senate Bill 24 is declared passed notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. Senate Bill 126, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich. Out of the record. Senate Bill 187, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, Senate Bill 187 amends an Act codifying the powers and duties of the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. What we're talking about in this Bill is we're talking about something that we're all trying to get at and that is the de-institutionalization of more people in our society. What this Bill does is insure that the Department goes over a three percent placement factor in local community operations for people who need these services, that the state will pick the financial reimbursement. This is absolutely necessary of the dire straits of these community-based facilities to keep providing these services otherwise they're going to be stretched beyond their ability to provide and we're not going to be able to place people regardless of the mandates of the Department of Mental Health. The policy that they have is placement and under the mandate these community-based agencies are taking care of the people but the shortfall of money on communities is a terrible burden and it's getting to a degree where they will not be able to do the job and the service very much needed by the mentally retarded and the adult mentally retarded in Illinois. This Bill passed out of here originally with a vote of



136 to nothing. Came over from the Senate at a vote and an override of 47 to 1. And I think it's still a good Bill. It deserves all of our support and I urge you to support me in the override of this motion."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I reluctantly rise to oppose this motion. I have all the respect in the world for the Sponsor of the Bill and, quite frankly, am sympathetic with what he is attempting to do. In fact, I think that if this Bill passes there are several community groups in my district that will benefit by it but I think a close look at the Governor's Veto Message will tell us that there's some problems in here and in this Bill that ought to be addressed. First off, the Bill will set up an unfair classification. If a person is discharged to a community agency or to a day treatment program from the Department's facility, and it's over three percent, the state will pick up one hundred percent of the cost. But if...if a person is sent to a day treatment center from the community the state does not have to pick up a hundred percent of the cost. In addition, the Bill will remove responsibility from residential treatment programs to deliver services beyond room and board. The Bill stipulates that life management services and evaluations and so on and so forth will be performed at the day treatment center implies that the residential center will be absolved from delivering any of these types of treatment services. I think that looking at the Governor's Veto of this Bill he indicates that the fiscal impact can't be determined. And one of the reasons is that the discharge from the institutions and Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities is not spread equally throughout the state. There is some areas where there are more people discharged, geographically, than in other areas and there are certain types of treatment that some people have to receive in higher degrees than in others so that they can't compute what exactly what the full fiscal impact of this would be. I'd like to draw your attention to the last paragraph of the Governor's Veto Message. He says, 'I will support Bills of this nature in the future if they address the concerns expressed in this message and are within the fiscal



resources of this state'. And I think this is the important point to remember that there is a problem here, the Governor recognizes that problem but that there are also some problems created that are not addressed in that he will support a Bill...a Bill in the future that will address these problems. And I would ask the people of this General Assembly to recognize that fact that the Governor is philosophically in concert with what it does but feels that there...the problems are overwhelming and ought to be addressed in the future. And I would ask that we not support this motion."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Ryan: "Representative Brady, can you tell me how much this Bill's going to cost the State of Illinois?"

Brady: "Yes, Representative Ryan, when we went through this on debate the first time around when the Bill passed, we asked the Department of Mental Health to submit a fiscal note. Their preliminary fiscal note said it could cost as much as three hundred thousand dollars (\$300,000) and then they hedged and said, 'I don't know, we can't predict the fiscal impact of this kind of legislation'. But from that point and from the points they made in their fiscal note to this Body--when we voted a 136 to nothing-- the Governor's Veto Message was drawn on."

Ryan: "Well, thank you, Representative. I don't understand why your figures conflict with the Bureau of the Budget. I understand that this is an open-ended thing and could reach almost to the two point one million dollars (\$2.1,000,000). Now the Governor's figures and the Bureau of the Budget figures indicate that we just can't afford this without a tax increase. And if you want to take money from the Distributive Aid Formula and from the public schools then perhaps we can afford this Bill. However, since education is a priority of the Administration we just simply can't afford this additional expense. And I think that your idea is laudable, your concept, but it boils down to another attempt to break the budget of this Administration. And I would hope that we could sustain the Governor in his veto."



Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brady, to close the debate."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members. Well, I think what was said, and I appreciate the comments from the Minority Leader and another spokesman who was obviously speaking on behalf of sustaining the Governor's Message here, but I think what they said if you listened closely is what we've talked about several times. This is laudable. This is good. I might add that this is necessary. If we don't do something to finance the community-based agencies giving these services they're going to go under and there's going to be no service that we're able to provide to de-institutionalize or to help people with a retarded problem. The fiscal note letter drawn by the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities, which I referred to, stated the three hundred thousand dollar figure (\$300,000). Then they showed some exhibits that showed it could possibly cost more on given situations or circumstances. What I'm suggesting to you is that we can't afford not to do it. You can't say that education is a priority and mental health is not. This is as important a thing as we're about in the State of Illinois. The Administration Veto Message should not be sustained just because it's a veto message coming from the Governor's Office. In this issue, frankly, I think he was ill-advised and I think he's wrong. The people of Illinois need this legislation. The community-based agencies need it to survive. And I urge your support of this now."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 187 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 95 'ayes' and 53 'nays'. This motion having failed to receive a Constitutional three-fifths majority declared lost. On the Calendar on Total Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 126, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes....Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 126 amends the Public Aid Code which expressly prohibits discrimination and eligibility for financial aid on account of sex, creed or handicapped. Qualifies this provision by authorizing



assistance for specific classes of persons if required for purpose of federal financial participation. The Governor's statement that Senate Bill 126 is identical in its language and duplicates in part House Bill 661 which he has approved. However, Senate Bill 126 differs slightly from House Bill 661 since House Bill 661 only pertains to sex. Senate Bill 126 also includes the handicapped and also nondiscrimination against the creeds. This was approved, the override of the veto by 56 to nothing in the Senate. And the only thing it does is simply includes nondiscrimination because creed or handicap under this Bill. And I would urge support of the override of Senate Bill 126."

Speaker Bradley: "Question? Discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "If the Sponsor would yield for a question...."

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Deuster: "I missed what Act this amends. Does it have to do with employment, did you....you cannot...you could not discriminate...."

Terzich: "No, it's the Public Aid Code. And we passed a series of Bills, nondiscrimination sex Bills, and the Senate Bill that was sent over by Senator Knuppel in addition to sex, he included creed or handicapped, nondiscrimination for those two items as well."

Deuster: "And this amends the Public Aid Code?"

Terzich: "Yes. Now this House Bill 661 also amended the Public Aid Code and amended the sex portion of it but it did not include the creed or handicapped provision. And this is all that Senate Bill...."

Deuster: "And I apologize for asking this question, but my staff analysis does not cover this Bill at all. What was the Governor's reason for striking that out?"

Terzich: "He said that it was duplicate....it was a duplicate of House Bill 661 which he did pass but 661 only included discrimination against sex. This includes not only sex but it also for creed or handicapped."

Deuster: "And so your position is his staff just overlooked that minor point?"

Terzich: "Right."

Deuster: "Thank you."



Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Terzich, do you wish to close or just...."

Terzich: "Well, I would urge a favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. The question is, shall Senate Bill 126 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, to explain his vote."

Terzich: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker. ...I see there is no money involved here this is simply one of the oversights of the staff personnel and all it simply states that no one will be deprived of any benefits on account of race, creed or handicap. And all we're doing in this Bill which is similar to other Bills that were passed, Senate Bills, that there would be no discrimination against the handicapped or because of creed. And this is all this veto does and I would appreciate, you know, a few extra votes to get this Bill passed."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have a 103 'ayes', 54 'nays'...the Gentleman from Cook."

Terzich: "I am sure that there would be four absentees that would give me a vote on this Bill which is a good Bill. I don't see any reason for any 'no' votes to be up there...."

Speaker Bradley: "The Clerk will call the absentees."

Terzich: "Especially Representative Geo-Karis."

Clerk O'Brien: "Collins, Daniels, Friedrich, Hoffman, Huff, Dave Jones, Kempiners, McAuliffe, Meyer, Molloy, O'Brien, Porter, Pullen, Schoeberlein, Stearney, Taylor and Winchester."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. O'Brien wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor, wishes to be recorded 'aye'. Any further changes? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners, what purpose do...you like to be recorded as voting....'no'. Have all voted who wish? Mrs. Geo-Karis wishes to be recorded, change you....you wish to change your vote, Mrs. Geo-Karis? From 'no' to 'aye'. Mrs. Geo-Karis from 'no' to 'aye'. Right? Okay. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels? You wish to be recorded as voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Bennett. You wish to be recorded as voting 'no', you're recorded now as voting 'aye'.



Change the Gentleman to 'no'. What purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Wolf, arise?"

Wolf: "...Vote to 'present' Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "He wishes to change his vote from 'aye' to 'present'.

On this question we have a 104 'ayes', the motion having failed to receive the Constitutional three-fifths majority declared lost.

Senate Bill 281, the Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 281 would require the Pollution Control Board to adopt regulations no more strict than the federal regulations for air quality standards in the State of Illinois. The Governor vetoed this Bill and I think the Governor was misinformed when he did so. And I hope that your consideration of this Bill in the override of the Governor's Veto will not depend on supporting him as a party matter. This...this is...this is not a party Bill, it's not a partisan Bill. This is a Bill to stimulate and help the economy of the State of Illinois. And it's a...it's a Bill in which I think the Illinois General Assembly should be taking the lead. We're the largest state in terms of coal reserve in the whole United States of America. Illinois' Legislature should be taking the lead in...in passing laws to promote the use of Illinois coal and it's up to the Illinois General Assembly to do so. This Bill would tend to stabilize electric rates by the encouragement and use of more Illinois coal. It would stimulate the economy of the State of Illinois by the use of more Illinois coal. It would reduce coal imports from out...out of state which I think that....I...I resent every ton of coal that's imported from another state to Illinois. I just think that it's an abominable situation when we have laws in our state which would require us to import coal into Illinois. The Pollution Control Board has thumbed its nose at the Illinois Legislature in the last few years. This Legislature passed and we had signed into law House Bill 114 which would have required the Pollution Control Board to adopt rules implementing intermittent controls. The Pollution Control Board has not done that and in direct conflict with the established policy of the General Assembly. The Chairman of the Pollution Control Board, Mr. Dumelle, is not worthy of belief.



He circulated letters on the Pollution Control Board stationary espousing his own views which in many times are contrary to the majority view of the Pollution Control Board. He has shown arrogance toward this General Assembly. He's shown a lack of respect for the truth or the Legislature. And I hope that the Members of the General Assembly will not follow this Gentleman in his views and half-truths and scare tactics. I want the Members of the General Assembly to follow your own senses and instincts. The federal standards for air pollution are adequate for everyone's protection. The Bill does not apply to Chicago, Peoria and East St. Louis areas which are considered as special situations in Illinois. This Bill has the support of all utility companies in Illinois both of the coal miners, of the co-ops, of the coal companies, of most of the manufacturers and the businesses in Illinois. Help Illinois' business. Help the people of Illinois keep down the cost of electricity. Be a leader. Vote 'ayes' and support the override of the Governor's Veto of Senate Bill 281."

Speaker Bradley: "Lady from Cook, Mrs. Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to strongly support the Governor's Veto of Senate Bill 281 and certainly solicit your help. Surely I'd hope that after the tension of the final days of last spring's Session that we by now would have been able to accept the inevitable veto by the Governor of this piece of legislation. If you recall even in those hectic summer days nonconcurrence of this Bill passed by only one long delayed vote. To further review the fact for you I'd like to emphasize that the Amendment that struck out the federally dominated restriction in Illinois passed both in Committee and on Second and Third Reading in this House. I hope that all of my colleagues who so strenuously opposed federal domination of our state laws will step forward now when they are needed the most. Further, after our adjournment in June, President Carter signed a new Clear Air Act in August that would make this Bill even more unworkable. No new use of Illinois coal will result in passage of this Bill because every power plant covered by this Bill currently burns Illinois high sulphur coal. We've passed legislation expending millions of dollars



and we've granted much needed support of technology and help to our Illinois coal industry. I've certainly been strongly in favor of most of that legislation and...would be willing to give all the help possible to see that our state's coal producers thrive and prosper. However, I cannot sacrifice the very health and livelihood of thousands of our citizens who have no lobby other than the conscience and the common sense of this Legislature. The grave reports of continuing increase of respiratory disease continues to come from doctors and hospitals and others throughout our state. Those doctors and other dedicated advocates certainly are not against anyone, they are only for the victims who will be struck down by treacherous solutions that can be controlled. Ladies and Gentlemen, I beg of you to put aside every other consideration but the protection of the people of our state and vote to sustain this veto."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman."

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

I'd like to begin by calling attention to one of the points made by previous speaker with whom I concur. That is that there will not be an appreciable increase in the use of Illinois by...by Illinois utilities outside the major metropolitan areas for the very reason that they already using Illinois coal. The...what we're really talking about here, and I think that this...this veto should be sustained as a pro-health, pro-lung veto, what we're really talking about here is people's health. Now the Federal Air Quality Standards, I'd like to remind you, are set at a level that if you see them you have an immediate imminent danger of health. Now there is a... very, very substantial accumulative affect to individual health from sulphur content air...sulphur dioxide content in the air which is below the federal standard. Let me tell you something a little bit about ambient air quality standards. The...the point is that more and more sulphur is being put into the air at...at the present time and the...and sulphur is an element. It doesn't break down in... under atmospheric conditions. The best that can happen is that it comes down in the form of....sulphur dioxide dissolved in water which is sulphuric acid. And if any of you have ever spent some time in Chicago during the hot summer days when we have stagnant air, you



...your...your lungs are practically cooked by the...this sulphur dioxide which is...which is in the air and it's precisely the sort of thing that's going on all the time, all the time, whether or not we are exceeding the federal air quality standards.. And I think it's entirely appropriate for the State of Illinois to say to its citizens that we are in the business of protecting your health whether you live in Chicago, whether you live downstate and that we are not going to permit the Air Quality Standards to deteriorate. And if...if the Sponsors of the override motion could convince us that people's health would not be impaired, it might be a different story. But that is ultimately the issue. You will not hear the Sponsors talking about health because they can't make the case that people's health will be improved by this overriding the veto. Their health will deteriorate and that's why we have to hold the line now for this veto."

Speaker Georgi: "Representative Cunningham on the motion."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't agree with anything that was said by the lovely Lady or with the Gentleman that continued to raise the sulphur dioxide scare tactics. Rather, I agree with Franklin's finest in his comments as to the need of the people of our area. I must take general exception from his regards...his comments that the Governor could be infallible or could not be infallible. But in this particular situation I ask you to believe that isn't a partisan issue and it isn't an issue of downstate against Cook County or Chicago. It's an issue of right or wrong. And the right or wrong issue is, is it right for one section of the state to say, 'We will reserve great vast areas throughout this state as a reservoir of fresh air, to blow fresh air into their industry'. Is it right to condemn our section of the state to be a pastoral wasteland absolutely devoid of industries, jobs and opportunity for the citizens that reside there? You know in your hearts that the answer is wrong, that you must not do that. We have a right to live too in downstate Illinois. We have Jefferson County, Hamilton County, Wabash County with big coal mines. This phony argument that somehow it doesn't increase the amount of coal being used should fall in its own weakness. The coal miners in the State of Illinois are the ones that say it does



increase them. They're the ones that you should rely on and believe in this manner. There is no one on the face of the earth that will suggest that the federal standards in regard to the use of coal are presently inadequate. And yet you're asked to adopt a double standard for the specific purpose of...of handicapping and harrassing the development of industry in our area. I say to you that fair is fair and in this instance it's fair to say that the Federal Government, if it's big enough to look after the Environmental Protection rights of all the citizens of the other 49 states, can look after the interest of the people in the State of Illinois. It's time for you to listen to your conscience and listen to the need of the people of southern Illinois and proudly vote green on this particular issue. We've had entirely enough of callous disregard for the continued existence of our section of the state. We're entitled to a moment under the sun too. Vote green."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Mudd on the motion."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think this is a good Bill. I think the motion is proper. The only thing that I find wrong with the entire concept of the Bill is that it doesn't include the metropolitan areas outlined in the regulation. I spent quite a bit of time discussing this particular problem with our Director who was very knowledgeable on the subject, Leo Eisel, before he left. And he even felt that some of the regulations that we imposed on some of the metropolitan areas, the three large metropolitan areas, was in excess. And I can't understand why when we say that we shouldn't allow the federal to regulate these kind of emissions, these kind of regulations and the state imposes the staunch regulations on our coal industry and also on the cost of supplying utilities to our constituents. For...for a good many months last year I sat here and listened to the people who promoted legislation to correct the utility rates in the State of Illinois. They spoke for hours on what...what was causing them. And this is one of the things that...that we touched on was the high cost of producing utilities in this state and we're...we're probably the largest cause of that by regulating beyond the federal standards. So those of you that are concerned about the rates of utilities for old people and people



who can't afford them, this is the first step to try to bring things in so that they are equitable, something that we can live with that produces good air for the people of Illinois but yet does not penalize the production part of our state resources and ship 'em out of state. So there's a lot of things involved here and I think a vote on this one should be an 'aye' vote, we should override this and start a step back to honest, equitable, responsible management of our resources and the cost of utilities in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Flinn on the motion."

Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this motion but I would like to raise a question about some of those who spoke against it. I would like to remind them that I...that I was at a meeting in Champaign a few weeks ago...two or three weeks ago in which the Chairman of the Pollution Control Board stated that the sulphur and the acid rain was not coming from Illinois but coming from Missouri, coming from Missouri and Iowa, the states that are west of us. The Director of the Environmental Protection Agency stated that there was absolutely not one violation of the SO-2 standards in this state, nowhere in the state, up or down. And I'd like to remind them also that this Bill does not apply to the Chicago, Peoria or St. Louis airsheds. It applies to those areas of the state that will have no problem whatsoever burning it. One other official high up in the Environmental Protection Agency told me off the record, and therefore I can't name him, told me off the record that...that Senate Bill 281 would have absolutely no effect upon the environmental standards of this state. And I think that it's high time that we stop trying to pass more stringent Bills, stringent those that are unneeded, more stringent than the US standards."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Bartulis on the motion."

Bartulis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise in support of this override motion for the simple reason the Governor has the power to veto this Bill, this wonderful Bill for the coal....coal industry of Illinois. Then on the same hand he had the power to say 'no' to the people of Wilsonville, Illinois, in this vicinity about dumping hazardous waste. And the same...



same agency, the same Governor, to saying 'no' on one hand and saying 'yes' on the other hand, and I...I think this...this Bill, Senate Bill 281 should be overrode. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Johnson on the motion."

Johnson: "...Speaker, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to support Governor Thompson in his veto of Senate Bill 281 and to ask the Members of the House to uphold the veto of the Governor in this particular matter. I've heard reference by Representative Flinn to unnamed sources in...to...respect to this Bill and by Representative Cunningham in accepting at face value the statements of coal producers. But what we've got to do in this veto or any other veto is to look at logic and look at reason and to see what the effect is going to be of either upholding or not upholding the Governor's veto in this particular matter. And I think that this ought to be regarded as the environmental vote of the 80th General Assembly 'cause we have an opportunity at this point and on this Bill to take a major step forward for saying that Illinois recognizes and we have unique problems. And also that Illinois says that notwithstanding the Federal Government we have a right to restrict our particular air pollution to a standard that we think that's appropriate for the State of Illinois. I think the people that represent agricultural district has been fairly clear, in fact entirely clear to me, that the acid rain problems can result.... substantial losses in our agricultural products particularly soybeans. I think it's also important to point out that in fact when you look at logic and not at the face value of some unnamed sources there isn't going to be any positive effect for the production of coal in Illinois in any way by this Bill. It's an opportunity to protect the lungs of the people of the State of Illinois. To protect our air and to say to the Federal Government, 'You have an opportunity and you have a right to set standards in a particular area but that we in Illinois can be progressive and take the lead and do something for our environment rather than just talk about it'. So I ask you to vote 'no' on this motion to support the Governor's Veto of Senate Bill 281."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Schisler on the motion."



Schisler: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in the Governor's Veto Message he says that this Bill violates the original rationale of the Illinois Environmental Protection Act. I say to you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that there was no rationale to this Act. It's been a boondoggle from the very beginning. How many Bills have we had to pass to rectify what some education idiot tried to put into law? ...Should be a lesson to us in the future that we better see the guidelines on the legislation before we put it in someone else's hands. Now this is also a matter of economics. How'd you like to live in the county where they're mining coal and you have in excess of a thousand miners and you see a hundred car-loads of Wyoming coal come into your county every day? It's going to put people out of work where there's already too many people out of work. And it's my feeling that we should override this. Fulton County where I come from is one of the largest coal producing counties in the state so it would have a devastating effect if this Bill is not overridden. And last of all, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when I have to stop breathing your cigarette smoke then I'll start worrying about SO2 standards. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Geo-Karis on the motion. Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that the Governor is concerned about the effect of sulphates and acid rain on human health and farm crops. And the national standards do not consider agricultural needs of midwestern states. And I think that's why the Governor feels that the states should set its own standards. By the same token he realizes the economic impact on the various areas and that is why he has requested the heads of the EPA, the Pollution Control Board and the Institute of Environmental Quality to move more expeditiously on this issue. I am one who has not always found the EPA right and at the outset the EPA was full of errors. However, I do feel that the consideration of clean air has to be maintained considering the fact that the Clear Air Acts Amendment of 1977 passed by Congress will nullify, in my humble opinion, Senate Bill 281 if it is passed. Another thing, the fact that Senate Bill 281 would permit greater use in Illinois



of coal of less cost, I don't think this was merit because of the thirteen electrical utilities facilities outside the three major metropolitan areas all burn Illinois' grade coal and only one does not qualify with Illinois standards. Much as I like the Sponsor in the Senate and the Sponsor in the House on this Bill, I am going to vote against overriding the Governor's Veto for the reasons aforesaid."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Ryan on the motion."

Ryan: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The implication that Senate Bill 281 would allow Illinois power plants to substitute high sulphur Illinois coal for out of state low sulphur coal is simply not true. The power companies affected by Senate Bill 281 are not importing coal. These plants are using Illinois coal right now. It's the three plants, it's the plants in the three metropolitan areas which are importing low sulphur coal for midwestern states. Senate Bill 281 does not affect power plants in Chicago, East St. Louis and Peoria and would thus have no impact on importation of out of state coal. And I think all this nonsense about bringing coal from outside the State of Illinois is some kind of a charade and I would hope that we could sustain the Governor's Veto by voting 'no' on this motion."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Skinner on the motion."

Skinner: "I also rise to oppose this override motion. And it's fairly appropriate that we should defeat this override today since this is the day when people are not supposed to be smoking. I would like to quote portions of the Governor's November 16th letter to us that came after the Veto Message. 'Since the Veto Message conditions have changed and there is an additional reason for sustaining my veto', the Governor writes, 'Public Law 9595 prohibits the use of any dispersion technics as a means of achieving compliance with emission standards including sulphur dioxide standards except for the use of tall stacks under specific and limited conditions'. Passage of Senate Bill 281 will not result in substantial increases in Illinois coal, as Representative Ryan pointed out. Why? The Governor continues, 'It applies only to existing facilities in rural areas all of which currently use Illinois coal'. Lot of smoke here.



It does not apply to existing facilities in Chicago, Peoria and East St. Louis, most of which do not use Illinois coal. It does not apply to new facilities constructed after April 13, 1972, all of which are constructed anywhere in any state must meet federal new...new source performance standards and install the best available control technology. In other words, imported coal will not be stopped by this Bill. I...he concludes by asking that we sustain his veto on Senate Bill 281. Well, that's one reason to vote against Senate Bill 281. The second reason is simply retention of state's rights which certainly ought to speak to all of us who were below the state's....the Mason-Dixon line. We can make up our own mind. Voting for this Bill is something like voting for the unemployment compensation laws that were crammed down our throats last week. It's like voting for the 55 mile an hour speed limit. We do it because the feds are going to punish us otherwise because Big Daddy says so. We couldn't do it....we couldn't disobey the Federal Government in unemployment compensation and we couldn't disobey them on the 55 mile an hour speed limit. But I would suggest this time is the time to tell feds where to get off. I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Katz on the motion."

Katz: "I rise in support of the Governor's Veto and want to point out that the Governor made one point that has not been made here that it seems to me would be very important to us as Legislators. Illinois is the great agricultural exporting state in the whole United States. And I would like to quote what the Governor has to say on that point. 'There is increasing evidence', the Governor wrote, 'that soybeans and corn are sensitive to acid rainfall. Since Illinois leads the nation in the production of soybeans and is a leading producer of corn, it is imperative that we not endanger Illinois agricultural production!'. And so I would say not only directly in terms of clean air but in our desire to keep Illinois food pure, we should vote to sustain the Governor's veto so Illinois will maintain its position as the number one agricultural state in the United States."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Meyer on the motion."

Meyer: "Mr. Chairman, I move the previous question."



Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall the main question be put?

All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Hart to close."

Hart: "Well, thank you very much. I believe that many of the statements that have been made on the floor of the House today by the opponents of this motion are in error as was the Governor's reasons for vetoing the Bill. The Federal Standards are adequate for the protection of the health of the people of the United States. The Federal Standards are adequate for the protection against acid rain. I want to point out to you that there are other states in the United States which are agricultural producing states which do not have laws as strict as those in Illinois. The utility company which serves my area, Central Illinois Public Service Company, estimates that unless Senate Bill 281 is...becomes law, that it will use one-half million less tons of coal per year than it is now using at a cost to the average consumer of a dollar per month in additional electric rates. There is absolutely no use for Illinois to have laws on the books which inhibit the use of Illinois coal which tend to reduce the number of businesses in Illinois using Illinois coal. As I said, I don't understand some of the opposition especially those who live in the Chicago area about this since it really doesn't affect them. They're saying on one hand that 281 will not have any effect and on the other hand we ought to be against because of the various reasons they give. This is as probably an important a Bill to the
of the State of Illinois as will come out of this Session of the Legislature. I ask the Members of the General Assembly to go along with the Senate which overwhelmingly overrid...overrode the veto of the Governor. Take the lead! Be leaders and override the veto."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 281 be passed notwithstanding the veto of the Governor? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Brummer to explain his vote."

Brummer: "Yes, in explanation of my vote, I would only suggest that those that are voting red are voting in favor of continuing to increase the cost of public utilities. Those who are voting green are in



favor of lowering or holding the line on public utility costs. I'm in favor of decreasing or holding the line on public utility costs, I vote green."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Harris to explain his vote."

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

Here we have the largest national resource for energy of any state in this nation but we want to put restrictions on this energy product but we want to sell it outside of our state. Don't most of us remember last winter when it was 20 to 25 degrees below zero? We were looking for methods of energy and Illinois coal was welcome? That day will come again. Let's change some of our red votes to green and help to sustain what we have in Illinois and build it and make it better.

Thank you...."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Friedrich to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'm always amazed around here how...what hypocrites we can be. Here we are worrying about this Bill which even the opponents say would not have any adverse affect and wouldn't change anything and yet I'm wondering why these same people don't come up with a Bill to outlaw cigarettes which is a known cause of cancer and causes more cancer than all the coal in the world. But they don't do that. They want to talk about something else. Here's something that creates jobs. We needs jobs in Illinois. We need industry in Illinois. And yet every time we turn around the government in one stage or another is doing something to discourage industry and jobs. Energy is...is the thing that makes this country a good place to live in. If you don't want energy, if you want to live without energy and you want all clean air just go down to Mexico. I can show you places you can drive a hundred miles and you won't see a smokestack, you won't see an electric line, you won't see a telephone line or anything. That's the place for you to go if you want to go someplace where there is no energy. But if you want the good living with energy and jobs for your people and electric energy and heat for the old people which you're now passing Bills to help the old people with their utility bills, then don't be voting 'no' on this Bill or else I say you're being hypocritical."



Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Pierce to explain his vote."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Illinois coal is a great resource. It's not going to go away. It's in the ground and we're going to find ways to burn it in an environmentally acceptable manner. We're working on a fluidized bed ...burning for Illinois coal that will remove the sulphur right in the burning process. We're working on coal-liquefaction, coal-gasification that will allow Illinois coal to be converted to a liquid or to a gas to be burned in an environmentally acceptable way. We're working on ways of removing sulphur in the stacks. And we're going to have...going to have sulphur removed eventually in the burning process in the stacks. Let's not be precipitous and burn Illinois coal in a way that's going to endanger the environment. It's there, it's not going to spoil, it's not going to rot, it's a great resource, it's a great value. It's going to be used. We don't have to burn it all up this year and we're going to find ways to burn it and at the same time preserve the environment. I think the government was right in his veto. And I will vote 'no' on the override."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Brummet to explain his vote."

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

I'd just like to clear up a few statements that have been made by some other people about not having any substantial increase in the use of Illinois coal. When I sat on the Environmental Committee, we had the utilities in to discuss the burning of coal in the State of Illinois and it was brought out to us that they're having to mix western coal with Illinois coal. One reason that they would like to use more Illinois is because it burns better than the western coal. Another reason is that it's got a much higher BTU unit than what we're getting from the western states. But it sounds perfectly ridiculous to think that we can't burn coal in our own part of the country and yet we can ship it out to other states and they can burn it perfectly legal when we're all operating under the same United States law. There are other places in the State of Illinois outside of Chicago, Peoria and East St. Louis. I happen to live in the country territory. And the thing that hasn't been brought out is the fact that we have a lot of smog utilities down there who were



forced, and I might say ridiculously, to start burning gas and oil some few years ago. It looks as if there's going to be a federal law to send them back to coal. But there are three of these in the 55th District and I'd hate like the devil to see them in the middle of the coal district and having to import their coal from out west. I think this is perfectly ridiculous. I vote to override the veto. Let's get enough votes up there to that."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Tipsword to explain his vote."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, a previous speaker on this issue indicated to us that the coal won't go away, it'll still be in the ground. It sure will be and it's going to stay there and stay there and stay there in the manner in which we're going. We have a great problem in the northeastern quadrant of the United States in industries fleeing from all of the states in the northeastern quadrant, going into the sunbelt. In fact, our Congressmen from these states have formed a coalition in the Congress of the United States to try to do something to avoid this fleeing of industry. Well, one of the things that can keep them here is a ready supply of energy because industry needs nothing as bad today as it needs a good source of energy. The provisions of this Bill they're not going to choke anybody. The provisions of this Bill are not going to kill anybody in the State of Illinois. All it is going to do is give us some reasonableness in the State of Illinois. They say that we should....would...should not take away from the Environmental Protection Agency this area they have of giving some authority for industry to come into an area. All this does is just simply open that area in which they now have this permission up and make it open throughout the State of Illinois within that limited range. At least give an opportunity for some more industry to come into the state and to provide employment to the people in this state. There is no reason in the world that we should be buying lignite from Montana and Colorado when we have a ready source of good energy in the State of Illinois that can be used without really causing any hazard to the people of the State of Illinois because we won't be going below the Federal Clean Air Standards. There is no reason that the Environmental Protection Agency in the State of Illinois



has to have the roughest standards of any state. There is no reason that it can...has to be able to go to national conventions and say, 'We're tougher than anybody else and we run more industry out of the state, we provide less of our own energy', just simply because it...it soothes their soul and makes their pride a little more evident than would be otherwise. We must put people to work in this state. We hear that cry all the time from people who are opposing this Bill. Well, here is an area in which you can do it and you're not really going to hurt anyone in the State of Illinois because of the limits that are contained in this Bill. Let's try to use Illinois coal. Let's give...industries in this state and industries that would like to come here a source of energy that is readily available here and not available in such quantities in hardly any other area of the world and let's use it."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Stiehl to explain her vote."

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

I'm voting 'no' on Senate Bill 281 because I think the situation here has changed significantly since this Bill was passed last spring. The Amendment to the Federal Clean Air Act that were passed in August placed Senate Bill 281 in direct conflict with federal law. The federal law will not permit the dispersion technics that are advocated in Senate Bill 281 except in very special circumstances. And in those circumstances where the federal law does permit high stacks there is no conflict with the Illinois EPA and therefore I think that this Bill is no longer necessary and I ask that you vote 'no' on overriding the Governor's veto. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Griesheimer to explain your vote."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm extremely concerned with the status of business in the State of Illinois. But I'm even more concerned with the fact that Legislators can get up on the floor of this House and decry the business climate and urge us to vote for this Bill when many of those Legislators are the same ones that voted for the increase in unemployment compensation, workmen's compensation and all those various things we've been using to bury business. But I think that when you get right down to it on the floor of the House, one of the prior speakers hit the nail on the head when he said,



'Do not be a hypocrite!... We have too many hypocrites in this House. As the Sponsor of the Clean Air Act in Illinois urging you not to smoke in certain areas so that we can at least sustain our lifestyle in the normality because we're not puffing on cigarettes, I would be quite a hypocrite to vote to override the Governor's Veto. Thus, this being the case, and not wanting to be a hypocrite, I'm going to vote to sustain the Governor's Veto."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Anderson to explain his vote."

Anderson: "Yes, Mr...Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I did not vote for the increase in unemployment or workmen's comp and I am voting for the override and let me tell you why. By profession I'm a metallurgical engineer and I spent twenty-five years working in a primary zinc plant. At this plant we had a lead chamber, sulphuric acid plant. There we roasted spalerite which was zinc sulphite which had thirty percent sulphur in it. Now this is about ten times, over ten times as much as Illinois coal has in it, and SO2 fumes were released in the atmosphere - now this is System #4, we had four systems, three systems prior to this one. We first started roasting zinc sulphite back in 1880. Now this was...this plant was located in the northeast corner of the City of LaSalle. Now the prevailing winds were from the southwest and directly to the northeast of our plant was farmland and from 1880 until the plant was closed down, these SO2 fumes, you know, just blew all over the farmland and it didn't hurt the crops any. Crops were there, we prospered. We have probably one of the highest outputs of soybeans and corn in that section of the State of Illinois. So I urge you to not to tie the hands of business like we did with the workmen's comp and the unemployment comp but to give our business and our people a chance to flourish here in Illinois. I urge you to vote for the override."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Cunningham to explain your vote."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We're grateful to the prior speaker for the breath of fresh air and reason and logic and knowledge that he brings to the subject. What's the objection, Mr. Speaker? I wanted to say that partisan civility shouldn't cause you to go over the brink of economic...."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Boucek, for what reason do you rise?"



To explain your vote? All right. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Hart, for what reason do you rise?"

Hart: "I'd like to place this on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Giorgi: "...Shall I announce the vote result first and then place it on Postponed Consideration? All right. 80 'ayes', 77 'nays', 3 voting 'present'. And the Sponsor asked that it be put on Postponed Consideration. Does the Gentleman have leave? Leave... leave....70....70, the rules object. Okay. Let the records show that Johnson objects. Senate Bill 392, Representative Deuster, for what reason do you rise?"

Deuster: "I thought, I thought I was 'no' on that and I see my button's not pushed, I'd like consent to be recorded as 'no' on that."

Speaker Giorgi: "There's no record, Mr. Deuster, it's on Postponed Consideration."

Deuster: "Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Senate Bill 392, Representative Hoffman. Is he in the chamber? Out of the record. Senate Bill 413, Representative Richmond. On the Total Veto Motion...Senate Bill 413."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 413 is identical to House Bill 1183 which on November the 4th we did vote 111 in favor of an override of the Governor's Veto, so I now ask that you give this Bill the same consideration. Just very briefly, I will not take much of your time because it is ...of rather recent nature that we did discuss this Bill, or one that's exactly like it. This Bill would eliminate the requirement that is presently imposed upon those who purchase aviation fuel in Illinois and I refer to that imposition that requires the purchaser to pay state motor fuel tax on aviation fuel and then permits application for refunding of the same. This is unnecessary layer of government that I think that we can remove and you have voted along those lines on three different occasions in the last Session and in this Override Session. So I ask for your indulgence and to uphold this effort to override the Governor's Veto of 413... Senate Bill 413."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Young on the motion. Representative



Rigney on the motion."

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I suppose at times it does look a little foolish to collect this tax and then in turn rebate it. But I would point out to the House that this is precisely the pattern that we follow with other motor fuel tax rebates, namely, the amount of fuel that is used by farmers, the amount of fuel that is used in the construction industry for off-the-road purposes. All of these things pay the tax initially and then at the end of the year they can file and get this back if they can justify the fact that this was indeed used as an off-the-road type of fuel. So I don't know why any special exception should be made for one class of fuel users."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Richmond to close."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. Very briefly, it is true that other motor fuels are...taxes are assessed for nonhighway purposes and there's a reason for that that...that we have need to go through this procedure that is not evident or is not necessary in this particular case because aviation gasoline is distinct inasmuch as it's color-coded. It is not really adaptable to...for diversion purposes around an airport to put in your car because if you used it long enough you would soon find that you have damaged your engine plus the fact that it costs more. So the reasons for diversion are completely absent as they would be in the case of farm fuel and nonhighway construction fuel because those are identical fuels that could be used for highway purposes so diversion...the temptation might be there where this certainly is not evident in this. I ask for your support of this effort to override the veto of the Governor on 413."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 413 pass notwithstanding the vote of the Governor...the veto of the Governor? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative McClain on the...to explain his vote."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this sincerely really is a good Bill. What happens right now is we collect motor fuel taxes from airplanes and then we



reimburse them for the same amount of money that we collect. It really ends up costing the state money just in the collection process. It doesn't do anything in terms of violating the Road Fund or any diversion of any sort. All it is is a duplication of effort by our collection agencies, it actually costs the state money and indeed if you'll talk to the people that control the airports, the people that fly the airplanes, this is a nuisance form. And in fact it really is a nuisance for our state government and I'd urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?"

Richmond to explain his vote? Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to point again, this is the identical Bill that a week or so ago you voted, a ll1 of you voted, to support my effort. And also, when the Bill was voted on before the House in Regular Session it passed a ll5 to 2. And the House version passed 128 to 4. This is not going to...it'll cost the state a little bit of money, some six hundred thousand (600,000) probably, and that's an estimate maybe on the high side. It is necessary to...point this out because there's been some misinformation concerning how much this could cost. The Governor said one to two million dollars (\$1 to 2,000,000) which is absolutely false and I can prove that. But the....I think he had poor information. But the fact is, is that the money is derived from this tax or from this reimburseable collection fee is...is one that I consider rather a poor way to raise state funds, and that is, we...we hold money that is not really owed to the state and someone doesn't ask for...to have it refunded and therefore they wind up...the state winds up as a recipient of those funds which I don't think we're entitled to and I don't believe this is the way the state should raise their money. I again urge you to support the motion."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Mugalian to explain his vote."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It might help to...to...in explaining my vote to say that those who believe in Republican rhetoric would vote green on this Bill. Republican rhetoric continues to say there's no reason to have unnecessary to paperwork, to get involved in extra bureaucracy. All this....this Bill does not change the



exemption of aviation fuel from gas tax. All it does is say that we won't require people to pay the tax, file a bunch of forms, send it to the Department and get a refund. It's really incredible to me that a Republican Governor and Republican Legislators can vote against this Bill. This is a Bill for the little people who sometimes buy the gasoline and forget to get their refund. It's a ripoff not to vote to override this veto."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are a 100 'ayes', 56 'nays', 6 voting 'present'. Representative Richmond, for what reason do you rise?"

Richmond: "I would ask permission to place it on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Giorgi: "Okay, Postponed Consideration. Senate Bill 1012, Total Veto Motions. Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1012 was overridden in the Senate by a vote of 36 to 4 with 1 present. This legislation which was originally passed by both the House and the Senate and overridden in the Senate puts court reporters in the same posture for the Industrial Commission as our court reporters in the Judicial System in the State of Illinois. The Governor's Veto states that there would be a...no diversion of....there would be a..the setting of salaries of the court reporters to the Judicial Court Reporters. He believes it's not a separation of powers. But in my estimation and that of the Members of the House that supported this legislation before, as well as those in the Senate, that for example, a carpenter working for the Judicial System gets x-amount of dollars per hour if he works for the Judicial System or the House of Representatives or private enterprise. These court reporters, and in many cases, are the same people who work in the courts as well as in the Industrial Commission should be paid at the same rate. That is basically the argument on the override and I ask for your favorable support in overriding the Governor's Veto of Senate Bill 1012."

Speaker Giorgi: "There being no further debate, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1012 pass notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor? All in favor signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'nay'.



Have all voted who wish? Representative Mautino to explain his vote."

Mautino: "I think there's some misunderstanding and I would like to explain why I'm on green. I've been informed that the average court reporter in the Judicial System works approximately two hours and thirty-six minutes a day. Those court reporters, the same people with the same qualifications work for the Industrial Commission on.... eight hour a day basis. We are paying, in many cases, the same person who works in the courts a different salary for working for the Industrial Commission doing the same thing. Now they must pass the proficiency examination before they qualify and they must be qualified to do the...the court reporting. So I cannot for the life of me understand the differences and the red votes board. It's very similar to being an attorney. If you charge forty dollars an hour to one person, I would assume you'd charge forty dollars an hour to a person in a different profession. But, the example is, you're an attorney giving the same service and the same qualification. Therefore, I submit to you that they're doing the same job and they should be paid the same wage. Very simple. All of us service in the General Assembly and get the same wage whether or not we are good, indifferent, excellent or noncommittal Representatives. It's the same thing....more green vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Bennett to explain his vote."

Bennett: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also rise to vote green on this Bill. I can't understand in looking at the board those... those of the Membership who voted to increase the arbitrator's salaries not voting for this piece of legislation also because the principle is really...really the same. And I would even go beyond what Representative Mautino said concerning these court reporters. These court reporters are there all the time that the arbitrator or commissioners are...are working and many times that's very late in the evening. I've seen them work more than eight hours a day and...and frankly not only being present but actually taking the shorthand reporting all during that time. They...they work very hard and they are certainly unpaid. Not only do...do they work hard but in many instances throughout the downstate portion of our state they travel a great distance to and from their work. In...in my particular area the territory that is



covered extends all the way from the Decatur area all the way down to Belleville and East St. Louis...and...and reporters have to travel a great distance in many instances. There's no reason, andin fact there's every reason, every reason to treat these particular people...at least equal to the court reporters who...who have a very short distance to travel and frankly do not work as hard."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Griesheimer to explain his vote."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill falls into the same category as the ludicrous Bill that we voted through last week, vastly increasing the amounts of money to be paid for arbitrators and commissioners in this particular Industrial Commission. I'm very much opposed to overriding the Governor's Veto on this. I think we should withhold any pay increases until he's had an opportunity to review all the pay standards in the State of Illinois. I would like to answer the question raised by the prior speaker concerning the question of, 'Do these people work as hard as court reporters in our Circuit Court in the State of Illinois?' And the answer is, categorically, no. I don't believe the Speaker is an attorney but if you ever went to an Industrial Commission hearing you will find out that these men are sitting by their machines doing nothing most of the time. A court reporter in a court of law is sitting there as a matter of law taking every word down and in many instances have to prepare records on appeal. And they are just deluged with the amount of work they have. I don't know of a single court reporter who wouldn't like to trade jobs from their court jobs with a job in the Industrial Commission where really what they do is take about two hours for lunch and fool around with the arbitrator and then casually get back to work again. And as the arbitrator is chatting with the attorneys he likes so well in order to resolve suit, the court reporter is sitting there collecting his state salary. I think we should sustain the Governor on this matter and vote 'no'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Katz to explain his vote."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, in my observation which is a good deal with regard to the court reporters, I think that the remarks of the last speaker were not really appropriate or accurate. In the first place, that was not the basis on which the Governor acted. And the second place,



I would tell you that the court reporters work very hard and they are transcribing highly technical material full of all sorts of medical terminology. I...you vote how you want to on the Bill but I do want to tell you that these reporters in my observation work extremely hard. They are excellent reporters. They're dealing with the most complicated kind of medical legal problems. And when you're voting on it you ought to be aware of those facts."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 95 'ayes', 55 'nays' and 2 voting 'present'. Representative Mautino, for what reason do you rise?"

Mautino: "Would you please put this on Postponed Consideration?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Postponed Consideration. Senate Bill 1312, Total Veto Motion by Representative DiPrima. 1312."

DiPrima: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Senate Bill 1312 is the Bill that would allow students in private colleges to be...have available to them the GI scholarships and... if they're available at state institutions I can't understand why they should be deprived while they're going to private institutions. And I would appreciate an affirmative vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Ryan on the motion."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to oppose the motion to override the Governor's Veto on Senate Bill 1312. I've discussed this legislation with the former Minority Leader and now the Director of Veteran's Affairs, Bud Washburn. He has six concerns and the Department has five reasons for opposing this legislation. First, it's not included in the Department's budget as recommended by the Governor. And if we're going to avoid a tax increase we must avoid multimillion dollar add-ons to the Governor's Budget. Second, without an accompanying appropriation this legislation could cost some veterans in other categories to lose benefits. Thirdly, this legislation has not received the active support of veteran's organizations according to the Director. Fourth, no administrative funds have been set aside in the Department's Budget to administer the program and without such funds the programs would be very difficult to administer. And at the time when our emphasis is on making state government operate



efficiently and smoothly we should not approve legislation which could result in chaotic situations within a Code Department. And finally, this legislation sets a very bad precedent. When it was originally introduced, the cost would have been about forty million dollars (\$40,000,000). This Bill is a foot in the door, the beginning of a program which could expand almost uncontrollably. And for those reasons I oppose this motion and urge everyone to support the Governor's Veto."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Stuffle on the motion."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I don't think that those who would vote against this motion should be cast with a lot of those who are opposed to veterans because a vote against this motion is not a vote against veterans. The Minority Leader has well pointed out the reasons why this motion should not pass. Beyond that, if we do pass this and don't appropriate more money we will in fact in the second semester of this year be taking money from some veterans who already awards, who are already supported under the Military Scholarship to give others. We will be cutting people out and cutting people down who already know that they have awards in the public school systems. The money is simply not there and it can't be spread any further without additional appropriation. As the Minority Leader pointed out and others have, this was opposed in Committee by a number of veterans' groups. So no one should believe that a vote for this motion is a vote for veterans because veterans are not in the main for this particular Bill or the motion. And for those reasons and those cited earlier, I would urge as a Member of the Committee that heard this Bill that we vote against the motion on 1312 and vote to sustain the Governor's Veto on 1312."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Lauer on the motion."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Indicates he will."

Lauer: "Representative DiPrima, as I recall this Bill when it was in the Higher Education Committee we requested an Amendment that would assure that private school...that veterans that chose to go to private schools would receive no more aid than veterans that would go to public schools. As I recall, that Amendment was adopted. Is



that so?"

DiPrima: "Yes."

Lauer: "So that in fact a veteran under this Bill could choose either a public school or a private school and would receive the same tuition support so that actually this...the net effect of this Bill at this time would not cost the state any more money but would give the veterans the benefit of being able to have a wider choice of schools where he could use the state benefit, is that correct?"

DiPrima: "Right."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, I would agree with Representative DiPrima that the Governor's Veto should not be sustained. I think that we need to recognize that we have private schools in this state that need to be able to attract students just the same as the public universities. I see no reason why we should deny freedom of choice to those veterans who might wish to go to a school that will meet their particular needs somewhat better than one of the public schools. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I strongly solicit an 'aye' vote on this motion to override the Governor's Veto."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Walsh on the motion."

Walsh: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm pleased to rise to support the position of the two foremost experts on higher education in this House, Representatives Lauer and Freeman. It is absolutely false, Mr. Speaker, to say that this Bill costs money. That is a deception and a fraud. It doesn't cost anything at all. To say that the tuition charged students at the University of Illinois is the cost of educating those people at the University of Illinois is downright ridiculous. They charge in the neighborhood of four hundred and fifty dollars (\$450.00) a semester, the cost is six or seven times that, I believe. And I suggest to you that the cost at most of the private schools in this state is substantially less than the cost the people of the State of Illinois are paying at the public colleges and universities. So there's absolutely no reason on earth why we should not support this motion of the Gentleman to override the Governor's Veto. The Governor was in error and I suggest to you that because of the differences that the cost there actually will be a cost savings to the people. And



there's no reason on earth why we should give scholarships to people to universities that are state supported and not support one of our most vital and important resources, the private colleges of the State of Illinois. I urge that you support the Gentleman's motion."

Speaker Giorgi: "For the purpose of an announcement. Channel 2 wants to take some still pictures this afternoon, so for the...CBS, I think. Representative Schneider on the motion. Representative Van Dwyne on the motion. Representative Van Dwyne on the motion."

Van Dwyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I was just going to point out one of...one of the things that I think is probably one of...one of the most important here that really hasn't been brought up and that is the fact that the living expenses that are going to be brought into contention here to most of the veterans. If you...if you attend a state supported college such as Champaign or...or DeKalb or Bloomington, that those from my area will have to leave home to go down there to stay. Now these fellas are older fellas, most of them are married, a lot of them with children. And to have to go there and stay and...and establish a residence while they go to these schools would actually prohibit them from taking advantage of any scholarship they have. So if they do have a private school in their neighborhood or close to home, I think this would give them a chance to avail themselves of these scholarships and I don't see a thing wrong with it. If you are type of person as I am that wants to give the veterans a chance to avail themselves of any scholarship that is...is...that are available, I think we should be voting for this."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative DiPrima to close."

DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the only thing is, I can't see how you can differentiate between state supported institutions and private schools. I think they should all be equally treated alike. And I would appreciate an affirmative vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1312 notwithstanding the veto of the Governor? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are...Representative, Miss Dyer, to explain her vote."



Representative Dyer to explain her vote."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have been consistently sustaining the vetoes of the Governor in areas that cost money. I respect his budget. I respect the ceiling on spending. But I want to point out to you that in this Bill we are not talking about an expenditure of money, we're saying that if a veteran receives a scholarship, he or she, may take the amount of money given him by the state and then spend that for tuition at either a private or a public college. Think about this. For every student that chooses the private college, the state is saving money because as Representative Walsh pointed out, there's a hidden overhead in capital development and subsidies of every student in a public college or university in this state. Our Republican spokesman on the Higher Education Committee, Representative Lauer, spoke eloquently for this override. We agree with the experts on the other side of the aisle, this is a veto that should be overridden. I urge a 'yes' vote on this one."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Keats to explain your vote."

Keats: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to, before I vote, announce that I have a rather blatant conflict of interest on this Bill since I teach at a private school but as Representative Epton says, 'I'll vote my conscience anyway' and I ask to be voted 'yes'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Shall we take another Roll Call? We inadvertently locked the...open it up again. Okay. Right. The question is... we're going to vote again, fellas. The question is, shall Senate Bill 1312 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted... take...take the record, Mr. Clerk? On this...on this question there are 82 'ayes', 61 'nays', 1 voting 'present'. And for the request of the House, Postponed Consideration. He does. The next two Bills on the Calendar are out of the record. Representative Ryan, for what reason do you rise?"

Ryan: "Question, Mr. Speaker, what was the disposition of that last Bill?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Postponed Consideration."

Ryan: "By the request of the Sponsor, he requested that?"



Speaker Giorgi: "Yes, he indicated that he wanted that...."

Ryan: "Is that right, Representative DiPrima, you requested Postponed Consideration on that Bill?"

Speaker Giorgi: "All right. He reaffirmed his request. On the Calendar same page 3 is the Reduction Veto Motions. Is Representative Edgar in the chambers? Out of the record. Representative Richmond, do you want to go with Senate Bill 437? Senate Bill 437, Reduction and Item Veto Motion. Senator....Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 437 was the Appropriation Bill for the ordinary and contingent expenses of Southern Illinois University both at Carbondale and at Edwardsville. And when this Bill was presented to you in the Regular Session, it passed a 126 to 13 and it's contained onepersonnel line item of three hundred and sixty-four thousand, roughly, three hundred and sixty-four thousand dollars which would have been used for one-half of one-percent increase for employees pay. And as I say, this was part of the Bill and was passed a 126 to 13 here in the House. It has since been, that part has been vetoed or reduced by the Governor and there was a motion in the Senate to override this particular action and it was successful with a vote of 35 or 6 votes I believe. So now I ask that the House concur with my effort to override...to restore these funds that were stricken by the Governor's action."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Ebbesen on the motion."

Ebbesen: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Ebbesen: "It was my understanding, you know, and if...if I'm mistaken correct me but, when the total appropriation for higher education came down as recommended and the Governor said, you know, he was, I think it was fifty million dollars...less than was requested and he...in...in that cut he gave it back to the higher board and he told them to distribute that money as they saw fit and that would be his budget and the....is that not correct, Representative, and is this a deviation from that? And we're talking about money that was not within this frame of reference?"

Richmond: "This...I'm not aware of any agreements, or made by, between



the universities and the Governor and the Higher Board or whatever, but the total Appropriation Bill was at an amount that was considerably less than recommended by the Board of Higher Education and of course it was somewhat higher than what the Governor wanted. So, he has since taken the pin to it and I'm just following the dictates of my constituents in my area and asking that we restore these funds..."

Ebbesen: "...For this, Representative, I commend you if that's the dictates of your constituency but the only point I'm trying to make and I hope I'm correct in stating this, that, and that Higher Education appropriation the Higher Board took that and spread that in the manner after the fifty million dollars (\$50,000,000) cut and that did become the appropriation Bill. And if this is something different from that I certainly would encourage everybody to sustain the Governor's position."

Speaker Giorgi: "Senate...Representative Richmond to close."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I again just ask that you give consideration to this request for this effort to restore this badly needed three hundred and sixty-four thousand dollars (\$364,000) to the SIU Edwardsville, Carbondale Budget for the purpose that was originally intended and that was to give the badly needed one-half ($\frac{1}{2}$) of one percent (1%) increase to those employees....employed by the university."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall the Reduced Item of Appropriation on page 1, line 11, of Senate Bill 437 be restored to its original amount notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. It'll take 89 votes. Representative Peters on the.... to explain his vote."

Peters: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Ebbesen did...did indicate in his comments exactly what the situation here is. The various systems, the Board of Governors, the U of I and the Board of Regents had all agreed with the Members of the Board of Higher Education on the dollar amount for their particular budgets. All of the other universities systems are living within that agreement. This is the only override motion we have for one of the universities. I certainly respect the



members of the particular district the university is located in for their efforts on behalf of their particular institution but I indicate to all of you and would remind all of you that if we are in the position of overriding on one we then have to be in a position of overriding on all of the others and breaking in fact the agreements that have been reached with the trustees and.....members of the Board of Regents, the Board of Higher Education and the Board of Governors. I would respectfully request a 'no' vote to sustain the action of the Governor."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Richmond to explain your vote."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I...I'm not aware of agreement. Again I would just ask that you give consideration to this one issue. If other motions are presented I will certainly support them in regards to other universities on the merits that they're presented. And I think this...this motion does merit and the need is there and certainly I do need your support."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 74 'ayes', 72 'noes', 2 voting 'present'. Representative Richmond, for what reason do you rise?"

Richmond: "Place it on Postponed Consideration please."

Speaker Giorgi: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Postponed Consideration."

Richmond: "Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: Tape difficulty. "Hang in there. On the Supplemental Calendar...on the second page of the Supplemental Calendar is Total Veto Motions by...on Senate Bill 856 by Senator.... Representative Getty. Is Representative Getty in the room? Take it out of the record. On the Supplemental Calendar are...is an Amendatory Veto Motion on Senate Bill 728 by Representative Getty. Representative Getty? He's not in the room. On that....(tape difficulty)....you want to go with Senate Bill 1041? Mr. Clerk, on the...motion on Senate Bill 1041. Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The motion is to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto. This Veto, the change is simply a technical change would simply provide that



new policies to the issues will coincide with the provisions of this Bill. Why the Amendatory Veto was placed I don't know because the Bill was not to be effective until July 1, '78. It certainly does no harm to the Bill. I don't know if it does any good but in any event I move we accept the Governor's recommendation. Move acceptance."

Speaker Giorgi: "Just a moment.... The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 1041? Senate Bill 1041 by adoption of the Amendment. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and those opposed will vote 'no'. It'll take 89 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. This motion having received the Constitutional Majority, prevails, there being a 132 'ayes', no 'nays' and none voting 'present'. This motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding Senate Bill 1041."

Speaker Bradley: "On the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1107, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This again is the, although it's not exactly a technical change, it's a change which requires by virtue of the fact that we had three other Senate Bills which also dealt with the time requirement relative to cancellation and on renewal. And in this case in order to have all four of the Senate Bills conform, Senate Bill 473, 526 and 1107, have already been....Senate Bill 473 and 526 have already been amended and we'd like to have Senate Bill 1107 comply. It simply requires that there...ten day notice to the assured will be given where the reason for the cancellation is nonpayment of premiums, applies only in the case of nonpayment of premiums. And I move we accept the Governor's specific recommendation."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? If not, the question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 1107 by adoption of Amendment. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. ...All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 146 'ayes', no 'nays and none voting 'present'. This motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails



and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding Senate Bill 1107 by adoption of the Amendment.

On the Calendar in the Supplemental appears Senate Bill 1310.

Mr. Getty. I think I saw Mr. Getty here just a second ago.

All right. ...On the Calendar.....(tape difficulty)...the Calendar appears House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 22, Mr. Totten. You wish that called? Out of the record? We read...(tape difficulty)...Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Capparelli, Chairman of the Committee on Executive, to which the following Bills were referred. Action taken November 16, 1977, reports the same back with the following recommendations: do pass Constitutional Amendments 12, 15, 24, and 33. Be adopted, House Joint Resolution 60, Senate Joint Resolution 57,...56. Senate Joint Resolution 57.

Representative Chapman, Chairman of the Committee on Human Resources to which the following Bills were referred. Action taken November 16th...oh, that's a special. That's a special."

Speaker Bradley: "Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed a Bill of the following title and the passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to-wit: Senate Bill 1383. Passed by the Senate November 16 by a three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Bradley: "Senate Bills First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1383. Ebbesen. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the downstate counties, Working Cash Fund Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Introduction and First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2534. Leinenweber. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Marriage Act. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2535. Schuneman. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to authorize the Director of Public Health to purchase and acquire sites. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2536. Schuneman. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections



and the title of an Act to authorize Director of Public Health to purchase and acquire sites. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2537. Catania. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unified Code of Corrections. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2538. John Dunn. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Capital Development Board. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2539. John Dunn. A Bill for an Act relating to county and municipal jails. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2540. Griesheimer. A Bill for an Act to make appropriations to the Department of Transportation. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2541. Griesheimer. A Bill for an Act to make appropriations to the Department of Transportation. First Reading of the Bill.

House Bill 2542. Griesheimer. A Bill for an Act to make appropriation the Department of Transportation. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 532. Antonovych. 534, Byers.

535, Matejek. 536, Mautino. 538, Williams. 540, Von Boeckman.

And House Joint Resolution 63, Lucco."

Speaker Bradley: "What purpose does the Gentleman from Lawrence, the distinguished Representative, Representative Cunningham, arise?"

Cunningham: "Honored Speaker, I wanted to answer an inquiry. Those of you who wondered about the Hard Hat Bill on Representative Jones' desk...that was, for yet another groundbreaking ceremony. And if you would like to have a hat like that on your desk quit voting for all of these projects that drain the entire state for the benefit of Sangamon County and vote for your own constituents. You watch my light and I'll show you should be going on this. In the meanwhile, I congratulate Jones for his efforts."

Speaker Bradley: "Agreed Resolutions, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wonder if the Clerk would pull out House Resolution 536 because that's going to require a Roll Call vote because that....."

Speaker Bradley: "It'll be taken out of the Agreed Resolutions...."

Matijevich: "Yeah, that asks for an investigation. House Resolution 532, he...congratulates the Molda Dumka and Ukranian Choruses of Metropolitan Chicago for a concert.



House Resolution 532, Mark Cappell, we congratulate him for becoming a Class 1A Cross Country Champion.

House Resolution 535, Matejek, Congratulates Chester Nowak for his 57th birthday.

House Resolution 538, congratulates Jack Leese on retirement after 15 years as coach of the East Leyden Eagles.

House Resolution 540 congratulates Mr. and Mrs. Lambert Tibbs of Pekin for 50 years together. Hopefully they're married, I believe. I didn't read that one closely.

House Joint Resolution 63, Lucco. The House does encourage and support the passage of all federal legislation developing in researching and implementing the use of gasohol.

I would move the adoption of those Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Now. Further Resolutions? Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker...."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 526, McGrew. House Resolution 536, Mautino. And House Resolution 539, Younge."

Matijevich: "Well, I don't have...."

Speaker Bradley: "Those will be the Committee on Assignments."

Matijevich: "All right. The House Resolution 536, I understand, asks the investigation of the Illinois Legislative Investigative Committee...Commission to direct and conduct an investigation into dumping of radioactive wastes...."

Speaker Bradley: "That was taken out of the agreement...Assignment... Assignment Committee."

Matijevich: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Announcements. Committee on Assignments. Announcements? Representative Mudd, the Gentleman from Peoria."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Executive Subcommittee on Resolutions that was supposed to meet tonight immediately after adjournment is postponed until next week and we'll announce during the first day of Session when that Subcommittee will meet."

Speaker Bradley: "I would suggest that you post that or suspend the



posting rule and you won't have the six and one-half days."

Mudd: "Well, I'd move then that the posting rule be suspended because right now they haven't adopted the Resolution. So I think...."

Speaker Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have unanimous consent to.... Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "I didn't...I can't understand what the Gentleman is saying..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Mudd, do you want to explain?"

Mudd: "Well, we're, we're cancelling this evening's Executive Session. Now a Subcommittee Session on Resolutions. And it'll be held next week immediately after the Session, the first day of Session."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman asks leave...or unanimous consent to use the Attendance Roll Call for...to suspend the posting rules, hearing no objections, Mr. Tuerk, are you objecting to that....all right, hearing no objections the rule has been suspended. Now, the Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "I wanted to ask a question if it's proper at this point."

Speaker Bradley: "Of who? Whom?"

Tuerk: "Mr. Mudd."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Mudd, You wish to yield to a question, Mr. Mudd from Mr. Tuerk? He wants a ride home."

Tuerk: "Now, my question is, we have a number of Constitutional Amendments that are scheduled for Subcommittee and we're running out of time to get to the full Committee and therefore any Constitutional Amendments that isn't heard yet in this Fall Session is not going to be considered until probably next April and it may be too late for any of the Constitutional Amendments. So I'm concerned with the time, the timing and the timetable of these Constitutional Amendments and that's the basis of my question now. Are...are you going to guarantee the Sponsors of the Constitutional Amendments that they're going to get a full hearing in the full Committee and... before we adjourn here in the fall?"

Mudd: "No, Sir, I can't guarantee it. Those Resolutions were submitted to a Subcommittee and that Subcommittee returned the recommendations at last night's meeting and was adopted."

Tuerk: "Yeah, but my problem is.....been trying for three or four weeks to get a hearing and I can't get the Chairman of the Subcommittee



to give me the hearing, so that's my problem. See what I mean?"

Mudd: "I can understand your problem but I'm not in a position to guarantee that. It'll have to be brought up with the Chairman and the Chairman of the Committee on Constitutional Amendments."

Tuerk: "Well, maybe you and I need some private conversation."

Mudd: "That might help."

Speaker Bradley: "Maybe you can get that worked out over the weekend.

Now, any other announcements? Further announcements? Then, Adjournment Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution and the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the

House of Representatives, to-wit: Senate Joint Resolution 61.

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 80th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring

herein, that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, November 17,

1977, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, November 22, 1977 at 12

o'clock noon. And when the House of Representatives adjourns on

Thursday, November 17, 1977, it stands adjourned until Tuesday,

November 22, 1977 at 1 o'clock p.m. Adopted by the Senate,

November 17, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Madigan on the Adjournment Resolution."

Madigan: "I move for the adoption of the Resolution."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of the Adjournment

Resolution. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'.

The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman's motion prevails, the Adjournment

Resolution is adopted. Further business? Gentleman from

Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker...."

Speaker Bradley: "Wait...we might...."

Madigan: "And Representative Giorgi."

Speaker Bradley: "Let us read Mr. Madigan's two Death Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 537, Daniels. Respects the memory

Mrs. Minnie Mead, Joliet. House Resolution 533, Kane. Respects

the memory Charles F. Kervin, former Chief Clerk of the House of



Representatives."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Giorgi moves the adoption of the Resolutions. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the two Resolutions are adopted. The Gentleman from Cook; Mr. Madigan, on the adjournment."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we adjourn until Tuesday at 4 p.m."

Speaker Bradley: "All in favor of the Gentleman's motion..."

Madigan: "I wonder, Mr. Speaker...."

Speaker Bradley: "The Adjournment Resolution came over from the Senate ...1 o'clock, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Is the Speaker within earshot? Mr. Speaker, Redmond....
Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we could move to adjourn until 1 o'clock which would be a Perfunctory....."

Speaker Bradley: "Not yet.....Good idea...."

Madigan: "Regular Session at 4 o'clock on Tuesday."

Speaker Bradley: "So everybody understands now. It will be a Perfunct Session Tuesday at 1 o'clock. Regular Session 4 o'clock. If I understand the motion. Mr. Madigan, is that correct? 1 o'clock Perfunct, 4 o'clock Regular Session."

Madigan: "That's correct."

Speaker Bradley: "The Rules will meet at 3:30. Mrs. Geo-Karis, do you have a question on the Adjournment Resolution?"

Geo-Karis: "Yes, I wonder if I could ask the Majority Leader if we're coming in Tuesday at 4 o'clock for a Regular Session, as he says, will we be here Wednesday also?"

Madigan: "The answer is yes, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you...."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. The Gentleman has moved to adjourn until 1 o'clock Perfunct, 4 o'clock Regular Session on Tuesday. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House will stand adjourned until 1 o'clock Tuesday."

Speaker Bradley: "Now the First Special Session will come into being



and Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Capparelli, Chairman of the Committee on Executive to which the following Bills were referred, action taken November 16, 1977, reported the same back with the following recommendation: do pass Senate Bill 12."

Speaker Bradley: "Adjournment Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Joint Resolution. Resolved by the Senate of the 80th General Assembly, the State of Illinois, the House concurring herein, that when the Senate adjourns Thursday, November 17, 1977, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, November 22, 1977 at 12:15 p.m. And when the House adjourns on Thursday, November 17, 1977, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, November 22, 1977 at 1:10 o'clock p.m."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Madigan moves the adoption of the...."

Madigan: "I move for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution."

Speaker Bradley: "All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Resolution is adopted. And, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I...I thought I heard the Clerk read that.... Special Session will come back in at 1:10...."

Speaker Bradley: "1:10"

Madigan: "1:10 and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move that we adjourn until 1:10 for a Perfunctory Session and then a Regular Session of this Special Session...4:10."

Speaker Bradley: "All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Gentleman's motion prevails. The First Special Session is adjourned...."

Speaker Bradley: "And the Second Special Session will come to order. Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Capparelli, Chairman of the Committee on Executive, to which the following Bills were referred. Action taken November 16, 1977, reported the same back with the following recommendation: do pass as amended House Bill 14. Do pass and re-refer House Bill 15."



Representative Chapman, Chairman of the Committee on Human Resources, to which the following Bills were referred. Action taken November 16, 1977, reported the same back with the following recommendation: do not pass as amended, Senate Bill 1."

Speaker Bradley: "Adjournment Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "Resolved....Senate Joint Resolution. Resolved by the Senate of the 80th General Assembly of the State of Illinois and the House of Representatives concurring herein, that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, November 17, 1977, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, November 22, 1977, at 12:30 o'clock p.m.

When the House adjourns on Thursday, November 17, 1977, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, November 22, 1977, at 1:20 p.m."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Madigan on the Adjournment Resolution. All in favor of the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The Adjournment Resolution is adopted. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Move for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution."

Speaker Bradley: "We already adopted that, let's, you know...."

Madigan: "Okay."

Speaker Bradley: "We're on the motion...."

Madigan: "What time on this one, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "1:20."

Madigan: "Therefore, I move that this Special Session adjourn until Tuesday at 1:20 for a Perfunctory Session and then for a Regular Session of this Special Session at 4:20."

Speaker Bradley: "All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Second Special Session stands adjourned till...as the Gentleman said in his motion."



SHUMPERT

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

TAYLOR

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION
CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

38

10
12
16
17
18
19
20
21
24
27
30
32
33
34
35
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE EIGHTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that there shall be submitted to the electors of the State for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least 6 months after the adoption of this resolution, a proposition to amend Section 4 of Article IX of the Constitution to read as follows:

ARTICLE IX

REVENUE

SECTION 4. REAL PROPERTY TAXATION.

(a) Except as otherwise provided in this Section, taxes upon real property shall be levied uniformly by valuation ascertained as the General Assembly shall provide by law.

(b) Subject to such limitations as the General Assembly may hereafter prescribe by law, counties with a population of more than 200,000 may classify or continue to classify real property for purposes of taxation. Any such classification shall be reasonable and assessments shall be uniform within each class. The level of assessment or rate of tax of the highest class in a county shall not exceed two and one-half times the level of assessment or rate of tax of the lowest class in that county. Real property used in farming in a county shall not be assessed at a higher level of assessment than single family residential real property in that county.

(c) Any depreciation in the value of real estate occasioned by a public easement may be deducted in assessing such property.

(d) Any home rule municipality may provide a growth incentive by designating certain specific areas within its boundaries to be taxed on the basis of site value, without regard to the value of improvements. Immediately after the

1 designation of such an area, each taxing district involved. 53
2 shall fix its tax rate on improvements in the designated area 54
3 at zero and fix its tax rate on land in the designated area 55
4 equal to the product of the real property tax rate of the 56
5 taxing district times a conversion factor, which will 57
6 thereafter remain constant, equal to the ratio of the
7 aggregate assessed value of all taxable real property in the 58
8 designated area divided by the aggregate assessed value of 59
9 all taxable land in the designated area. Taxation of 60
10 designated areas under this option shall continue for 12
11 years, but may be extended without limit as long as any such 61
12 extensions are for no less than 12 year periods. 62

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
1.	12:00	Speaker Redmond	House to order
		Reverend Krueger	Prayer
		Speaker Redmond	Roll Call
2.		Clerk Hall	House Joint Res. Const. Am.
	12:05	Speaker Redmond	Reg. Session recess Call of Chair
3.			First Sp. Session to order First Sp. Session recess Second Sp. Session to order Second Sp. Session recess Regular Session to order
		Clerk O'Brien	Introduction and First Reading
		Speaker Redmond	
4.		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Committee Reports
	12:15	Speaker Redmond	
5.		Telcser	Leave to hear all SB-40-59 Condominium Bills
		Speaker Redmond	
		Lechowicz	Take out SB-60
		Speaker Redmond	Leave granted
		Telcser	SB-40 through 59 Motion to accept
6.		Speaker Redmond	House accepts
		Telcser	SB-60..Motion
7.		Speaker Redmond	
	12:25	Lechowicz)) Telcser)	Yield?
		Speaker Redmond	House accepts Gov. recommendation
8.		Lucco	Introduction



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	SB-66...Motion
		Speaker Redmond	House accepts Gov. recommendation
		Terzich	SB-110...Motion
9.		Speaker Redmond	
		Darrow)	Yield?
)	
		Terzich)	
		REPRESENTATIVE BRADLEY IN CHAIR...	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Terzich	
		Speaker Bradley	House accepts Gov. recommendation
		Matijevich	SB-280...Motion
10.		Speaker Bradley	
		Skinner)	Yield?
)	
		Matijevich)	
		Speaker Bradley	
11.		Schuneman)	Yield?
)	
		Matijevich)	
		Speaker Bradley	
12.		Tipsword)	Yield?
)	
	12:35	Matijevich)	
		Speaker Bradley	
13.		Schlickman)	
)	
		Speaker Bradley)	
)	
		Matijevich)	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Bradley	House accepts Gov. recommendation
		Friedrich	Introduction
		Speaker Bradley	
		Holewinski	SB-301...Motion
		Speaker Bradley	House accepts Gov. recommendation
14.		Greiman	SB-368...Motion
		Speaker Bradley	House accepts Gov. recommendation
		Marovitz	SB-421...Motion
		Speaker Bradley	
15.		Schlickman	Asks for explanation
		Speaker Bradley	
		Marovitz	
		Speaker Bradley	House accepts Gov. recommendation
		Speaker Redmond	
16.		Speaker Bradley	
		Chapman	Leave to meet...Human Resources
		Speaker Bradley	
		Skinner	Objects-
		Speaker Bradley	
	12:40	Chapman	
17.		Speaker Bradley	
		Deuster	Objects
		Speaker Bradley	
		Chapman	
		Speaker Bradley	
18.		Skinner	
		Speaker Bradley	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Deuster	Request verification
		Speaker Bradley	
		Peters	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Macdonald	Change to 'aye'.
		Speaker Bradley	
		Ebbesen	
19.		Speaker Bradley	
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Chapman	Poll absentees
20.		Deuster)	Withdraws request
)	
	12:55	Chapman)	
		Speaker Bradley	Motion prevails
		Katz	Announcement
		Speaker Bradley	
		Marovitz	SB-526...Motion
		Speaker Bradley	House accepts Gov. recommendation
21.		Kent	SB-598...Motion
		Speaker Bradley	House accepts
		Darrow	SB-606...Motion
		Speaker Bradley	House accepts Gov. recommendation
22.		Kosinski	SB-624...Motion
		Speaker Bradley	House accepts Gov. Recommendation
		Luft	SB-708...Motion
23.		Speaker Bradley	House accepts Gov. recommendation



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		DiPrima	SB-745...Motion
		Speaker Bradley	House accepts Gov. recommendation
	1:10	Friedrich	SB-803...Motion
		Speaker Bradley	House accepts Gov. recommendation
24.		Laurino	SB-964...Motion
		Speaker Bradley	
25.		Schlickman)	
)	
		Speaker Redmond)	
		Speaker Bradley	
	1:12	Walsh	TOOR?
		Speaker Redmond	Responds
		Speaker Bradley	
		Kempiners	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Bowman	Urge OVR.
		Speaker Bradley	
		McMasters)	Yield?
)	
		Speaker Redmond)	
26.		Speaker Bradley	
		Walsh	Oppose OVR.
		Speaker Bradley	
		Speaker Redmond	To Close
		Speaker Bradley	
		Laurino	Explain vote
27.		Speaker Bradley	
		Dyer	
		Speaker Bradley	SB-964...OVR.



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Flinn	SB-1129...Motion
		Speaker Bradley	Hosue accepts Gov. recommendation
		Houlihan, D.	SB - 1208...TOOR
28.		Speaker Bradley	
		Luft	SB-1298...Motion
	1:21	Speaker Bradley	House accepts Gov. recommendation
		Campbell	SB-1308...Motion
29.		Speaker Bradley	Stand at ease House accepts Gov. recommendation
		Speaker Redmond	SB-203...Motion
		Speaker Bradley	Trouble with machine
30.		Skinner	Question
		Speaker Redmond	
		Speaker Bradley	Stand at ease House accepts...
		Macdonald	SB-1208...Motion
		Speaker Bradley	
		arrow	
31.		Speaker Bradley	
		Pullen	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Kempiners)	Yield?
)	
32.		Macdonald)	
		Speaker Bradley	
33.		Deuster)	Yield?
)	
		Macdonald)	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Levin	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Bradley	
		Pierce	
34.		Speaker Bradley	
	1:45	Deuster	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Pierce)	Question
)	
35.		Macdonald)	
		Speaker Bradley	
36.		Macdonald	To close
		Speaker Bradley	House accepts Gov. recommendation
37.		Madison	SB-23...Motion
		Speaker Bradley	House accepts Gov. recommendation
38.		Matijevich	SB-3 Motion to OVR.
		Speaker Bradley	
39.		Griesheimer	
40.		Speaker Bradley	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Mudd)	Yield?
)	
41.		Matijevich)	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Deuster	
42.		Lauer	MPQ
		Speaker Bradley	
	2:05	Matijevich	
		Speaker Bradley	
43.		Katz	Explain vote



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Bradley	Motion to OVR. lost
		Ebbesen	SB-24...Motion
44.		Speaker Bradley	SB-24...OVR...
		Brady	SB-187...Motion
45.		Speaker Bradley	
		Kempiners	
46.		Speaker Bradley	
		Ryan)	Yield?
)	
47.		Brady)	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Terzich	SB-126...Motion
		Speaker Bradley	
48.		Deuster)	Question
)	
		Terzich)	
)	
49.		Speaker Bradley)	
		Terzich	Explain vote Poll absentees
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
	2:25	Speaker Bradley	
50.		Wolf	Change to 'present'.
		Speaker Bradley	Motion lost
		Hart	SB-281...Motion
51.		Speaker Bradley	
		Macdonald	
52.		Speaker Bradley	
		Bowman	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
53.		Speaker Bradley Cunningham	
54.		Speaker Bradley Mudd	
55.		Speaker Bradley Flinn Speaker Bradley Bartulis	Supports OVR.
56.		Speaker Bradley Johnson	Oppose OVR.
		REPRESENTATIVE GIORGI IN CHAIR.....	
		Speaker Giorgi...	
57.		Schisler Speaker Giorgi Geo-Karis	
58.		Speaker Giorgi	
	2:50	Ryan Speaker Giorgi Skinner	Oppose OVR. Oppose OVR.
59.		Speaker Giorgi Katz Speaker Giorgi Meyer	MOVE PREVIOUS QUESTION
60.		Speaker Giorgi Hart Speaker Giorgi	To close



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Brummer	Explain vote.
61.		Speaker Giorgi	
		Harris	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Friedrich	
62.		Speaker Giorgi	
		Pierce	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Brummet	
63.		Speaker Giorgi	
		Tipsword	Explain vote.
64.		Speaker Giorgi	
	3:03	Stiehl	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Griesheimer	Opposed to OVR.
65.		Speaker Giorgi	
		Anderson	Support OVR.
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Cunningham	Explain vote
		Speaker Giorgi	
66.		Hart	POSTPONED CONSIDERATION
		Speaker Giorgi)	
)	
		Deuster)	Record me 'no'.
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Richmond	SB -413...Motion
		Speaker Giorgi	
67.		Rigney	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Richmond	To close
		Speaker Giorgi	
		McClain	Explain vote.
68.		Speaker Giorgi	
		Richmond	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Mugalian	
69.		Speaker Giorgi	
	3:16	Richmond	PPC.
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Mautino	SB-1012..Motion ..OVR.
		Speaker Giorgi	
70.		Mautino	Explain vote.
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Bennett	Explain vote..support OVR.
71.		Speaker Giorgi	
		Griesheimer	Explain vote.
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Katz	Explain vote.
72.		Speaker Giorgi	
		Mautino	PPC.
		Speaker Giorgi	
		DiPrima	SB-1312...Motion to OVR.
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Ryan	Oppose OVR.
73.		Speaker Giorgi	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Stuffle	
		Speaker Giorgi	
74.		Lauer)) DiPrima)	Yield?
		Speaker Giorgi	
	3:30	Walsh	Support
75.		Speaker Giorgi	
		Van Duyne	
		Speaker Giorgi	
		DiPrima	To close
		Speaker Giorgi	
76.		Dyer	Explain vote.
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Keats	Vote 'yes'.
		Speaker Giorgi	PPC.
		Ryan	
77.		Speaker Giorgi	
		Richmond	SB-437...Motion
		Speaker Giorgi	
78.		Ebbesen)) Richmond)	Yield?
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Richmond	To close
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Peters	Explain vote.
79.		Speaker Giorgi	
		Richmond	Explain vote.



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Giorgi	
	3:45	Richmond	PPC
		Speaker Giorgi	
		Epton	SB-1041...Motion
80.		Speaker Giorgi	
		Epton	SB-1107...Motion
		REPRESENTATIVE BRADLEY IN CHAIR....	
		Speaker Bradley	House accepts
81.		Clerk O'Brien	Committee Reports
		Speaker Bradley	Messages from Senate
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Bradley	Senate Bills, First Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Bradley	Introduction...First Reading
		Clerk O'Brien	
82.		Speaker Bradley	Agreed Resolutions
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Cunningham	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Matijevich	Pull out HR-536
83.		Speaker Bradley	
		Matijevich	
		Clerk O'Brien	Further Resolutions
		Speaker Bradley)	
84.		Mudd)	Leave to suspend rule....



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Bradley	
		Ryan	
85.		Mudd	
		Speaker Bradley	Leave granted
	4:00	Tuerk)	Question
)	
		Mudd)	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	Adj. Resol...Tues. 1:00 p.m.
		Speaker Bradley	
		Madigan	Move for adoption
		Speaker Bradley	Resolution adopted.
		Madigan	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	Death Resolution
86.		Speaker Bradley	Resolution adopted.
		Madigan	Move House Adj. 1:00. Perfunctory
		Speaker Bradley	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Bradley	House adjourn 1st Special Session
87.		Clerk O'Brien	Committee Reports
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	Adjournment Resolution
		Speaker Bradley)	
)	
		Madigan)	
		Speaker Bradley	Second Special Session



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	Committee Reports
88.		Speaker Bradley	Adjournment Resolution
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads
		Speaker Bradley	
		Madigan	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Madigan	
		Speaker Bradley	Second Special Session
			Adjourned.....

