

Doorkeeper: "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. Representative Watson will... preside to introduce the guest Chaplain. Representative Watson, do you want to introduce the Chaplain?"

Watson: "We have today with us Earl Justice from Salem, Illinois, who's the Pastor at the Christian Church of Salem. I've known Earl and his family for a long time and I'm very happy to introduce him here today and have him give thanks. Earl."

Pastor Earl Justice: "O God and our Father, we are thankful for the things that do unite us. The passion for freedom and the hatred of tyranny whose arm will try to erase Thine imagine from our minds. We think about how God can work through our Nation and someday where there is gnawing hunger, that it does not have to be but that we can just be haunting memories and that people's lives can be cared for. We just pray that our lives in this room can be united because there is no solution to the world's ills except as it comes from within the hearts of men and women in this room. We then pray a special blessing upon each of these. So cleanse our hearts by Thy grace, feed us Thy truth from Thy word and guide us...footsteps as we travel throughout this land. And someday may history record it for all of us that the Nation that did trust in God was blessed. Without God we realize that we're just doing vain things. But with God's assistance, great things can happen, without it we shall fail. May these in this room and all of us in the State of...this great State of Illinois be strengthened today whether young or old and may all of us come to know the eternal God



and guide us in. And thank you for these that represent us because of Jesus' holy name we pray. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Pledge of Allegiance. Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "I Pledge Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 458, Yourell. 459, Taylor. 460, Leverenz. 461, Leverenz. 463, Yourell. 464, Yourell. 465, Matijevich. 466, Kent. 467, Schisler. 468, McCourt. 469, DiPrima. 471, Meyer. 472, Meyer. 473, Keane. 474, Capparelli. 476, Schneider. 477, Boucek. 478, Kornowicz. 479, Ralph Dunn. 480, Yourell. 481, Yourell. 482, Yourell. 483, Deuster. 484, Virginia Frederick. 485, Daniels-Redmond-Hoffman. 486, Daniels et al. 487, Daniels et al. 488, Griesheimer. 489, Collins."

Speaker Redmond: Representative Giorgi."

Clerk O'Brien: "459 isn't in the Agreed."

Giorgi: "459 is out?"

Clerk O'Brien: "459 is out."

Giorgi: "Out."

Clerk O'Brien: "Also on the Agreed are House Joint Resolution 65, Wikoff. House Joint Resolution 66, Kornowicz and Senate Joint Resolution 71, Lechowicz."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Yourell's 458 marks the appearance of Walter Schirra, the Astronaut to Oak Lawn. 460 by Leverenz recognizes James Donald Erl. 461 by Leverenz regards Steven Paul Wright. 463 by Yourell heralds Willie Mays in the Hall of Fame. 464 by Yourell calls attention to Emmett (Bud) Meyer...Hall of Fame. 465 by Matijevich marks the Holy Rosary Church's anniversary. 466 by Kent congratulates Laurence C. Buckmaster.



467 by Schisler talks about the 60th anniversary of International Harvester. 468 by McCourt heralds the Kiwanis new Governor. 469 by DiPrima honors John Houlihan, former Member of the House. 461 (sic) 471 by Meyer logs Larry Reynold of Marquette Park. 472 by Meyer celebrates the 100th Birthday. 473 by Keane notes a celebration of a Golden Wedding Anniversary. 474 by Capparelli records the retirement. 476 by Schneider records a new birth. 477 by Boucek marks the change in a school naming. 478 by Kornowicz tells about a 50th Wedding Anniversary. Ralph Dunn gives accolade to Mrs. Lois Feigenbaun. 480 by Yourell heralds the deeds of Miss Williams, Teenage Volunteer of the Year. 481 by Yourell says that Miss Jessie Barry is a Candy-striper of the Year. 482 by Yourell heralds the Oak Lawn Association...Oak Park Lawn Association. 483 by Deuster measures the 70 thousand students that College of the Lake is run through its operation. 484 by Frederick says that some people spent 50 years together. 485 by Daniels approves the Boy Scout Award. 486 by Daniels does a big job with the Boy Scout Award. 587 by Daniels logs another Boy Scout Award. Griesheimer records a 70th Wedding Anniversary. Collins honors a 52nd Anniversary. House Joint Resolution 65 notes the retirement of Bill Rice, everybody's friend. Kornowicz's 66 creates the Commission on Labor and Lechowicz's 71 notes a.....Silver Wedding Anniversary. I move for the adoption of all the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried, the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Further Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 459, Taylor. House Resolution 470, DiPrima."



Speaker Redmond: "Committee on...okay. 470, Committee on Assignments and...what's the other one? 459, the Speaker's Table. Death Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 475, Ewing, to respect the memory of Mr. Glenn L. Antrim. House Resolution 490, Collins at el, respects the memory of Edward M. Moran."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi moves the adoption of the Death Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried, the Resolutions are adopted. Death Resolution.

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 462, Ewing. Whereas, in the due course of time and season, each of us will have stayed his time on this earth; and Whereas the Honorable Arthur F. Falter, former Representative from the Forty-first Legislative District in the General Assembly, has stayed his time and now departed, leaves those of us behind saddened but very gratified to have know him; and Whereas Arthur, born to John and Minnie Falter on June 15, 1906 on a farm near Kempton, Illinois, devoted the first seven years of his career to the teaching profession being entering the grain business; and Whereas Mr. Falter, spent the rest of his life as a grain dealer and elevator owner, having been part owner of the Roberts Grain Company, the former grain...the Ford Grain Company and sole owner of the Morris Grain Company; and Whereas Mr. Falter leaves a proud heritage to mourn his passing in the persons of his loving wife, Arlie, his daughter, Ann, two sisters and two grandchildren; therefore, be it Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the Eighty-First General Assembly of the State of Illinois that we express our profound sorrow upon the death of our beloved friend and former colleague, the Honorable Arthur F. Falter; that we extend our heartfelt sympathy to his family during their time of bereavement; and be it further



Resolved, that a suitable copy of this preamble and Resolution be presented to Mrs. Arlie Falter as a formal indication of the sorrow that is felt in the hearts of the Members of this Chamber."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi on the Death Resolution."

Giorgi: "I move for the adoption of the Death Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Death Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried, the Death Resolution is adopted. Reading of the Journal."

Clerk O'Brien: "Journal for the Eighty-fifth Legislative Day. The House met pursuant to adjournment. The Speaker was in the Chair..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we dispense with the reading of the Journal and that Journal #85 of October 3rd, 1979 be approved as read."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the reading of the Journal be dispensed with. Those in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried, the reading of the Journal is dispensed with and the minutes are approved as read...as if had been read. Now what do you have, Jack? Page 8, Amendatory Veto Motions. House Bill 128. Representative Catania, DiPrima and Mahar. I saw Representative Catania a minute ago. There she is. Okay, out of the record. 211, Sharp. Out of the record. 339, Kelly. Out of the record. Is that all? 339 Out of the record. 472, Kucharski. Out of the record. 493. Representative Lechowicz. Out of the record. 516. Representative Harris. Out of the record. 551. Representative Griesheimer. Representative Griesheimer."



Griesheimer: "I'll proceed with the motion on 551 to concur with the Governor's recommendations. There were two matters in House Bill 551. This is the Bill to provide for the registration and titling of boats in the State of Illinois. The Governor did nothing to change the substantive portion of the Bill. He did find an error. When the Bill was passed in the Senate certain language adopted in the House was not concurred in and in order to get that language back in the Bill to make it correct...it's purely a technical correction. He amendatorily vetoed it. The Department of Transportation also asks that the effective date of the Bill be changed to January 1st, 1981. I have spoken to the Director of the Department about this. This time is necessary to gear up for this program. And I would move to concur in the Governor's recommendations in his amendatory veto."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 551 by adoption of the Amendment? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Matijevich, will you come up here? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 92 'aye', 0 'nay' and the motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change by adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "House Bill 67...657. Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Governor's amendatory change on this had to do with...the original intent of the Bill was to state that those people who file for a gas tax...refunds, particularly for non-highway use...there was a tremendous delay on behalf of the state government in refunding those. And I attempted



to stimulate the efficiency of government somewhat by putting in 60 days with a penalty thereafter. The Governor, in his wisdom, realizes there is a problem here. He extended the 60 days to 90 and took off the initial penalty and retained the 1 cent penalty for every 30 days thereafter. And I think this is a good move in the business of trying to stimulate the efficiency of government and to also return those refunds that people have paid...as much as ten months to a year and a half before. So I move to accept the Governor's amendatory...changes."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ropp has moved to accept the Governor's specific recommendations. On that, the Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Representative Ropp, how much money does that involve?"

Ropp: "The total refund varies but normally it's around 14 million dollars plus."

Giorgi: "Fourteen million dollars...this is sort of a... like the sales tax rebate?"

Ropp: "That's the..."

Giorgi: "...Is supposed to be the waiver of the motor fuel ...to the seven and a half cents gallon, is this what this is?"

Ropp: "Yes, that amount...amounts to...14 million, plus... up to 16 million."

Giorgi: "In other words, it absolves these people of the seven and a half cent gas tax?"

Ropp: "Well right now they do not pay it now. I mean, they pay it initially but they file for a refund and get the refund back."

Giorgi: "Yes, but..."

Ropp: "And what is...what's been happening, a large number of people will file right after the first of the year



and there is a sizable amount of workload. But this is right at the time particularly where farmers are involved in..."

Giorgi: "And this is a...but this is mostly for farmers on their exemptions from paying the motor fuel tax gas when they buy fuel for their farm equipment."

Ropp: "Off...off highway use, yes."

Giorgi: "Off highway use, but in many instances they have to use the highways to get to their other sections of their farm. Is that right?"

Ropp: "Well, you exempt that from what you ask for. You still have to pay for the gas that you use on the highways. This is for when you're in the field."

Giorgi: "Well is that an honor system? Do they..."

Ropp: "Yes."

Giorgi: "...report their speedometer markings?"

Ropp: "Correct."

Giorgi: "They do?"

Ropp: "Yes, Sir."

Giorgi: "And how much is that amount to?"

Ropp: "Well I don't know how much...they don't ask for... but I do know the amount that they ask for."

Speaker Matjevich: "Is there any other discussion? Representative Ropp has moved to accept the Governor's specific recommendations. The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 657 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. It takes 89 votes. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 96 'aye', 0 'nay', 1 voting 'present'. And this motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 657 by adoption of the





Amendment. House Bill 662, motion to override. The Gentleman from Tazewell, Representative...who's on this...Von Boeckman or Yourell, Ryan, Lechowicz, Bluthardt? Anybody ready? It's going to be Yourell. House Bill 700. We're going down the Calendar on page 9, Amendatory Vetoes. Let's see...Stuffle. Let's go on to...House Bill 723. I don't see Cullerton here either. Skip...798. 841, White is not here. House Bill 961, Stearney. Out of the record. House Bill 1025, Kempiners. House Bill 1025, Representative Kempiners...motion to accept. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that amends the Illinois Nursing Act. And the Governor used the amendatory veto...it...it is not a controversial Bill and the amendatory veto is acceptable to the nursing profession. It basically addresses the... amendatory veto basically addresses the requirements for expired licensure and a necessity for refresher courses if nurses fail the exam or portions of the exam over a period of time. And I would move that we accept the amendatory veto of the Governor."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Kempiners has moved to accept the Governor's specific recommendations on House Bill 1025. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1025 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The issue takes 89 votes. Vote me 'aye', Zeke. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 125 'ayes', 0 'nays' ...the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kelly to explain his vote."

Kelly: "No, Mr. Speaker, I just want to make an announcement



after you get through with your vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Vote Lechowicz and Barnes 'aye' and Ropp 'aye'. On this question there are 128 'ayes' and 0 'nays' and 1 voting 'present'. And this motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 1025 by adoption of the Amendment. On the order of birthday cakes, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. We do have a birthday cake which was available last night and I'd like to extend an invitation to all the Members of the House to come over and have a piece if they would like to this morning. Thank you very much."

Speaker Matijevich: "What color is the cake?"

Kelly: "It's...it has a green shamrock on it for some reason."

Speaker Matijevich: "It's Kelly green. House Bill 1031, John Dunn. The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to accept the Governor's amendatory veto with regard to House Bill 1031. The specific change that the Governor has made with regard to this Bill is to change the statute of limitations set forth in the Bill from 8 to 12 years. This is a Bill that would provide a statute of limitations for claims against architects, engineers, consulting engineers, contractors and builders. This Bill has now in this form become acceptable to the Governor so I would request a favorable vote with regard to this motion."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn has moved to accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change on House Bill 1031. On that, the Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber."



Leinenweber: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. What the Governor's Amendment does is make a bad Bill better. This Bill is the Bill that exculpates architects for their negligence after a certain period of time which would leave any responsibility for the negligence solely on the owner of the buildings. It's not a good Bill but it's an infinitely better Bill...not infinitely better, but substantially better because of the Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "Is there any further discussion? If not, the question is shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1031 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. And this motion because of the effective date takes three-fifths Constitutional Majority, 107 votes. Have all voted? Need 107. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115 'ayes', 4 'nays', 6 voting 'present'. And this motion having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations on House Bill 1031. House Bill 1100, Jane Barnes. The Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Well, House Bill 1100 had changed the conveyance price of some property in Oak Lawn in 34 thousand, 4 hundred dollars to 1 dollar. However, the Amendment failed to make the same change in the preamble."

Speaker Matijevich: "And you are moving to accept the Governor's specific recommendations?"

Barnes: "Right."

Speaker Matijevich: "The...Representative Barnes has moved that the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations on House Bill 1100. Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the House accept the Governor's



specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1100 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. And this motion because of the effective date takes 107 votes, three-fifths Constitutional Majority. The camera lights are on. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Van Duyne, to explain his vote."

Van Duyne: "Thank you. Well, actually I wanted to ask the Sponsor a question. It says for...for the consideration of .1 dollar, and I kind of jokingly said, 'Well what are they selling here for a dollar that's been appraised at whatever.' And somebody came up and I don't really know whether he was giving me a flippant answer or not. But he says, a piece of property was...was estimated at 34 thousand...what are they doing here, Jane; for a buck?"

Barnes: "Representative Van Duyne, this was property that had belonged to Oak Lawn and there is a water tower constructed on the property now. When they were putting in the tristate it was necessary to loan some of this property to the Illinois Department of Transportation for those purposes. But those purposes are now finished and we get the right away back because of the water spheroid that has been built on the property."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 136 'ayes', 1 'nay', 2 voting 'present'. And this motion having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations with regards to House Bill 1100. House Bill 1100....1110, Representative Watson. The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Watson."

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to move to concur with the Governor's amendatory veto of House



Bill 1110. All the veto did was change some of the legal discription of the land."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Watson is moving to accept the Governor's specific recommendations on House Bill 1110. Is there any discussion? All right. If not, the question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1110 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. And this motion because of the effective date takes 107 votes, three-fifths Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there 127 'ayes', 0 'nays', 3 voting 'present'. And this motion having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations on House Bill 1110."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "House Bill 493, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House do concur on the Govenor's amendatory veto on House Bill 493. Basically what it does, it changes the effective date to July 1, 1980. And I'm sure that the Membership will remember that this Bill requires the Department of Public Aid to disregard assets of a single person of up to 15 hundred dollars and a married person up to 2 thousand, 2 hundred and 50 dollars in determining income eligibility for medical assistance. This complies with the federal standards. I move that the House does concur in the Governor's amendatory veto changing the effective date to July 1, 1980."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Lechowicz has moved to accept the Governor's specific recommendations on House



Bill 493. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 493 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. This issue takes 89 votes, a simple Majority...and a Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 133 'ayes' and 0 'nays', 0 voting 'present'. And this motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 493 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 1139, Yourell. Out. House Bill 1184, Ewing. The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, on House Bill 1184, I would like to move to accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change in his veto message. This is the agricultural areas Bill which was passed out of the Houses and sent to the Governor last summer. The change that the Governor has made in the Bill, he has deleted land which might possibly restrict municipalities and utilities from condemning land that is...been included in an agricultural area. He also has an added language provided that no land owner can be included in an agricultural area unless he agrees to be involved. And I would move for the adoption."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ewing has moved that the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change in House Bill 1184. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty."

Getty: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Getty: "Representative Ewing, do I understand that as the Governor has amendatorily vetoed this that the land in



an agricultural area could now be used for any purpose?"

Ewing: "Well that would depend on the zoning available that ...there was Amendment put on in the Senate which utility companies and some of the municipalities felt restricted their right to eminent domain. And it was at their urging that he removed from the Bill that language in the second Amendment."

Getty: "Well, I'm...I'm just wondering if maybe he didn't go a little bit too far inadvertently. As I read it, it appears that the land could be used for purposes other than production of agricultural products. You might have heavy industry put in there. And I'm just wondering if that is the intent of this?"

Ewing: "Well I think you're subscribing to this legislation more intent than is there. If heavy industry can be involved in agricultural land, it could be involved under this Bill. This doesn't change zoning. This allows farmers to gather together in areas of 5 hundred acres or more and protect their area as far as investment in farming operations. It doesn't change local zoning. It doesn't supersede local zoning. If local zoning...allowed industrial use in an agricultural area, then it could still be there just like it is now. We're not changing that."

Getty: "Thank you."

Ewing: "I think it could have gone farther too, but I don't think it changes the law from what it is now."

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

Skinner: "I have a question along the same line. Would this allow, under your legislation, could a gravel pit be put in an agricultural area?"

Ewing: "Again that would be determined by the local zoning, either the county or the municipality that had jurisdiction over the area for zoning."



Skinner: "Well, I...I don't mean to suggest that you're incorrect, but you are. The...there is no local zoning for gravel pits because the Governor vetoed my House Bill 233. I would..."

Ewing: "I'm very sorry about that."

Skinner: "Not half as sorry as my county is. Under this legislation, which I intend to vote for, a gravel pit could be put in any agricultural area that has gravel. I have here the regulations from the Department of Mines and Minerals and they are as loose as a goose. You could put a gravel pit anywhere. And I'm sure that's not the intention of the Sponsor of the Bill, but it is an unfortunate consequence...of the Governor's action on House Bill 233."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, if we accept this amendatory veto, as I understand it, there can be any type of construction or shopping center or whatever the zoning would allow within the agricultural area. If that's the case, what are we really left with if we accept the veto? What's the impact of the legislation with the veto accepted?"

Ewing: "Well I think it's...the important part that's left in this Bill is that we state in here that it is public policy that we protect our good farm land from erosion such as shopping centers...and it is public policy of the state and of local units of government. And I think they would have to take that into consideration when they approved a shopping center in an ag area. And I don't know any zoning law that approves a retail shopping center in an ag area."

Brummer: "You're saying that we would state in...in the preamble or something that it's a public policy but then we would allow it, is that right? It would be lik a...."





Ewing: "No, no, you're saying...tell me if...if any of your clients that you represent, municipalities or anything, allow shopping centers in ag areas. I don't believe they do."

Brummer: "What are we...what are we...currently, municipalities can by zoning preclude shopping centers or multiple housing or whatever they want in...in an area that they have set aside or designated as agricultural area. So what are we really doing if...if as a result of this amendatory veto, we allow that to continue. Isn't this an exercise in futility?"

Ewing: "No, I don't believe it is, Rich. Because, first of all, if they have to change the zoning to allow the use, then I think there's something in this Bill for the land owners who want to stay...retain it as farm land, to hang their hat on, to keep it from being changed to commercial use. If a commercial use is allowed in an agricultural area, this won't change it. But if they have to change the zoning, this is will help."

Brummer: "Well this sounds like a congratulatory Resolution of the Legislature that really has no...no legal impact."

Ewing: "Well..."

Brummer: "It's a nice statement of public policy of preservation of farm land."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Jaffe: "In looking over our staff analysis, it says that the language amended curtails opposition to the Bill by the utility companies. What..what opposition did the utility companies have to this particular Bill?"

Ewing: "Was that...that was the question? The problem with the language that the utility companies objected to



was that they were afraid it was a curtailment of their right to eminent domain. For instance, if a utility company needed to run a high power line through an ag area, then they were afraid that the language which the Governor has removed might prevent them from doing that. We all know that a high power line across an ag area does...does not destroy it for an agricultural purpose. So in a compromise effort, the Governor has removed the language from the Bill."

Jaffe: "Is that the only objection they had to it?"

Ewing: "That's...that's the objection, yes."

Jaffe: "Okay. And the other that the analysis says, it says ...and I know you've talked a little bit about it, but perhaps you could be more specific. It says, it weakens the Bill by allowing land in an agricultural area to be used for other purposes other than production of agricultural products. How do you envision that? What ...what type of uses do you see?"

Ewing: "What type of uses do I see? I personally don't believe that it...it is going to weaken it in any great extent because if it's an ag area, with ag zoning, there are certain limitations built in. And I think the Bill will keep it from being changed to a commercial or industrial use. If it's allowed in an ag area, it will be allowed in this agricultural conservation area...under the local zoning."

Speaker Matijevich: "Are you through, Aaron? Is there any further discussion? If not, the question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 1184 by the adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The issue takes 89 votes, a Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 'ayes', 14 'nays', 4 voting



'present'. And this motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding House Bill 1184 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 1244, Representative Campbell. The Gentleman from Vermillion, Representative Chuck Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm a hyphenated Cosponsor along with Dick Mugalian on this Bill. I've talked with him, I've talked to Dan Pierce, Chairman of the Revenue Committee and we have agreed to accept the changes recommended by the Governor. And this was the Bill which would provide assistance to local assessors in assessing commercial and industrial property. And we established an office of appraisals in the Department of Local Governmental Affairs to be staffed by ten professionals to assist taxing units and assessors and those who made requests. One of the things that we didn't do was to have an appropriation corresponding to the cost. Another thing that...change that the Governor made was changing from the Department of Local Governmental Affairs...because of the fact the property tax functions are being transferred to the Department of Revenue. And it deletes the 2% of...of the...a petition of 2% of the real property taxpayers on line 19. And we feel that we should accept these specific recommendations and I would ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Campbell has moved that the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 1244. On that, the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it appears that the Department of Revenue has joined the Secretary of State in chicken farming. It's time for the Department of Revenue to start looking at homeowners problems with property taxes."



And they are not doing so through this amendatory veto. The original Bill would have allowed 2% of the taxpayers in a...in a township to petition the department to get an expert appraisal on something like a power plant. Now you may remember that the Illinois Supreme Court has recently held that power plants will be put into the rate base on the current market value. All right, if they're going to do it on the current market value that means that utility rates are going to skyrocket, absolutely skyrocket in this state because of this Supreme Court decision. Well if the utilities are going to charge us tax...if the utilities are going to charge us our utility rate based on current market value, by God they're going to pay taxes based on current market value. And they are not paying taxes on the base of current market value. And the local township assessors just do not have the skill in most cases to assess an atomic power plant, for example, in Zion or a...or a coal fired plant, for example, in Vermillion County. And...I suspect the amendatory veto will be..will be concurred with. But I want everybody in this General Assembly, and I want particularly the new director of the Department of Revenue, Mr. Zagle, to know that I'm not going to sit still and I hope my colleagues will not sit still while his department does nothing, nothing whatsoever to help homeowners achieve assessment equity."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Van Duyne's light is on but I don't see him. Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Well, I would just like to say in response to Representative Skinner that this is at least a start that we're attempting to try to get assistance to those local assessors. And we're not changing the procedure from the standpoint of what he's talking about. We're just simply trying to get assistance to those local assessors in...in assessing complex, industrial and...



commercial property. So I would ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "If there's no further discussion...

The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1244 by the adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. This motion takes 89 votes, a Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 127 'ayes', 2 '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 House Bill 1244 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 1258, Representative Sumner. Sumner. Is she...there she is. Representative Sumner, from Peoria. Mary Lou Sumner."

Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd move to accept the Governor's recommendations with regard to House Bill 1258. It does not change the Bill. It only makes a...makes clear the effective date which was omitted. I urge the support of the recommendations to accept."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Sumner has moved that the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to 1258. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1258 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. This motion takes 107 votes because of the effective date. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 140 'ayes', 1 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. And this motion having received the



three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations on House Bill 1258."

Sumner: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijeich: "House Bill 1334, Representative Kent. The Lady from Adams, Representative Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1334 was the retired teachers insurance program. And the action by the Governor just clarified the administration of it which would mean that this amount would be deducted from their checks prior so that it would save administering costs...and so that the state would pay one-half and the participant would pay one-half, but it would be taken from the pension check...as it was sent. I move to accept the Governor's veto...amendatory veto."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Kent has moved to...that the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations on House Bill 1334. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1334 by the adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. And this motion because of the immediate effective date takes a three-fifths Constitutional Majority, 107 votes. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 131 'ayes', 0 'nays', 1 voting 'present'. And this motion having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails and the House concurs with the Governor's specific recommendations on House Bill 1334. House Bill 1345. The counter has Mike Brady as Sponsor. I think he did his work yesterday. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Preston on House Bill 1345."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I would move to accept the Governor's amendatory veto of



House Bill 1345. It essentially changes the composition of the Ethnic Heritage Commission by adding eight public members that are appointed by the Governor."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Preston, has moved that the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1345. Is there any...We're on motion #2, Preston's motion #2, to accept the specific recommendations. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, I wonder if the Sponsor could tell me if the major effect of the amendatory veto is to take control of this Commission away from the Legislature and give it to the Governor?"

Preston: "Yes."

Skinner: "And you're moving to concur?"

Preston: "Yes. Mr. Speaker...Mr. Speaker, what I...Mr. Speaker, what I would ask to do at this time, there are some technical errors I've been made aware of, I would ask to take this out of the record for the time being."

Speaker Matijevich: "Take it out of the record. House Bill 1350, Representative Schneider. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Glenn Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I have moved to accept the Governor's amendatory veto on 1350. He has deleted only the workshop portion which would...would cause an expenditure of funds. He has totally vetoed 1351 which would have been...that Bill which contained the money for the workshops. However, he has left in the important items of studying the transportation of...role in Voc. ed, regular ed and special education. I think that's essential to any evaluation of school transportation. The School Problems Commission is involved in that currently. We



do need that data and I would move that we concur with that motion."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Schneider...hold on. Representative Schneider has moved that the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1359 (sic). Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1359 (sic) by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Because of the immediate effect of the Bill...three-fifths Constitutional Majority, 107 votes. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 100... the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Birkenbine."

Birkenbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You are recording 1359, I think you want 1351."

Speaker Matijevich: "1350 rather, I'm sorry. We've got... we had the wrong number. 1350. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, you said there was an immediate effective date. I don't see that..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Well, it was July '79 which is passed ...the effect of that is the...it's in the Bill. The July 1979...so therefore we need 107 votes."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 122 'ayes', 4 'nays', 0 voting 'present'. And this motion having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations with respect to House Bill 1350. House ...Representative Sumner, the Lady from Peoria, for what purpose do you rise? Sumner."

Sumner: "When the Bill was called it was listed up there as





1358 and I voted with 1358. Would you please change my vote to 'yes'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Yes. Record Representative Sumner as 'yes'."

Sumner: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The...House Bill 1382, Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 1382 has been amendatorily vetoed by the Governor. And all it does is add an immediate effective date. And I would move that we accept the Governor's amendatory veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Flinn moved that the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 1382. Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 1382 by the adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. And because of the immediate effective date, this motion takes 107 votes. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 137 'ayes', 0 'nays'. And this motion having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations with regards to House Bill 1382. House Bill 1526, Representative Bower. The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Bower."

Bower: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change in this Bill. It merely deletes excessive language that was put in...in the Senate. The Bill originally passed the House with only two or three descending votes."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Bower has moved that the



House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with...House Bill 1526. Is there any discussion? Would you clear the board, Jack? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1526 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. And this motion because of the immediate effective date takes a three-fifths Constitutional Majority, 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 135 'ayes', 4 'nays', 3 voting 'present'. And this motion having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations with regards to House Bill 1526. House Bill 1676, Ryan-Wikoff. The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1676 was a Bill which was put in which made it a criminal offense to basically pirate or steal a cable television signal which was already in a building...and add on to. The Governor made several changes which mostly were technical and they eliminated some certain prohibitions which...he felt were unconstitutional or...or repetitive of present law. Basically...eliminated the penalty for advertising equipment for sale which might be used to obtain illegal cable TV service. He argued that it was protected by the first Amendment. And he made some other changes in there which I would be happy to go over if anybody wants. I would move that we accept the Governor's recommendations."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Wikoff has moved that the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations on House Bill 1676. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Ryan to...no. Is there any discussion?"



No discussion. The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1676 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. This motion takes 89 votes, a Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 143 'ayes', 0 'nays', 1 voting 'present'. And this motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 1676 by adoption of the Amendment. On excused absences today, the Gentleman from Kankakee, the Minority Leader, Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Oblinger, Polk and Margulas are to be excused for illness."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Journal will so record. The assistant Majority Leader, Representative Lechowicz, from Cook, on excused absences. One moment. The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Darrow, on the order of excused absences."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have no objection to Representative Polk being excused but I'd like to have the Minority Leader explain where the other two Representatives are. And if it's illness or just what it is and how long they will be out, if possible."

Ryan: "Well, thank you. I'd be glad to try and answer your question. Representative Margulas, the last time I called was on his way down to x-ray at the hospital. And I'll find out what hospital if you want me to. Representative Oblinger called in this morning and I haven't had a chance to talk with her. Either she called or somebody called. She went off the floor yesterday sick and she...is still sick today."

Speaker Matijeich: "I might add there are quite a few of



us sick today."

Darrow: "Are you...Oblinger called in ill though?"

Ryan: "Well, Clarence, all I know is that I got a call from my secretary and she said there were three people that were sick today; Oblinger, Polk and Margulas. And I really haven't question that..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the record indicate that Representative Garmisa is excused because... recovering from an operation."

Speaker Matijevich: "Let the record so show. House Bill 1677. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz."

Katz: "This is a technical change. The Bill is one that gives permissive authority to library boards to reduce the present six year term to a four year term. The statute...the Bill speaks of election of directors. It should have said 'appointment' of directors. The amendatory veto simply makes the change from 'election' to 'appointment' which is the appropriate language. I would move to concur in the amendatory veto of House Bill 1677."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Katz has moved that the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with House Bill 1677. There's no discussion. The question is, shall the House so accept the Governor's specific recommendation on...I'm sorry. The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "I would like to ask the Sponsor a question."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Pullen: "Would this Bill then apply only to library boards which are appointed rather than those that are elected? Because a number of library boards in this state are in deed elected."

Katz: "Well, what I would suggest is that I come over and discuss it with the Lady from Cook and we can take this



up later."

Speaker Matijevich: "Out of the record?"

Katz: "Yes."

Speaker Matijevich: "Out of the record. House Bill 1693.

The Assistant Majority Leader from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi. Representative Giorgi on..."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 1693 in the manner and form as follows. We're talking about public depositories and the language that the Governor inserted says, 'When such deposits become collected funds and are not needed for immediate dispersement, they shall be invested within two working days at prevailing rates or better and...the treasurer of the concerned public funds and may require such bank too. I move for the...accept the Governor's amendatory veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Giorgi has moved that the House accept the Governor's recommendations on House Bill 1693. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1693 by adoption of the Amendment. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. This motion takes 89 votes, a Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 145 'ayes', 0 'nays', 2 voting 'present'. And this motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 1693 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 1718, Representative Jane Barnes. The Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to move to accept the Governor's recommendations."



Speaker Matijevich: "Tell us a little bit about it, Jane."

Barnes: "Well, the Bill itself, provides emergency treatment and ambulance services at no charge to alledged victims of deviate sexual assaults...changes the reimbursement procedure."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Barnes has moved that the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for changes on House Bill 1718. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1718 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. This motion takes 89 votes, the Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 138 'ayes', 2 'nays', 3 voting 'present'. And this motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 1718 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 1733, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to call Motion #2...which is...which is a motion to accept the Governor's amendatory veto in line with my motion and the language involved."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right, proceed."

Sandquist: "This Bill originally was introduced in order to insure that all taxes would be paid on liquor that's sold in Illinois. That was a problem about a state distributor sending...sending liquor in...in which the taxes would not be paid. That's what the original Bill did and...and this is to insure the collection. The Governor, in his amendatory veto, stated that there were certain distributors in the city...primarily in the City of Chicago who would...who would not...the



Bill would knock them out of a practice that they had been following for years. I think his idea was a good one. We have gotten together on the language and I can represent to you that all elements of the...of the industry are in favor of this. In addition, the Illinois Liquor Commission is in favor of it. And the Governor will accept this language that we have in my motion #2 and I urge that we do concur in the Governor's amendatory veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Sandquist has moved on motion #2 to accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change. Is there anybody...about the Amendments...is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 1733 by adoption of the Amendments? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. This motion takes 89 votes, a Constitutional Majority...oh, 107, I'm sorry...the immediate effective date. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 148 'ayes', 0 'nays', 6 voting 'present'. And this motion having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations on House Bill 1733. The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Friedland."

Friedland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to introduce the parents of our newest Member, Rick Burnidge, Mr. and Mrs. Logan Burnidge of Elgin, are here in the east balcony along with their friends, Mr. and Mrs. Richard Berkley of Genoa. Would you please recognize them, please."

Speaker Matijevich: "How do you do? We'll revert back to House Bill 1677. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz.



Katz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the Bill relating to library boards where the Governor had made a specific proposal relating to appointment of directors. I have had... occasion to go over it with Miss Pullen. The point is, she was raising the question about what the Governor's veto does to the election area where library board members are elected. The answer is that it makes no change in those provisions. It only affects the library boards under the Commission form of government where they are appointed. I think Miss Pullen is satisfied and I would move to concur in the specific amendatory veto of the Governor in House Bill 1677."

Speaker Redmond: "There's no discussion. The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1677 by adoption of the Amendment. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. This motion takes 89 votes, a Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 145 'ayes', 0 'nays', 0 'present'. And this motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding House Bill 1677 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 1769. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1769 created the Library Study Commission for only a two-year period effective upon the successful override of this Bill. Section 8.2 of the Bill repeals the Study Commission as of July 1, 1981. We've been in contact with the Secretary of State's office and the problem with the Bill, according to the





Governor, was the funding. And the Secretary of State, who is the Chief Librarian, has agreed that he would fund it out of his appropriation and not...not go to the Governor for funds through the regular appropriation process. What the Secretary of State has done and agreed to do is to provide 50 thousand dollars for the funding for the Library Study Commission. And I move to override the Governor's veto of House Bill 1769."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Yourell has moved to override the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 1769. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the...the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I rise again to oppose this Bill. There is absolutely no need whatsoever for a Library Study Commission. This is absolute and total waste of money. And I base that on the experience of having served on the Library Financing Subcommittee of the Revenue Committee in 1973 and 1974. The Illinois House Members, there were six of us including the Minority Leader, myself, Representative Beatty, Representative Ryan...who disagreed with me...excuse me, Representative Dunn, who...who you will find in disagreement with me on this Bill and Representative Alsop. We went around and must have heard every library...a representative from every library in the entire state at a series of six hearings. It did not cost 50 thousand dollars. It didn't cost anything more than the travel and the per diem for the Legislature. We were staffed as well on that Subcommittee as on any Committee on which I have ever served by the Illinois State Library Staff. They did an absolutely superb job. And as a result of our recommendation, the State Library financing laws have been almost completely rewritten this decade. There is just no need for this.



And for...the Representative from Chicago on my side of the aisle who suggested last night that he was going to be around here, that he was going...I heard him on the radio this morning. He said he was going to be around here watching those of us who voted for the override and making sure that there was replacement revenue. I would suggest that we don't need replacement revenue if we can cut out fat and outright waste in state government. This is outright waste. And I urge you to vote 'no' in sustaining the Governor's veto, even though if he has the mike turned on he may faint when he hears that."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also rise in opposition to the override of the Governor's veto. During the... during this last Session in April...or May, Representative Barnes introduced a comprehensive Bill to study the codification of the library systems throughout Illinois. Now that Bill left in the Cities and Villages Committee, a Subcommittee was appointed to study the codification and report back recommendations and I think that that Committee is qualified to study it at no cost to the General Assembly. It just seems to me this is a duplication of effort. There's really no need for it and we ought to stay with the Governor's veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Perry, Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I concur with Representative Yourell in the fact that we ought to vote to override the Governor's veto. The Governor took the money out, the 50 thousand dollars that they requested, he took it out of an appropriation Bill so there isn't any appropriation. This Bill is not



a matter of spending money. It won't go on your conservation union report I don't think, Representative Skinner. Because all this does is create a study Commission to look into the library consolidation for after the next census in 1980 and to maybe, hopefully, make some consolidation of library...districts and library service units. Representative Alan...State Librarian Alan Dixon and the State Library Association both urge that we pass this. There...there's a library ...as Representative Skinner said, we did have a Subcommittee that went around and did some good. But we can do a lot more...or the Committee can and it doesn't ...this doesn't entail spending money. I urge for a favorable vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative...on the override. The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Giorgi...Borchers."

Borchers: "Well, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, for ten years I was a member of the Decatur Library Board until the unfortunate war took me away and I was forced to resign. However, anything that cost money...I think in this case is unnecessary and this is an unnecessary cost. So I would suggest..."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. I certainly join the growing chorus of those who are opposing this motion to override the Governor's excellent veto here. I don't doubt for one moment that the Library Commission ...the groups of libraries throughout the state want this Commission created. Because the last Commission that Representative Skinner sat on basically came up with nothing more than recommendations on how to increase taxes, how to fund more money into libraries. So not only would we be saving 50 thousand, which I



understand is federal money...and I would just remind you that the federal government is in worse shape than we are. So I don't that that's a good argument to say that this would be federal...50 thousand of federal money. But we're going to save more money down the road because we won't have a bunch of recommendations from the Library Association to increase local taxes, to provide for tax increases without referendum, Bills of that nature and kin and also Bills to provide much, much greater funding. Certainly we do want to keep the state in shape where...hopefully if we don't override this year and it appears that we won't on the sales tax, that we will be able to override and provide meaningful tax relief. One way is not to create...types of Commissions which will give us suggestions to spend more money down the road which we haven't already thought of."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Yourell to close."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Gentleman who spoke last is absolutely correct in that he suggested to you that these...the 50 thousand dollars that was totally vetoed by the Governor in the Bill, is not state money, it's federal money. And I've often heard the argument on the floor of this House that we should try to get more federal funds into the State of Illinois. So I'm suggesting to you that we're doing just that with this legislation. The Secretary of State has agreed to use the 50 thousand dollars of federal funding for this purpose. And again I urge your override of...the veto of the Governor notwithstanding of House Bill 1769."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, shall House Bill 1769 pass notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendation for change? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'nay'. The motion takes three-fifths, 107 votes. Have all voted? Have all voted who



wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there 79 vote... 'ayes', 59 'noes', 0 voting 'present'. And this motion having failed...the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Emil Jones... 'aye'. 80 'ayes'. Marovitz 'aye'. This motion having failed to receive the three-fifths Constitutional Majority...declared lost. Representative Yourell on House Bill 1139. 1139. The Governor won another one."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentleman of the House, I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor relative to House Bill 1139 in the manner and form as follows."

Speaker Matijevich: "Are you through? All right. Representative Yourell has moved that the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1139. And there is no discussion ...so that is the question. Shall we accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change on House Bill 1139 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, we can't kill this Bill unless we don't agree with the amendatory veto. So if you voted 'no' before you ought to vote 'no' now. Oh, different Bill? That will teach me to walk around the floor. I apologize."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 138 'ayes', 1 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. And the motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 1139 by adoption of the Amendment. Representative Yourell on House Bill 662. Are you ready for that one, Bus? Where did he go? Take it out of the record. All right."



Back on page 10, House Bill 1774. Representative Schisler."

Schisler: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to...Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to call 1774 and 1777 at the same time since...they're similar?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Does the Gentleman have leave to hear both 1774 and 1777 as a package and we'll have two Roll Calls? Proceed...Lee."

Schisler: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that the item on page 2, lines 14, 15, 32 and 35 of House Bill 1774 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor...and that on page 2, lines 15 and 16 and on page 2, lines 32 and 34 of House Bill 1776 (sic). To explain the Bill, Mr. Speaker, it is a practice of the Department of Conservation to confiscate weapons from those that are in violation of the Fish and Game Code. My Bill asks that an annual auction be held so that the people that lost their weapons and or vehicles would have an opportunity to buy them back. And that any interest...accrued from the sale would go into the Fish and Game Fund and the Governor vetoed those two items. I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Schisler has moved that the House override the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bills 1774 and 1777. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would join with Representative Schisler in asking you to override the Governor's veto on this particular matter. Let me point out to you that one of the more important aspects of this Bill that I do not believe was referred to by Representative Schisler has to do with the interest which is drawn on the Fish and Game Fund generally. I call this to the attention of



Representative Yourell and Representative Wolf and the many outdoorsmen who have promoted the Fish and Game Fund in the State of Illinois. The Governor by his veto has indicated he wants the interest on this Fish and Game Fund, which we've worked on for years to protect the betterment of our fish and game and wildlife programs in this state, he wants this interest to go into the General Revenue Fund. Now this Fish and Game Fund produces about 150 thousand dollars a year in interest. This is money that is dearly needed in our Department of Conservation to promote our fish and wildlife development in a state which has traditionally been many decades behind every adjoining state. There is no good reason to do this whatsoever. The issue of the confiscation of weapons was also raised by the Governor but I think that strictly a red herring. He is suggesting that there should not be an annual sale of confiscated property, weapons, etc. Well it stands to reason if you read the Governor's veto, if there's nothing to sell we don't have to have a sale. But why should the Department of Conservation hold property indefinitely or have the property spun off in some manner...in a nonpublic manner without the benefits going back into the Fish and Game Fund. We would suggest that there should be an annual sale of confiscated property and that this money should go into Fish and Game Fund, again, to better the wildlife programs of this state. I really don't know why the Governor took this position. It's certainly not a meaningful position. It's a position that's not favored by the Illinois Wildlife Federation. And I would suggest if the rest of the wildlife organizations that have worked so hard to protect the Fish and Game Fund of this state knew of this, they would be disagreeing also. I think we most definitely should override



the Governor. I think he was somewhat nit-picking when he was going through this Bill. There's nothing to be gained by taking this money and putting it into the General Revenue Fund. It's a very small amount of money. If we are going to better our wildlife programs in this state we should most definitely vote to override the Governor."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, shall House Bill 1774 and House Bill 1777 pass notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendation for change? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. This motion takes a three-fifths Constitutional Majority, 107 votes. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 135 'ayes', 5 'nays', 1 voting 'present'. And this motion having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails and House Bills 1774 and 1777 are declared passed notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendation for change. House Bill 1802. Gene Barnes is not here. Representative Skinner, the Gentleman from McHenry, on House Bill 1802."

Skinner: "Do you mean Representative Barnes isn't here yet?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He was here but he took off. Are you ready or shall we..."

Skinner: "Well the file is here someplace. Maybe we better wait for him."

Speaker Matijevich: "Out of the record. Gene Barnes is here. On 1802, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Gene Barnes."

Skinner: "Go ahead, Gene. No, it's yours, you're the Chairman."

Speaker Matijevich: "Are we going to argue about the...Co..Co-Chief Sponsorship again? No, we passed that. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman...Mr. Speaker."





Forgive me. But I would move that we would accept the recommendations of the Governor on House Bill 1802. What...what those recommendations...does is change some wording, it clarifies the private non-profit carriers to insure that the language is clear relative to assistance received from the Urban Mass Transit Act for a purpose that's set out in House Bill 1802. And I would solicit the support of the House for acceptance of the Governor's amendatory veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes, has moved that the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations on House Bill 1802. If there's no discussion...the question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1802 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. This motion takes 89 votes, a Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 138 'ayes', 0 'nays' and 0 'present'. And this motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 1802 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 1812, Mr. Wonderful...after yesterday, I'm not sure. Okay, Big Al. Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would ask that we accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change in House bill 1812. The Bill gives a contractor a lien on property from which a house or other structure is removed when payment is not made. The Governor stated that he adds the word 'remove' in order to clarify the legislative intent. It's just a dramatical change. I ask for..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Mr. Cullerton has moved to accepted the



Governor's recommendations. If there's no discussion... if not, the question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1812 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed 'nay'. 89 votes. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 151 'ayes', 0 'nays', 2 voting 'present'. And this motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 1812 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 1914, Representative Yourell. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to accept the Governor's recommend... change...amendatory recommended change in House Bill 1914. What the Bill does, it extends absentee voting rights to employees of the State Board of Elections and all law enforcement agencies involved in election day activity. That he agreed to, his problem was with the establishment of the dates for special congressional elections. And since he's already set those dates, I ...my only alternative is to move to accept the change that was recommended by the Governor relative to House Bill 1914."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Yourell has moved to accept the Governor's recommendation...there's no discussion. The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1914 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. This motion takes 107 votes because of the immediate effective date. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On



this question there are 136 'ayes', 3 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And this motion having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations regarding House Bill 1914. House Bill 1919. The Lady from Cook, Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change on House Bill 1919. It would extend the effective date until January 1st of 1981 to accommodate the Illinois Hospital Association for infectious hospital wastes. After the Bill was passed and signed, we had meetings with the Hospital Association and they are very much agreed to this. And I asked the Governor to make this change which he did. So I urge you to accept this recommendation."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Macdonald has moved to accept the Governor's recommendations on House Bill 1919. If there's no discussion...The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 1919 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. This motion takes the Constitutional Majority of 89 votes. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 143 'ayes', 1 'nay' and 2 voting 'present'. And this motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding House Bill 1919 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 1975, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would urge that we accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change on House Bill 1975. It simply clarifies the legislative intent with regard to CETA employees,



that we won't be taking anything away from existing CETA employees that we'll just take away from those that are newly hired. And I'd urge we accept the recommendations."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Vinson moves to accept the Governor's recommendations on House Bill 1975. There's no discussion. The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1975 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. This issue because of the effective date takes 107, three-fifths Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 138 'ayes', 3 'nays', 0 'present'. And this motion having...motion having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations on House Bill 1975. House Bill 1986, Representative Reilly. Out. Oh, here he is. House Bill 2012, Representative Terzich. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, since House Bill 700 is similar to House Bill 2012, I would like leave to have House Bill 700 heard simultaneously with House Bill 2012."

Speaker Matijevich: "Does the Gentleman have leave to hear House Bill 700 as a package with House Bill 2012? Leave. Proceed, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2012 deals with the exclusion of federal income tax under the employee contributions into the pension system. The Governor has stated that there's some question whether the contributions are wages for social security purposes and whether contributions are considered salary for the purposes of state deferred compensation programs. As well as there is a



relationship between the Bill and the federal tax law since the IRS indicated a desire to delay rulings on employer pick-up plans. The Governor feels that the effective date of this legislation should be moved from January 1, 1980 to January 1, 1981 during which time the IRS determination could also be made. And I would move that we accept the Governor's amendatory veto to House Bill 2012 and also House Bill 700."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Terzich has moved that the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations with regards to both House Bill 700 and House Bill 2012. The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite."

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

Speaker Matijeich: "He indicates he will."

Satterthwaite: "Representative Terzich, can you tell me what the situation will be? As I understand it there was some flexibility in the original Bill as to whether or not this contribution would be a reduction in salary. Did the Governor's amendatory veto affect that section at all?"

Terzich: "No, it did not. The amendatory veto basically stipulated that there are problems with social security that has come up and also the IRS has not been ruling on that particular provision. And they felt that since the money would have to be put in escrow funds and it would cause problems in reporting that it...he would support the Bill if we changed the effective date to one year during which time we could clear up those problems."

Satterthwaite: "Then he just changed the effective date, nothing else?"

Terzich: "That's correct."

Satterthwaite: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Representa-



tive Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Brummer: "With regard to H.B. 700, are the...directors or whatever they're called of the State University Retirement System in agreement with the Governor's recommended change?"

Terzich: "Well I would refer that to Representative Stuffle."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, we took the two motions together because they deal with the same subject. Representative Brummer, the Board of Directors and the people who run this system are in agreement pursuant to a conversation that I had with Mr. Hoffmeister of the university system...about a week ago. Also, it's important to note and I was trying to get the floor to do that, some groups have passed Resolutions asking us to override on 700. It's my considered opinion that we should accept the amendatory veto because of contacts I've made with the IRS, contacts I've made with the University of Illinois and the retirement system. A lawyer is being hired through the University of Illinois and the system and that lawyer has told us that he does not believe we can secure an opinion from IRS or in the alternative from a federal court before the effective date that the Governor imposed. So we've taken the position to accept the amendatory veto at this time and that is in concurrence with the viewpoint of the retirement system and, I understand, with the board."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yeah...well, in my experience, many times waiting for the...a ruling from the IRS is a...a lengthy period of time and...and a lot tax decisions would never be



made if you always waited until you had a ruling from the IRS. One of the experts in the income tax area, I think, is J. Nelson Young from the University of Illinois College of Law. I know he was in strong support of...of House Bill 700. Is it his opinion that we now ought to wait for a ruling of the...of the Internal Revenue Service, do you know?"

Stuffle: "Representative Brummer, to answer that the best I can. You're correct about that with regard to that Gentleman and also with regard to Professor 'Cohen' whose also well versed in that area as well as pension law from the University of Illinois. It's my understanding, as I said, having talked with the retirement system, having talked with the University of Illinois..."

Brummer: "Do you...do you know the answer of the opinion of J. Nelson Young?"

Stuffle: "He has given me nothing with regard to this since amendatory veto. If he's given you anything, he's given you something he hasn't given the Sponsor. But I want to reiterate what I said before. You are right. It is difficult to get an opinion, but the IRS is not giving opinions. We're going to have to go to court to get an opinion it appears now, regardless as to when this effective date is. But the lawyer that I understand the U. of I. has hired in conjunction with the retirement system has told them and told me that they will not be able to get an opinion they don't believe until the 1981 effective date that the Governor has placed on this Bill. So I don't want to lose the Bill so I'm going to accept the amendatory veto."

Brummer: "Maybe we ought to override."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 700 and House Bill 2012 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye',



all opposed vote 'nay'. This motion takes 89 votes, a Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 150 'ayes', 0 'nays', 1 voting 'present'. And this motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding House Bill 700 and House Bill 2012 by adoption of the Amendment. Mautino, are you ready on that? The ...House Bill 2111. The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that we accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change on House Bill 2111. Basically what the change is, is clearing up technical errors. Number one is, puts this legislation is the same posture as Senate Bill 1425 which was signed previously by the Governor. It also keeps the same language as far as taxation is concerned, both have 6% and the effective date immediately, which was not in the legislation. And I move for acceptance of this recommendation."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Mautino has moved that the House accept the Governor rec...specific recommendation for change on House Bill 2111. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 2111 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. This issue because of the effective date takes 107 votes, a three-fifths Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 139 votes...2 'noes', 2 voting 'present'. And this motion having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority





prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change on House Bill 2111. House Bill 2207. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill deals with teacher's certification. The Governor has made a recommendation that the effective date of the Bill be deferred until July 1st, 1981 in order to give students currently enrolled in post secondary institutions sufficient time to complete their academic studies. And I think it's a good recommendation and I wish to concur. I move we concur."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McCourt has moved that the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations on 2207. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 2207 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. This motion takes 89 votes, a Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 141 'ayes', 1 'nay', 0 'present'. And this motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding House Bill 2207 by adoption of the Amendment. House 2228. Representative Yourell, the Gentleman from Cook."

Yourell: "Yes, may I have the attention of Representative Skinner?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Skinner, give him your full attention."

Yourell: "Are you ready? Okay. Pursuant to Article 4, Section 90 of the Constitution, the Governor returned House Bill 2228 with specific recommendations for change.



In his message to the General Assembly, and I quote, 'This excellent cost saving Bill which passed without a negative vote in either House must be returned to correct technical impediments recognized by the State Board of Elections after passage. That's all he did with the Bill and I move to accept the specific recommendations for change relative to House Bill 2228.'

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Yourell has moved that the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change the...on 2228. The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield, please? Since this is final passage, what will the Bill do as amended?"

Yourell: "There was a technical change on..."

Friedrich: "I understand that."

Yourell: "...page 9, line 28 by changing two business days, unquote, to two business days of the day and hour endorsed on a petition. It makes a change on the petition relative to the days and the hour of the petition."

Friedrich: "Well what...what specifically does the Bill do now that it's amended? That's what I mean, what..."

Yourell: "It changed...it changed, technically, two business days to...to two business days of the day and hour endorsed on a petition to clarify exactly when those days were."

Friedrich: "Well that's what the Amendment does. What does the Bill do?"

Yourell: "It hasn't anything to do with consolidation of elections, if that's what you're..."

Friedrich: "That's...that's great, that's progress. But what does the Bill do?"

Yourell: "This has to do with the filing of manuals and



information data relative to the filing of petitions  
for public office..."

Friedrich: "Thank you."

Yourell: "...by the State Board of Elections."

Speaker Matijeich: "If there's no further discussion...the  
question is, shall the House accept...oh, I'm sorry.  
The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Matijeich: "He indicates he will."

Dunn: "What is the position of the County Clerk's Association  
with regard to this Bill as amended?"

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Yourell."

Dunn: "Do the County Clerks support this? Okay, thank you."

Speaker Matijeich: "The question is, shall the House  
accept..."

Yourell: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Matijeich: "I'm sorry. Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Yes, I think I'm going to..."

Speaker Matijeich: "Take the Bill out of the record."

Yourell: "...take the Bill out of the record because I  
think there's a change that we might make. It will  
make the Bill even better."

Speaker Matijeich: "All right. All right."

Yourell: "We want to put an effective date in the Bill."

Speaker Matijeich: "All right. Take the Bill out of the  
record. The Lady from Adams, Representative Kent, on  
House Bill 2331. Mary Lou Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the Bill that allows  
the Armory in Quincy to be sold. And the Governor has  
made one change that the money rather than going back  
into a fund to build more armories...will just go back  
...the proceeds will go into the General Fund. I agree,  
so I hope you will vote 'yes' on his suggestion."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Lady from Cook...from Adams has  
moved to accept the Governor's specific recommendations."



Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 2331 by adoption of the Amendment. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'nay'. And this takes 107 votes to be effective. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. This motion...has 143 'aye' votes, 2 'noes', 0 'present'. And this motion...motion having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations regarding House Bill 2331. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Eugene Barnes on House Bill 2355. Out of the record. Out of the record on all three...of those Bills. 2367, Matula. Is Matula here..I think...he was excused. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty, on House Bill 2467."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would move that the House does accept the specific recommendations for change by the Governor. The Bill, as passed by the General Assembly, provided that a local official could issue a certificate for proof of loss claim applied to the municipality. Under the proposed provision, the Bill would apply only to the City of Chicago. I would move for the acceptance of the Bill under recommendation for change."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved that we accept the Governor's specific recommendations on House Bill 2467. There's no discussion. The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 2467 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. And this will take 107 votes to become effective. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's



135 'ayes', 0 'nays', 0 'present'. And this motion having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation regarding House Bill 2467. House Bill 2540. The Gentleman from Knox, Representative McMaster. McMaster. Tom McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I would suggest that the board be changed to reflect House Bill 2540 rather than 2467."

Speaker Matijevich: "I'm sorry. 2540."

McMaster: "Right. Mr. Speaker, I move that we accept the Governor's recommendation for change in House Bill 2540. This is in regards to the deliverance and posting of voter's instructions within the polling place. The Bill as amended would require that the instructions to the voters still be delivered, it would delete only the fact that they have to be posted. And I would accept the Governor's change."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McMaster has moved to accept the Governor's specific recommendations on 2540. Is there any...Representative McMaster, do you want to have an immediate effective date? If you do, maybe you ought to take it out of the record or...is it all right the way it is?"

McMaster: "I'll accept it the way it is, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right. The...Representative McMaster has moved...moved that the House accept the specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 2540 by adoption of the Amendment. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. 89 votes is...Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 146 'ayes', 0 'noes', 0 vot... 'present'. And House...and the motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House



accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding House Bill 2540 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 2719. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty. Out of the record. All right. Let's revert back to Representative Matula. We skipped over House Bill 2367. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Matula."

Matula: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move at this time that we accept the Governor's amendatory veto regarding House Bill 2367. What the Governor in his veto message stated that it is necessary to clarify the relationship among service recipients in the Department of Public Aid and the health corporations. And I move for a favorable vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Matula has moved to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor. There's no discussion. The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 2367 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. And to become immediately effective, this motion takes 107 votes, three-fifths Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 146 'ayes', 0 'nays', 0 'present'. And this motion having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding House Bill 2367. The Gentleman from Knox, Representative McMaster, now on House Bill 2746."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that we accept the Governor's recommendations on House Bill 2746 if the board would please be changed to reflect that. 46 instead of 47. Thank you."



Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McMaster has moved to accept the Governor's specific recommendations. Is there any discussion? If not..."

McMaster: "Let me explain it, Mr. Speaker. I didn't get a chance to explain."

Speaker Matijevich: "Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead."

McMaster: "The only change that we made, the Bill as introduced required that all County Clerks follow the rate limitations on tax levies. And the only change made by the Governor was that he exempted home rule units who have no statutory limitation upon rates. Therefore, I accept the Governor's recommendations."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, shall the House accept ...the Gentleman from McHenry on discussion, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Representative McMaster, can you tell us why the County...don't the County Clerks do this already?"

McMaster: "We feel that they should, Cal. This Bill was brought to me by the Taxpayers Federation who were concerned in some cases the County Clerks were questioning areas of the statutes that they felt were gray. They felt, therefore, that this statutory language would clarify the situation to County Clerks and require specifically that they would not exceed great limitations in tax extensions."

Skinner: "It's certainly an excellent Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "If there's no further discussion, the question...the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty."

Getty: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

McMaster: "Sure, yes. Go ahead."

Getty: "I'd like to clarify in the record that this would not limit the authority of a home rule unit. Is that correct?"

McMaster: "Mike, I made my statement, perhaps you weren't



listening. The Governor's specific recommendation exempts home rule units to have the authority to establish their own tax rates and we are not affecting home rule units. And that's the purpose of the Amendment and I made that statement."

Getty: "All right. All right, and it would be clear that it would not...further not limit the maximum taxing authority of any home rule unit. Is that correct?"

McMaster: "Absolutely not, Mike."

Getty: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Is there any further discussion? If not, the question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 2746 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. This motion takes a Constitutional Majority of 89 votes. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 133 'ayes', 4 'nays' and 2 voting 'present'. And this motion having received a Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 2746 by adoption of the Amendment. The Gentleman from Winnebago, the Assistant Majority Leader, Representative E. J. Zeke Giorgi, for the pur...on a motion to recess."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Stay in your seats."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we recess for ten minutes to allow the calling of the Special Session by the Governor at noon."

Speaker Matijevich: "The motion is to recess for ten minutes. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The Regular Session shall stand recessed for ten minutes for the purpose of.....convening of the...one, two, Third Special Session. House will be in recess."





Speaker Matijevich: "It is now twelve o'clock. The Third Special Session of the Eighty-First General Assembly will come to order. The Clerk will read the proclamation."

Clerk O'Brien: "Proclamation. State's General Fund balance has increased from 52 million dollars on June 30, 1977 to 390 million dollars on June 30, 1979. This hopeful change in the state's economic condition has occurred as a consequence of prudent restraint at all levels of government and decisions on revenue and spending by the Executive Branch and the General Assembly which focused wisely on the bottom line. However, the increase in the state spending balance should be graded with cautious optimism because it represents only 15 working days of cash and 5.8% of total spending by the state. Illinois' balance is still less than those kept by many other states. Nevertheless, the change in the state's economic picture does justify some tax relief. But the relief must be enacted in light of both present and future economic uncertainties. The national and state economy will probably be worse than the projections contained in the fiscal year 80 budget submitted to the General Assembly six months ago. Loss of over 1 hundred million dollars federal revenue sharing funds appears likely which will put serious pressure on the state's responsibility for its school system. This demand for increased government spending continue unabated funded by need for additional services and inflation in costs of extending services. This is evidence by the fact that the General Assembly approved the largest dollar spending increase in the state's history in the Spring Session. Because many of these same economic pressures affect taxpayers, some prudent tax relief is appropriate. The General Assembly rejected many proposals for tax relief offered to it in recent Sessions and has chosen to focus on the sales



tax on food and drugs. In my veto message on House Bill 2564, I expressed my concurrence in the generally held policy that the state, particularly in the inflationary economy, should not tax food and drugs which are staples in so many people's lives. But we must not achieve that goal at the expense of fiscal solvency of the state, a condition threatened by automatic removal of the sales tax. I believe we can, and should, begin the elimination of the sales tax on food and drugs now, but must do so in a manner that permits elected Representatives to weigh the benefits of the continued steady removal of the tax in light of the annual demands on our citizens...of our citizens for the services government provides and of more certain estimates of revenue and expenditures by the state. Automatic elimination of this revenue source does not provide that opportunity. It is risky and financially imprudent. Elimination of one cent of the tax on food and drugs in calendar year 1980 and thereafter is... is possible and important. Elimination of the additional four cents in subsequent years deserves examination as those years approach. My proposal permits that examination and I pledge to do so. Therefore, pursuant to Article 4, Section 5 (d) of the Constitution of 1970, I, hereby call and convene the General Assembly into Special Session on October 17, 1979 at twelve o'clock noon to consider House Bill 2796. James R. Thompson, Governor."

Speaker Matijevich: "The media has permission to film..some-one has permission. Roll Call for attendance in the Third Special Session. Roll Call for attendance. The Clerk will take the record on the Roll Call. Will those who are voting 'aye', vote 'present' on the board. Kornowicz, you didn't get fired yet. Vote 'present'. Ewell...he's not here...I don't think. Is he here?"



Oh, all right. Change Ewell....there you go. The Clerk will take the record. And include the absences that were recorded in the Regular Session as excused absences in the Third Special Session. The...show Anderson as being 'present'. A quorum of the Third Special Session being present, the Assistant Majority Leader, Representative Georgi, on the motion to recess."

Georgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the Third Special Session of the Eighty-First General Assembly recess until three o'clock, three o'clock today. Three o'clock."

Speaker Matijevich: "On that motion to recess, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman. Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Point of inquiry to the Chair. Do the rules of the...do our general rules apply to Special Sessions or do we have to adopt them or when do we adopt them and..."

Speaker Matijevich: "We'll let you know at three o'clock when we're coming back."

Greiman: "Well I..I'll try and be here then."

Speaker Matijevich: "Hold that in the ..... On the motion by Representative Georgi to recess by three... the Third Special Session until 3 P.M. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay' and the Third Special Session is declared recessed until 3 P.M. on this afternoon. We are now back in the Regular Session of the Eighty-First General Assembly. House will be in order. And we're back to the order of amendatory veto motions. And we will begin back on the Calendar on page 8. We'll start all over. We've gone through the Calendar once and done fairly well. We are now on House Bill 128. Representative Susan Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. When this House considered House Bill 128, it passed overwhelming. The purpose of House Bill 128 is to extend the Veteran's preference to the spouses and



parents of those disabled Veterans who cannot use it themselves or those people who were killed in action. What the Governor did was to eliminate the parents. He left in the spouses, but he took out the gold star Mothers. And frankly, I...I cannot see why this would have to be done. We contacted the Federal Civil Service System which uses this program of letting wives and Mothers use the Veterans preference of disabled Veterans and those people killed in action and using the number of people who take advantage of this in the federal system, we calculated how many would take advantage in Illinois. And at the absolute maximum participation which I wouldn't estimate would happen for at least a couple of years, about 120 people would probably take advantage in the entire State of Illinois if we have both spouses and parents included. So I think that this would cause very little problem for the state to administer and I think it is a good program which extends a benefit to those people who need it most, the spouses and the parents, of the disabled Veterans. And I ask that you join me in restoring House Bill 128 to the condition it was in when it passed out of this House and override the Governor's veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Catania has moved to override the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 128. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 128 pass notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendation for change? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'nay'. This takes three-fifths Constitutional Majority, 107. The Lady from Cook, Representative Penny...is having a tantrum. Proceed."

Pullen: "I wasn't having a tantrum. They put me on before you did."



Speaker Matijevich: "I'm sorry."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain my vote. The reason that I will be voting against this motion is that a goal of the Women's Liberation Movement is to remove Veterans Preference. And I do not want to do anything to weaken it by extending it to more than Veterans. That's why I vote 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, we've told the...the people who need this Veterans Preference that they can't have sales tax relief. So don't you think maybe we ought to let them get a job so they won't...so they will have enough money to be able to afford to pay the sales tax? Now I really find the prior Speaker's logic peccable. I have never seen her do anything to help the Women's Liberation Movement. And I really think to vote against it, for that purpose, is not a very good reason. Now I'm sure Representative DiPrima will join my argument in asking for an override and I assure you he will harangue you much more than I will. And it would be better to vote 'yes' now rather than to go through it."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Vinson to explain his vote."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I happen to believe that the basic requirement for hiring people for public employment systems ought to be merit. Now what we have right now is an exception to that in the case of Veterans. The question is whether we should further expand an exception for some other reason than merit. I would argue that we should not and we ought to vote 'no' on this."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McCourt, are you still looking for attention...no, I guess you're not. Mr.



Veteran, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative DiPrima, to explain his vote. Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am completely appauled by your lack of response in regards to this Bill. Jesus, how soon we forget...the Gold Star Mothers, my God."

Speaker Matijevich: "Come on, you Monkey."

DiPrima: "...She lost her son in the service. Now, like Susie explained, there's a dozen, maybe two dozen, Mothers probably take a Civil Service test and we're going to deprive them...Gold Star Mothers of getting that Veterans Preference. Come on, let's wake up. Let's give a green vote here. Let's get that over the hump."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I see it's for a lost cause so I guess there's no use in me saying any..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 122 'ayes', 34 'nays', 0 voting 'present'. And this motion having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails and House Bill 128 is declared passed notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendation for change. House Bill 211. The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Sharp."

Sharp: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 211 is the Bill that we accepted the Governor's amendatory veto on yesterday and then we reconsidered it after it was brought to our attention that a mistake was made in drafting the amendatory veto. So I would now like to move to override the Governor's amendatory veto of House Bill 211. The reason we're doing this is that the intent of the amendatory veto was to eliminate compensation...or reimbursement from the



state for unemployment compensation insurance payments. When the amendatory veto was drafted, they went too far and they eliminated reimbursement for all employee benefits. And so we have discussed this with the Governor's office and indicated that...and we have their approval that we would move to override the veto and then since payments and reimbursement is made on a prior year basis, this Bill, as far as the financial impact, will not go into effect until next year. And we'll put in a Bill to take out what they requested or thought they had taken out in the amendatory veto. So at this time, I would move to override."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Sharp has moved to override the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 211. There's no discussion. The question is, shall the House...shall House Bill 211 pass notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendation for change? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Three-fifths Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 128 'ayes', 12 'nays', 2 voting 'present'. And this motion having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails and House Bill 211 is declared passed notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendation for change. House Bill 339, Richard Kelly, the Gentleman from Cook. Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and the other Members of the House. I would move to accept the Governor's specific recommendations for changes on House Bill 339. The Governor made these changes to coincide with Senate Bill 675 which he signed into law this fall. The Legislation, in other words House Bill 339, allows



alcoholic beverages to be dispensed or used in certain public facilities which have convention-type centers. The Governor's action has been one of...of a technical nature. It's merely to coincide House Bill 339 with Senate Bill 675. And I ask for your support."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Kelly has moved to accept the Governor's specific recommendations on House Bill 339. If there's no discussion...the question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 339 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. This takes 89 votes, simple Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 133 'ayes', 11 '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 House Bill 339 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 472, Kucharski. Representative Ed Kucharski from Cook County."

Kucharski: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with the Governor's amendatory veto on House Bill 472."

Speaker Matijevich: "Is that for motion #1?"

Kucharski: "Yes, motion #1."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right, we're on motion #1. Proceed."

Kucharski: "Which deletes language that the department felt that may restrict them in other areas or programs that they have. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Kucharski has moved that the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations on 472. Is there any discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Since this is final passage, could the Sponsor give





us some idea what the Bill is about?"

Speaker Matijevich: "All right. Proceed, Representative Kucharski."

Kucharski: "Yes, thank you. The Bill authorizes the Illinois Housing Development Authority to sell up to 50 million dollars worth of revenue bonds of which 25 million to be used in Cook County and 25 million throughout the rest of the state. The bonding authority would be used for a 10 thousand dollars...for people to apply for a 10 thousand dollar loan for the purpose of a down payment on a first home purchase or a condominium...first time condominium purchase. The interest on the loan would be a half percent to one percent higher than the interest on the...on the revenue bonds with the payments in terms of ten years. Basically, that's what...what we're accomplishing in this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "If there's no further discussion...the question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific...oh, I'm sorry. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I think this is an important Bill perhaps because I just had to come up with an extraordinary down payment to buy my first house. There are mortgage companies in the Rockford area and in the Chicago area that are requiring a forty percent down payment in order to get a mortgage which will cost eleven percent. And what this Bill does is say that one must still come up with five percent, but the difference between five percent and whatever the mortgage company requires would be allowed to be loaned from the Illinois Housing Development Authority. So that's...that's what the Bill is. The amendatory veto takes out some language which would have required the Illinois Housing Development Authority to run all of its loans to lender programs which is the second part of IDA that not many



people know about. IDA also builds public housing... subsidized housing. It would take that out and allow them to use their...allow the agency to use its discretion as to when to run this program. It will receive the opposition of my colleague standing in front of me but he's too late because I'm closing."

Speaker Matijevich: "To hear that opposition, the Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I wasn't under the impression that he was closing at all. He was contributing to a debate in what is really kind of a silly Bill if we look at this from the total perspective of what's happening in the country today. Now one of the reasons why Representative Skinner had to come up with forty percent down payment for his first home was, I suppose there's two reasons, one is his credit situation. And secondly..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Did you say credit or credibility?"

Leinenweber: "And secondly, and more importantly, because of an action of the federal government to wit the Federal Reserve Board in raising the discount rates so that the banks will not be able to loan...which will raise the...the interest rate on the cost of money in order to prevent people from making loans to people like Representative Skinner. And the reason they're trying to do that is they're trying to dampen inflation. Now this program and the various programs such as Mayor Bilandic came up with and other programs around the country where we're going to be using tax exempt bonds in order to get low interest...mortgage money is an attempt to work across purposes with the Federal Reserve Board which, in it's peculiar way perhaps some people may think, is trying to do something about the inflation. So...it's really kind of using a...one federal law, that is the fed..the internal revenue code provision for tax exempt local bonds in order to offset



another action by federal law, that is the Federal Reserve Boards. So it's a bit inconsistent. It probably will lead to inflation. And I think we ought to think twice about embarking on these schemes."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Kucharski, if I read this amendatory veto right...or if I'm interpreting correctly, rather, it would seem to me that this would be probably the only...the only way that you could possibly release mortgage money at less than fifteen percent or...because of the usury rates at this time. It seems to me this would be a benefit to those homeowners, is that correct?"

Kucharski: "Yes."

Mautino: "Well I don't see any rational reason for not accepting this. I think it would be a...a good procedure to take in light of the drying up of the mortgage money now from the regular institutions."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman..."

Mautino: "Am I reading that right?"

Kucharski: "I'm...I'm not sure I understood your second comment."

Mautino: "Well I mean this is the only...this is another avenue to increase mortgage money now that the private sector is dried up, is that not true?"

Kucharski: "It would loosen it, yes."

Mautino: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr...Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I facetiously would say that I think that Representative Skinner was required to put forty percent down because of the insecurity of employment. But...but be that as it may, we have been told by the Federal Reserve Board



that we have to cool down the economy by making money hard to get. And as a result, the private sector is completely out of the housing business now. Now we're in the situation where government said, 'Well you can't get housing so we'll pump money in so you can get housing.' I think this is exactly opposite of what ought to be going on and it's amazing to me, at a time when they are trying to shut off housing building, that the government pumps money in on the other side and certainly defeats the efforts to slow down the economy and inflation, which is exactly what Representative Leinenweber said. I was for this concept in the beginning, but this is not the time to be pumping public money into the private competition to private sector which has been put out of business. I don't know whether you know it or not, it's impossible for a savings and loan or a bank now to make a loan at the legal rate on a house without losing about two percent a year on it. And I can tell you that not very many of them are willing to do that."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Representative who sponsored this Bill put in a lot of effort on this Bill. The Governor's veto is very minor. This Bill has a very fine concept. It helps people in one of their dearest hopes, and that is to own a home. The way the market is going now with interest rates many people will never be able to own one. I think we owe it to people who don't have as much money as others to own a home. I think it gives people an entirely different prospect on living when they have a place to call their own. They feel part of our society. It will help many young people. I don't know how young people can get homes today. They need every kind



of aid they can get. And I certainly think we should support this fine Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Darrow, the Gentleman from Rock Island."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is one of those situations where this legislation was introduced by the fine Representative from Cook County. He allowed us to attach an Amendment to that Bill which would provide that half the funds would go to downstate Illinois and half to Cook County. I feel this is equitable and that it's a good measure. We should all vote in favor of it. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Kucharski, to close."

Kucharski: "I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to House Bill 472 by the adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Because of the effective date, this motion takes a three-fifths Constitutional Majority, 107 votes. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 127 'ayes', 28 'nays', 2 voting 'present'. And this motion having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations with regards to House Bill 472. Representative Harris on House Bill 516. The Gentleman from Williamson, Representative Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor on House Bill 516 in the manner as written."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Williamson, Representative Harris, has moved that we accept the Governor's



specific recommendations. If there's no discussion... the question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 516 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. 89 votes, simple Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 148 'ayes', 1 'nay', 0 'present'. And this motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding House Bill 516 by adoption of the Amendment. Ropp...did we do that yet? 657, Representative Ropp ....we've already done that. House Bill 662, Yourell, are you...that's out. Out of the record. 716, Stuffle. The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle, on House Bill 716."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Governor's amendatory veto of 716 deals only with that Section of the Bill which concerns itself with school consolidations under Article 11-1 of the School Code. I would move to accept the amendatory veto of the Governor."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Stuffle has moved to accept the Governor's specific recommendations. On that, the Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Now, Mr...Representative Stuffle, as I understand, what the Governor struck out was the provision which allows a dismantling of a school district by one district accepting only a part of another district without taking the whole thing. Is that right?"

Stuffle: "In effect, I guess that's what it does in the sense that 11-1 allows for consolidation through a process of annexation of less than an entire district. That's been on the books for some time. There are two



Sections, one which allows that procedure and one which allows only the taking of an entire existing district with its consent and that's 11-6, I believe." You are correct. It in effect reinstates the current law in 11-1 which allows that procedure in a partial district."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, very briefly on this very, very bad amendatory veto of the Governor. He struck out a provision which was put in there by the Senator from the 42nd district in which I strongly supported on the floor of this House last spring. And this is the provision which allows a school district to accept part, but not all, of another district in the form of consolidation. Now the practical effect of not having this particular provision in the Bill, and I understand the Governor's reason was that he thought it would inhibit consolidation, which it certainly would at least of the type which this particular provision had in mind preventing. And that is where a school district can come in and try to take, and if he can talk the local regional school superintendent in going along with them, try to take some very substantially valuable assessed valuation type industrial property from one district and in effect rate one district and put it in another without taking any of the school kids. Now this very despicable practice is being attempted in Will County right now by trying to take the Mobile Oil Refinery from the Joliet school district and put it in a neighboring school district. Now this is... this will have a tremendously adverse affect on the Joliet school district if this does come to pass. And this would probably require a tremendous increase in real estate taxation. Of course, it would provide a decrease in taxation for the district getting it because of...enhancing of it...of its assessed valuation. I think it's a bad amendatory veto. This



was a very excellent provision...very needed in order to prevent school districts from having their assessed valuation taken from them. Now if they want the whole Joliet school district, then fine, let them go ahead and take it. But they ought to take all the kids with it. Don't take the assessed valuation from one district without taking the kids. And I urge a 'no' vote for this motion."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative J.J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Wolf: "Representative Stuffle, I'm a little bit confused in here. Does this Bill as it now stands...does this provide that..that Members could be vested in the General Assembly Retirement system concurrently with the benefits from the Teachers Union? I'm confused on that point."

Stuffle: "Well, your confusion is probably well taken, Representative Wolf. The Governor had, I believe, three Bills on his desk that dealt with this issue, two Senate Bills and this Bill. This, I believe, is the only Bill that clarified that the person who sits as a Member here and who teaches in a public school could, during the same year, get pension credit both places but he couldn't, or she couldn't, get credit for a day here that they got credit in whatever school district they were in. The other Bills were not succinct on that issue, this one is. The Governor, initially, was going to act on this Bill, as he did on those, and knock that Section out. When he was confronted with that question a second time, and the language in this Bill which differed, he agreed with us that that possibility of getting credit for the same day here that you get up there will not apply. Because





this Bill says specifically that you can only get credit in the General Assembly system where you are also a teacher for those days in which the General Assembly or its Committees are convened. So there would not be concurrent service there. We could talk to a specific example of that here in the General Assembly for a Member on this side, and I believe one on that side, gets credit for only those days they teach there and not those days they're here. In fact, I talked to one of the Members yesterday, and he said that he had X number of years of service, I believe he said a 14 but in the pension system he has considerably less than that because those days that he is here, he does not receive any credit so he does not receive concurrent credit in those situations. And the Bill differs with the others for those reasons. The Governor...the bottom line is, the Governor made a mistake and what he put in here with regard to that one paragraph that he read in the Veto Message does not even apply to the Bill at all. If you look at the deletions, they only affect the issue raised by Representative Leinenweber of which affects school consolidations."

Wolf: "Thank you. One...one further question. How...how does that compare with other local pension funds? For example, if a Member of the General Assembly is also say a county employee, there is no...no...concurrent service involved there. Does a county employee, for example, who also serves as a Member of the General Assembly, can they receive pension credit for the county time other than the days on which they're in Session?"

Stuffle: "Representative, I'm not certain of that situation with regard to them. This Bill only applies to people who are public school teachers in this situation, is my understanding. It's my understanding that the



situation works the same there."

Speaker Matijevich: "Is there's no further discussion...the Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle, to close."

Stuffle: "There...there have been some questions arising with regard to the Section of the Governor's amendatory veto dealing with the situation in the Joliet school districts and that area. For that reason, at the request of several Members, I would like to take this out of the record."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to take the Bill out of the record. Out of the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative John Cullerton, on House Bill 723."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Bill that passed deals with continuances in criminal cases. It permits a court to dismiss an indictment on information which has been pending for over a year after a hearing. And what the Governor did was to make it apply only to indictments or information filed after the effective date of the Bill which is January 1st, 1980. So I would ask that we accept the Governor's recommendations for change."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Cullerton has moved to accept the Governor's recommendations on 723. If there's no discussion...the question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 723 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. 89 votes, a simple Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 152 'ayes', 0 'nays', 0 'present'. And this motion having received a Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding House Bill 723 by adoption of the Amendment. House Bill 841. Representative White,



you have a second motion which is not on the Calendar. Are you going to proceed with that one or the complete override? Representative White, the Gentleman from Cook. If...if it's on the complete override you can go now but if it's on the second motion, we'll have to wait."

White: "Well, it's the second motion."

Speaker Redmond: "All right. Out of the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Stearney, on House Bill 961. Is Dave Epstein in the House anywhere?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Hello, George."

Stearney: "Has the Bill been read, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed, yes, go ahead."

Stearney: "I have a...motion #3 to override. I would move to table...or to withdraw that particular motion."

Speaker Matijevich: "You're proceeding with which motion, Representative?"

Stearney: "And would proceed with motion #2 which has been filed by Representative Schuneman."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right. Proceed with motion #2. We're on motion #2 on House Bill 961."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move that the House accept the...motion #2 regarding the amendatory veto on this matter. What it does is merely change a comma to a period and capitalize the word 'You'. But I do want to emphasize that it is the legislative intent to retain the mandatory requirements about insured motorists coverage in the State of Illinois and not make it optional. I move for the acceptance of Amendment #2."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Stearney has moved to accept the Governor's specific recommendations on 961. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi."



Georgi: "Mr. Stearney, does this...is this true that this veto message takes out the offering of the uninsured motorist coverage to the...to the applicant for insurance? Are you doing away with the uninsured motorist clause, in this case?"

Stearney: "Well, Representative Georgi, you can rest assured that I would never do that. I was very concerned about the Governor's amendatory veto. I think...his staff man who prepared this particular message was not quite apt in using the king's English. However..."

Georgi: "Yeah, but we've got to be careful too."

Stearney: "I know. But we believe that the...our...our legislative intent is to retain the mandatory requirements of uninsured motorist's coverage. and not make it optional whatsoever."

Georgi: "Correct."

Stearney: "So that's why I stated on the record what the legislative intent is. We also...our staff man has discussed this with James 'Skeltney', Deputy Director of the Department of Insurance, so that if necessary the Department of Insurance would promulgate a rule making certain that uninsured motorist's coverage is still mandatory as of...and has...will continue to be as it has been since 1963."

Georgi: "Also, how about the new limits now? Do we have new limits with this Bill."

Stearney: "The...the limits have not been touched by the amendatory veto."

Georgi: "Are there limits...did we increase them with the Bill..."

Stearney: "Yes we did."

Georgi: "Okay."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I have listened



to Representative Stearney's explanation and I am still curious and I would ask the Gentleman if he would yield and explain to us how he can get around the clear language that says, 'Unless the insured requests such coverage in writing, uninsured motorists coverage need not be offered in any renewal or supplemental policy where the insured has rejected coverage in excess of that required in Section 7203 of the Illinois Vehicle Code, etc. I would like you to explain how we can overcome the specific recommendations for change by the mere statement on the floor that it is our legislative intent that uninsured motorists remain mandatory, which I think you said you support and I support."

Stearney: "Well absolutely. Representative, I was...I have the same concerns as...have shared the same concerns as you now express. And that is the reason I filed a motion to completely override the Governor's amendatory veto. However, it's my fear that if it were not...and if I did so and we were to pass that in the House, I'm fearful that in the Senate the matter may die all together. And...and on the other hand, however, I do not want negate existing law which mandates uninsured motorist's coverage and has done so since 1963. But I think the...the amendatory veto message may be somewhat confusing, but nevertheless, I think it's officially clear to provide that only if an individual refused coverage in excess of 15 or 30 thousand dollars. In that situation in the future the insurance company need not offer it in an excess amount. That is in an amount greater than 15 and 30 thousand dollars."

Getty: "Well, speaking on the issue, I...I respect what you say, Representative Stearney, and I know your intent is good. I think it's unfortunate the the Governor's amendatory veto is not accurately drawn. I don't think



they intended to do what I think this clearly does. I think your motion to override was the correct one and I'm going to oppose this motion to accept."

Speaker Matijevich: "If there's no further dis...the Gentleman from Whiteside, Representative Schuneman. Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker and Representative Getty, the language that's in the...motion #2...Representative Getty. Representative Getty, would you follow with me the language that's in motion #2? Do you have a copy of the motion there, Representative? This is language that was put into the Bill because of a concern on the part of some company that they would have to bug their policy holder every six months or every three months about increasing these limits. And I don't think it was the intent of the Legislature that they be required to do that. But rather that they be required to make the coverage available. So the Governor's language, while not perfect, I think does accomplish that purpose when it says that, 'Unless the insured requests such coverage in writing, uninsured motorist's coverage need not be offered in any renewal or supplemental policy where the insured has rejected coverage in excess of that required.' So I think that they are let off the hook in offering this coverage on every renewal only in those cases where the insured has been offered the coverage and he has rejected it. The other thing that...that I would say to you to try to alleviate your concern about that and...and I have the same concern, is that the Department of Insurance has agreed that if we accept this amendatory veto they will issue a departmental ruling saying that the intent of this law is not to make uninsured motorist's coverage optional. The purpose of the Bill was, in fact, to increase the minimum uninsured motorist's limits."



Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty."

Getty: "I would make this suggestion to the Gentleman. I think we're all in general agreement of what we want to do. I would suggest that we pull it out of the record at this time and I think we might be able to rewrite it so that it would be done appropriately."

Speaker Matijeich: "Is that agreeable to Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Well...well I'm amenable to Representative Getty's suggestion."

Speaker Matijeich: "All right. You do agree?"

Stearney: "I'm amenable, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijeich: "All right. Representative Stearney agrees and we take House Bill 916 out of the record. Thank you, Mike. Is there anybody who has a Bill on the Order of Amendatory Veto Motions which...I think we've gone through all of them. And those who have wanted it out of the record, it is out of the record. Is there anybody who still has one and is ready to go? Representative Mugalian, I think we passed yours but... The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "I'm not sure I heard the Chair properly. I want ...I want to accept the amendatory veto on House Bill 1345."

Speaker Matijeich: "13 what?"

Mugalian: "1345. That is a..."

Speaker Matijeich: "All right."

Mugalian: "...established a Commission..."

Speaker Matijeich: "All right, we have that. And Representative Preston wanted to take it out of the record. But you are now ready to proceed with House Bill 1345, Representative Mugalian. On which motion?"

Mugalian: "Motion to accept."

Speaker Matijeich: "All right. Representative Mugalian."



Mugalian: "The Amendment of the Governor affected the Ethnic Heritage Commission which was drafted onto the original Bill which only created a Land Resources Study Commission. I find that thoroughly acceptable. That is the Amendment and...move that we accept the amendatory veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Mugalian has moved to accept the recommendations of the Governor on House Bill 1345. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti."

Conti: "Just a point of clarification. I notice the Sponsor is Buddy Lemke. How did Mugalian get in on this?"

Speaker Matijevich: "They're Cosponsors, Brady and Mugalian. Is that what you're asking."

Conti: "Are they Cosponsors? I don't see Mugalian's name here at all."

Speaker Matijevich: "He's on the Calendar. House Bill 1345, Brady-Mugalian...and Brady doesn't want to handle it. He's busy right now."

Conti: "I see. All right."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right. There's no further discussion. The question is, shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1345 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'. And because of the effective date, this Bill takes 107 votes, a three-fifths Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 'ayes', 22 'nays' and 0 voting 'present'. And this motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding House Bill 1345 by adoption of the Amendment. Is that it on amendatory veto motions? No other Member has a motion on amendatory vetoes? We will





now proceed to the Order of Total Veto Motions on page 4 and go down the Calendar. The first Bill is House Bill 18. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Huskey...are you ready? I don't see Representative Huskey. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster, on House Bill 108."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one of the hardest...one of the hardest tasks that any of us has...that all of us has is to try and repeal some law. Our statute books pile up and pile up with every idea that comes to us in years passed. And any time a law appears to us to be ridiculous and of no use whatsoever, it still is very hard to repeal it. House Bill 108 repeals an Act called Good Roads Day. I have Good Roads Day in front of me...in fact, many people didn't even know we had such a thing as Good Roads Day. It is a law that requires the school teachers to tell the children about the virtues and values of good roads on April 15th of each year. It's not even in the School Code. It's in the Section on roads and bridges. Now I have to be honest and say that the end of the world is not going to come if we leave Good Roads Day on the books and the end of the world is not going to come if we repeal it either. But I think the proper thing to do is to repeal this. The Governor's veto message really didn't say much other than he...he thought a single day's observation throughout the state would be an educational and enlightening experience. As it happens this year, Good Roads Day fell on Easter Sunday. The schools weren't in session. It was impossible to commemorate this in the schools. And to my knowledge, there was not one single instance anywhere in the State of Illinois of the observation of Good Roads Day. I think we should free our school teachers from the obligation to do this. I do think that it is



a statutory expression of somebody's fantasy. We could just as well have a day to commemorate the Tooth Fairy or the Easter Bunny or Santa Claus. And I think probably if we're going to commemorate Good Roads Day we might just as well commemorate the day that RTA was created. I'm sure that would be something worthy of the school children to study. As it happens, Good Roads Day is set on April 15th because in the preamble to the Act it says, 'Whereas the first shovel of dirt was turned beginning the construction of the first hard road in Illinois to become a part of the state aid system of highways on April 15th, 1914.' I believe in history. I think we all do. I think that roads are important, that's not it at all. But I just think that our teachers can tell the children about roads and as...when they're in session and not on Easter Sunday or not artificially on April 15th. I would move that we repeal Good Roads Day notwithstanding the veto of the Governor."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved to override the Governor's motion on House Bill 108. On that, the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I must tell you that I'm shocked and appalled to hear Representative Deuster stand up before this august Body and suggest that the Governor's veto not be sustained. After all, everyone of us in this great Body know of the outstanding road system we have in the State of Illinois...one of the finest roads systems found anywhere out of Siberia. After all, consider this fact, if we did not have Good Road Day when the teachers could tell the students what they were about, our students would never know what a good road was. I would hope that they would use visual aids in school to show our students what a nice macadam road



is or what good concrete looks like. After all, I know Representative Deuster lives in one of the best areas of the state, beautiful Lake County. It is so pockmarked with deep potholes that you can hardly see where the roads used to be. These students might go through a whole generation and never, ever see a good road. Now let's just consider how important this type of legislation is. It deserves the keen observation of the Governor to analyze Representative Deuster's Bill who was just trying to do a little bit of good work for our school teachers who he's worked so closely with over the last few years. I think in all deference to the earnest efforts of Representative Deuster, we ought to look at the Governor's veto and say to ourselves, 'Do we need to teach good roads to our students? Is it really important?' I think in the end there is only one way to vote and that is to override the Governor again."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Lake...this is a Lake County show. The Gentleman from Lake, Chairman of the Revenue Committee, Dan Pierce. By the way, there's a pair of lost glasses that were found in the middle aisle, I believe, somewhere on the floor. If anybody has...or way in the back. If anybody has lost a pair of glasses, they will be at the podium. Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I'm rather shocked at my colleagues from Lake County wanting to abolish Good Roads Day. In fact, this is for the Gentleman from DuPage who is standing here and for yourself on the stand. I just got a call from Chicago from our former colleague, Representative Brady, that Good Roads Day is part of the package...part of the package of the Thompson-Byrne Transportation Program. And that is the reason for the veto of this Bill which would take away and destroy



the tradition of Good Roads Day. And now, Mr. Speaker, that you know and now that Mr. Daniels knows that this is part of the package, with the word right from Chicago, I'm sure you will sustain the Governor's veto of this Bill which would abolish our prairie state tradition of Good Roads Day. And because of that I intend to vote 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Pierce would like to amend it to be Good Railroads. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "After having the transportation program jammed down our throat and the 8 billion dollars connected with that, it's no small wonder that Good Roads Day is April 15th, income tax day."

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

Skinner: "It is probably appropriate that the Democrat from Lake County who supported the Governor's 20% sales tax increase in Cook County and the 5% sales tax increase in Lake County and the 16 and 2/3% increase in railroad fare. Oh, no, I'm sorry. It was a 10% increase in railroads fares that he was...he was promised, should go along with Chicago Democrats on this issue and vote to sustain the Governor's veto. It is totally appropriate. There are only two people in the suburbs, in the collar counties, who voted with the Governor. One was Representative Blair's replacement and the second one, let's see...or was that person from Lake County? No one has really read the Governor's message. I really think you ought to read the second paragraph. It says, 'The recent passage of the Transportation Finance and Administration Act of 1979 by the Eighty-First Illinois General Assembly again underscores the importance of an integrated system of highways and streets in this state...so



essential to the general welfare of the people. Now it's because of the transportation package which forces Cook County taxpayers to pay 20% higher tax...sales taxes starting on November 1st in order to build good roads downstate...that we ought to keep Good Roads Day according to the Governor's veto message. Well if I could cackle I would. This is certainly one of the most humorous, one of the most humorous veto messages I have ever read. And I intend to join Representative Deuster if I can trip over the...trip through the potholes to my desk to push my switch."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook...'for a poem on the side of the bus'...Representative Peters... probably."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, not so much to comment on the Bill but just to make a general observation. I'm always pleased to hear the distinguished Representative from McHenry County and it would appear to me that if Jesus Christ came down to earth today and said, 'Let him who is without sin cast the first stone,' our distinguished Representative would pick up a rock."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hudson. George Ray Hudson."

Hudson: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I feel, really in good conscience, that this Good Roads Day should be repealed because it's blatantly discriminatory. If we're going to have Good Roads Day we should also have Good Bridges Day, Good Canals Day, Good Railroads Day, Good Sidewalks Day and Good Curbs Day, just to list a few. So I think on a basis of a discriminatory piece of legislation, we're either going to make it fair for all or nothing at all. So I...I would suggest, Ladies and Gentlemen, that we...that we repeal the Good Roads Day, we override



this veto, support Representative Deuster and this will be truly a blow for, I think, fairness and equity."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Move...move the previous question."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Mulcahey, moves the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The main question is put. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster, to close."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, nobody is going to miss this law. Nobody is going to lose a job for voting to repeal it. And this is a way that everybody can strike back and really go home and say you repealed something that was ridiculous and useless and not one citizen knows about or cares about. So I urge your 'yes' vote and thank you for your support."

Speaker Matijevich: "Question is, shall House Bill 108 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. 107 votes, three-fifths Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 130 vot...'ayes', 12 'nays', 3 voting 'present'. And this motion having received a Constitutional three-fifths Majority prevails and House Bill 108 is declared passed notwithstanding the veto of the Governor."



Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 156... Kindly record Representative Borchers as 'aye'. House Bill 150. On the Calendar under total vetoes appears a motion to override the Governor's Veto with respect to House Bill 150. On that motion, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the provisions of Federal Public Law 94-142 favor the placement of exceptional children in the regular classroom rather than in special surroundings. Mainstreaming of students with special needs demands that they be greeted by teachers, administrators and others in the school environment who can spot their problems. Exceptional children are those with specific learning disabilities, often appear to be lazy or just slow. For these problems to be ignored during a child's formative years can mean a lifetime of discrimination. For these problems to be discovered and corrected can mean the vital difference in one's ability to function as a productive adult. In response, House Bill 150 was introduced and it provides that Illinois Colleges and universities shall include course work for future teachers which is geared toward the psychology and identification of the exceptional child, including the learning disabled child. House Bill 150, as it was passed by this House and by the Senate overwhelmingly, was in the form and the substance as drafted by the Office of Education and consequently supported by the Office of Education. Without notice, the Governor vetoed the Bill. I discussed the veto with his staff and was advised, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that in vetoing this Bill the Governor engaged in an inadvertent act and I'm so advised that



I can report that to the House. Based on the need for this Bill, based on the support for the Bill by a myriad of organizations, including the Office of Education, and based on the admission of the Governor's Office that the veto was inadvertent... I now move, Mr. Speaker and earnestly solicit your support for the override of the veto of House Bill 150."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any debate? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, on Sunday I had WIND on and I heard this splendid editorial endorsement of this Bill, which with your indulgence I'd like to play for you. (tape) 'The other night, a listener called Clark Weber with a tragic story that is happening all too often. (woman) I have a 13 year old son.'"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, on a point of order."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, I think that if we start allowing recordings of people we're going to be inundated. I think the Rules of the House allow only Members to speak from the floor and I would raise the point that this is quite out of order."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Your point is well taken. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, do you want to conclude your time? The timer is on."

Skinner: "It is all of one minute. I'm sorry if you don't want to hear a parent who's...who's son was found to not have been learning anything from 4th grade through 8th grade because the teacher of that one did not know how to identify that the child was not able to learn. What this Bill will do will be require that all teachers after 1981 will have to have course work in the characteristics of those people who need special education. We





have this special education system in place but it doesn't do any good whatsoever because students never...never go to the program. I join WIND, which unfortunately some of my downstate colleagues apparently can't get on their radio. It was a superb editorial and I hope that you will vote in favor of the override."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I feel there is no controversy over this any longer, since the Governor's Office has indicated that they are now in support of the Bill. But I would like to recognize the fact that in the left gallery we currently have..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "My fault. Please, proceed."

Satterthwaite: "We currently have representatives of the Illinois Association for the Learning Disabilities who are here in town today and I'm sure have been very instrumental in seeing that this piece of legislation was introduced and passed in the earlier part of the year. I think there would be no more fitting welcome that we could give to them than to not override the inadvertent veto of this Bill so that the legislation will be in place."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson."

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I've had our staff check with the Governor's staff and it was an inadvertent mistake. I supported this Bill when it was brought up and I urge everyone to ... to vote for the override."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, to close."

Schlickman: "I earnestly solicit your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House, on House



Bill 150 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', and opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 150 'aye', 3 'nay', none recorded as 'present'. This motion, having received the Constitutional three-fifths majority, prevails and House Bill 150 is declared passed, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. House Bill 190. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 190 was an attempt to bring order out of chaos by requiring that the Department of Children and Family Services and the Department of Public Aid enter into an inner agency agreement which would place clear administrative responsibility for day care programs within the jurisdiction of the Department of Children and Family Services. The Bill was vetoed by the Governor because he alleged that the two Departments had already entered into such an agreement and therefore, the Bill was not necessary. However, we had hearings today, this morning, in which Director Cohler and Director Miller, from the two Departments, appeared and said that, for the record, that the... the agreement did nothing more than ratify a pre-existing arrangement that had already...been in place but which had not been written down. In other words, the Bill is still needed because the situation which had existed before the Bill was introduced still exists and we need to place some kind of legislative guidelines or make a clear expression of legislative intent known to the Department so that they will...get their act together and so they will not be constantly feuding



over this program and that we will have one place to go in which to place the responsibility. The Bill passed out of this House with 114 votes. I simply ask the people that voted for it the first time to vote for it now. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall HouseBill 190 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. All in favor signify by voting 'aye' and opposed by voting 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Well, in explaining my vote, Mr. Speaker, I see a lot of red votes which appear to be coming from the other side of the aisle. I think it's very nice that the Republican Party wishes to support their Governor in his vetoes, however, it seems to me that Members of both parties ought to be concerned about bureaucratic chaos in this state. We have a situation where two Departments are constantly feuding with each other over a particular program. One Department controls the money, because it comes from the Federal Government and they are designated as the Title 20 Agency, the other Department, which had been given the primary responsibility for this program prior to the Title 20 program coming on line, you know, and should have the program managing responsibility, find that the two departments can pass the buck back and forth between each other and it's the... the people who are out in the fields, the service providers, who are getting caught in this kind of bureaucratic chaos. Now I don't think any... any person here, regardless of what their party is, feels that that kind of bureaucratic chaos is justified. We all run on a platform that's pledged to, you know, trimming the fat in government and bringing order out of chaos and this is the Bill



which seems to me, to do precisley that. And I think, while it's nice to...to be...it's okay to be nice to the Governor when he's right, in this case he's simply promoting chaos in his own bureaucracy to keep his Department Directors off his back and I...I don't think that's appropriate. I think we ought to override the veto."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise in support of Representative Bowman's motion. I participated in a hearing this morning where we heard from Director Coler and Director Miller and we also heard from people who are trying to run day care centers here in the State of Illinois. Their problem is that they don't know who to go to when there is some sort of bureaucratic snarl up. They used to have 30 days to notify the Public Aid Department or DCFS when someone no longer was eligible for state reimbursement in their day care centers. They told us that that policy has suddenly been discontinued and now they no longer have a 30 day grace period. But they don't even really know who to complain to. They don't know if they're suppose to go to DCFS or the Department of Public Aid. DCFS and the Department of Public Aid tell us that they have some sort of wonderful new agreement so that they can make this work in the State of Illinois. But the providers of day care services tell us that they can't understand how that's suppose to function and if those two Departments can't transmit to the people who are providing day care services in the State of Illinois how it's supposed to function, I fail to understand how it can possibly the single, clear day care policy that the Governor's Veto Message says it is. The



two Departments tried to tell us that what they have is an equal partnership."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Will the Lady kindly bring your remarks to a close?"

Catania: "Yes. I can only submit to you that anybody here whosever worked with either Department, Public Aid or DCFS, knows it's difficult enough to work with one of them at a time. If you have to try to get along with both of them simultaneously as equal partners you can, I think, understand what the day care centers are up against. Please vote with Representative Bowman, vote green to straighten out this mess."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 94 'aye', 57 'nay', 1 recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Yeah, can we put it on Postponed? Well we only have 25 absentees. Could you poll the absentees? We'll try that first."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Requests a poll of the absentees. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters. Peters, please."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, if the Representative would reconsider there are a number of people that are not here and I'm sure that if it does get 107 on this that it will be...verified, so, whatever you want to do, but..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "E.M. Barnes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Barnes, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Capparelli. Daniels. Deuster."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Capparelli, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ralph Dunn. Ewell. Gaines. Garmisa.

Hoffman. Hudson. Kosinski. Margalus. McBroom."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you vote Hudson, 'no', please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Hudson as 'no'. Please continue."

Clerk O'Brien: "Molloy. Oblinger. Polk. Schlickman. Schuneman. Stearney. Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich. Winchester. J. J. Wolf and Yourell."

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

Bowman: "Yes, would you please put this on Postponed Consideration?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Postponed Consideration, at the request of the Sponsor. On the Calendar, under Total Vetoes, appears a motion to override the Governor's Veto with respect to House Bill 233. On the motion, the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 233 is an important Bill which has received virtually no attention of... at the present time, because of a defective Appellate Court Decision, in my district, there is no control whatsoever over the siting or regulation of gravel pits. In order to reassert the traditional local zoning control and control over operations which local governments have traditionally had, I introduced House Bill 233. At the specific request of the coal mining industry I tightened the language so that it would not apply to the surface mining of fossil fuels. In response to a specific request from the Environmental Protection Agency I took out concurrent power on the part of the Environmental Protection Agency. What remains is a very simple assertion saying, 'This is an Amendment to the Environmental Protection Act. Nothing in this Act is limit on the



power of any unit of local government to pass or enforce any ordinance concerning surface mining or land affected thereby, provided that this Section is not applicable to the surface mining of fossil fuels and provide it further that no unit of local government is here granted power over any other unit of local government or school district, whether within or without the boundaries of such other units of local government or school district. All I'm trying to do here is to reassert the power that has traditionally been there. Now what's going to happen if this does not, if this veto isn't overridden...no actually I guess I should go into why the Governor vetoed it. He vetoed it for one of the most invalid reasons that I can understand. He says it's a piecemeal approach to the problem of state and local control of land use and said that we should support, instead, Representative Deuster's Bill, which didn't get out of the Senate Committee. In the analysis, the Republican analysis, it is incorrectly stated that because surface mining is not defined the Bill could apply to landfills. Well that's just absurd. This has nothing whatsoever to do with landfills. It has to do with gravel mining and sand mining. The regulations right now on gravel and sand mining that are applicable are from the Department of Mines and Minerals. And virtually no gravel pit qualifies, because to apply for a permit, to be eligible to apply for a permit one must do one of two things; one must take more than 10 feet of overburden off the gravel. And the gravel in Northern Illinois does not have 10 feet of topsoil above it so virtually



6

no permits are required under that provision. Or, one must mine more than 10 acres of gravel a year. Now, that may not sound like much to you but 10 acres is a very large plot of ground when you take gravel 50 feet deep out of it. Now you probably could build a crosstown expressway with 10 acres of gravel. It's an awful lot of gravel. There are...so virtually no one applies for the applications. I've written the E.P.A. and asked them what regulations they have and they say, 'Well in some cases you might need an air pollution permit and other cases you might need a water pollution permit.' But the Department of Mines and Minerals will have the primary responsibility for determining where these gravel pits will be sited. Well, I just told you what the Department of Mines and Minerals do and that's nothing. All right, let's take it one step further. Who's going to win if we don't override this veto? It's a company called Material Service Corporation. It is run by a crook. The crook is named Lester Crown. He was granted immunity from prosecution in a legislative bribery case. His firm is the firm that wants to put a gravel pit right next to the Village of Carrie, Illinois. Right next to a subdivision. There will be no controls over this gravel pit. The gravel pit can operate 24 hours a day. They can run a crushing plant 24 hours a day right outside the bedroom of kids that have to get up the next morning. McHenry County, nor any other county, will be able to have any regulations whatsoever on any gravel mining operation anywhere in the State of Illinois. Now you may not have been contacted by your local officials because 60 percent of the gravel in





this state comes from McHenry County. Approximately 70 to 80 percent of the gravel comes from the 33rd Legislative District. The 2 billion dollar transportation program, which we just passed for the six county area is going to come out of my district. Basically, we're taking gravel from my district and putting it in potholes in yours, except for Representative Deuster's of course, and he will continue to have his potholes. I feel very strongly about this, because I don't think that companies which have a known criminal background should be allowed to operate with the very minimal standards that are in the state law, in the statutes, that regulate the Department of Mines and Minerals. That regulation is so bad that it looks as if the Department...that somebody in the gravel industry paid for the loopholes. These aren't loopholes though, these are chasms you could drive a gravel pit through anyone of these loopholes, either one of these loopholes. Now this is a...this is the regulatory law that's there looks like Material Service Ready-fix Corporation, and I did say 'Ready-fix' because that's what they've been doing in this Legislature, designed the Bill and drafted it. The regulations are absolutely loose as a goose and the Governor's explanation for his veto is the weakest explanation on the...it is weaker than the explanation for the veto on...of the good roads Bill, which was just appalling. I apologize for getting a bit emotional on this but I am angrier about the veto of this Bill than any other Bill any Governor has ever vetoed of mine and I earnestly solicit your override vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino."



Mautino, please."

Mautino: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to comment on this proposal and the total veto presented by the Governor as well as the position of Representative Skinner. I've had the opportunity to read the proposal that has been presented by the...by Mr. Skinner on the Rockford Register Star concerning this question and I'd like to remind the Members of the General Assembly, we discussed in length last year in another proposal... the last...the Regular Session, under a very similar piece of legislation and I'd like to explain how it got to this posture because I'm not quite sure that you want to override... this proposal. Number one, we got to this proposal because prior to enactment of legislation of this nature the counties had the authority. Now it's my feeling that I would much rather see the state, either the Mines and Minerals or the E.P.A. have authorization over all operations in the area of surface mining. This is a rather piece meal measure because if you want to do it and give the authority to the local county board you might as well do it for low level nuclear waste, coal mining, strip mining, as well as the aggregate industry. I don't think you want to do that. We got to this posture because county board members, and I happen to be an ex-county board member, I feel do not have the expertise to make the decisions that are needed for aggregate mining and surface mining because as elected officials there is no qualified people to make the decisions. I also feel that we have within the existing statutes, the 45 day provision for expansion of



a surface mining site, where the local county where this is going to occur does have the opportunity to set before the populous of that area an open hearing on the expansion of that site or the development of it. At the local level you also have the zoning and planning committees which can or cannot allow this type of operation within a county at this time. I think the safeguards are better off at the state level than at the county level and if, in fact, they were at the state level years ago I'm sure you probably would not have had the problems within McHenry County that you now have. But you have them now because the County Board didn't know what they were doing in this field before. I'm sure those of you downstate would not like to have the coal mining industry under the offices of the county boards within your areas and I'm very sure that those of us that have nuclear waste disposal sites in our areas would be rather concerned if the county boards had local, total authority in that regard as well. So I do think it's a piecemeal effort. I think if you're going to do it you should do it with everything. Not just take a specific area and say, this is special interest because I don't happen to like one person or one company. It should be regulated at the county level. But those other agencies that do the same thing, and other private industries do the same thing, are not controlled. So I would oppose the total override motion for those reasons on this measure. And I respectfully request others to do the same."

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

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



I'd like to ask a...the Sponsor, Cal, a question. I'm not too concerned with your personal problems with Colonel Henry Crown, but just right outside of my district, in the district I used to represent at one time, is the town called Hillside. And Hillside is a real ball of fire the last couple of months because they have a stone quarry there some 300 feet deep, I believe it is, by maybe 15 or 20 acres and the E.P.A. has granted them permission to use that as a landfill. Now will this help Hillside or will it be against Hillside?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Representative, I'm afraid this will do absolutely nothing for or against Hillside. It incidentally, is not Colonel Henry Crown. I wouldn't know Colonel Henry Crown if he ordered me put in pier of a new highway overpass. It's Lester Crown who was given immunity and...personal immunity from prosecution for bribing legislators. It has really not anything to do with Material Service except they are the specific company in my county that is suing to make darn sure that no county government can shut down a gravel pit between the hours of 10 P.M. and 5:30 A.M. I...it has nothing to do with the Hillside..."

Conti: "Well...let me...let me just interrupt you... I don't think you answered my question. Hillside does not want this landfill there now. The E.P.A. says they can have the landfill there now. With this override...the staff analysis here looks like this would help the...the Village of Hillside. Your explanation's contrary to what the staff analysis is. All I want is an answer to that."

Skinner: "I personally think the staff analysis is irrelevant to the Bill. It has nothing to do with landfills."



It certainly can't hurt Hillside at all. And if you can use this to keep...to keep a garbage pit out of Hillside, God bless you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Williamson, Mr. Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have a question for Representative Skinner."

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

Skinner: "Yes, Sir."

Harris: "Representative Skinner, how do you think House Bill 233 would affect strip mining in..."

Skinner: "It won't affect strip mining whatsoever. It has nothing to do with low level nuclear waste, it has nothing to do with landfills. And the Gentleman from central Illinois ought to know that."

Harris: "Don't you feel as if it might set a precedence as far as being enlarged for strip mining?"

Skinner: "Only if this General Assembly decides to make it a precedent. There is a discreet problem here that affects a discreet part of the state, my part of the state. This is the biggest natural resource problem that we have. We have voted for any coal mine legislation that the people from the coal mining areas in the state have asked for. And all we're asking is for reciprocity."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Representative Skinner."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

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

Skinner: "Certainly."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Vinson: "I just have the analysis here, I don't have the Bill here and I understand there's some flaws in the analysis so I'd like to know what prohibits,



right now, a county or a city from zoning out gravel mining?"

Skinner: "From zoning it out?"

Vinson: "Uh huh."

Skinner: "Common sense, for one thing."

Vinson: "Isn't what you want to do to regulate and prohibit in certain places?"

Skinner: "Not at all. I disagree with the Representative from central Illinois who lives slightly north of you when he says that the County Board isn't bright enough to figure out where a gravel pit ought to go and where it can't go. My entire county could be a gravel pit. There is gravel under almost every acre of McHenry County. And I think the County Board is smart...I mean the County Board has demonstrated by past decisions that it's...it is willing to zone gravel pits. There are gravel pits all over McHenry County. You fly over my county, it looks like the armpit of the world."

Vinson: "Well what are you trying to accomplish?"

Skinner: "I'm trying to allow the County Board to continue to regulate gravel pit operations, with regard to hours, with regard to...basically, hours. You know, how many hours a day can they run the crushing plant? 24 hours a day? The E.P.A. and the Mines and Minerals say, 'Sure, what the hell. We don't care. We don't have to live next to it.' And it seems to me that the County Board also ought to be allowed to determine whether...how close to a residential area that a gravel pit may be...may be dug."

Vinson: "Okay, that latter question would be a zoning issue. Right?"

Skinner: "That is quite correct. It would be a zoning issue."



Vinson: "What prohibits you, in a zoning ordinance, from doing that right now under the general zoning authority?"

Skinner: "It has been preempted through this Appellate Court Decision by the Environmental Protection Agency and by the Department of Mines and Minerals, apparently."

Vinson: "So you're telling us that the status of the decision law on the subject is, that a county board, through the zoning ordinance, can't regulate the siting of a gravel pit?"

Skinner: "Absolutely."

Vinson: "Okay, now on the hour question, why can't you do that as a general police power subject?"

Skinner: "All I know is what my State's Attorney told me..."

Vinson: "And the State's Attorney says you cannot?"

Skinner: "Yes, it's a preemption. The Department of Mines and Minerals is god. And frankly, I think... I don't trust god...small g."

Vinson: "Thank you, you've answered my question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I stand in support of the override of House Bill 233. It based it maybe on a little different opinion than my colleague, Representative Skinner, has. I happen to feel that...the county board may, in some way, have not really not really done the job they should have in the past. But I do believe that they are smart enough to know that when the citizens around the community that happen to live in the area that is zoned for a gravel pit are complaining enough that the dust and the noise and the commotion that is taking place throughout the hours of the night and day plus the future usage of that gravel pit, such as in the case of Hillside, I



believe that this Bill that the Governor vetoed will affect that kind of operation. I think that the Bill is necessary so that county board members... you talk about giving the local governments the right to...enact ordinances and the right to make determinations for the citizens at the local level, this is a perfect example. That we have to give back to the county boards something we have taken away from them, and that is the right to regulate the usage of the gravel pits. Now there are other proposals that they will have for gravel pits besides just the hours they can mine the minerals out of the... sand and gravel out of the pits. There's other usages, such as what is happening in Hillside, that I think that this Bill will affect. And that is whether or not the E.P.A. or the Illinois Pollution Control has the sole authority to determine what happens concerning surface gravel mining pits. I think this is a step in the right direction. I disagree with Representative Mautino and his observation that it's piecemeal. The only thing that's piecemeal about it is the fact that we're talking about a specific type of mining. And certainly, I commend him if he thought that a Bill of this nature concerning radioactive wastes that his district is very sensitive in, would be put forward, I would support that Bill. But the fact remains, we have this problem in the surface mining. We have a Bill that the Governor vetoed and certainly with an aura that stinks, especially in the area of Lester Crown, a...an admitted felon. And admitted thief and briber of people. When this man is granted immunity by the same Governor who now vetoed a Bill that only protects this same





company. I think there's an appearance of impropriety here. And, you know, I heard during the campaigns about this Governor, how he wanted to be as clean and as white as pure snow, and to avoid all appearances of impropriety. Well I'd suggest that this certainly is an appearance of impropriety when he vetoes a Bill that the citizens that are directly affected are demanding passage of. And he vetoes a Bill with almost a silly type of Veto Message concerning the Environmental Protection Agency and...and you know, they're pretty fraudulent in themselves. All I know about the E.P.A. is that they have created more pollution in transfers around this state than they have protected us from. All I know about the E.P.A. is what they do is move the pollution. Move the...the pollutants around. They don't really protect us from it. And I'd suggest that if we allow gravel pits to do anything they want based on somebody here in Springfield's wisdom or lack thereof, I think we're going the wrong direction. I think this is one case where we have to put the faith in local government in determining what is going to happen as far as the regulations of surface mining in our state. And specifically in those counties around the state that have this specific problem. McHenry County, for example, is one of those counties and we're being raped, absolutely raped in McHenry County in the exploitation of our land with these gravel pits. I can't stop that. This Bill does not stop that, but it does go a long way of making a more livable county to live in, that the operation of the gravel pit can be controlled by the local county board. And I support the override."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Willer."

Willer: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speak...Speaker. I would just like to clarify something having heard my village's name in debate. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will. Mr. Skinner."

Willer: "Cal, I understand your Bill correctly, if I do, it would govern the quarry in Hillside if it was still being mined. But because it was closed down and is no longer being quarried, is this why you say it does not apply to what happens now to an abandoned quarry?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "You have just triggered a thought in my mind. If this is a gravel pit..."

Willer: "No, it's a quarry... It's surface mining."

Skinner: "Surface mining, it's not a coal mine?"

Willer: "No, that's right."

Skinner: "If it's....not fossil...if it's not a coal mine, which is what the exclusion of fossil fuel... of fossil...whatever the language is, fossil fuel has to do with and it certainly isn't that. You don't...you can't burn lines from your furnace..."

Willer: "No, it's surface mining."

Skinner: "It's still a quarry, it's still a surface mine, so I see what Representative Conti was saying now. Yes, I think this would prohibit...this would give the Village of Hillside zoning authority over... over that pit. Yes, you're right."

Willer: "Well, I'm not so sure because...I would love to think you're right, I'm very disenchanted with the E.P.A. at this time."

Skinner: "Well, I'm the Sponsor and I give the legislative intent. You win."

Willer: "I think because it's closed down now and the purpose has been changed to waste disposal. But I'd



love to...I'd love to think that you're right and maybe somebody else will join with Representative Conti...oh, my counsel right next to me says it's right too. Okay, thank you.

Skinner: "Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, may I deviate from traditional procedure to ask if someone from Hillside would inform the House whether any garbage has been dumped into it yet? If there's no garbage..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The answer is no, according to Mrs. Willer."

Skinner: "All right, if there's no garbage in it, it's still a surface mine and this would give the Village of Hillside, very clearly, the authority to keep it a surface mine if the Village of Hillside were smart enough to do that very quickly after we override the veto."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; 'aye', opposed? The previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to close."

Skinner: "I would just ask for a favorable vote. It seems there are more issues going around here than I thought of when we started it and there's just every reason for voting for it and I don't see any reason for voting against it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House...the question is, shall House Bill 233 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll have to speak very



fast. There is two concepts that I've heard a number of people aspose in this chamber. One is the conservative concept that big government doesn't do things better, that the local people really do have a better handle on it. To those of you that feel that way, this is a Bill that should definitely be enacted into law. The second group of people are those people that have continual problems with the E.P.A. And we have found that the E.P.A. has sort of a wall built up between itself and local officials and the people living in the area. We found that when they decided to build a garbage dump in Lake County and approved it on 4 different occasions until every Legislator, every Mayor started screaming. Give a chance to this Bill. This is something purely local, especially to the County of McHenry. Any of you that have every been up there, they have a serious, serious problem. Give them a chance to at least manage their own affairs and vote for this."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Meyer, to explain his vote. The timer is on. Meyers, please."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just briefly like to point out that Mr. Skinner's amending the wrong Act. The case in question involved an issuance of a surface mine permit, not the issuance of an E.P.A. permit. Gravel pits generally fall in the same category as strip mines. The agency lacks jurisdiction unless they're causing or threatening to cause air, water or land pollution, per se...in which...in that case it becomes the agency's jurisdiction. This Bill will do nothing to address the questions of safety of hours of operation because that isn't in the E.P.A.'s jurisdiction, it would be in the Mines and Minerals jurisdiction."



Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Birkinbine, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We seem to be moving into a time where we've got government by bureaucracy and government by agency. The problem that faces McHenry County today very soon could be facing one of our counties or one of our local municipalities in the future. I think we should make a move today to override this veto and move toward a continuance of local control and government away from federal... state agencies or agencies such as the E.P.A. Government by bureaucracy is not what we want and it's not what the people of this country want. I urge you to override."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Borchers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in Macon County we have gravel pits, sand and gravel pits. And I feel that this is something that's best handled by local control. Now I always have believed in local control and I think most of you do here. I see no reason why we should allow a state agency like the E.P.A. or Mines and Minerals or whatever, interfere; when we in our own county know best what should be done. So if we have gravel...and we have numerous gravel pits in Macon County, I feel it's my duty to protect the rights of the people that know more about it, that is the people of Macon County. So I think we should all vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Mulcahey...Dick. Would you press my button 'aye', please? Aye. We'll get to that in a minute. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record."



On this question there's 110 'aye', 39 'nay'...39 'no', 9 'present'. The motion, having received the Constitutional three-fifths Majority, prevails and the House...House Bill 233 is declared passed, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. 110... On the Calendar under total vetoes appears a motion to override the Governor's Veto with respect to House Bill 292. On the motion, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 292 grants the peace officer status to arson investigators, which the Governor...vetoed. The Governor stated in his Message that the peace officer status should not be conferred to anyone without full and complete law enforcement training. The Bill provides firearms training but does not require the full range of investigation education..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Jack...excuse me, Mr. Terzich. Correct it. #292. Thank you."

Terzich: "The range of investigation education necessary to build successful cases. And he also states that fire investigators might blow a case and that joint police and fire department arson investigation teams should not be used. Now I don't know who did the staff analysis on this Bill but apparently they couldn't read the Bill because the Bill does provide for full training of arson investigators in firearms, evidence investigation, etc., which is equivalent to police training, since in order to obtain peace officer status the firemen must complete a training program offered or approved by the Illinois Local Government Law Enforcement Officer's Training Board, which substantially conforms to the standards promulgated pursuant to the Police Training Act



and an Act in relation to firearms and training for peace officers. The only area that the Bill did not exclude is that they did not have to take training in vehicle or traffic law, traffic control and accident investigation or first aid. However, they did have to go through an entire training course. Now I went through this Bill through Judiciary II and needless to say, anybody who could go through that Committee had to go through a fine tooth comb. The Bill did provide, and I did accept all the Amendments to put in whatever was necessary to make this a comprehensive Bill. Now, anybody who does qualify as an arson investigator would have to satisfactorily complete a 240 hour law enforcement officer's training program, which would include firearm's training that is certified by the Illinois Local Government Law Enforcement Officer's Training Board. In addition, he must complete...the fire department investigators have completely...have successfully completed the national fire academy's 80 hour fire arson training program, which, by the way is being offered at Lincolnland College, which covers 21 specific categories of special interest to a professional fire investigator. Some of the topics include building construction, origin and cause determination, fire scene examinations, photography, sketchings, vehicle fires, evidence and collection and preservation, improper submission procedures to the scientific laboratory legal aspects, which would include the laws of arson, constitutional law, civil liberties, interviews, interrogation and confession, case preparations, etc., etc. Now I...I don't see how anybody can be against this Bill. It did pass out...quite substantially, out of the House and 48 to 0 out of



the Senate. It only...it does provide that the municipalities would authorize arson investigators. It does not apply to the fire department or the police department but would be given to those who are designated as arson investigators by their local municipalities. This was recommended by the Illinois Investigating Commission, which did an in depth study on arson. And they recommended this. Now the Bill does provide, however, it does give local jurisdiction, the option to choose which agency, fire or police, should have primary jurisdiction. They may also want to consider the establishment of the team system or task force approach to such investigative endeavors. In this connection each of the partners on the team would have the same authority and this would certainly make for a better cooperative effort and negate petty jealousy. Now, it has gone on to state that the fire fighter is easier to train the principles of criminal investigation than it would take to teach a police officer the technical aspects associated with the making an accurate fire cause determination. Now the Bill provides that the firearms or the peace officer's status is only applicable when they are investigating an arson investigation which is a Class I Felony. I would urge that the Members support this Bill. There's ample room for everyone who may have a legal or financial moral interest in the successful control and eradication of the arson problem. We in Chicago have a serious arson problem. I think that if you have seen some of the news releases and also the T.V. editorials that we're having more buildings being burned down than are being built. This is a serious problem. This is an attempt to give the local





municipality to give an arson investigator the right to go out and investigate. About blowing a case...that this information would be given to the State's Attorney and the State's Attorney would determine who or what they should prosecute on the case and I would be more than happy to answer any questions. Let's give a good, resounding vote on this."

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

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Governor has never, I repeat, never vetoed a law and order Bill of mine. I subscribe to this Bill. I think he's been misdirected by some staff people. In this issue it's imperative in terms of certainly our locality, that these powers be given to investigative officers of the police... of the fire department. I think the Governor's Veto is wrong in this instance. I would recommend very highly that we go along with Mr. Terzich in overriding this veto. I think it's important to arson investigation. I would ask you, in the name of law and order, please vote to override."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Steele."

Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise also in support of Representative Terzich's motion. Arson is a serious problem. The fastest growing crime here in Illinois and you really have to give the investigators the proper authority and the proper tools to work with. One of the reasons that arson is growing is we've not been willing to really give these investigators the proper authority as peace officers. This Bill only requires that they are qualified, that they do get 240 hours of training before they would become investigators. And you know, time..."



is of the essence in arson investigation. After the ashes are cold a lot of the good evidence is gone. And so I think it is a good Bill. I think it's a needed Bill to beef up and strengthen the arson investigations in Illinois to properly deal with what is one of our most serious crimes and I support this motion of Representative Terzich."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Mr. Terzich, do you know what the position of the Illinois Police Association is on this Bill?"

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

Terzich: "The Illinois Police Association and I believe the Chief of Police were supposedly the main movers on objecting to this Bill that this was an infringement on the law enforcement, which is ridiculous. Now they stipulated firemen. This does not deal with firemen, it deals with arson investigators. They can work jointly. The municipality, by the way, can either approve a firemen and policeman, a policeman only or arson investigators only, whatever the case may be. And you know yourself that we covered all of these areas and put in all the protective clauses on your recommendation."

Johnson: "If I were in a court I'd object to the answer as being nonresponsive to the question. I just asked if you knew what the position of the Illinois Police Association is?"

Terzich: "Well, they're a misguided...I guess against. For what reason, I don't know."

Johnson: "Okay...that's all I wanted to know. Okay, thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 292 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor? all in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed



by voting 'nay'. Jack... David, give me an 'aye' over there. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, to explain his vote."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in the...in my discussion...that the analysis that the Governor's Office gives, that there is not adequate training, or...or satisfactory completion of an educational process is wrong, it is written in the Bill, they have to take the same training as police officers. This is the same as saying that all policemen should be lawyers, God forbid, or they should be law professors to determine whether or not proper investigation is made. Now arson is a very, very serious problem that should be dealt with. This is a move that local municipalities have the jurisdiction of determining who their arson investigators are to be or whether or not they should have it. If they do have the arson investigators, you're having someone who is charged with investigating a Class I Felony, a Class I Felony. And you are saying that you should stand by and watch a person set a building on fire, or maybe call 911 and call a police officer because you do not have the authority to make an arrest. At this same time, you are going to a neighborhood where they...where they have organized crime, where they have gangs starting arson every single day and that you cannot do a single thing because you do not have the authority, nor does the General Assembly see fit, to give an arson investigator this type of protection and authorization to eradicate this serious, serious problem. And we're not talking about millions of dollars, we're talking about billions of dollars of losses and I urge everyone to give this their support. That I



079

did, again, take all the Amendments, I went through the Judiciary of both Houses and I put in all the Amendments and I think that that's the least consideration you can give of overriding this veto and give the arson investigators an opportunity to do their job."

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

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I...I would encourage you to vote green on this Bill. I personally know an arson investigator and if you can put yourself in that individuals shoes, they are going out and talking to people, they may end up talking to a person that committed the arson directly. On 3 occasions his life has been threatened. I don't believe that we're going too far by giving a person investigating arson peace officer status as well as giving him the training to do the job very adequately. If you'll consider that, if you don't know about it maybe you would find out about it. It's a very limited situation in terms of number of people but it's a very risky business and the only option they have is they're...with the state, is to take a state trooper along with them and that's not very easy to do. I encourage your green vote."

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

Vitek: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm very familiar with this Bill because a young man that lives in my precinct is the fella that has worked all over the nation on the arson investigations. He's wrote thesis's on this Bill and, as Terzich has explained, we've complied with everything necessary under the Federal Act, the Illinois Act and I hope and pray, with his explanation, that you will follow and give



us a green vote. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge, to explain her vote."

Younge: "I'm voting green on this Bill because I think that this authority ought to be given to organized fire departments. In St. Clair County there has not been one indictment over the last several years for arson. Arson is not a matter that the police departments seem to take very seriously. Half the fires that are occurring in East St. Louis, Illinois are arson fires. And I...it seems to me that it would be logical to give the power to investigate arson to the fire department so that there could be more prosecutions of this matter of arson. And I think that we have an arson epidemic in Illinois and I think that we ought to confront ourselves with the fact that the... the way the law enforcement authorities are handling it at this time is simply not satisfactory. Arson must not be a crime that the police departments take seriously, as indicated by the fact that there absolutely aren't any indictments. And if you let the evidence get cold and let the people... and then a policeman is called in later, you just don't get any prosecution. And I think that this Bill greatly covers a gap and shows up law enforcement in an area by giving those people who know that this is a very serious matter and who can take care of it and that's the police department, the authority to investigate. And I think there ought to be more green votes on the board."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn, to explain his vote."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I too rise in support of an override of the Governor's total veto of this



piece of legislation. One of the best ways to prevent adequate investigations of crimes of arson is to take away the tools necessary from those who are charged with the primary responsibility of conducting the investigation. We've heard people say that it's police officers who have this primary responsibility now but they are not equipped because of background to do a good job. The arson investigators are equipped, because of background, they don't have the other necessary tools that this legislation would provide, such as the right to carry firearms for their own protection, the right to gather evidence by means of arrest and search and seizure warrants. So this is good legislation. This is a step forward. This simply would provide the necessary tools in the hands of those who are the best qualified to conduct arson investigations and I would urge a green light in support of this legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski."

Kosinski: "George Ryan, I have never deliberately misdirected the Republican Party. A staff decision was made here and it's the wrong decision. I implore you to switch your vote to green to override the Governor's veto...amend...veto in this situation. It's extremely important on Cook County. And I examined that situation, George."

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

Leon: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, with great reluctance I have a green light on this Bill. However, on looking back, experiences that I have had, and I'm going to relate



37

one and I think when I do you will then change your vote or vote green if you have not done so. There was...I was working for the arson attorney...or the fire attorney with the City of Chicago and we conducted arson investigations. At 3:00 one morning I went to the South side of Chicago, which is about 25 miles from my home, where there were two fatalities in a fire. We apprehended, the arson squad apprehended two persons who were involved in setting that fire. I went to the police station and low and behold, the City of Chicago police put those two defendants in the same cell. One would not talk. The other, who would talk and would confess to his complicity in this fatal event was prevented from talking by the stronger of the two persons. It was amazing that I could not get a statement from either one of them because of them being confined in the same cell. If an arson director or an arson investigator had apprehended these two persons they would be put in separate cells and interrogated and perhaps we could have received a conviction. Therefore, I urgently ask everyone to support this fine piece of legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 106 'aye', 42 'nay', the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, requests a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Bianco. Capuzi. Currie. Garmisa. Hoffman. Huskey. Kane. Kempiners. Kent. Kucharski. Margalus. McBroom. Meyer. Molloy. Oblinger. Peters. Polk. Robbins. Schneider."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"



Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker, would you change me from 'no' to 'aye'?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Ebbesen from 'no' to 'aye'. Mr. Sandquist... Record Mr. Sandquist as 'aye'. Mr. Bluthardt. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt, please."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker, would you change my vote from 'aye' to 'no', please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Bluthardt as 'no'. Mr. Stanley. Kindly record Mr. Stanley as 'aye'. Mr. Matijevich as 'aye'. Mr. Bianco as 'aye'. Mr. Huskey as 'aye'. Anyone else? Please continue with the poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Stearney. No further."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Currie, as 'aye'. What's the count, Mr. Clerk? How many 'no'... How many? On this question there's 112 'aye', 43 'no'. The motion, having received the Constitutional three-fifths majority prevails and House Bill 292 is declared passed, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. On the Calendar under Total Vetoes appears a motion to override the Governor's Veto with respect to House Bill 316. On the motion, the Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 316 and the concept of that Bill has overwhelmingly passed this House on several occasions. In the wisdom of the Governor, the present Governor and previous Governors, the Bill has been vetoed on the basis that there is no way to predict what this will mean to the state in terms of fiscal impact. And I readily admit that, having no real track record as to what might be coming up in terms of special...or local improvements by special assessments. What this Bill does is put the state and the state property on the same





status as any other property owner when it comes to a local improvement project by a special assessment. There are some safeguards built into the Bill that there will be no burden beyond 25 thousand unless it comes before the Body in terms of a special appropriation Bill. I think it's total equity, I think it's fair to assume that the state should accept this responsibility to pay its fair share in any term of a local improvement project by a special assessment and therefore, I would move to pass this Bill, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This veto should be overridden. It should have been overridden every time it's passed the Legislature, which has been many times. And I'd like to just say a few words about this Bill because most attorneys don't understand the philosophy and the principle of special assessments. So that if most attorney's don't understand it and just maybe a few municipal attorneys understand it, it will be worthwhile for the Membership to explain exactly what this Bill does and why it ought to be passed and the Governor's veto overridden. Those of you who are Mayors or know something about special assessments, I don't think need this explanation. All this says is that the State of Illinois must pay for improvements to its property. The special assessment law requires that when a new street goes through, which adds to the value of properties along the street, or street lights, or any other public improvement, that every property owner that is affected by that improvement, whose property



is benefitted, must pay his proportionate share for that improvement. Up to now and without this Bill the only property owner that doesn't have to pay for improvements to his property is the State of Illinois. That situation should not exist. It should not have existed. We've tried to correct it many times since I've been here. We have passed this Bill time and time again and for no good reason the Governor has vetoed it on the shadowy basis that we don't know what it will cost. But all it means is that the State of Illinois will pay for its share of improvement to its property in the event of a special assessment. Those of you who believe in paying your own way, those of you who believe in the property owner in your local district and in your municipalities, you must vote to override this. The Governor... this Governor and previous Governors just do not understand special assessments and why this kind of legislation should become law."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any other discussion? The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "I think this is a good Bill and the...the veto override effort ought to be supported. I'm just surprised the Sponsor last...yesterday, as I understood though, stood up on the House floor and...and expressed reservations about voting for a different Bill because of its unknown fiscal impact and now he's advocating a...am I erroneous on that? I stand corrected."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm going to vote 'yes' on this Bill but I just wanted to remind some of the Members on the other side of the aisle and some of my colleagues on



this side of the aisle that last year they exempted forest preserves and counties from that being assessed where an improvement went in. So I disagreed with that Bill at that time, I'm disagreeing with the Governor at this time. I think the state should be assessed, just like any other governmental agency whose property is going to be improved. Unfortunately we couldn't see that when they came in with that Bill last year and we did exempt forest preserves and counties."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk, to close. Tuerk, please."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, several Members of this Body have spoken in behalf of the concept. I merely, in closing, say it's only fair, as was pointed out by me and others, that the state should pick up its proportionate share in the burden of this kind when it involves a local improvement by special assessment. I would ask for your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 316 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'nay'. Totten...give me an 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? The... Kindly record Mrs. Macdonald as 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 127 'aye', 8 'no', 1 recorded as 'present'. The motion, having received the Constitutional three-fifths Majority, prevails and House Bill 316 is declared passed, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. The Speaker asked me to make an announcement that there will be a Rules Committee meeting probably tomorrow morning and anybody who wants to have a Bill



heard in Rules kindly see his Secretary, Nancy. And make sure you put a motion on the Calendar. He hasn't informed me as far as what time the Rules Committee will meet. It is posted for 9:30. Thank you... You have to have a motion. Make sure you also file a motion to suspend the posting rule with the Clerk. On the Calendar, under Total Veto, appears a motion to override the Governor's Veto with respect to House Bill 348. Mr. Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 348 was totally vetoed by the Governor. The reason for House Bill 348 was for simplification and clarification for those who carry insurance policies in the State of Illinois, which is each and every one of us. The synopsis says that House Bill 348 provides that automobile or homeowners insurance policies may not be cancelled for the following reasons: Due to age, location of property, sex, race, color, ancestry, or occupation. The present statutes on the Insurance Code, Article IX, read as follows: '1. Noncancellation due for nonpayment of premium. 2. Misrepresentation or fraud in opinion of policy or claim. 3. For any act which measurably increases the risk originally accepted.' I ask you this question; what does the third item mean? 'For any act which measurably increases the risk originally accepted'. What does this mean to you and I? Does it mean if you're 70 years of age, you've carried a policy for 40 or 45 years that you shouldn't have this policy? You shouldn't be allowed to have 200 and 500 thousand comp insurance or liability insurance? Does it mean that due to being under 25 and unmarried that



you shouldn't be rated justly? That you should have a higher rate? Does it mean because you're a minority that you shouldn't have insurance? Does it mean because you live in an area that maybe is not...is a blighted area, East St. Louis, Chicago, or other areas here in Illinois, that you shouldn't have insurance? Does it mean that you should be discriminated for any reason cause or purpose whatsoever? I ask for a favorable vote to override this veto."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I reluctantly rise on this matter to oppose the Gentleman's motion. When this Bill came to the Insurance Committee last spring I said at the time that it did nothing more than mess up the Insurance Code of the state. I said that again on the floor of the House when the Bill was considered and now the Governor is saying the same thing in his Amendatory Message. While I sympathize with some of the things that the Sponsor and others are trying to accomplish, this Bill is not going to do any of the things that the Sponsors are hoping to accomplish by means of the Bill. The fact of the matter is that the Insurance Code presently sets out specific, only specific reasons for which insurance policies can be cancelled. And what the language in this Bill would do is ignore those specific reasons and say that insurance policies cannot be canceled for age, for sex, or race, or color, or creed, or ancestry, or occupation and the fact of the matter is that the Insurance Code presently does not permit cancellations for those reasons. I suggest to you that the Governor's amendatory...the Governor's



Veto is absolutely right on this issue and that we should vote against this motion to override."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Emil Jones."

Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill was heard in the Insurance Committee, but the reason why this piece of legislation was put in is because the Insurance Code is vague. And let me read one part to you. It says; 'For any act which measurably increased the risk originally accepted.' Now, what that means is... simply is this, say, for example, you have a homeowners policy and you live on one end of the block and someone else's home on the other end of the block may happen to burn down. That act in itself can cause an insurance company not to renew your insurance policy. Or if you have a business located on a business street and some other areas on that business street...the stores may be vacant or they could have been burned out, that insurance company can use the Insurance Code not to renew your insurance policy. This is the reason why Representative Harris wanted this language in new law, to make it more specific. It says, 'location of property', which is very important. Your insurance policy should not be nonrenewed because it is located in a certain area in the city or in the suburbs. So it's a very good piece of legislation. The Governor, in his Veto Message, did not allude to that fact. And this is the reason why we should override the Governor's Veto. Because it has happened to several Legislators as far as their homeowners policy is concerned and it can happen to you again if you do not vote to override the Governor's Veto on this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman



from Williamson, Mr. Harris, to close."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think most of us in our district offices have had complaints about the large insurance conglomerates, just to things dealing with sex, age and others. I just ask for a favorable vote... Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 348 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'nay'. Marco, give me an 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Williamson, Mr. Harris, to explain his vote."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to explain my vote in this regard. I feel like just because a person has been with a company for 40 years and they're 70 years of age that they have no reason to change their policy of cancel their policy or place them with another company, because your broker, insurance broker is your friend. The conglomerate does that to you and your constituents and we all know that. I don't feel like that they have reasons to cancel a policy or not take a policy due to sex. I don't feel like the large insurance conglomerates have reason, due to race, minorities, location of where you live, your creed, your ancestry, nor your occupation. I feel like everyone is entitled to this, the insurance. I feel like the insurance people are the ones that's making the money, controlling the economy to a great extent. I feel like everyone should be treated justly, fairly and I'd ask for more green votes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record."



On this question there are 92 'aye' and 54 'nays'.

Mr. Harris, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Harris: "Postponed Consideration, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave for Postponed Consideration. Hearing no objection, Postponed Consideration. On the Calendar under Total Vetoes appears a motion to override the Governor's Veto with respect to House Bill 430. The Gentleman...on the motion, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 430 is the...strictly a safety Bill. It's a Bill that will provide inspections and regulations of carnivals and amusement rides and equipment. This is to provide safety for the public. In the House, previously, we received 126 votes to 10. In the Senate it went over with 48 votes and 4 and 1. It's a Bill that the Governor vetoed and I ask you to override the Governor's Veto. He states in his statement that it does not provide for inspection staffs that's large enough. I discussed this Bill with many amusement people and they feel it's time that we should have some type of regulations in the State of Illinois. In regards to the State of Illinois, there's no regulations to regulate these amusement parks and I ask you for a favorable vote. And before I turn it over, I'll call on my Co-Sponsor, Mr. Johnson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill passed out of the House in the Spring by an overwhelming margin and likewise out of the Senate by an overwhelming margin. This Bill is a result of 5 years study by Representative





Kornowicz and 2 and a half years study by myself and many Members of the Republican Staff to come out with a workable Bill. It's a bit confusing to me as to the stated reasons of the Governor for opposition to it. He indicates on the one hand that there isn't sufficient staff provided under the Bill to insure safety of carnival rides and at the same time that there's going to be some sort of bureaucracy created by it. It seems to me to be a fairly mutually inconsistent position. The number of accidents in connection with amusement parks rides, in particularly the transient carnival rides, has really been shocking. Four young children were nearly killed in the Sunnycrest Shopping Center in Urbana about a year and a half ago, someone electrocuted in Kane County about a year and a half or two years ago, two people killed in the St. Louis area, two or three other areas in various shopping center carnival rides, serious injuries result and so forth. The list can go on and on. The fiscal impact of this Bill will be zero after we get going on it because the inspections and licensing fees, which are spread equitably among the carnival rides and operators will pay for the inspection process. The inspection process is fair. We provide for 33 percent of the board, namely one out of three, to be manned or womaned by a...by a representative of the amusement park business. Also, one from the Department of Labor and also one who's a registered professional engineer. This Bill directs itself to the most serious problem... one of the most serious problems we have with respect to life safety in Illinois, and that is that young children, people under the age of 12 are



least able, in fact not able at all, to assume the risks of the rides, that in many cases, are very unsafe, go at extremely high rates of speed and really provide for a very definite threat to the life, health and safety of children in Illinois. All you have to do is use your own experiences in life and go out to your local shopping center or the local county fair, in some cases, depending upon the people there, to see the terrifically dangerous condition that these rides are in. This isn't going to create a bureaucracy. The Department of Labor didn't and to my knowledge, doesn't oppose the Bill. I've had communications from the reputable carnival and amusement park people who support this concept. And there's one other very important thing. Let's say your five or six year old child, or even an adult, goes out to a carnival or an amusement park and is injured. So what if you get a judgement for 100 thousand dollars or a judgement for a half a million dollars or a judgement for 5 thousand dollars for personal injury or death or serious bodily harm, you have a penniless defendant. This requires that you have some standards for insurability. That you have some insurance set up before the gypsy operations can come into your local shopping centers and provide for rides that are dangerous, that are going to injure people that have no...no pool of money to be able to provide compensation for people who are seriously injured. I don't know what the basis for opposition by the Governor is to this Bill. I don't know what the basis... in fact there was almost no opposition when this Bill came before the House before. If you think it's unnecessary you're going to create a bureaucracy when people are electrocuted, when four children are



nearly killed in...in an accident downstate, when people are threatened with a very serious, dangerous type activity and with no protections at all. We regulate horseshoers, we regulate every conceivable type of thing, and in my opinion, unnecessarily regulate them for one of the most dangerous activities known to...to people in Illinois and around the county it totally unregulated. We have no Federal Law, we have no State Law and outside the City of Chicago, we have no local law. This Bill is modeled on the Michigan and the Iowa and the Ohio Statutes. It's come up with a very reasonable, middle ground approach to the problem and I think it's something that ought to be supported by every Member of this House. I think we're...as soon as we have discussion and questions Representative Schneider is going to close."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Morgan, Mr. Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Reluctantly, I arise to oppose the motion of my friend, Representative Kornowicz, to override the Governor's Veto. Frankly, I think the Governor, in his Veto Message, was not his own best advocate. The problems with this Bill are not, I think, well stated in that. The Bill, as it came into the House, as originally introduced, I think, was probably a pretty good Bill and it was indeed modeled on the Michigan Statutes. But a couple of things happened along the way that makes me think that the Governor's phrase that the Bill would create the impression that we are regulating and meaningfully controlling hazards in this industry, without the reality of that, make me think that that's a valid charge. First of



all, the board that deals with this in...that regul... that oversees the regulation is just a three member board. First of all, the Director, second of all, an Operator, that is someone who must be a member of the industry being regulated, and third of all, an engineer who may be and probably in all probability would be someone who work in that industry. Now, you know, I have no reason that those kind of people shouldn't be represented on the regulating board, but surely, if we're really going to give the public any kind of protection at all, if we're going to make sure that somebody really cares about the public interest, there surely ought to be a larger board with some members who have no vested interest in the regulated industry and people whose only concern is safety in that industry and not the profitability in that industry. It seems to me that's a major weakness. And frankly, I tried to talk the Governor into an Amendatory Veto of this Bill, which I could have supported, but I failed in that... that effort. Second of all, on a more...somewhat more minor point, the Bill requires, as amended, that all the inspectors be graduate engineers. Now, that's just...the Governor makes the point that the staff that would be provided within the Bill simply isn't large enough to do the job that's needed. This makes it even worse. We're going to have to have graduate engineers for a lot of inspection jobs that wouldn't require that. I guess the point I'm trying to make and I think the Governor did not make very well on his Amendatory Veto, if we're going to regulate the carnival industry, and I agree that we should and must, then let's really do it. Let's not create



a cardboard image of regulation, let's not let the public think that we're regulating them when in fact we're not. Let's not satisfy the public's demand, pretend to satisfy the public's demand for regulation when we don't give it. I think the Governor's Veto should be sustained."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Adams, Mrs. Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, could I ask a question of the Sponsor?"

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

Kent: "What will be the state's liability if we have the regulatory board and there is an accident?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Kornowicz, please."

Kornowicz: "Yeah. It provides insurance. It's 100 thousand dollars for bodily injury, or 2...or death of one person in any accident and also 300 thousand dollars for bodily injury and 500 thousand dollars for...for injury or destruction of property."

Kent: "This is from...paid for by the state, it's an insurance policy of the state?"

Kornowicz: "It's by the operator."

Kent: "But what will be the liability of the state?"

Kornowicz: "There's no liability. The insurance...the insurance takes it. There's no liability."

Kent: "I think there might be."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've been listening to the discussion on House Bill 430 and the override of the veto and I've heard some say that we should do nothing because this isn't the best Bill that we should have to regulate carnivals. This isn't the first time we have tried to pass this type of legislation. And I'm afraid if we do not override this veto



47

we will have nothing. Even if it is not perfect, I think we must proceed on this very important issue. Some of you may recall the injur...the accident that involved death at Six Flags in St. Louis. It was a week after that tragedy that I was at the...the Marriot's Great America in Gurnee. And my wife and myself and my child were walking through the carnival...the grounds and one of those sky rides stopped and was motionless for about 20 minutes. Luckily, it wasn't a windy day and nothing did occur, as happened in Six Flags. About an hour and a half later we were still there and one of those rides, one of those fast ones and I can't remember the name of it, were...again had stopped and there were those people hanging up there and somebody walking up precariously to try to...to correct that situation. We have nowadays so many of the carnival type rides at the shopping centers all over the State of Illinois. Because of the heavy volume and the...so many shopping centers asking for those types of carnivals at...to try to bring business we find that some of them are not of the highest quality. So we had better now get into regulating it. If we do we ought to feel within ourselves some guilt of those injuries and of those deaths that might occur. I think we must do something now and I applaud and commend Representative Kornowicz for what he's attempting to do and by supporting him we should override the Governor on this veto."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Ewing: "In the Bill, how frequently will these rides be inspected, Representative?"



Kornowicz: "At least once a year."

Ewing: "At least. They don't have to be inspected each time they're put up?"

Kornowicz: "No."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "The Bill, Representative Ewing, authorizes the board to promulgate rules and regulations for the inspection of...of these rides. Our...our anticipation is, with respect to those that come in and out of shopping centers and so forth, that before they can be...they can receive a permit to operate, they have to be inspected. So as to those, those that are in and out, we provide for a schedule of inspections and permit fees in Section VII of the Bill. And that protects us against the gypsy operations that come in and do nothing except operate and hurt people. As far as the permanent places are concerned, those are again according to a schedule set up by the board...rules and regulations and it has to be done at least once a year. The real problem is not with the Great America's and Six Flags by and large, the problem is those that come in and out of the shopping centers and sometimes the county fairs who just have absolutely no concern for safety and no concern for children's lives."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr...Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, another question. What Department is going to handle the inspection?"

Johnson: "The Department of Labor."

Ewing: "And what type of qualifications do you expect an inspector of a complicated ride would have to have? Would he have to be an engineer?"

Johnson: "Well, this Bill, again, authorizes the board to designate various inspecting agencies or inspectors. I would presume the people who...who



would inspect rides would have some sort of mechanical engineering background or at least some experience in having dealt with carnival and amusement park rides. I suppose the same question could be posed, you know, who do we designate to inspect boilers? People who know about boilers."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't question that the motive of the Sponsor to this legislation is the highest, that there probably is a problem here. The number of deaths and the number of injuries which have been brought up here probably, if there's a percentage of those people who ride or take advantage of these amusement parks is probably much lower than walking on one of our streets today. There is no guarantee that we can protect all of our people from the cradle to the grave. I think that there are other ways that we can get around this. I think that we can make insurance requirements and should make insurance requirements for these types of itinerant amusement dealers that come into our state, come into our communities. I don't think this Bill is the proper form. I think the Governor's Veto is very well placed and I think we should sustain his veto. We don't want to put a cruel hoax on mothers and fathers around this state by tacking on a machine that it's been inspected, when in fact it can't be kept inspected, probably, under the terms of this legislation."

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

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, with respect for the sincerity of Representative Kornowicz, nonetheless, I'll urge





all of you to vote 'no' on this. I happen to have Great America in my District in Lake County and they have...many of the Members of this House have visted that fine park. They have about 38 rides. They have a big staff of engineers and people who inspect those rides daily. In fact they go out with x-ray equipment to make x-ray tests of the parts of the various pieces of equipment that come under stress. We would, without deceiving the people of the State of Illinois, have to hire an army of engineers and inspectors to go out and adequately do what Great America and many other reputable rides operators are doing right now. As it is right now, when you buy a ticket to Great America part of that ticket price goes to pay their staff, which includes these engineers and these people who are inspecting those rides on a daily basis. This Bill, the philosophy of this Bill is well intentioned but instead of confining itself to licensing or requiring insurance it goes on to plunge into the deep waters of total inspection. I want to, at this time, at the same time that I am expressing opposition to the Bill as it is, in my hope that you will all vote against it, I do want to express as the Representative from the County in which Great America is located, my desire to work conscientiously and closely with Representative Kornowicz in the Spring, as the Governor suggested he would support too, a Bill that is workable and a Bill that is not excessively involved with bureaucracy and cost. Lastly, I'd make the point that Cook County is one area under the home rule powers where if they wanted to regulate and do this...do it, they



could do everything that's done in this Bill. And I don't know any county or any municipality that doesn't have the authority to require a permit and to insist that even the fly-by-night carnivals that come in conform to local requirements, which can be as stiff as the locality would like to impose. I do think there is some need, but this Bill goes too far and the statement, or at least the implication, that reputable operators are for this Bill is absolutely false. At least with respect to Great America, with whom I have been in touch as late as this morning. We...they recognize the need for a Bill. They're willing to work cooperatively with the Sponsor, but this one would cost too much money, it would mislead the public and, as I said earlier, we'd almost have to hire an expensive army of engineers to do what Great America and other reputable operators are doing right now on their own initiative. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider, to close."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

I don't know if Messers Ewing, Reilly and Deuster ought to go into writing with the kinds of imagination that they have demonstrated in criticism of the Bill. However, I should point out and I think Representatives Johnson and Kornowicz have already done this prior to my speaking now, that the provisions in the Bill do allow for standards to be set by those individuals who are part of the board. We do not have, if Great America was concerned about the proposal earlier they certainly didn't talk to us after the Bill had been sitting in the House



for two or three years. It's interesting that they would call this morning and acknowledge that they'd like to have some kind of Bill but this isn't the Bill. But aside from that, I think some of the items that we ought to be concerned about is, number one, that anybody who's been in this Legislature 6 months knows that..."

Spaaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Schneider. Let's give the Gentleman some order."

Schneider: "Anybody that's been in this Legislature for 6 months knows that we don't put kinds of restraints on bodies that are statutory. We allow some of the agencies, hopefully, to make judgements and discretionary decisions based on the time that they are involved. Certainly, Mr. Reilly knows the value of modification and compromise in the process of a Bill, as in 1377. Certainly, Mr. Ewing is going to be concerned about modifying the... the loan rates that are going to go on...before us, I'm sure, within a next couple of weeks regarding listing of ceilings. He wouldn't want a standard 12 percent in there in statutory language. I don't see why we all of a sudden are going to choose to play games with people's lives. If Mr. Reilly has a concern about the Legislation, I think Johnson and Schneider and Kornowicz are willing to work with him. If Mr. Ewing wants to put in statutory language, I'll talk to him about it and I still think it's a bad idea. But if Mr. Deuster thinks Great America is going to me negatively affected I think we can work with them as well. What's at stake is that there are young people that ride those rides when they go into a situation that they're unsure...that might be unsafe and they come out as a child who is maimed



or injured and possibly a child who will not come out of an accident, I think we're willing to say, in the State of Illinois, that what we need now is proper restrictions on those kinds of operations that jeopardize the health, the welfare and our children. So I would suggest that on this vote, to the Members of the Assembly, this is indeed a beginning step. And I think we're always open to make alterations and changes in the proposal and it's this kind of beginning that I'd like to say that the Illinois House had an...had an impact on and I would ask that we give the required 107 votes to override the Governor's Veto."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 430 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kornowicz, to explain his vote."

Kornowicz: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in regards to some of the quotes of the previous speakers, I discussed, I discussed with the people from Mid-America, it wasn't about an hour ago, and the...Mr. Deuster mentioned that he discussed this with them and that they're against this. An hour ago they told me they're very satisfied with the Bill, as long as we can sit down in the Spring Session and see if we can get some Amendments to it. It's...it's a Bill, as mentioned previously, it's a starter. It's a Bill to get these gypsies out of the State of Illinois. This is not on the...on the people like Mid-America or other amusement parks, it's on the gypsies that come in for two or three days at the shopping centers. They have nothing in safety-minded...they're not



safety minded at all. So I ask you to support<sup>141.</sup>  
this Bill and...and override the Governor's  
Veto."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster,  
who's name was mentioned in debate. Deuster."

Deuster: "Well I...the name of the group in my district  
is not Mid-America, it's Great America. And  
since my name was mentioned in debate, I just  
spoke, a moment ago, with Ron Johnson, who is  
the manager. And you know, it really shouldn't  
affect our votes one way or another but since  
the suggestions was made that they're for it, I've  
got to say, they're absolutely against it. And  
they feel we can wait until the Spring and we  
will work together and write a good Bill and write  
it the right way. And I'm going to request a  
verification on this in the event it does get  
107 votes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "And what about if it gets 177? The  
Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Well, I looked at the Roll Call a few minutes  
ago with the other Sponsors of the Bill and  
compared it to the Roll Call now. I don't know  
what's changed between last Spring and now  
other than the fact that we've had a couple or  
three more accidents in Illinois. Two resulting  
in very serious injuries in the operations that  
Representative Kornowicz is directing himself  
towards. People who operate these are people who  
are from Florida and Mexico and Oregon and everywhere  
else, they have no connection with Illinois, no  
concern about Illinois and no concern about anything  
other than coming into the shopping center  
for three days, doing whatever is necessary to  
make...turn over a quick dollar and then leaving  
and never seeing the area again. We have indicated



to everyone that we're willing to work with Great America, I talked to their lobbyist just about 15 minutes ago, at the appropriate time to make sure that a very safe operation, which they are, is...is not unduly regulated. But we're directing ourselves to a problem that's a very serious problem and one that's going to come back to haunt you time and again and again. There's probably 50 Legislators in this room...in this... in this House floor that have had injuries or accident or deaths in their legislative districts. Two years from now there will be another 25 or 50. And when it hits so close to home as it has in the 52nd District, as it has in Kane County and other areas, then you realize what a schlocky operation they're running and the reason we need some meaningful and moderate regulations in this area. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 111 'aye', 39 'no', 8 recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, re...wants a verification. Mr. Kornowicz, Schneider and Johnson want a poll of the absentees. I'm not going to call your Amendment. Poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. Collins. Davis. Garmisa. Hudson. Margalus. McAuliffe. McBroom. Meyer. Mulcahey. Oblinger. Peters. Polk. Reed. Schlickman. Schuneman. Stearney. Telcser. Totten and Winchester."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The absentees have been polled. Does the Gentleman persist in his verification? Do you persist in your verification, Sir? The Clerk will proceed to verify the Affirmative Vote."



Clerk Leone: "Poll of the affirmative."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Poll the affirmative votes, please."

Clerk Leone: "Alexander. Anderson. Balanoff. E.M. Barnes.  
Jane Barnes. Beatty. Bell. Bianco. Birchler.  
Borchers. Boucek. Bower. Bowman. Bradley.  
Braun. Breslin. Bullock. Capparelli. Capuzi.  
Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton.  
Currie. Darrow. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico.  
Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Dyer. Epton.  
Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Gaines. Getty. Giorgi.  
Goodwin. Greiman. Hanahan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from Cook,  
Mr. Stearney, for what purpose do you seek recog-  
nition? Kindly record Mr. Stearney as 'aye'.  
He asks leave to be verified. Mr. Stanley as  
'aye', he has leave to be verified. Please  
continue. It's 113."

Clerk Leone: "Hanahan. Hannig. Harris. Henry. Hoffman.  
Hoxsey. Huff. Jaffe. Johnson. Dave Jones.  
Emil..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Mrs. Younge wants to have  
leave to be verified. Mrs. Younge. Leave is  
granted."

Clerk Leone: "Emil Jones. Kane. Keane. Kelly. Kornowicz.  
Kosinski. Kozubowski. Kucharski. Kulas.  
Laurino. Lechowicz. Leon. Macdonald. Madigan.  
Marovitz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Mr. Anderson requests leave  
to be verified. Mr. Anderson. Leave is granted.  
Marovitz."

Clerk Leone: "Marovitz..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What? Leave to be verified, Mr. Marovitz.  
Okay."

Clerk Leone: "Matijevich. Matula. Mautino. McClain. McGrew.



McMaster. McPike. Molloy. Mugalian. Murphy.  
 O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey.  
 Preston. Rea. Richmond. Ronan. Ropp. Sandquist.  
 Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schneider. Schoeberlein.  
 Schraeder. Sharp. Slape. Stanley. Stearney.  
 Steczo. Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich. Tuerk.  
 VanDuynes. Vinson. Vitek. Von Boeckman. White.  
 Wikoff. Willer. Williams. Sam Wolf. Younge.  
 Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Friedland.  
 Kindly record Mr. Friedland as 'aye'. Mr. Tuerk.  
 Kindly record Mr. Tuerk from 'aye' to 'no'.  
 Mr. Woodyard. Kindly record him from 'no' to 'aye'.  
 Woodyard is 'aye'. Anyone else? What's...what's  
 the count, Tony? We're starting off at 114 - 39.  
 Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Alexander."

Speaker Lechowicz: "She's here."

Deuster: "Anderson..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Anyone else?"

Deuster: "Anderson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Anderson was leave to be verified  
 and it was granted."

Deuster: "Barnes, E.M."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Barnes is here."

Deuster: "Okay. Beatty."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who?"

Deuster: "Beatty...Beatty."

Speaker Lechowicz: "John Beatty?"

Deuster: "John Beatty."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Beatty. How is the Gentleman  
 recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman in the chamber? Mr. Beatty.  
 Remove him."

Deuster: "Boucek."





Speaker Lechowicz: "Boucek. Mr. Boucek. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Boucek. Remove him."

Deuster: "Bowman. Oh, there he is, sorry."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Bowman is here."

Deuster: "Bradley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Bradley. Mr. Bradley. How is the Gentleman re...excuse me. John. Okay. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Deuster: "Capparelli."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Capparelli is here."

Deuster: "Chapman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Chapman. Mrs. Chapman."

Deuster: "Oh, I'm sorry....I'm sorry, she's here. Okay, I will not question her. Christensen."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Christensen. Put Mr...he's there and put Mr. Beatty back."

Deuster: "Is Cullerton?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Cullerton. He's here."

Deuster: "Darrow."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Darrow is here."

Deuster: "Dawson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Dawson. He's here."

Deuster: "Doyle."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who?"

Deuster: "Doyle."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Doyle? Always here."

Deuster: "John Dunn."

Speaker Lechowicz: "John Dunn is here."

Deuster: "Ray Ewell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ray Ewell. Mr. Ewell. How is the Gentleman recorded? Mr. Ewell."



Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is the Gentleman in the chamber?"

Mr. Ewell. Take him off the record."

Deuster: "Farley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Farley is here."

Deuster: "Flinn."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Flinn. He's there."

Deuster: "Giorgi."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Giorgi. Mr. Giorgi. He's here."

Deuster: "Hoffman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hoffman. Mr. Hoffman. How is the  
Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mr. Hoffman in the chamber?"

Clerk Leone: "Remove him

Deuster: "Hanahan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hanahan's in the chamber."

Deuster: "Henry."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Henry is here."

Deuster: "Huff."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Huff. Mr. Huff. He's in the chamber."

Deuster: "Emil Jones."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Put Mr. Hoffman back on, please and  
Mr. Jones is on the floor."

Deuster: "I don't see Kane...Oh there he is..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kane is in his Chair, maybe that's why  
you don't see him. And Mr. Keane is right in the  
back over there."

Deuster: "Mr. Bell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Bell. Where's he at? Mr. Bell.  
How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mr. Bell in the chamber? Remove  
him."

Deuster: "Mr. Kulas."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Kulas is there. As always."

Deuster: "Laurino."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Laurino is here."

Deuster: "Madigan's there. McClain."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. McClain. Mr. McClain. Mr. McPike.  
He's here. McClain's right here. He's right  
here..."

Deuster: "Did you say McPike was here?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "McPike's over here too."

Deuster: "All right. Mugalian."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's here."

Deuster: "Patrick."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Langdon Patrick?"

Deuster: "Langdon Patrick."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's here... he's here."

Deuster: "Ronan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ronan. Mr. Ronan. How is the Gentleman  
recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's right and he's on the floor."

Deuster: "Sharp."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Sharp? He's here."

Deuster: "Slape."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Slape. Mr. Slape. Mr. Slape. How  
is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's right here."

Deuster: "Stanley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Stanley was recorded and verified. He  
asked leave to be verified and it was granted."

Deuster: "How about Stearney?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Stearney's the same request."

Deuster: "Steczo."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Steczo? He's here."

Deuster: "Steczo, yeah."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Who...who did you ask for?"

Deuster: "That was Terry Steczo."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's there, he's in his chair."

Deuster: "Okay, fine. Tuerk."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Tuerk? He's in his chair."

Deuster: "Van Duyne."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Van Duyne, he's on the floor."

Deuster: "Von Boeckman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He is here."

Deuster: "Jessie White."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He is here."

Deuster: "I don't have any further questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the count, Tony? Kindly...

the Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Mulcahey.

Kindly record Mr. Mulcahey as 'aye'. Mr. Laz

Murphy...I'm sorry. Put Murphy on, I can't

hear him. Mr. Murphy, please."

Murphy: "May I be verified, Sir?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leave is granted and put Mr. Boucek

back on. And Mr. O'Brien wants to be sure he's

still on the Roll Call. What's the count, Mr. Clerk?

There's 112 'aye', 38 'no'. This motion, having

received the Constitutional three-fifths

Majority, prevails, and House Bill 430 is

declared passed, notwithstanding the veto of

the Governor. Introduction of Bills. Introduction

of Bills."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2817. Satterthwaite. House Bill

2818. Redmond - Ryan. House Bill 28...House

Bill 2817. Satterthwaite. A Bill for an

Act to amend Sections of an Act to provide for

the ordinary and contingent expenses of the

Office of the Governor. First Reading of the

Bill. House Bill 2818. Redmond - Ryan.

A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Motor



Vehicle Retailer Installment and Sales Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2819. McPike - Kane. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to State Revenue sharing with local governmental entitites. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Committee on Rule. Let me just point out to the Membership, on the Order of Motions yesterday we had a number of motions that would require an individual vote...or a group vote and we ask that the Membership...those were all the Bills that were in the Rules Committee yesterday and were deemed emergencies and we are going to go to the Order of Motions now, we're going to asked that these be exempted and that the Committee Hearing be this afternoon. And what's the intent of the Chair...is the motion is passed and granted that the House will then recess for an hour while Appropriations II and the Revenue...and the Pensions Committee meet on the Bills that were heard in Rules yesterday and then the House will reconvene in approximately one hour on the Regular Session and the Special Session will be postponed till 5:00. So on the... on the Order of Motions. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, these motions all relate to Bills which have been approved for consideration by the Rules Committee. I believe that there has been a good discussion among many Members concerning the Bills and at this time I move to suspend the posting requirement so that the following Bills may be heard by Appropriations II immediately. House Bills 2789, 2790, 2791, 2794, 2798."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On the motion, the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."



Skinner: "I'm sure this is futile because the...this is a House of the Leadership and not of the Membership. But I would appreciate it very much, since there is no way one may find out what these Bills contain, if at least the title could be read."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Clerk will read the title. It's on page 13 of your Calendar and these are the Bills that were on your Calendar yesterday and at the latter part of the day we thought that the Membership was engrossed in some other matters, they didn't have an opportunity to review it. It was brought to the attention of the Membership that these matters would be brought again today and I would hope that you had time from last night to 3:00 this afternoon to review that order and that's the order we're on. 2789. That's 150 thousand dollars...2790...that was Chapman's Bill in Rules yesterday. Let's let the Clerk read it."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2790 is Chapman. An appropriation to DCFS. House Bill 2791 is Currie. Public Aid. House Bill 2794 is Bowman. DCFS. And House Bill 2789 and 2790 is Bell. Capital Development Board for appropriations for East Moline Correctional Institution."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On the motion. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Would the Sponsor yield to two questions?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Kane: "Could you tell us if all of these motions are passed how many dollars we're talking about and from which funds they'll be coming from?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Why don't the individual Sponsors answer that question? I think... Chapman...Mrs. Chapman. 150 thousand dollars that comes out of the General Revenue Fund...for Mrs. Chapman. Mr. Currie."

Currie: "My Bill is not an appropriations Bill. It deals with



appropriations... the General Assembly appropriated last spring. I consumed it to make sure that the Department of Public Aid does not expend further sums without coming back to the General Assembly on a particular contract involving the Medicaid Manners and Information System. So the intent is only to limit appropriations under the Department of Public Aid."

Speaker Lechowicz: "And that one, they appropriated 4 million dollars, they're asking for a supplement of 3.4, in which she's asking for further review to stop that appropriation. Bowman. Mr. Bowman, please."

Bowman: "The Bill which I have appropriates Federal Funds only... No State Funds. The problem arises because last year we...brought some nonappropriated funds into the appropriations process because this was the first time these funds had been appropriated. They...the need for the funds was not estimated correctly. Consequently, the Department of Children and Family Services found that when they entered into contract with local units of Government persons...5 million dollars but is not any...there is no state money in that at all, it's all federal money." And it's needed to match local money that has already been put up by local governments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Bell. Mr. Bell."

Bell: "The...our appropriation is 5.9 million for the East Moline facility and part of that also goes to the Galesburg Mental Health and bond appropriation.. or bond authorization, rather, is a little bit more than that. It also accounts for some money that was appropriated for the Department of Conservation to purchase land throughout the state."



Kane: "Where's the 5 million coming from? Is that bond money or is that General Revenue..."

Bell: "Bond money..."

Kane: "How much is the authorization increase?"

Bell: "Just...just one minute. 7 million 1. 2.5 million for Conservation and that was already appropriated last Session but they didn't authorize the bonds. And it's for purchase of land throughout the state."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kane."

Kane: "One other question of the Sponsor. When will these Bills be on Second Reading and how much time will we have to prepare Amendments?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well if the Committees have an opportunity to meet they'll be later today as far as Second Reading. And we can hold them till tomorrow if you'd like...for Amendments... So we'd have to suspend the Rules to do that."

Kane: "So an opportunity will be given tomorrow to amend these Bills?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes. On the Gentleman's motion. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Kindly record me as 'aye'. Gene... Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 135 'aye', 10 'nay', 1 recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman's motion prevails. Any further motions? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I now move to suspend the posting requirements to provide that House Bill 2801 can be heard immediately in the Committee on Personnel and Pensions."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's Mr. Friedrich's Bill. Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I have a motion pending to suspend the Rules so this can be heard in Pensions Committee this afternoon and I would appreciate your support."





Speaker Lechowicz: "That's exactly what Mr. Madigan's motion does. The Membership would like to know what the Bill does."

Friedrich: "This Bill, as is presently introduced, makes the minimum pension for down...widows of downstate teachers 300 dollars. And the immediacy of it is that we have some of those people now who are about to starve. And incidentally, they can't get social security, they can't get medicare and they are really the forgotten people. And of course, it's a diminishing race because anyone that's retired in recent years should be making more than that anyway. So I think this is a group which is entitled to that consideration and the immediacy of it is that if we have to put it off until next July some of those people will starve to death by that time."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The fiscal impact is about 3 million dollars."

Friedrich: "Yes, I have filed a statement."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On the Gentleman's motion, all in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130 'aye', 5 'no', 3 recorded as 'present' and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Any further motions? Mr. Madigan. Third series, Mike."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I now move to suspend Rule 31 so that the following Bills may move to the Order of Second Reading without reference to Committee. House Bill 2792, 2795, 2797, 2799, 2800, 2804, 2805. Mr. Speaker, if there are questions possibly your procedure, allow the individual Sponsor to explain the Bills."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What about 2792...okay... Is there any



discussion? Is there any discussion? On what? Oh. All right, we'll proceed then to have the Sponsor briefly explain the Bill and the...why it should bypass Committee. On that, House Bill 2792, Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 2792, passed both Houses and went to the Governor but the Enrolling Office..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Correction... Enrolling and Engrossing, correct?"

Giorgi: "Enrolling and Engrossing Office omitted the line that was the heart of the Bill and allowed employees in the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to get the same credit as the person who is hired by the Board of Education or the County Superintendent of Schools Office, so... The heart of the Bill was forgotten by the Enrolling and Engrossing Department and all the Leadership is aware of it on both sides of the aisle. I urge your support for that motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill..."

Giorgi: "The Bill was passed, that's the emergency. You ought to go back to Hilton..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion on that? The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Wait a minute, Zeke. Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Are we voting on each of these Bills separately?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, we're explaining them and then if you have any objections we'll take one out...out of the agenda. There's seven Bills involved."



Skinner."

Skinner: "The swifty speaker from Rockford sneaked it though a little bit too fast. I heard Regional Superintendent of Schools and didn't hear much else. Could he speak a little slower?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's a corrective Bill because of the fact that Enrolling and Engrossing made a mistake and the Bill was passed and signed in the wrong form."

Skinner: "Yeah, but what's the Bill do? I can't understand you, you speak too quickly. Articulate more articulately."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "You can't hear with your brain when your mouth is engaged. You can't do both, you can't rub your tummy and pat your head. The Bill passed the House and the Senate and went to the Governor and the heart of the Bill was omitted by the Enrolling and Engrossing Office. That's the extent of the Bill. The Bill allows service in an Educational Service of the compared to service with a Board of Education. It's a simple Bill, a one line Bill. It was unanimously passed by both Houses." "No, it's for another guy."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, could I request a division of the question and then we could just vote on each Bill right after its been explained?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Fine...fine... Division has been requested. The question is, shall House Bill 2792 bypass Committee? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Corrective Bill. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "I figured out what it did. When you fire a local principal and they go to work for I.O.E. they're



going to get credit for retirement now. Now if you think all the fired principals and all the fired Superintendents ought to end up in I.O.E. by George, this Bill certainly..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Laurino...give me an 'aye'."

Skinner: "That's not it. Okay."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Did I understand the Sponsor right on this that it was...Enrolling and Engrossing deleted the heart of the Bill? It was a simple one line Bill and therefore they took everything out and sent a blank page to the Governor and he signed it?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 121 'ayes', 13 'no', 7 recorded 'present'. The Gentleman's motion prevails. House Bill 2800. Mr. Daniels. Same request, same problem. The problem in Enrolling and Engrossing. All in...wait a minute. All in favor vote 'aye' all opposed vote 'nay'. House Bill 2800. Laurino, give me an 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 135 'ayes', no 'nays', none recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman's motion prevails. House Bill 2795. Mr. Taylor. The Gentleman makes the motion to advance the Court of Claims Supplemental Appropriation which is contained in House Bill 2795, to bypass Committee. Is there any discussion? Medley Movers is not in there."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, Medley Movers is not in there at this time and I don't anticipate doing anything this Session with Medley movers."



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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, the staffs on both sides have looked at this Bill and we see no need for it to go to Committee. Representative Taylor is correct, we could save a lot of time by just moving it out to the House floor."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the Gentleman's motion prevail. All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "I was going to ask the Sponsor of the Bill if he would oppose any motion to attach Amendments to this Bill since we've had appropriations in the past that have become vehicles for things that are entirely different."

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

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Sponsor...Mr. Speaker. There is one Amendment that I've already filed and that Amendment has come in since the time that this Bill was printed. And that Amendment will not do anything other than pay awards that have been adjudicated by the courts."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 129 'ayes', no 'nays', 4 recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman's motion prevails. House Bill 2797. Mr. J. J. Wolf... Mr. Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a supplemental appropriation for the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency in the amount of 1 million 166 thousand dollars in federal funds to be distributed between...or spent on the programs involved with public water supply safety and air pollution control."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Federal funds that came in after October the 1st. On the motion, the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "I would ask Mr. Peters the same question on Amendments."

Peters: "We anticipate no Amendments other than the Bill."

Kane: "Would you resist any Amendments?"

Peters: "Difficult question to answer. We have...we have... I don't know what Amendments could be offered but we have..."

Kane: "Any Amendment that's not relevant to E.P.A."

Peters: "I agree. Yes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the Gentleman's motion prevail on House Bill 2797? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Give me an 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 126 'aye', 4 'nay', 2 recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman's motion prevails. On House Bills 2804 and 2805, Mr. Yourell. He makes a motion to bypass Committee on House Bill 2804 and 2805. Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2804 is a Bill that would provide counties to participate and get back from the Department of Revenue certain amounts of money that are due them since we passed the Real Estate Transfer Tax Act. And a failure of many counties in the state from April 17 to the signing of the Bill in July, did not pass an ordinance allowing them to collect their half of the Illinois Transfer Tax Act money. I've talked this over with the Department of Revenue. They are in agreement. This is a vehicle that they need, that they want to restore to the counties the money that's due and owing them."



The other Bill is an appropriation Bill that the Department of Revenue must have in order to comply with the substantive Bill. There is an Amendment to the Bill filed. The original amount was 150 thousand dollars and the Department of Revenue has indicated that their figures were in error the first time they drafted the Amendment and now the Amendment is for 250 thousand dollars. I move to suspend Rule 31(b) for the immediate consideration and...for the bypassing of Committee and move to Second Reading without Committee..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Reference to Committee. Any discussion?"

The question is, shall the Gentleman's motion prevail on House Bill 2804 and 05? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Danny... O'Brien, hit my button, please. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 140 'ayes', no 'nays', none recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman's motion prevails on House Bill 2804 and 2805. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman, on House Bill 2799."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 2799 is a...an election clean-up Bill. We have passed a Bill, Senate Bill 1146, which I had put on an Amendment providing for special procedures for supervising the casting of absentee ballots in nursing homes. After the Bill passed the County Clerks Association had some questions about the administration of the...the Act. They had some recommendations for changes that would make their administrative jobs somewhat easier. So I sat down with them and came up with this clean-up Bill. This Bill is supported by the County Clerks Association and by the State Board of Elections, both of whom would like to see it



passed into law before the March primary. It passed out of Rules Committee unanimously and I ask for your support this time."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, whether the Gentleman's motion should prevail on House Bill 2799. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 138 'ayes', no 'nays', none recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman's motion prevails on House Bill 2799 to bypass Committee, it's on Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. That's it. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan. You do? Oh, wait. It's been... informed...brought to my attention that the Clerk said there's a Supplemental Calendar coming out for some additional motions and we'll address those when we get back. We got to go to the Committee now."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, you can turn my microphone off now."

Madigan: "Mr..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Barnes, you've got an announcement?"

Barnes: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Appropriations II Committee will meet immediately in Room 118. We have one hour and we have the Bills that have just been presented to you. So precisely on time, immediately following the recess in Room 118."

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

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Personnel and Pensions Committee will meet immediately in Room 122. We do have one Bill and I appreciate your attendance there. It will just take about 10 minutes."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, are there any other Chairmen of





Committees who wish to announce meetings?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Those are the only two that are scheduled. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters."

Peters: "Mr...Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the Republican Members of the Appropriations II Committee would be certain to attend the meeting, at least in order to make certain that we've got a quorum so that we can conduct the business, we'd appreciate that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Thank you, Sir. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, it is now out intent to recess for one hour to allow those Committees to meet and then to return to the floor. Therefore, I now move to recess till 4:30."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Regular Session. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; 'aye', opposed. The Regular Session is recessed till 4:30. Now, on the Special Session, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, moves that the Special Session recess till 5:00. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; 'aye', opposed. The Special Session has been recessed till 5:00. So we will return on the floor in one hour at 4:30. Thank you. The House stands in recess."

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order. The Regular Session. Introduction and First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2820. Kane - McPike - et al. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "I want to advise the Membership that we're probably here at least 4 more days so you can introduce a lot more Bills. I can't guarantee what will happen but you can introduce them. Representative Friedrich."



Friedrich: "If I introduce them can you help me get them out of Committee? I didn't have much luck with the last one."

Speaker Redmond: "Put in a good one, you'll have better luck. Page 4, Total Veto. House Bill 450. Steczo - Yourell and Hoxsey. Out of the record. 460. Bradley. Out of the record. 462. McPike. Out of the record. 512. Murphy. Out of the record. 739. Pechous. Out of the record. 742. 742. DiPrima. Out of the record. 829. McClain - Madigan - Giorgi. Out of the record. 884. Capparelli - McAuliffe. Out of the record. 944. Cullerton. You need 118 votes. Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, do you have any idea how many people are here? If there's 107 maybe we can go with it but I don't think we have enough."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, what's your pleasure?"

Cullerton: "Take it out of the record, Mr. Speaker. 1052. Marovitz. Out of the record. 1211. Kornowicz. Out of the record. 1508. Borchers. Out of the record. 1776. Schisler. Out of the record. 1784. Representative Ropp. Out of the record. 2014. Meyer. Out of the record. 2129. Chapman. Out of the record. 2132. Chapman. Out of the record. 2146. Keane. Out of the record. 2192. Farley. Out of the record. 2200. Skinner. Well, I want to go through everybody and if you don't...if you don't have any luck don't blame me 'cause I've called them. Blame your colleagues. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Okay colleagues, it's time to fly this Bill out of here. This is my furry and feathered friend Bill, House Bill 2200. Which the Governor had the indiscretion to veto. The Governor vetoed the



Bill for either incon...inconsequential or absolutely false reasons, in my opinion. He vetoed it because...well, let me tell you what the Bill is first. It's a Bill which would put an extra box on the State Income Tax Form which would allow anyone having a rebate on a State Income Tax to check a little box and designate 10 dollars to the Illinois Non-Game Wildlife Protection Fund. The Governor had two basic contentions. Number one, that it would set a precedent, and of course we all know that what government bureaucrats dislike the most is setting a precedent. God help us if we ever do anything new in the General Assembly or in the State of Illinois. He did not allude to but let me suggest that another so-called worthy potential recipient of an income tax rebate check off might be the Illinois Arts Council. I would suggest that that might have been an accurate statement 10 years ago when no money was going to the Illinois Arts Council but it's not an accurate statement today, because over 2 million dollars of general fund money is going to it. Someone has suggested that we should fund cancer research this way. Well cancer research gets absolutely hundreds of millions of dollars from the Federal Government. So there's really not a need for something like this. In the State of Illinois, however, the Non-Game Section of the Department of Conservation received only 30,000 dollars last year. Now the second basic objection the Governor made was that government activities should not be financed through voluntary contributions. Now, I can't believe this but he signed the Veto Message five days before he came out in favor of a



daily lottery. I somehow think a daily lottery is a voluntary contribution of...in fact, I think it's something of a fraud of a voluntary contribution because only 45 cents of a dollar ends up going to government, whereas 100 cents from a dollar will end up going to government for this program if a taxpayer checks the box. Now I hope my colleagues who are not here on the House floor, and there are numerous of them who are not here on the House floor, will start coming back from their offices because it would be a shame to have to have a verification just to give them more time to come back. Now, as you...you probably don't remember this Bill passing the first time around and the reason you don't remember passing it was because it passed on sort of a paperclip Bill...a paperclip vote. It was in that list of noncontroversial Bills on which there are more than enough votes on the board as soon as the board was opened up because people would automatically depress their 'yes' button. That is how noncontroversial the Bill is. Because it was not debated it was not very well known and I managed to find Bill Volker, who is a trainer and breeder of eagles through artificial insemination and he agreed to come with his eagle to the Capitol last week in order to sort of raise the consciousness of my colleagues in the General Assembly. I would like to apologize to the Governor for my friend's eagles indiscretion. The eagle is a trained eagle but it is not yet house broken and I assure the Governor that the indiscretion which occurred on his reception room floor, which was rapidly wiped up, would not have occurred had not the press corp egged me on. In any event, if



we override this veto Bill Volker is now flying around the country picking up three pair of bald eagles and he says if any of them can be handled by himself that he will bring a bald eagle to the State Capitol to watch over the State Senate while it votes on the override. If there are any questions I'd be happy to answer them. I think that this is the type of Bill for the type of cause that is needed."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I think this should be a controversial Bill. In fact, I reluctantly rise to urge that we sustain the Governor's Veto. I'm as enthusiastic about our feathered furry friends as Representative Skinner is and in fact I consider myself a strong environmentalist. Nevertheless, I would urge that we sustain the Governor's Veto. It seems to me that the Governor's own reasons for vetoing this Bill are legitimate ones. What we are asked to do here is to offer some people an opportunity to help support non-game wildlife. So some people are those who are silly enough to be owed money back from the income tax people in the State of Illinois at the end of the year. There will be little old ladies who are getting their 10 dollars back who will check off, 'Yes, this money should go for the non-game fund'. Those people are likely to think that the money that they're giving so cheerfully to the non-game fund is money that belongs to the State of Illinois, no money that belongs to themselves. The kinds of check offs we're used to on income tax returns, for example, the ones dealing with presidential elections on our Federal returns, indeed



does talk about distributing dollars that belong not to us individually but dollars that belong already to the Government. For this state to get involved in that kind of scam seems to me to be offering to our people the prospect that they won't know in fact whose money it is they're offering for this purpose. The state should not use its own sources to engage in voluntary contributions. The environmental groups, I believe, will be a lot better off if they were to go and organize a voluntary campaign to help the state do a better job with non-game...with non-game animals. And I think the state should take this as a priority issue and appropriate money from the General Revenue Fund, if indeed we're not doing a good enough job. I agree with Representative Skinner that we aren't doing a good enough job but I don't think this is the way to solve the problem. He recognizes that this week it may be this issue and next week it may be cancer or heart research or any one of 750 other million worthwhile causes. I think that's a legitimate concern. I sit on the Revenue Committee and I voted against proposes comparable to his to use check offs for other worthwhile human social purposes. For those reasons I think Representative Skinner, although he is certainly a man with his heart in the right place on this issue, is going about it the wrong way and I would urge us to sustain the Governor's Veto."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Stearney: "Representative Skinner, the monies that are involved here, these are...would be solely refunds



due to the taxpayer. Am I right?"

Skinner: "That is certainly correct."

Stearney: "So in other words, the amount that's asking to be checked off would be money that is solely owned by the taxpayer?"

Skinner: "That is correct."

Stearney: "And none of these funds are being taxed and taken from the state coffers?"

Skinner: "Not one dime."

Stearney: "One other thing. The monies that would be checked off and refunded, they would be given to the Department of Conservation, I understand?"

Skinner: "Yes."

Stearney: "And would the Department of Conservation be able to acquire habitat and maintain these endangered species?"

Skinner: "That's one potential use for the money."

Stearney: "And what other potential uses are there for this check off refund?"

Skinner: "Well, the example that the Golden Eagle was meant to symbolize is the breeding of Bald Eagles in the State of Illinois. We have no nesting Bald Eagles in the State of Illinois to anybody's knowledge. There are 500 to 1,000 Bald Eagles who winter in Illinois but none nest here. Bill Volker says that it will cost about 6,000 dollars a year to...to run his project. Now obviously this passage of the Bill does not guarantee that his project will be funded by the Department of Conservation but it's a concrete example of what could be done with the money that would be extremely creative."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in addressing myself to the question, I would say that I totally endorse this proposal."



This is...this money is the taxpayer's money. It is not state money. The only reason we are using the state is the...is a means of a funnel to put that money into the Department of Conservation who can best able manage intelligently that money and devote it for the acquisition of habitat to maintain certain animals and certain birds so that they do not become extinct. And remember this, if you're going to maintain these... these particular individual species so that they do not become endangered you're going to have to acquire habitat. The biggest danger to any animal, to any species, that is, now on the endangered species list is the encroachment of civilization. And the more we allow civilization to encroach on habitat you're going to wipe these species out. So if we can acquire habitat, allow the Department of Conservation to purchase land, to expand the habitat, to maintain the marshlands, the swamps, and the forests that we have in the State of Illinois without tearing them up for subdivision purposes, you're going to maintain and keep these species alive. And as I say, this is not the state's money. This is the taxpayers money. So I see no objection if...if an individual taxpayer wishes to make a contribution. It's his money. Let him do so as he pleases. It is not state funds. We should vote 'yes' on this matter. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of House Bill 2200 and the attempt by the Sponsor to override the Governor's Veto. And I...and I hope that you'll bear with me for a few moments so that I can tell you





why. You know there's...there's been distributed among us a very colorful poster that indicates some of the Illinois endangered species both in wildlife and in plants and so forth. But I can suggest to you that this does not paint a true picture. Because when one endangered species becomes extinct you have really compounded the situation so that those who are predators...and the endangered species feed on other animals, the in turn will upset the balance of nature and disturb the ecology to the point where you have a very significant problem, not only in Illinois but in the entire country and the world as well. If there's anybody that believes that by extinction of one species that it does not affect all other species, they're absolutely incorrect. What happens, for example, in San Francisco Bay affects a tiny coral atoll thousands and thousands of miles away. We cannot...we cannot, in good conscience, do anything but vote for this Bill, for the override, to protect these endangered species. Because by doing so we will protect the flora and fauna not only of the State of Illinois but of the country as well. There's only one problem I have with the Bill and Representative Currie spoke in opposition to the Bill and I have talked with her and she suggested to me that if Representative Skinner, by drawing or by other indication, would include some Democrats and Republicans on this endangered species list we would then release her opposition and she would be in support of the legislation. And on behalf of Representative Kelly, I don't know how you're going to artificially inseminate a Bald Eagle but you have to consider his problem as well...



and with his support...and if you could answer that problem I'm certain that we could pass House Bill 21 in spite of the Governor's override."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Vinson: "What assures us that this won't be simply the first example of a long list of the use of this kind of mechanism for taking money from the people?"

Skinner: "Having people like Representative Braun and I on the House Revenue Committee."

Vinson: "Do you think that we can be assured that that will continue indefinitely?"

Skinner: "I don't know about her but I come from a fairly safe district."

Vinson: "Do you think it's very...very possible that next year we might see an effort to have a check off for Israeli Bonds on the..."

Skinner: "No."

Vinson: "Why not?"

Skinner: "Well, Representative Stearney's answer is that Israel is not within the State of Illinois. I just think it's a dumb idea."

Vinson: "Well regardless of where you stand on Israeli Bonds, Representative, I want to...I want to speak against this Bill. I think it's very obvious that every good cause that comes down the road, if this Bill is adopted, is going to try to get a check off for that cause. Maybe the arts, it may be Israeli Bonds, it may be the Palestinian Liberation Organization, it may be any conceivable kind of good cause trying to get that kind of check off. And I submit to you that we ought not create that precedent, create the administrative costs that it's going to involve



the state and lengthen the tax form, complicate the whole taxing process. Those organizations are private organizations. They ought to remain private organizations with all of the freedom that involves, without the regulation that can someday be attached to the use of this mechanism. For all those reasons I would urge that we accept the Governor's Veto and enthusiastically support it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birkinbine."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The previous speaker alluded to the possibility that we might find more check offs in the future and indicated that one of these might even be the arts. Well actually, I think that's a terrific idea because if we had enough people checking off for the arts we wouldn't have to go through and pass the goofy Bill that would pay for the arts out of the taxpayer's money. A great many people don't want to do that. We seem to be talking about this money as though it belongs to the state, as though it belongs to the Government. There's a new phrase that has taken hold in Washington among bureaucrats and among some of the liberal politicians, it's called, 'tax expenditures, tax expenditures' Do you know what they are? They are legal deductions. Now what causes people to call those legal deductions 'tax expenditures'? It's the kind of thinking that says, 'It's our money. It's the Government's money.' If somebody gets a deduction they're taking that money away from the Government, just as though the Government actually owns all of the money. Well, it's not our money, it's the people's money. This is a perfect example



of how we can avoid future taxes for something like a wildlife fund by having people voluntarily give their money. It's not our money, it's not the state's money to decide whether or not it should go there. We're talking about voluntary contributions by money that people have coming back to them. It's a good source of avoiding... a good way to avoid any future tax increase or new tax to do the same kind of thing that can be done voluntarily with private contributions through this check off. I encourage you to vote for the override. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I hope you've all noticed that I am a Co...hyphenated Co-Sponsor of this Bill. And, as the previous speaker spoke of, I think that is the freedom of choice that we ought to give the people of this state. I see nothing wrong with the principle of allowing people to spend their own money in any way they see fit. I don't think it's a dangerous precedent. I think it certainly is an environmental need. I think that the administration of the funds that would be so checked off are well provided for within the Department of Conservation and I personally think it is a unique idea, whose time has come, and we might meet a number of problems in the State of Illinois through this system and I frankly see nothing wrong with it and I hope that you will join with Representative Skinner and me in giving the people of this choice, with their own money, their opportunities to check off for conservation preservation in the State of Illinois. We are not



doing a thorough enough job and I hope that you will join us in overriding this veto."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this motion, although I confess that when the Bill came up the first time I did vote 'present' on it because I was concerned about some of the same issues that have been raised here. However, I have had this change of heart upon reflection, upon some of the things which I have read in the papers over the last several years. For example, I think many of you do recall the issue in Tennessee where the... the Department of...the E.P.A. held up the construction of a dam because of the snail darter fish. And a lot of people ridiculed the Environmental Protection Act and the Federal Government for holding up this dam project because of the lowley snail darter which might become extinct. What I'm fearful of is that if we don't provide some kind of optional program such as this provides that we might wind up in the posture of putting additional pressure on our environmental protection laws to...repeal the mandatory laws we now have. I think we ought to give people a voluntary option to support wildlife conservation. Because there is no one to speak for these endangered species, they certainly can't lobby for themselves and I think we ought to give everyone the opportunity to lobby on their behalf by checking off an amount on their income tax return. I think this is a good Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, as the previously...Representative Skinner, I think, is misdirected. When the



when we enacted the state income tax in 1968, those of us who were down here were very careful to exclude all exemptions save the personal exemption. There is no exclusion for refund on sales of drain tile or reduction in the state income tax because you bought machinery or sales tax payments, the only exemption is for personal exemption. Additionally, the Governor, in his Veto Message, has promised to support an appropriation for the object of the non-game wildlife conservation fund and over and beyond that the nature conservancy, which receives state and federal money, provides the same services. For those reasons, I believe the veto should be sustained."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, if we could turn back the pages of time maybe Adam could have had a check off system and we'd saved the dinosaurs. In the meantime, I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "Would you repeat?"

Friedrich: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly, the immediate...well, not the immediate previous speaker but the speaker before that from Cook County, tries to confuse the issue by pointing out or suggesting that this has something to do with an exemption. It has nothing to do with an exemption. What it has to do with is putting a simple, little line at the bottom of the state income tax form asking people who have



a rebate coming to them if they wish to designate 10 dollars or less, if their rebate is less, to the Illinois Non-Game Wildlife Protection Fund. He has disseminated incorrect information in another respect, and that is he has claimed that the nature conservancy receives state and federal money. That is just not correct. The nature conservancy prides itself on not taking any money from the Federal or State Government. The nature conservancy does what Federal and State Governments do not do soon enough, local governments as well. This Bill was vetoed because of a hangup based on the purity of the income tax form on the part of the bureaucrats in the Department of Revenue. Now I know of which...I know what I'm talking about because my first job was as McHenry County Treasurer. And in the court house in the Treasurers Office I kept asking my staff, 'Why is it done this way? Why is it done that way?' And I kept getting the answer, 'Because we've always done it that way. And I finally told my staff that the next person that said that wouldn't have a job. If they didn't know why it was that way they shouldn't even answer the question, just tell me that they don't have any idea why it's done that way. I'm disappointed that the Gentleman from DeWitt County has given you information about his stand on this Bill, which may not be totally accurate. I really think he's just afraid of snakes and is afraid some of his money will go to support some of the snakes that are listed on the...the poster I've handed out. I'd like to reply a little bit to the...the woman who undoubtedly will become known among her colleagues in the...in the Independent Democratic



Caucus as the hatchet Lady from Hyde Park. There was a Sunday Supplement which was a color supplement, front page article on Bill Volkens breeding project in the Metro-East area. At the end of it was a little scribe asking if anybody that wanted to make voluntary contributions to support the project should send the contributions to the Autobahn Society of St. Louis and not one dime was contributed. Now I don't know what the reason was but it seems to me that the need is overwhelming that we have money to support research such as he is carrying on. Now take a look at the back of your seats. Right on the state seal in gold on our leather, expensive, leather chairs is a picture of the Bald Eagle. None of whom are being born in Illinois annually. Take a look at the bronze eagle above the Speaker's head and above Representative Daniel's head. Do you want to have nothing but bronze eagles left in the State of Illinois? If you don't, I hope you'll join me in voting in favor of the... of overriding the Governor's Veto on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall House Bill 2200 pass, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor? All in... Representative Meyer." Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege. For the information of the new Gentleman from McHenry County, I, in 1971, sponsored legislation that by Amendment to the Department of Conservation to acquire habitat at Lock and Dam 17 on the Mississippi River, in this very House. Now I... I...you know, you're glib, you'll use an eagle, the Governor rides through the second floor with a horse, I can't compete with your words, nor your





deeds, nor your eagles, nor your horses. But I take offense to your innuendos and your actions. Additionally, If you look at the 1979 budget of the Department of Conservation I'm sure that you will see transfers of funds to the Illinois Nature Conservancy for the acquisition, for the purchase of land which was acquired by the Nature Conservancy which I have donated to and so have you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall House Bill 2200 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in explanation of my vote I would just like to point out a few things. There was an analogy drawn earlier that this might set a precedence for the cancer fund or the heart fund or the purchase of Israel Bonds. Let me point out, there is a distinct difference. What we would be doing under House Bill 2200 is having one state agency collect the money, which is taxpayers money, and distributing it to another state agency, namely the Department of Conservation. We talk about the heart funds or Israel Bonds or the cancer fund, this is not going to another state agency, this is going to a private charity. So there is a distinct difference. Also, I'd like to point out that those of us who hunt and fish in the State of Illinois, and I happen to be probably one that does more than most Members of this House, we support our hunting and fishing projects in this state through Dingle, Johnson and Pittman, Robinson Funds, which is a tax placed on all hunting and fishing sporting equipment. I think this is an excellent idea for people who would like to



enjoy the nature spots of this state who don't hunt and fish. This is an excellent opportunity for the taxpayers, not to use tax dollars but only their own voluntary funds and deposit them with a state agency which means less money is going to have to be appropriated out of General Revenue Funds and possibly we can go on with more income tax or state sales tax relief and I proudly vote 'aye' and urge others to do likewise."

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

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, when I was a little boy my mother would take me now and then to our fence post and hold me up so that I could look at the eggs of the Bluebird. I'm telling you, I haven't seen a bluebird in years in the same areas that our fence posts once were placed. My grandfather, when I was a little boy, told me about the flocks of passenger pigeons. They're the only American Pigeons that this country ever had. Now these pigeons flew in such flocks that it would take all day for one flock to pass. They would actually darken the sun. Now if you don't believe that, read the history of Illinois, because it's true. They chopped them out of the trees, the trees... they built fires, they fed them to hogs, there is not one left alive in the United States of America. The last one died in the Cincinnati Zoo in 1914. My father was an ornithologist, he collected, we have now in cases in my home, practically all of the species in Illinois that lived before 1900 in Illinois. I want you to know we have 3 passenger pigeons, but they're only the stuffed pigeon, they are not alive and they were killed off by the lack...the lack of interest



of men, the men who shipped hog heads of these pigeons to...not only to feed the hogs but to New York for the market. Now this is what some of these pictures represent of our native species of birds and etc., the plants, that we should begin to be interested in and do something about protecting. And the Bluebird and the Passenger Pigeon and the other animals, the other birds are not the only ones. I can remember when we had on the Sangamon the 'Parliated' Woodpecker. Even the Red-headed Woodpecker, the Sap Suckers are becoming scarce. It's time we begin to take some interest and do with our own money what we want to do. It's no business of the Government to say if I want to do this and give some money out of a tax return to the Department of Conservation. I should have that right. It hurts nobody. We're hurting no one, therefore, we should pass this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's... Representative Skinner. On this question there's 87 'aye' and 38 'no'. Representative Skinner has requested a poll of the absentees. Mr. Clerk. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "If this gets enough votes I'll have to ask for a verification. I'm sorry to take the time of the House but apparently he's willing to, so..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Jane Barnes. Beatty. Bluthardt. Bradley. Breslin. Capparelli. Christensen. Collins. Cullerton. Davis. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. John Dunn. Ewell. Ewing. Garmisa. Hoffman. Hudson. Jaffe. Dave Jones. Emil Jones. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Kucharski. Kulas. Lechowicz. Leverenz. Margalus. Matijevich. McBroom. McClain. McCourt. McGrew. Molloy.



Oblinger. Polk. Preston. E.G. Steele. Terzich.  
Van Duyne. Walsh. Sam Wolf and Younge."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beatty, 'aye'. Representative Van Duyne, 'aye'. Representative Christensen, 'aye'. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I want to only explain, because when Virginia Macdonald dropped that on my desk about the birds and the bees I gave an indication I might support this. However, I listened to the discussion and I think it is not a good policy and I therefore vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? What's the count? 90 'aye' and 39 'no' and the motion, having failed to receive the Constitutional three-fifths Majority, is hereby declared lost. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege. Apparently Representative Meyer and I have had some disagreement or misunderstanding, I hope it's a misunderstanding. When I referred to the Nature Conservancy does not takes gifts from Government, State or National, what I meant was that they do not solicit money from State or National Government. They solicit contributions from private individuals. Now, as Representative Meyer has pointed out to me, there are indeed line items in the State Budget to buy property from the Illinois Nature Conservancy. That property has been purchased through private contributions and I'm...I have a feeling that we're both approaching it from different directions and I hope that... well, I apologize, if I have impugned his character as apparently it appears he thinks I have. I also am quite aware that he was Sponsor of a Bill to buy Eagle habitat, in fact I was on the Appropriations Committee and voted for it



with him. I just know what is in the budget now, it's 30 thousand dollars and I believe politicians should be known by their deeds. That is what the Governor has put in the budget. He can double it and there will only be 60 thousand dollars there and this program could bring in, according to the Department of Conservation, something in the nature of a million dollars. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "You have on your...on your desks some motions. Where is it, Mr. Clerk? Supplemental Calendars 1 and 2 on the reverse side of the ... Let's take Supplemental Calendar #1. House Bill 2793. Representative Catania. Representative Catania. Out of the record. 2802. Representative Braun. Representative Braun."

Braun: "Yeah, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 2802 and 2803 relate..."

Speaker Redmond: "Do you desire to have those heard together?"

Braun: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Does she have leave? Hearing no objection... Representative ... Okay, proceed with 2802."

Braun: "All right, 2802 provides for...is a substantive Bill that provides for a system of state support for public hospitals that provide health care to poor people. It is...it provides for a system of impaction grants. In any event, we would like to have this motion...is to have the rule suspended so that this matter may be...may be heard."

Speaker Redmond: "This is to suspend the Posting Rule so it may be heard in Rules tomorrow, is that correct?"

Braun: "In Rules, yes, that's right. It's just to have the Bill heard in Rules Committee, that's all."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Is this one of the Cook County Hospital Bills that was defeated in Rules yesterday?"



Braun: "Yes, it is, Penny."

Pullen: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Braun: "It is only.... In response to Representative Pullen's question, it is only to allow the... a full exposition of the issue in Committee, there is an emergency and...I'll...so that the Committee may take it up tomorrow."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I sat in a Committee this afternoon where Bills were introduced so that there could be a full hearing in the Committee and I don't think anybody disagrees that there's a problem with Cook County Hospital. But sitting and listening to the issue for about the 10th time isn't necessarily going to help us come up with a solution to that problem by November 1st, when we will be leaving Springfield. And I would suggest that we just kind of let the Bill sit and find other means of discussing the issue and coming up with solutions and then debating realistic solutions at that time rather than doing it right now."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Kempiners, I...your concern is...is well taken. However, I would suggest that... that, as one of the Co-Sponsors of this Legislation it was our thinking that the Bill should come out of Rules, or at least be heard in Rules, and get a vote on it in Rules. This is only regarding the Committee, this is not bringing the matter to the floor, this is not a vote on the actual substance of the Bill. And I would appreciate your deference to this procedure."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I would request that the Sponsor, at this



point, take this out of the record and confer with Representative Taylor before she moves further."

Braun: "Thank you...thank you, Representative Vinson, for the suggestion."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure I heard Representative Braun correctly. This was or was not heard in Rules Committee yesterday?"

Braun: "It was heard in Rules yesterday."

Schraeder: "And what was the verdict?"

Braun: "It's my understanding that it failed in Rules."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I object."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further?"

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Schraeder, this is an attempt to get it...to get a hearing on it in Rules. There was not a full discussion of the issue yesterday, as I understand. I, for example, was not even there. That's all."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I suspend the proper rules for leave to have this Bill 2810 heard in the Rules Committee... This is..."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait till I get there, Representative Kornowicz. We're on 2802."

Kornowicz: "Oh, I'm sorry."

Speaker Redmond: "2802. We're on that now. Are you ready for the question? Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "So we can have a clarification, there seems to be some confusion over this. Are you asking to have this heard in Rules Committee tomorrow or in the regular Committee?"

Speaker Redmond: "Rules Committee."

Friedrich: "I would not object to that."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Lady's motion to suspend the posting requirement in Rule 18 so that



House Bill 2802 may be heard by the Rules Committee tomorrow. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Braun... Have all voted who wish? Representative Braun, to explain her vote."

Braun: "Point of information, Mr. Speaker. How many votes does it take?"

Speaker Redmond: "107. Representative... Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?"

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for all the red votes up there, this is not a vote on the Bill. We just want to have it heard in Rules. This is an emergency and I would appreciate a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we heard this in Rules yesterday and it was held in Rules Committee. Now, what does she want to hear it over again for in Rules? I think... I'd like to have her clarify it. We did hear this Bill yesterday and she didn't get enough votes to get it out of Committee, to be exempt. Now what does she want to hear over again?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "Representative Conti, I was not there when it was heard yesterday. I was there earlier for Representative Catania's Bill, if you recollect. At the time that this Bill was called, as one of the Sponsors, I was not even there and I was told later on that it had failed in Committee. I was not... I had wanted to make certain that certain information was brought to ..."

Conti: "Your Co-Sponsor was there, Jim Taylor."

Braun: "I understand that, Sir. And...and...but there is





certain information that I wanted to make certain got to the attention of the Committee and for that reason we wanted to take it back to Rules. That's all."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Parliamentary Inquiry, Mr. Speaker. Is the Rules Committee subject to different rules with respect to votes? In other words, ordinarily if a Bill fails to get enough votes on one Roll Call the Sponsor of the Bill can request a second Roll Call. Does that apply in the Rules Committee as well?"

Speaker Redmond: "We don't have a Committee Meeting."

Bowman: "I beg your pardon?"

Speaker Redmond: "There is no Committee Meeting scheduled as of now."

Bowman: "I see. However, if that Committee Meeting were to be scheduled then there could be another Roll Call on the same motion. Is that correct?"

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute...wait a minute... The Parliamentarian advises me that the Rules Committee was not recessed. We adjourned the Rules Committee so we have to go through this procedure in order to have another posting and have another Rules Committee. Okay. Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you, very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, It seems to me and I've been around here and I think all of you have for a long, long time, that it has been procedure within our rules that a Bill has at least two hearings in a Committee if it does not receive the prerequisite number of votes. Now, as I understand the...one of the prime Co-Sponsors of this measure was not in the Rules Committee and I'm



here speaking in support of at least affording her the same opportunity that many of us have enjoyed in the Committees that we serve on. I've had Bills in Rules, I've had Bills that were defeated in Rules and come back on the next day, after discussing the matter with the individual Rules Committee Members and those Bills have then been voted out. The only thing that I understand that's being requested here is that this Sponsor of this Bill be afforded the same opportunity that all of us have enjoyed at one time or another. Her Bill was correctly heard in Rules but apparently she, as one of the prime Sponsors, was not in attendance at that meeting. The only thing... recourse to her at this particular time is this method, since the Rules Committee is not scheduled to meet again tomorrow so that this can be heard. I believe, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, just and simple courtesy to this Member, as we enjoy this same courtesy upon our requests to have our measure... have our measures given full consideration. We should give this Member that same courtesy and that full consideration to at least have her Bill heard and afford that opportunity to offer her argument in that Rules Committee. I don't see that we can do anything less than that if the Rules Committee still decides that it should not be brought to the House floor, that is another question. But I do believe that in this case I cannot understand the red vote that is not affording this Member the same opportunity that each one of those red votes would ask if they were in the same situation, to insure that their measure gets the proper hearing in that Committee with them in attendance. I see nothing



wrong with that and I can't understand red votes not affording a Member of this House the same kind of...same kind of procedure that they would want if they were in the same position. I would urge you to give here the prerequisite number of votes to at least have that Rules Committee to sit and consider these Bills and act on them in accordance with our rules."

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

Barnes: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, Parliamentary Inquiry. Is there..."

Speaker Redmond: "Parliamentarian. Wait a minute, get up here, David."

Barnes: "Is there a Rules Committee Meeting set for tomorrow morning?"

Speaker Redmond: "There is, to hear one Bill, 2808."

Barnes: "Well, Mr. Speaker, may I address this question to the Parliamentarian? In keeping with that, according to the Rules of our Standing Committee, and I'm not certain that the Rules Committee fall under that, in the Rules of our Standing Committees, a Bill is afforded two opportunities to be heard in that Committee before it is completely completed its process. In other words, if a Bill is heard and does not receive the ~~pre~~recorded number a Committee Member can request that same Bill to be heard again. Can the Sponsor of these particular measures make that same request at the meeting that is set for tomorrow morning? "

Speaker Redmond: "The answer is 'no', because they're not posted for tomorrow. Tomorrow is not a recess meeting. If it was a recessed meeting and there had been a posting at the regular meeting then upon the recess, anything that has been in that meeting..."

Barnes: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted that clarified"



because some Member was thinking that that could be brought up tomorrow because the Rules Committee is set. So the only alternative to this Member is to try to move in this fashion."

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct."

Barnes: "So the only thing that she's asking is to allow her to hear the Bill in Rules Committee tomorrow and she needs 107 votes to do it. That's the same consideration as having that Bill to come up one more time under the normal course of events."

Speaker Redmond: "I'd like to call the Members attention to the fact that if there is a meeting, not only of Rules but of any other Committee and all matters before the Committee have not been taken care of, which is the situation here, then upon the recess it isn't necessary to post again. The only reason that this motion is necessary is because we did not recess, we adjourned it and this merely is waiving the posting rule. Have all voted who wish? Representative Conti."

Conti: "My only concern is, Mr. Speaker, that there is some...some...several other Bills that got the same kind of treatment and we're going to have to go through these motions of all these other Bills. If you extend the courtesy..."

Speaker Redmond: "If they have filed a motion and they're here, we will do it. Certainly. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 97 'aye' and 38 'no' and the motion fails. 2803. Representative Braun."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, I don't want to be obstructing us in this House but on this last Bill here it was only as Representative Barnes pointed out, a matter of courtesy being extended in the Rules Committee. This is not a vote on the legislation,



it's only an opportunity, in Rules, to have this set of Bills, 2802 and 2803, heard or presented. I would ask the Members of the House... I understand the vote's been taken already on 2803 but toward that end I would ask you to reconsider your 'no' votes or your 'present' votes and I would ask for a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the Lady's motion to suspend the posting regulations so that House Bill 2803 may be heard in the Rules Committee tomorrow. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. 107 votes required. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 90 'aye' and 30 'no'. The Lady's requested a poll of the absentees. Mr. Clerk, poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Beatty."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "I withdraw my request for a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Braun withdraws her request.

2810. The previous motion was 90 to 30 and the motion failed. 2810. Representative Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I ask for us to suspend the proper rules for leave to have this Bill heard, which is 2810, in the Rules Committee tomorrow. This is the regular standing Committee. It's the Labor Laws Commission that got lost in the shuffle. The money is appropriated and I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that Rule 18(k) be suspended in order that House Bill 2810 be heard in Rules Committee tomorrow. Those in favor vote 'aye',



opposed vote 'no'. Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Parliamentary inquiry, this Bill is not yet printed. Don't we have to suspend that rule first?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "I thought it was printed. 28..."

Darrow: "Here we have a Bill that's not printed with not much of an explanation. I don't know if I'm going to be for it or against it but I think we ought to follow the steps and suspend the rule in regard to printing."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "Take it out until we get the Bill printed."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 2812. Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have a cleared this...waiver of the posting rule with both the leadership on the Democratic and Republican side. And both of the leadership have agreed. This Bill is a Bill which deals with age discrimination. At this point, in Illinois, because House Bill 65 lost and House Bill...and Senate Bill 1377 was put over, people who are the victims of age discrimination under the Federal Acts have no place to go, no forum to go in Illinois so that we have a Federal Act with no place to go at this point."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten, for what purpose do you rise?"

Totten: "Point of Order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Totten: "This Bill has not been printed either and I don't think we should be considering the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "I...I really don't know whether it has been or not, however, I'm not... I will say this, that the only



thing that the Constitution provides actually is that the Bill be on our desk at final passage. The...the explanation that I'm giving is to send it merely to the Rules Committee. And it's...it's the kind of Bill that the Senate, as a matter of fact, when we...when they considered H.B. 65 said, 'If you'll conform it to the Federal Rules we'll pass it.' And this Bill conforms that Bill to the Federal Regulations. That's all it does."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative..."

Totten: "The point I'm making, that I..."

Speaker Redmond: "What rule...will you tell me what rule requires it to be printed before it can be heard in the Rules Committee?"

Totten: "Well, I don't know. The prior Sponsor agreed to take his out because Representative Darrow had cited the printing requirement. And I thought that what's good for one Rep ought to be good for the rest of us."

Greiman: "I don't want any special treatment. I think that there's no requirement, however, of that. There would be if the substantive Committee were considering it, I certainly would agree with you. And if this were a Bill, a motion to put it on Second Reading or something like that I think that would make sense then but at this point to...to waive the posting requirement for Rules Committee, I just don't see that, frankly, as being significant. We all know what the Bills say. We have some trust and sense of that. The leadership on both sides of the aisle have seen the Bill and have agreed to put it into the Rules Committee. They haven't agreed to vote it out of it but they've agreed to put it into the Rules Committee. And I take that agreement and that



support as being significant and important. What we have is senior...our citizens of Illinois with a right against discrimination because of their age and no place to go. No forum to go because the General Assembly...essentially, they got caught in the switches in the General Assembly. And I want to give a BILL that will...this is a Bill that the Senators have asked for and I want to give it to them."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you. The point that I'm making is that the Sponsor is talking about discrimination on age, he's talking about discrimination, he's got an idea what he wants to do with the Bill, we haven't seen it. He's trying to put this idea forward without ever having the Bill reproduced and he's discriminating against other people's ideas not being heard in the same manner. You just can't just present an idea and move it to the Rules Committee. We need something in the way of a printed Bill to move it. I've got some ideas I'd like to move to the Rules Committee too, if we're going to do that."

Greiman: "Well, it's just, I've gone to the Legislative Reference Committee, I've filed the Bill, it has a number, I filed a...the appropriate emergency waiver and...and I...there is Rule 18(i), which I'd move to suspend as well. This is a very simple... simple Bill, a very simple concept. It passed out of here with a lot of votes and it's not just a concept in the air, it's a Bill...and it has a number. And I would like to have it...and both sides of the aisle understand it and have agreed to pass it out."





Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Matijevich in the Chair."

Totten: "Mr. Matijevich."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "On my point of order, I believe the Rule is 18(i)."

Greiman: "That's what I said, I also would move to suspend  
18(i) as well."

Speaker Matijevich: "The motion is to suspend that Rule  
so that motion is in order."

Totten: "Is it in writing?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Further discussion on the motion?"

The motion is by Representative Greiman to suspend  
Rule 18(i) and Rule 18(k). Those in favor of  
supporting that motion signify by voting 'aye',  
those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted?  
Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the  
record. On this motion there are 68 'aye', 25  
'nay', 3 voting 'present' and the motion fails.



Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Kornowicz here? Representative Kornowicz, we're coming back to your motion. Representative Kornowicz is slowly going back to his chair. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kornowicz, on the motion on House Bill 2810."

Kornowicz: "Speaker, and Members of the Committee.. of the House, I ask to suspend the rule 18-I and 18-K on House Bill 2810. This is a regular standing Committee of the Labor Laws Commission and it was lost in the Committee shuffle. The money is appropriated. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Kornowicz has moved to suspend Rule 18-I and 18-K. The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Kornowicz: "Yes."

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Ebbesen: "What's the Committee shuffle?"

Kornowicz: "A shuffle... it was lost between the Bills."

Speaker Matijevich: "Committee shuffle."

Kornowicz: "You know how you shuffle the cards?"

Speaker Matijevich: "That's a new disco dance. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten."

Totten: "Point of inquiry, Mr. Speaker. He.. is he suspending 18-I also?"

Kornowicz: "That's right."

Totten: "What does it mean when it says this subSection may only be suspended prospectively? 18-I."

Speaker Matijevich: "Are you, hopefully, addressing Kornowicz on that?"

Totten: "I would like Mr. Kornowicz..."

Kornowicz: "Mr. Speaker.."

Speaker Matijevich: "Will you tell the Gentleman what it means when it says it can only be suspended prospectively? He's looking at me. One moment."

Kornowicz: "It's a goldmine Bill."



Speaker Matijevich: "We are suspending prospectively. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Alright. We..."

Speaker Matijevich: "All those in favor of the motion by Representative Kornowicz signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 87 'aye's, 19 'nays', 4 voting 'present'. And the motion fails. The Lady from Cook, Representative Catania, are you... Representative Catania, are you ready on your motion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Catania, on... motion on Senate.. on House Bill 2793."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 2793 deals with the emergency at Cook County hospital. What it would do would be to require preregistration of patients who are at an income level which is 25% above the green card eligibility level so that their care could be reimbursed by the Illinois Department of Public Aid and it would also authorize impaction payments. Its companion appropriation Bill is House Bill 2816 and I would like to have the same Roll Call on both of them if I may."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to have the same Roll Call and consider the motion on 2812 also. Leave. Representative Catania has moved to suspend the Rule 18...Yeah..18-K for House Bill 2793 and House Bill 2816. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel."

Piel: "Question of the Sponsor please.. Was this heard in Committee yesterday?"

Catania: "The first Bill was. The companion appropriation Bill was not."

Piel: "Okay, the first Bill, what happened to the first Bill in Committee?"

Catania: "The first Bill had nine 'aye' votes and I believe there was some talk about please come back after the over-



ride vote."

Piel: "In other words, it failed in Committee."

Catania: "That's correct."

Piel: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevidich: "Representative Catania has moved the suspend the posting requirements for House Bill 2793 and House Bill 2816. Those in favor... The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I can't find these Bills on my desk. I was wondering if the Sponsor would tell us what the subject matter of these Bills is."

Catania: "Yes, Representative Brummer. On... as I mentioned before, the first part...the first Bill, 2793, deals with preregistration of those people who are cared for in public hospitals who are below 25% above the green card eligibility level and it further would provide for impact payments to those public hospitals which spend over 20% of their patient days on care of the indigent. And what I'm asking for is a hearing tomorrow morning in the Rules Committee on that Bill and its companion appropriation Bill, which is for \$20,000,000."

Brummer: "How many public hospitals qualify for that percentage?"

Catania: "Estimates vary, but there may be 41 hospitals around the State of Illinois which might be eligible."

Speaker Matijevidich: "The Gentleman..."

Catania: "One's in Cairo."

Speaker Matijevidich: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Kempiners."

Brummer: "One in Cook County?"

Speaker Matijevidich: "I'm sorry."

Catania: "There's a big one in Cook County, yes."

Brummer: "Commonly called Cook County Hospital?"

Catania: "Right."

Speaker Matijevidich: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Kempiners."



Kempiners: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I don't, you know, like to be an obstructionist or anything, but we are scheduled to be in session for four more days up to November 1st, which means if this Bill got out of Rules Committee, went to Committee for hearing, went through Second and Third Readings and then to the Senate and moved in 3 days, it still wouldn't pass. This is at least the second time that this Bill<sup>h</sup> has been introduced in this General Assembly this year and the first time it didn't pass. Now, if you're going to be wanting to take a lot of time, fine. But try to be considerate of the other Members. This thing didn't pass before. There are some discussions going on between Cook County Hospital, Cook County, and the Governor's Office. People are trying to look for a solution to th's problem that will solve the problem but without putting the burden on the entire State of Illinois. And the least you can do is give those discussions an opportunity to produce something that would be acceptable enough to a Majority of people in the Legislature to pass and be signed by the Governor and quit playing these games. And I would suggest that we just stop with these motions and, you know, take the rational route."

Speaker Matijevich: "The W. The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Darrow."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Darrow, has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no' and the main question is put. Representative Catania to close."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Representative Kempiners is quite right in saying that there are a lot of people talking about what can be done to save Cook County Hospital. I think it would be very irresponsible on our part not to have a vehicle or to



alive and well, ready and waiting in case such an agreement is worked out. I hope that you will provide support for getting such vehicles alive and well by at least saying that this Bill and this companion appropriation can be heard in the Rules Committee tomorrow morning so it has a chance of being there when the agreement is made. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Katz... Catania has moved to suspend Rule 18-K, the posting requirements, in relation to House Bill 2793 and House Bill 2816. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson, to explain his vote."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to indicate to this Sponsor as I did to Representative Braun on her Bill that there are some of those of us here who have in the past opposed this legislation who might be persuaded to favor it and to vote for it and I would suggest that the Sponsor confer with Representative Taylor on that matter and until that happens I still will vote 'no', but then I could be persuaded."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Braun, to explain her vote."

Braun: "I was going to ask of the Ladies and Gentlemen of the House to accord this Sponsor the courtesy that was not accorded me and allow this Bill to be heard in Rules. It is only.. it is a courtesy that has been extended to each and every one of you in the past and I would ask that you extend it to Representative Catania at this time."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bluthardt, to explain his vote."

Bluthardt: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, some people seem surprised when I said I was a Cosponsor of this Bill and I was proud to be a Cosponsor. Some other people say, 'Let's wait and see what can be worked out



with the Governor's Office and the city of Chicago.' Well, we've seen what's happened to the people of Cook County when those kind of deals are worked out. I can't, for the life of me, see why we can't send this to Committee, give it a hearing and even pass it into law and let the Governor have it on his desk to decide what he wants to do in the event he doesn't work out a proper deal with the city of Chicago and the County of Cook. I'm.. I'm ashamed of the people on my side of the aisle because you hear them scream that it's 30 million dollars...30 million dollars. Hell, they just passed a law that hit the people of Cook County for 300 million dollars in additional sales tax and they're crying about 30 million dollars. The Cook County Hospital serves hundreds of thousands of people in dire need. The Cook County Hospital is in very very serious financial condition today and no one knows whether it can stay open another week or another month. Cook County Hospital's gone to County of Cook, got no relief. They've gone to the city of Chicago and had Mayor Byrne turn her back on them. They come to the State. Where the hell are they going to go if we turn them down? Their people need your help. This is not going to bankrupt the State of Illinois. Cook County Hospital needs your help. The people who are served by Cook County need your help. Give this Bill a chance. Let it go through the hopper. Let's see what we can do with it. Let the Governor and the other cohorts of this work out what they want to in the meantime. Let's at least have this vehicle there so that we can enact it into law if it's necessary and it certainly would seem to be preferable to me that we keep the County hospital open even if it cost the State 30 million dollars a year."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted?"

Bluthardt: "Vote in favor of the motion."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will



take the record. On this question there are 79 'ayes', 28 'nays', 16 voting 'present'. And the motion fails on both 2793 and 2816. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Van Duyne, has a motion on Senate Bill 1444."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This appropriation is for the Department of Education and I want to impress upon everybody this is all federal money and if we..we have to appropriate it it's 160 thousand dollars, roughly 139 thousand for redistribution of the school system, to the libraries I understand for.. well, I haven't got it right here in front of me.. for National Defense Education Act and 22 thousand dollars for Title 6-D. And if we don't get it heard tomorrow we'll be caught in the crunch and we won't get it heard. So, I just ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Will, has moved to suspend Rule 18-K, the posting requirements for Senate Bill 1444. Is there any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Takes 107 voted, three-fifths Majority. The Gentleman from DuPage, we think.. 107 votes. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 117 'aye', 8 'nays', 2 voting 'present'. And the motion carries. On Supplemental Calendar #2, appears a motion House Bill 2811. Representative Ryan, the Minority Leader. I don't see him. Repre... The Gentlemen from Cook, Representative Schlickman, for what purpose do you arise?"

Schlickman: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "Yes, Sir."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, by Proclamation of the Governor of the State, we convened at noon for the Third Special Session of this General Assembly. That Special Session was recessed until 3:00 o'clock. It was recessed until 4:00 o'clock and then recessed until





5:00 o'clock. It's now the hour of 6:00 p.m. and I wonder, Mr. Speaker, when we're going to get to the people's business and take up the call of that Special Session."

Speaker Matijevich: "As soon as we get back ... we get through with these motions so she can post, we're going to get back to it. I thought you were going to give the score of the Cubs game tonight."

Unknown: "The Cubs didn't lose today."

Speaker Matijevich: "We'll get back to the Special I guess.

2812 is a duplicate. We've already disposed of that motion. On Supplemental 2 appears House Bill 2813, the motion by the Gentlemen from Cook, Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, 2813 is a Bill that makes a simple correction in a Bill that we passed dealing with election law and it's been signed into law by the Governor. There was a technical error that referred to the county clerk where it should have referred to the Board of Election Commissioners. The reason I would ask for consideration at this time as an emergency is that it has created some confusion among the Boards of Election Commissioners in the State. It's merely a technical clean up and I would ask for the suspension of the rules so this Bill could be heard tomorrow."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Collins has moved to suspend Rule 18-K, the posting requirement, for the purpose to hear House Bill 2813 in Rules Committee tomorrow. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Marion, I think your light is on accidentally. There's no discussion. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The motion takes three-fifths, 107 votes. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. 107 votes. Have all voted? Someone want to vote Giorgi. the Giorgi Roll? The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to be consistent, is this Bill been printed, or if not, is that rule being suspended also?"



Speaker Matijevich: "I thought I heard him say he's suspending that rule too. 18-I... is that right? And he says my hearing is excellent. Thank you, Representative Darrow. Thank you. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 144 'aye', 1 nay', 1 voting 'present'. And the motion carries. On House Bill 2811, 2811, the Minority Leader, Representative Ryan, from Kankakee."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to suspend the appropriate posting rules on House Bill 2811 to have it heard in the Rules Committee tomorrow."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryan has moved to suspend the posting requirements, Rule 18-K, on House Bill 2811. And Representative Totten wishes an explanation of what the Bill does."

Ryan: "It eliminates Totten's District."

Speaker Matijevich: "That should carry unanimously."

Ryan: "It eliminates the usary rate on mortgages.. the ceiling."

Speaker Matijevich: "You had to tell. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall the...'. . . Those in favor of the motion signify... just one moment. Representative Piel, from Cook. Representative Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, before we even get to the vote, I'll explain my vote. I discussed this exact situation for about half an hour with the Chairman of the Financial Institutions Committee last week on the phone. I spent about another two hours discussing the same situation with Savings and Loan people in my District. They had a meeting this morning with contractors, Savings and Loan people in the State, bank people in the State and the Governor's Office. Seeing as that Chairman Leon, Representative Rea and I were on a... or on a Subcommittee, that we're going to discuss this, I asked the Governor's people if we could sit in on this meeting. At that time I was told 'no'. So at this time I'm just going to explain that I'm going to



vote 'present' and I'm for the Bill, but I'm voting 'present' if that's the way they feel about it."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. For the record, he is suspending both 18-I and K, the posting and printing. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Kane."

Kane: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryan, do you yield for a question? He indicates he will."

Kane: "Are these Bills printed?"

Ryan: "No."

Speaker Matijevich: "He's suspending both those ...."

Ryan: "I asked to have that suspended."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one of the reasons why we have rules is to correct.. protect both the Members of the public and the Members of this General Assembly. And with a Bill of this import it's going to affect all of the people of this State and not just the money lenders. I would urge that we don't go around suspending rules for Bills that we don't know what's involved. They're not printed. There's no notice of a hearing. The people, the Savings and Loan people, the banks, I'm sure know that there's going to be a hearing. But the rest of the people that are going to be paying those higher mortgage rates don't know that. And I'd urge that we defeat this motion to by-pass our rules and let's have complete input from everybody and not just a select privileged few."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I concur with Representative Kane. I.. I really don't know what the right answer is here. We all know that Savings and Loans Institutions are putting their money in the Florida condominiums and other condominiums. They're putting their money in money markets



rather than loaning to local people in their own communities. Now when we first formed the charters for Savings and Loan Institutions in the State of Illinois, we thought that we were forming charters that those institutions would fund money to their local Savings and... to the local residents and commercial institutions for home loans and commercial loans. The whole purpose of S and L's was not to make money. It was to loan money to the community. We are now faced with S and L's that are making money, building Taj Mahals, and are not necessarily loaning monies to commercial people or to residents. Now what we're faced with in the State of Illinois is not that there's a lot of money. There is a lot of money to be loaned to people buying homes. What those people are doing is, those S and L's are loaning money out for money markets, certificates... they're buying condominiums. They're buying second mortgages instead of loaning to the communities. Now, I don't know what the right answer is. I don't think anybody does. No one wants a business to lose money, but I do think that we ought to have public hearings. If the issue was a public hearing here so that those S and L's could tell us... yeah, they're farming 50% of their monies, 70% of their monies, 80% of their monies going for money markets and only 10 or 20% are going for residents's loans.. well, then we'd have the right issues. Then we could have the usary rate and we could develop the issues. But the issue right now is... what we're faced with is, all they're trying to do is raise the usary rate so they can make more money on usary rates than they can on money markets. That's what the bottom line is. And that is wrong. The issue is that they're violating, from my perspective, violating the entire issue of how we developed S and L's. And I strongly strongly ask you not to grant this motion so at least we have public hearings so we can develop what



the S and L's are doing with that money."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich, and I would urge the Members not to have the latitude that my seat might have and address the substance of the Bill. On the motion, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Gentleman from Adams has convinced me he not only doesn't know the answer, he doesn't even know what the question is. The question is whether this shall be submitted to the Rules Committee to determine if this is an emergency. He doesn't understand that. He thinks we're going to pass the Bill in Rules Committee and send it to the Governor I guess. The is an emergency and he doesn't understand Savings and Loans either because we don't ... we don't invest in money markets certificates. We pay those to the customers. That's on the other side of the fence, Representative. There is an emergency. Under the...we're now required to pay 11.7 for money and the top rate we can lend it for is 10.78 and I wonder if he knows how you can make money doing that. If he does, I'll hire him tomorrow. This is an emergency and it should be heard by the Rules Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ebbesen has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The main question is put. Representative Ryan to close."

Ryan: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First of all, in response to Representative McClain, Mike, all we're trying to do is get this Bill in the Rules Committee. We have no intention of trying to



short circuit the process. There'll be public hearings. We'll take this thing to Committee where you'll be able to come in and talk about what you were talking about. I want you to understand what this motion is because you certainly weren't talking to this motion. The home builders, the construction people, the bankers, the Savings and Loan people met this morning with the Governor and the Leadership, Representative... Speaker Redmond and I agreed to Cosponsor this legislation due to the emergency that was pointed out to us. If this doesn't fly, I understand that we're going to have unemployment upward of 25% in the home builders industry, as an example. Probably in Adams County, yes... at least.."

Speaker Matijevec: "Representative.."

Ryan: "All we're asking for here is an opportunity to have this heard in the Rules Committee tomorrow. It will then go to Committee and stay there until we've had some time to talk about it and discuss it. So I would ask for the ..favorable vote that is needed."

Speaker Matijevec: "Representative Ryan has moved to suspend Rules 18-I and K to hear House Bill 2811 in Rules Committee. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. It takes three-fifths Majority. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes, to explain his vote."

Barnes: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, before that green vote runs up to 107, I would like to raise the question of what emergency exists to give a small number of people in this State an opportunity to make a killing off of little folk when that same number could not be raised to at least afford an opportunity for conversation relative to an hospital staying open that was relative to the health care of many people in this state. Anyone can show me an emergency in the housing market that will in fact, afford those little persons that own the Savings



and Loans to make a killing in a very short term to insure that those new young married couples can get them a usary rate, a mortgage up to some where in the area of 15 to 16%, that they will never be able to pay off in their lifetime so that some small very wise financial people in this state can make a killing on the people back in your districts. Explain that to me, that I will know what emergency exists that this Bill should be.. should be suspended to be heard tomorrow, not going through the regular process, to insure that those low persons that you are talking about will be stuck again to insure that, not only will they be stuck again, but they insure they will be stuck for the next forty years."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Huff, to explain his vote."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, very briefly, I think that the previous speaker is correct because the money market rate for ... for loans is at 14% and everyone knows that this is an attempt of the federal reserve to hold down inflationary spiral. And as I listened to this conversation it's quite clear to me that what we want to do is defeat that purpose and continue the inflationary spiral by uping the usary rate and bringing in young couples to buy homes as was pointed out that they will never own. Can you imagine paying 14% on a 50 or 60 thousand dollar home? You'd never pay for it. I think we should follow the use restraints. Let the federal government raise the interest rate to the point that it is now. Hold the market down. If we're going to ever solve this problem, we have to start by taking state cuts. We may as well start with the building industry."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Braun, to explain her vote."

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



House. You recollect when Representative Catania's Bill came up I asked of Members of this Body to extend the courtesy that that Bill, which related not only to health care, but indeed, the lives of many, many, many poor people in the city of Chicago, could be heard in Committee. That was all we were asking for, that we get a hearing on that important legislation. Many of those who have now voted green on this one voted 'no' to send House Bill 2802 and 2803, which would have saved Cook County Hospital had they passed, back to Committee. Many people... many of the same people who are voting green, voted 'no' to send Representative Catania's Bill back to Committee. I want to ask the Sponsor of this motion, what is the emergency here? How many Savings and Loans won't make their payrolls next week? How many people will die because they can't get exorbitant interest rates out of the Savings and Loans in the state? I.. I.. the hypocrisy of this situation is just appalling to me, Mr. Ryan. I have to say to the Sponsor of this Bill, I would ordinarily vote to send any Bill back to Committee so that it can be heard because I think that that is part of the deliberative process of this Body. However, in light of the treatment that poor people have received in the last hour here, I'll have to vote 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Kane, from ... Representative Schoeberlein from Kane County, to explain his vote.. One moment... The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes, for what purpose do you arise?"

Barnes: "Just so that to insure everyone that is apparently convinced of the emergency that exists that this Bill received 107 I'd like to verify the Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. There's an indication of verification. Representative Schoeberlein, to explain his vote."

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





I understand this Committee.. this Bill will not be heard in any Committee at this time. I have one city of 37,000 in my district, one of those fast moving cities. They haven't been able to sell a house in the last week. Every realator in town in crying. Now they can sell homes. Let's give them the money. Let's take our money over there and put it in the Savings and Loans. We've got 2 jobs. Let's take one of the jobs and the money from that and put it over there. You know you can do a lot of talking here when you're taking one job away from somebody; you're getting paid by two different people, but let's get the money into the Savings and Loans and give employment to others."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman.. No.. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leon, Chairman of the Committee. Representative Leon."

Leon: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have been advised of the serious emergency in the housing market as regard to interest rate. In the last 48 hours I've canvassed and talked to every Member of my Committee. They are appraised... they have been appraised of the seriousness of the situation. They feel that this Bill should be entitled to a fair hearing with possible Amendments. And in speaking with the Members I have been assured by a Majority of the Members of my Committee that if this Bill becomes before it they will vote it out and put it on the floor of the House so that every Member of this Body will have an opportunity to have some input in the Bill. I would appreciate more green lights and I would also appreciate that we would do our homework in the next 48 hours on this very important measure because I believe it affects all of us because it's a matter of whether we will have money for home mortgages or whether we will not have any home building and mortgages in the State of Illinios in the next 6



months. Thank you very much."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Barnes, for what purpose do you arise?"

Barnes: "Just.. just a Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker . I thought that the motion was for this to go to Rules. I didn't know it to go to Financial Institutions."

Speaker Matijevich: "You're right. The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson, to explain his vote. One minute."

Johnson: "Representative Barnes asked what the emergency is. All over the State new housing starts in the ability of people in middle and low income range to enjoy the American dream of owning their own house is being impaired by the lack of availability of funds in the market. That affects, not only home buyers in the lower and middle income range, it also affects people who direct.. are involved in realators, contractors, builders, and everyone else who are affected collaterally by this... by this drawing up of funds. And I think the emergency is certainly there and something that we ought to address ourselves to now and if we don't, the economic repercussions on everybody are going to be significant and I think catastrophic over the course of the next 6 months."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115 'ayes', 21 'nays', 16 voting 'present'. And Representative Barnes withdraws his motion and the motion carries... his request for verification of the motion carries. On Supplemental Calendar 1 House Bill 2816, Redmond-Ryan... Who's calling? The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie, for what purpose do you arise?"

Currie: "My switch doesn't work and I was present but the... I was pressing my 'present' button but the vote recorded me as red. I can't seem to make anything but my 'no' button work this afternoon."

Speaker Matijevich: "I thought I saw it going back and forth."



The electrician is looking into it right now. The Gentleman... the Minority Leader, Representative Ryan, on the motion on House Bill 2818 which is... oh, the Speaker of the House is going to... Alright. Representative Ryan is going to represent the Speaker of the House on this motion."

Ryan: "The Speaker asked me to handle this Bill and if you've got any questions that are too heavy, you're going to have to ask him about it. This amends the Motor Vehicle Retail Installment Sales Act to increase the fee that can be charged... that the seller can charge on any new motor vehicle from 8 to 10% and again I would ask to suspend the appropriate posting rules and printing rules to have it heard in the Rules Committee tomorrow."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryan has moved to suspend rules 18-I and 18-K so that House Bill 2818 can be heard in Rules Committee tomorrow. There's no discussion. The question is.. those in favor signify.. oh, the Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Indicates he will."

Brummer: "Was that the raise of.. from 8 to 10% simple interest or what annual interest rate is that?"

Ryan: "Well, whatever it is now, we're going to raise it to... 2 percentage points."

Brummer: "Well, I am not the Sponsor of that Bill. I don't know what it is now and that's why I'm asking."

Ryan: "It goes from 8 to 10 dollars per hundred."

Speaker Matijevich: "Before we go into that, could we have the.."

Ryan: "\$100."

Speaker Matijevich: "Speaker of the House, Representative Bill Redmond, on the Bill.. motion. He's Co-Chief Sponsor of the Bill. Representative Redmond."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I'll have to confess that I really don't know a great deal



about this Bill. But I have been advised by the automobile dealers that they're in exactly the same shape that the home builders and the real estate people are with respect to mortgages unless a Bill comparable to this is passed, it will be absolutely impossible to finance the purchase of automobiles that we know that this is a pretty important industry. Now obviously, this Bill probably would have to take some.. some amending and dressing up and then put it in the proper form, but unless we get it in Rules and consider it, there isn't anything that we'll be able to do on an emergency basis and that's the reason that I asked that the motion to waive the posting rule and have it heard in Rules Committee .. would be passed."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Kane. "

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what we have in the country right now is a short term financial crisis. The Federal Reserve Board has made some changes in the money markets to drive up the interests rates to fight the thing that we have always said is the worst thing that's happening to our economy and that is, inflation. So what's our immediate reaction to what the Federal Reserve Board is doing? Raise the interest rates. Let's keep inflation going. We're putting loopholes in everything that the Federal Reserve is trying to do. The only way we're going to take inflation out of the economy is to take our lumps, to hold back, and what we're doing here is responding to a very short term crisis. It's going to be short term. There's absolutely no reason to take off forever the usary rate on mortgages or to increase the.. the usary rate on automobiles from 8 to 10% which is add-on interest, which the effect.. the actual rate of interest will be closer to 18 and 19% and they're not going to come in as soon



as these interests rates go down.. they're not going to come in and say, 'Heh, let's lower them again.' We're crazy. "

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain, and this time he said he's going to keep his remarks to the motion. My seatmate, Representative McClain."

McClain: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I hate to mention that I agree with Doug Kane because he's so fiscally reservative he makes me look like I'm a big spender, yeah. But generally, now on this issue Doug Kane's right. What we're really doing is raising the price of money and I know and I guess Doug knows and almost everyone else knows that we can feel the money coming and there's nothing we can do to stop it, but there's no way to... what we're doing here .. we're going to raise interest rates to 10%. What's going to happen is money is going to get more expensive. Those banks and institutions are going to end up and credit unions are going to end up investing their money somewhere else. You're not.. you're going to have a month or two months of free enough money so they can buy cars and all you've really done is ripped off a few people for a short term effect. I really think all we're really doing is harming the process and harming our constituents for looking good on a particular vote or a particular time that the press has already gone to sleep. The daughter and me has already had the 6 o'clock news and we've done absolutely nothing. You've received 2 or 3 telegrams from realtors today. Probably nothing from banks and I'm sorry Clarence.. except for you lobbying in the Membership.. and other than that, we've got absolutely nothing. There's no crisis. All we're doing is raising the price of money, short term, so that these banks and institutions can make more money and you're not going to



help your constituents at all. I think we're making a violent error and I agree with Doug Kane completely and I.. it bothers me that I agree with him."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman. The Speaker of the House, Representative Redmond."

Speaker Redmond: "I think that Representative Kane and Representative McClain are addressing themselves to the Bill rather than to the motion as to whether or not they will be heard in Rules Committee. It may very well be that it would have the results that they're talking about. The only thing is that if we don't at least have the opportunity to see if this industry is in the dire condition that they tell me that it's in, and if this should be done, if we don't have that opportunity there's nothing we can do until, after the first of the year."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative ... from Will County, Representative L., now that Hoffman wants to re.. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Regardless of what position you take on this particular issue and the questions you may have about the timeliness of the presenting of this legislation, there's no question, I don't believe it will stand questioning, that the usary rate in Illinois relative to what the money market is, is ridiculously low. We create an artificial market when we get involved in the limits that can be charged in these particular areas that are too low to make it worthwhile for people to put their money in Illinois. If you had money, you wouldn't put it into Illinois either. You don't throw seed on barren ground. You throw it where it's going to grow and if it's going to grow in Florida, you're going to put it in Florida. I think it's ill-behooves us today to say that we won't even discuss this issue and I



would hope that you would rise to the occasion and support our Speaker and our Minority Leader on this particular motion."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Hannig."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hannig has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The main question is put. The Minority Leader to close."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Speaker Redmond and myself would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryan, the Speaker of the House Redmond, and Ryan have moved to suspend the posting and printing requirements so that House Bill 2818 can be heard in Rules Committee. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. It takes 107 votes, three-fifths... 107. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will ... The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn, to explain his vote."

Dunn: "Let's.. it.. well it looks like this is going to pass. It sure is a sad day when we.. when we can't provide tax relief to those people in Illinois who eat food, but we can provide profit incentives to those who sell brand new cars. So, I just want to emphasise the darkness of the day here, the low point in the General Assembly."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will make the ... the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti, to explain his vote."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am really shocked at some of the attorneys that are coming up with the rationale that they have here today. I was a little concerned about the economy here a few months back



when .. I've looked at the real estate listings in the great city, great village of Schaumburg, where there are five thousand listings and they haven't moved a single home in Schaumburg, right in the heart of the Elk Grove area. We have 59 million square feet of industrial space. They can't sell a home because they can't get the money. The Savings and Loans cannot make any loans because they cannot compete with the Washington's 14½ prime rate that they're giving. It has slowed up construction in Cook County to a standstill. When construction's out of work, suppliers, everybody goes out of work. It created an unemployment.... a problem and a crisis there and the last six or seven months that is unbelievable. If you think you've got a recession and you have to bite the bullet today, just wait till the middle of February when everybody's out of work. If we don't loosen some of the money up and put some of these people back to work, and I didn't want to talk on the merits of the Bill at this time, because I don't know what the contents of the Bills are at this time, but I certainly think that the emergency is here. It should go before the Committee and let's get it back on the floor of the House and then if you want to discuss what we're doing to the people back home, let's come up with some statistics and prove what it's done. When the building industry is crippled, you're crippling over 150 to 200 thousand jobs alone in Cook County."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz, to explain his vote."

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe all this request is is that the Rules Committee consider this Bill and in all equity, if the other one passed, which it did, all this one does is provide an increase in the amount of money that would be .. interest rates as far as automobile loans. And it'll go to Rules Committee. It will be assigned to Committee





and we'll be able to debate it totally on the floor, I'm sure. And the Speaker, I believe, .. this is the least we can do in all courtesy to have this Bill considered by the Rules Committee and I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 112 'aye's', 17 'nays', 16 'present', and the motion carries. On Supplemental Calendar #2, appears a motion regarding House Bill 2812. The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite. 2817, I'm sorry. 2817."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the reason for the urgency for this measure is that it's a revision of an Fy '80 budget, a minor revision by ... that I think is very necessary and obviously, if we are to have it in effect in time to be timely, we have to work on it now rather than waiting until January and I solicit your support for this revision. Waiving the motion.. ..waiving the posting so that we can hear it in Rules tomorrow... and the printing rule."

Speaker Matijevich: " The Lady from Champaign has moved to suspend Rule 18-I and K in reference to House Bill 2817 and on that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the Sponsor, but I did not quite hear or understand her explanation in regard to the content of the Bill." If she would repeat that I'd appreciate it."

Satterthwaite: "My.. yes. I indicated that the reason for the emergency is that it's a revision of an Fy '80 appropriation and obviously, if we are going to revise an Fy '80 appropriation, we need to do it now in order to be timely before the funds are already expended."

Peters: "I'm certain that's what I heard you say the first time, Representative Satterthwaite. What I'm concerned about is exactly what the contents of the Bill does. Where are we transferring these funds and what.. what is the



emergency in making the line item transfers you see that should be made?"

Satterthwaite: "It really is not a transfer. It is a reduction."

Peters: "Then why the reduction?"

Satterthwaite: "In order to be fiscally responsible and also hopefully to have some educational impact on an officer of the state who seems not to realize what inflation does to people's budgets."

Peters: "Would you.. would you care to go a little bit further on that? I'm still at a loss to really understand what you're trying to do."

Satterthwaite: "Well, I would defer to the Speaker to find out how far we can go into the substance of the measure. It was my impression that in these motions we were not to discuss the substance of the Bill, but simply to document the emergency nature."

Speaker Matijevich: "I think you've gone far enough, yes. I think you're right."

Peters: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not.. I make the same observation as has been made before. I don't know that this Bill has been printed and I'm sure outside of the statement that this has been an emergency and a reduction to.. to bring some state officer to life is not really quite sufficient in terms of why the reduction and what state officer? I would hate to think that that might involve Secretary of State Dixon, or perhaps even Roland Burris. I'm not sure where it's coming from or Cosentino, or Scott or.. well many others, Cronson and so forth and so on. I'm not sure who is being singled out for this kind of reduction and this kind of discussion. Since it has not been printed, I would think that the House would follow the same procedure it had in the past and deny the 107 votes to have this moved to the Rules Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative



Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Some of you will recall a couple of years ago a professor at Illinois State University in exercise of his rights of free speech urged the Legislature to adopt the Equal Rights Amendment. I'm an opponent of the Equal Rights Amendment, but at the time there was an attempt to reduce his salary and I opposed that for the same reasons that I would urge people to oppose this Bill this time. We ought not engage in punitive legislation to try to discourage people from expressing a political believes. So I'd urge a 'no' vote on this motion. "

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Satterthwaite, to close."

Satterthwaite: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think the fact that it is a Bill dealing with a fiscal 19.. fiscal 1980 appropriation, which I seek to revise, indicates that it does have to be taken care of very soon or it will be too late to have any impact on the budget that is at stake. If there is any question about the printing of the Bill in order for it to be adequately heard as an emergency matter in Rules tomorrow, I will be happy to xerox enough copies to make sure that the Rules Committee all have copies at their disposal. I would seek your support for this motion."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Satterthwaite has moved to suspend the printing and posting requirements so that House Bill 2817 can be heard in Rules Committee. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. It takes three-fifths, 107 votes. To explain his vote, the Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This isn't truly emergency legislation. We are going to be considering sales tax relief on food and drugs shortly. This Bill deletes the appropriation for the Governor's food. Up to this state ... up to this time the State of Illinois has been pur-



chasing food for the Governor. Under this legislation he will be required to reach into his own pocket and pay for his own food and pay his own sales tax next time he goes to the grocery store. I would solicit an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Come on. He's going to have to buy his own food? Isn't that going just a little bit too far to make a point?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 57 'ayes', 59 'nays', 3 voting 'present' and the motion is declared lost. The Assistant Minority... Majority Leader, Representative Lechowicz moves to recess the Regular Session for the purpose.. until the recess of the Special Session. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed say 'no' and the Regular Session is recessed. The Special... the Third Special Session will now come to order. Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution #1; RESOLVED that the rules of the House of Representatives of the EIGHTY-FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY be adopted as the rules of this Third Special Session so far as the same may be applicable, that the standing Committees of the House of the EIGHTY-FIRST GENERAL ASSEMBLY and their Membership shall constitute the standing Committees and that the Journal Review Committee appoint in pursuant to House Resolution 446, be authorized and directed to review and approve the Journals of this Third Special Session."

Speaker Matijevich: "On the Resolution, the Gentleman from Cook, the Majority Leader, Mike Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, this is the organizing Resolution which provides that the rules of the Special Session shall be the rules of the Regular Session. I move for the adop-



tion of House Resolution #1."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Madigan has moved for the adoption of House Resolution #1 during the Special... Second (sic) Special Session. Third Special Session. Is there any discussion? If not, those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 118 'aye', 19 'nay', and the Resolution is adopted.. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman, for what purpose do you arise?"

Schlickman: "Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijeich: "State your inquiry."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the 1970 State Constitution in Article IV Section 1 provides that the legislative power is vested in a General Assembly consisting of a Senate and House of Representatives elected by the electors from 59 Legislative Districts. Article V of the Constitution provides in Section 8 that the Governor shall the supreme executive power and shall be responsible for the faithful execution of the laws. We know, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that by the legislative Article the Governor may convene the General Assembly or the Senate alone in Special Session by a Proclamation stating the purpose of the Session. Now, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, the Legislative Committee of the 1970 Constitutional Convention in recommending the adoption of Article IV, the legislative Article, indicated that purpose meant subject matter. And that Section went on to say that only the business encompassed by such purpose, subject matter, can be transacted. Now, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, if you will look at the Proclamation for the call of this Session of the Governor's, he provides as the purpose or subject matter House Bill 2796 and if you look, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, at the Calendar for today, under subject matter, one cent sales tax reduction



on food and medicine. My parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, is, what can we do? According to the Proclamation the purpose or subject matter is one cent sales tax reduction on food and medicine. Are we given House Bill 2796 on a take it or leave it basis without any Member of this House vested with the Constitutional authority to legislate and the Governor doesn't have it by the Constitution, are we prohibited from introducing any Bill on the subject and are we prohibited, Mr. Speaker, from even offering any Amendments to this Bill in as much as they would go outside the scope of the purpose or subject matter being a one cent reduction sales tax on food and drugs?"

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Schlickman, on your inquiry, the... the limitations are the subject of the Bill. House Bill 2796, is that it? And I believe that the House can amend that Bill and we'd have to look at that Bill, both the title of the Bill, to determine whether it is within the subject of that Bill. So, in other words, I believe your inquiry is, are we limited only to that Bill and can we in its present form, and can we amend it? If your inquiry is that, we surely could amend it. But how far we can go would have.. would have to be a case by case basis."

Schlickman: "Well, wait a minute. Is the subject matter... is the purpose of this Third Special Session, this particular Bill... or the subject matter that's contained in this Bill, the subject matter being sales tax relief.."

Speaker Matijeich: "I believe the purpose is the Bill. However, we are not limited to accept the Bill in its present form. He hasn't limited us to that by the Proclamation."

Schlickman: "Well, what you're saying, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, is that the Governor has the.. has attempted to preempt and to assume the legislative authority that has been given to the General Assembly by the Constitution. He is telling us what we should be doing. He's giving us a Bill and saying that we, convened in a Special



Session, can not, as the Attorney General has indicated in opinions, introduce Bills on the subject matter. The Governor is telling us, 'I understand your opinion.' But he wants to be the supreme Legislator and Executor, Executor in the State of Illinois. Is that correct?"

Speaker Matijevich: "I would tend to agree with you and, unfortunately, I don't like it. I don't think any Governor ought to so limit us to one Bill and, unfortunately, by court decision he has that power evidently. And maybe.."

Schlickman: "...What that suggests is that there are no court decisions on the subject. There are Attorney General's opinions with respect to purpose, but no court decisions."

Speaker Matijevich: "I am told there are court decisions, but not directly on point."

Schlickman: "Well, I 'm speaking directly on the point and Dave, if he goes to Smith heard alone, we'll see only Attorney General opinions and no court decision. Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, now that I have raised a parliamentary inquiry, I rise on a point of privilege. And the point of privilege..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Schlickman: "Is this, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I resent very very much the Chief Executive Officer of this state breaching or violating that basic principle of government which involves the separation of branches. And I resent very much his assuming and being so presumptuous in doing it, assuming the role as Chief Legislator as well as Chief Executive. Thank you very much."

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

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to bear out the argument of the last Gentleman, let me point out that the Governor in his Proclamation wherein he asks us to consider House Bill 2796, says exactly in the Proclamation what House Bill 2796 does, namely the



elimination of one cent of the tax on food and drugs. Now I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that this Proclamation is limited to House Bill 2796 as 2796 was introduced and that the Proclamation leaves no room whatever for any Amendment. And I submit to you that we would not, under this Proclamation, be acting within it if we did amend the Bill to do something other than what the Proclamation says. Mr. Speaker, this is limited. The Governor is legislating. He has given us a specific Bill and has mandated in the Proclamation that we may not amend it and I, therefore think that he cannot do that. This is a violation of the separation of powers and I think that this Session should be adjourned right now."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative... Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I move we adjourn sine die."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Representative Kane."

Kane: "Pursuant to House Rule 67 and 71 and Rule 21 of Robert's Rules of Order newly revised, I move that the Third Special Session of the Eighty-first General Assembly be now adjourned sine die. If you would..."

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

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, I believe if you would recognize that motion, I believe it's a debatable motion and I would ask to be heard on that motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane, it is a debatable motion."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we don't need a Special Session at this time to consider sales tax relief for the people in the State of Illinois. We are not faced with an emergency. The only emergency that we have before us is a political emergency that was created by the Governor himself by his own veto of the Bill. In the Constitutional Convention the debates of the Constitutional Convention.. let me quote to you a couple of sentences; says, 'Although the General Assembly is a continuous Body under the proposed Section 5-A, which we





have just discussed as we've already noted, it would not necessarily be in continuous Session if it did not so desire. Thus, the Committee believes that a need exists to provide for a Special Sessions when there is a recess or an adjournment.' We are not now in recess and again another sentence; 'True emergencies should be the only reason for Special Sessions.' We already have a sales tax relief Bill in Regular Session. We have the one that the Governor vetoed. We also have the one that has been introduced by Representative Madigan and Representative Ryan. But what the Governor has done by calling a Special Session and limiting it only to one Bill, he has hamstrung the General Assembly. And this is not the first time that the Governor has done this. This is the third time. And the Governor is making a habit of calling a Special Session, not on a subject, but on a particular Bill and by limiting us to only one Bill the effect of that is to give absolute control of the General Assembly to the Governor. We can't adopt Amendments that he doesn't like because he has specified a Bill with specified Sponsors and those Sponsors can table the Bill or refuse to call it if Amendments are put on it they do not like. And so what we're left with the position of doing what the Governor wants, or doing nothing at all. And that was the position that we were placed in last month when he called a Special Session on the transportation package. He's doing it again on this particular Bill to give tax relief to the people of the State. A second effect of calling a Special Session and limiting it to one Bill is to provide a by-pass to House rules for only that one Bill and for only those preferred Sponsors because our House rules specify that Bills introduced after a particular deadline have to go to Rules Committee and that rule is not suspendable except for Special Sessions. And so the Governor can by-pass



our rules but none of us can. Our Constitution gives the Governor the role of Chief Executive, not that of super Legislator. If he doesn't like what we do he can veto it. He should not be able to control what we do at the beginning of what we do. If we are going to be a General Assembly that's going to maintain our own integrity, if we're going to maintain the separation of powers and the interests and integrity of the General Assembly, the only way that we can do that is to tell him that he cannot call Special Session and limit it to one Bill. He must allow other Members of the General Assembly, all Members of the General Assembly to introduce Bills on that.. on that particular subject. And the only way for us to do that and to give him that message is to adjourn at this time sine die, the Special Session."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson.. Pardon me."

Kane: "If this motion passes, the Bill will not be killed. The Bill is a general Session Bill. It is presently on the Speaker's desk. If the Special Session is adjourned sine die that Bill will still be in the House, it will still be on the Speaker's table. And I would urge the adoption of this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think Representative Schlickman and Kane have raised valid points. I think if you consider the structure of the Constitution it's.. it's our duty if we are going to be a co-equal branch of government to preserve the separation of powers concept. Now I believe there's another way to do it besides adjourning the Special Session. I believe that the Speaker has the authority to rule that the call for Special Session, that power in the Constitution, cannot be used to defeat the separation of powers contained in the Constitution. That specific power has to be subordinated to the general power of the Legislature. And I would urge



that the Speaker simply rule the Amendments are germane and that Amendments can be considered to the Bill and consider the subject of tax relief in general. I think the Speaker has that power and should do it in this case."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to address the Constitutional issues because I think they've been abnormally spelled out already, but I think that the reason that we ought to adjourn sine die is because we were insulted by the Governor with his call for the Special Session. He had a Bill on his desk and he could have used an amendatory veto. He could have done any number of things during the Regular Session before that Bill got to his desk to put it into a shape that he would have found... that met his requirements for his signature. He did not do any of those things. He completely disregarded the Legislature and its initiatives and I think that we have been insulted by this call for the Special Session and I think we should adjourn sine die and work within the framework of the Regular Legislative Session."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I believe that the previous Speaker, Representative Matijevich, has already ruled that this Bill can be amended in the Special Session. I am the Sponsor of House Bill 2796 and what I propose at this time is that the Bill currently being assigned to the Committee on assignment, be assigned to the Revenue Committee and that the Revenue Committee schedule a hearing on this Bill for Tuesday, October 30th, at 11:00 a.m. in the morning. I've already discussed this with Representative Pierce and he has agreed that once the Bill is assigned to the Revenue Committee that he will post the hearing on the Bill at that time. Also, Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a point of order. The Constitution provides that this Body cannot adjourn for more than 3 days unless there is



a Joint Resolution with the Senate. It's my understanding that that Resolution has not yet been adopted and therefore the Gentleman's motion to adjourn sine die is out of order."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the House rules specifically allow. I believe the rule that Representative Madigan is referring to is House Rule 67 which is the rule on adjournment and that covers only adjournments and adjournments for more than 3 days. Rule 71 of our House rules specify that Robert's Rules newly revised are applicable in all cases where they are not inconsistent with our present House rules. In Robert's Rule 21 page 203 of the newly revised version it made. It makes a clear distinction between a motion to adjourn a motion to adjourn sine die. The motion that Representative Madigan is referring to would be a motion to adjourn for more than 3 days. That is not a debatable motion. It cannot be amended and it is not subject to subsidiary motion. However, Robert's Rules on page 207 clearly makes a distinction that a motion to adjourn sine die is a main motion, that it is a debatable motion, that it's subject to subsidiary motions, and that it would be adopted by a Majority vote of those voting. I would say that on the basis of Rule 67 of the House, Rule 71 of the House and Rule 21 of Robert's that the point of order raised by the Majority Leader is not germane."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of the motion to adjourn this Special Session sine die for the following reason. I rise because I took an oath of office to support the Constitution of the State of Illinois like every Member sitting here did and I rise as a Republican Member, not because I'm opposed to the present Governor at all. I am opposed to this



Proclamation and I would be opposed to this Proclamation no matter whose signature was affixed to it, whether it was Otto Kerner or Jim Thompson or Dan Walker, or whoever did it, because it's wrong. It's a perversion of the Constitution and I would like to make this point and I wish the Gentlemen would stop snapping their fingers and let me express the free speech that I normally accord to them."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes, for what purpose do you arise?"

Barnes: "On a point of order. I believe that the previous Speaker, the previous before the last two had raised a point of order that the Chair did not address itself to. And I was wondering whether or not the Chair intended to address that point of order before we get into additional debate on the original motion that was offered."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I asked for other discussion on the point of order."

Barnes: "I don't believe that this Gentleman is discussing the point of order. He's discussing the original motion. And I would ask the Chair whether or not it intends to direct a Chair's ruling toward the point of order..."

Speaker Redmond: "But I'm letting the Members have their contribution towards the matter."

Barnes: "Well, I believe, Mr. Speaker, they are addressing themselves to the original motion and that was a point of order that interceded between the original motion and the matter in which the Gentleman is addressing himself to. I'm asking the Chair whether or not it.. if the Chair will address itself to the point of order that was raised ..."

Speaker Redmond: "I will when the..."

Barnes: "Relative to the main question."

Speaker Redmond: "I will when the discussion is completed."

Barnes: "Of the main question, or the point of order? That's



I'm asking you."

Speaker Redmond: "On the point of order. I'm getting guidance from the Membership here."

Barnes: "On the point of order?"

Speaker Redmond: "That's right. Continue, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Yes. The Proclamation that I'm holding in my hand, as I was saying, is a perversion of the Illinois Constitution. You could call it something that ignores the Constitution. You could also say that it's an abuse of the Illinois Constitution. The Illinois Constitution says that the Governor may call a Special Session by a Proclamation stating the purpose. On the same Constitution you'll go down in Section 8 and you'll see a Section relating to passage of Bills. The people who wrote the Constitution and the people who ratified this Constitution knew the difference between a Bill and a purpose. A Bill is something that's numbered HB something or other and a purpose is a general generic term describing a subject matter and this Proclamation is a nullity because it does not conform to the Constitutional endowment of powers to the Governor. He has.. he has exercised something that he doesn't have. He does not have the power to issue a Proclamation stating a Bill. He has a power to call a Special Session with a Proclamation describing a purpose. Now, the reason that the Constitution did not give him this power after we've completed Sessions to write Bills and call Sessions for Bills is because the Constitution contemplates that we are elected by the people to deal with subjects and with purposes and in our Spring Session, we dealt with a purpose and that was tax relief and an Amendment to the sales tax. We have legislated and we sent it to the Governor and he had a Constitutional choice earlier in the year. He has the same choice any other Governor would have and I hope that this will not be construed as a personal criticism of the present incumbent



Governor. But he had a choice to veto this Bill, to amend it, or to sign it. He chose not to sign it. He chose not to amend it. He chose to veto it and now what he is doing is try to correct a mistake that he made earlier in the game. Now I'm sorry that he made a mistake, and I'd like someday, if there was a Constitutional way to accommodate his desires, but there is no Constitutional way and the Proclamation we have is a nullity and I think, relating to the point of order, that the motion of Representative Kane to adjourn this sine die is about the only procedural way we have to deal with the fact that we have been called here in this Session for nothing and in an unConstitutional manner. I want to emphasize for Members on this side of the aisle that I hope all of us who have respect for the Governor, as we have respect for the Speaker, as we have respect for the Majority Leader and the Minority Leader, that this vote to adjourn this Session sine die is no reflection of a hostility in any of our hearts toward big Jim Thompson, the Governor, whoever might be down on the second floor. This vote to adjourn sine die is simply our only way of saying that this is wrong, that it's unConstitutional, that it's a nullity and that it ought to be thrown in the trash can and besides being wrong, it's unnecessary because this Bill is already introduced and has been pointed out and referred to in the remarks of the Majority Leader. All we have to do is suspend the rules, send it to the Rules Committee tomorrow like we've done with all these other Bills on usury rates and everything else and consider it. We don't need the Special Session. It's unnecessary. It's wrong. It's unConstitutional. Let's get on with it. Let's adopt Representative Kane's motion and let's not do any further abuse or perversion to the Constitution of the State of Illinois that we all swore that we would uphold when we were in this office. Thank you."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to speak both on the point of order and as you have allowed the latitude for us to discuss the motion also. First on the point of order, Mr. Speaker, as Representative Kane has said that the rules are those that limit us as to adjourning more than 3 days.. a motion to adjourn sine die is a finality. We will not come back in 3 days. So, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think the motion to adjourn sine die is in order because it is at finality and there.. there is the expression and the intent by the.. the Robert's Rules that the House expresses itself to have this Body conclude. Now, as to whether that is right and proper... I think that what the Governor has done is a debasement of the legislative process and I don't think .. I think we want to do this respectful of Governor Thompson, but I think those of you who know me know that every single time I have defended the legislative process and today I was going through quite rapidly the news clip service that we have and I read one of the articles by Chad Brooks that is titled; 'Governor now a Lawmaker.' And I think that he had reference mostly to the matter of the amendatory veto process. However, if there is a real prostitution, if you will, of the legislative process, it is what has been happening with the so-called Special Sessions. And I don't want to just limit my criticism to Governor Thompson. I recall in the past where other Governors have done that. We had that one silly Session where we were recessing one Special Session and going to another and at the same time that we have a Regular Session. I mean, can't we do our own work? This issue really is whether we are Legislators or if we are going to be at the will of the Executive in the legislative process. Now I think, as you remember, my ruling when I was at





the podium I think was fair that this Bill could be amended. However, I also said that it is my opinion that it is totally improper what the Governor has done because we are in a Regular Session. Then on top of that, being in the Regular Session where we don't need to have a call for a Special Session, then to say that we are limited to House Bill 2796. How ridiculous. Even if we have the amends... the process of amending, I still think it's ridiculous because if we are going to try to legislate on a particular subject matter I think that we ought to be able to have other matters considered, rather than just House Bill 2796. So what really is at stake here, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House? And I think that we finally have to come to it because without the Special Session we can still do what has to be done or whatever those .. some people say has to be done. That's a matter of question, too. But we finally have to decide that issue as Legislators. Do we finally want to have to come to an end these silly Special Sessions calls when they're not needed? And also the silly Special Session calls that limit us.. do we want to put handcuffs on all of us as Legislators? And I say that the best way we can tell, and I hate to make it as to refer.. Governor Jom Thompson, because my remarks go beyond him to the Governors that follow him. The best way we can do it now to express our will is say that we believe in the legislative process. We are the legislative ... we are the Legislature and the Governor has now become a lawmaker, is to support Representative Kane in his motion to adjourn sine die. And I so do support him."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of parliamentary inquiry. I would ask the Chair to rule that if we were to adjourn sine die, and thereafter the Senate refused to adjourn sine die and that thereafter they certified that there was



disagreement existing between the two Houses, would the Governor pursuant to Article IX, Section 15-B be able to call us back into Special Session?"

Speaker Redmond: "Parliamentarian says that 15-B is proroguing. Is that your answer?"

Getty: "That ...that provision states, 'If either House certifies that a disagreement exists between the Houses as to the time for adjourning a Session, the Governor may adjourn the General Assembly to a time not later than the first day of the next annual Session.' And I would ask if the Chair would rule that that would mean that the Governor could then declare us adjourned to, for example, the following day."

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, if there's a disagreement."

Getty: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything else? Representative Totten."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, that's a complicated question and I wonder if while the Parliamentarian is looking that up if we could go to my Constitutional Amendment HJRC 13."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "According to the record, House Bill 2796 was introduced on October 3rd. Now we were not in Special Session on October 3rd. Obviously it was introduced in a Regular Session at that time. As I understand it, that is the proposal that is supported by the Governor. The Proclamation for a Special call was not issued by the Governor until October 9th. It would therefore appear that not only was the Governor's call improper, it served no purpose, whatsoever since that legislative item was already filed for consideration before the Legislature. The only possible reason that I could see for the Governor for calling a Special Session in abuse of his authority was for the purpose of granting media attention with regard to the Special call. Not only is it without foundation in the Constitution, it appears to be highly questionable and I



would support Representative Kane's motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone else? Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry to make.

On the copy of the Bill we're speaking of it does not show as having been introduced into this Special Session. Special Session #3, House Bill #1. We've been discussing ... Bill with four numerals. I'm making an inquiry, if we are actually discussing a Bill that has been introduced into this General Session, or are we, in reality, discussing a Bill that is a part of the Regular Session? And if so, does the Majority Leader, Mr. Madigan, intend to introduce a new piece of legislation that we would discuss in terms of the Governor's Proclamation?"

Speaker Redmond: "I think the Proclamation concerns a Bill that was introduced in the Regular.. the Veto.. or the Veto Session. I think, in fact I know that, I think that we have in the past... It seems to me that the Governor called us back to consider a Bill that was in another Session.. if my memory.."

Schraeder: "Would it have to be as a new introduction of a Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't think so. No, Attorney General's opinion on that. Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I.. if I understand what you said that has been done in the past, nobody has objected to it and I would now object to it and I would raise this question of the Chair. Is the Proclamation of the Governor, or the call of the Governor, for the Third Special Session in proper order and in conformance with the Constitution of the State of Illinois, namely Article IV, of the Illinois Constitution?"

Speaker Redmond: "I think that it is and I think that we have so held before and I think that the Attorney General has so indicated. I tell you what the problem that is presented to the Chair at the moment and that's that I, frankly,



believe that the Governor needed to should have called a Special Session because if you read the proceedings of the Constitutional Convention and if you read the Constitution itself with respect to the meetings of the General Assembly, I think it is rather crystal clear that the Governor or the two Legislative Leaders can call a Special Session when the Session is in recess and we're not in Session, although by definition we are a continuous Body and in continuing Session... to get us back he could call a Special Session. Or if you called a Special Session limited to one subject matter and he decided to expand that subject matter and he wanted to have a Special Session running concurrently with the expanded subject matter or purpose of the Special Session... So, in my judgement, the Special.. the call for the Special Session was really unnecessary and I think that is .. there isn't anything that I've been able to find out how we attached.. or how we addressed ourselves to the question of an improper call of a Special Session. Now the further con.. the further confusion here is the fact that the Bill that is under consideration was introduced in the Veto Session, was in the Rules Committee. There was a hearing before the Rules Committee. I don't .. I wasn't there and I don't recall whether an effort was made to have it determined exempt, but it is still in the Rules Committee and it's in the same posture as other.. other Bills that have been under consideration in the Rules Committee. So, I quite frankly don't know whether sine die is more than three days. I know it's without day.. I don't know whether that means more than 3 days quite frankly. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I'm not sure if this is a point of order or an inquiry, Mr. Speaker. And I happen to agree with everything you've said. Let's have this hypothetical. We have



been brought here by Proclamation to consider 2796. When do we go home? When do we go home? Well, it doesn't say when you pass it, when you consider it. You know, what is consideration? In other words, really how can you consider a Bill in a Special Session if that Bill really isn't in that Special Session? You know, in other words, what I'm saying is how do you know as a Special Session when to go home? When do you really adjourn? I mean, we really don't know when to adjourn by that call of the Governor. Except by adjourning right now as Doug Kane has said. I mean think about that. I see Dave Epstein there gleefully laughing. But really that poses a real problem. When do you adjourn? If you really want to go forward with what the Governor has done by this Proclamation... I mean that's a very interesting point of order, inquiry or what."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Meyers will tell you when to go home. "

Meyer: "Mr. Speaker, I won't tell you to go home, but I don't think it's proper for you to rule on your speculation."

Speaker Redmond: "Well that's... Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker, would a motion to recess subject to the call of the Chair solve the problem?"

Speaker Redmond: "No. There's no solution to the problem. Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, I assume that we are on the .. Representative Kane's motion. Correct?"

Speaker Redmond: "We're on Representative Madigan's point of order."

Stuffle: "I would move the previous question, then on that point of order."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the .. well he's telling me to rule I guess is what he's telling me to do. Well, in as much, I'm probably wrong on this, but in as much as the Bill that we're talking about is already



in the Veto Session and it's in the Rules Committee, and there's a way to have a hearing and a way to have it referred to the Revenue Committee, it would seem to me that the Gentleman's motion is well taken and I will put the question as to whether or not the House will adjourn sine die. Now Representative.. On that there will be a Roll Call. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I thought, Mr. Speaker, you were asked to rule on whether or not if we consider this Bill in the Special Session it could be amended and I don't recall having you're ruled that. I think that might influence them both."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevecich was in the Chair at that time and I understand that he did so rule. Now the question is on Representative Kane's motion to adjourn sine die. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. After you assumed the Chair and before, I believe, before Representative Kane asked to adjourn, he had spoken before but I beldeve he asked to adjourn after I spoke. I asked you to rule on the question as to whether the ability to use the call for the Special Session as a way of ruling that Amendments were not possible or germane, that that was subordinate to the theory of two co-equal branches and separation of powers. Would you rule on that question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevecich. "

Matijevecich: "Point of order. Representative Kane clearly cited the rules and afterwards.. afterwards, when it was deemed to be debatable, that's when he spoke on the issue. Mr. Speaker, his point is completely out of order."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I am putting the question on the motion to adjourn sine die. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Griesheimer, to explain his vote."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, just a parliamentary inquiry. How



many votes does it require?"

Speaker Redmond: "Simple Majority. Representative Braun."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my motion.. my vote on this motion, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the biggest challenge to Democracy does not come from the Communists or from the PLO or from the Red Brigade, it starts right here. It starts right here in this Body in our decision on whether or not we will abdicate to the Executive the legislative prerogative intrusted in us by the Constitution and by the voters who sent us here to this office. It does not mean Democracy... the separation of powers does not mean giving up the responsibility to legislate to Executive fiat. It seems to me that this Proclamation limiting the deliberations of this Body to House Bill 2796 does represent Executive legislating and that we should reject that attempt and I therefore vote 'yes' on this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative MaPike. McPike."

McPike: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there are other questions here besides whether or not we're looking at co-equal branches, and that is whether or not the Legislature is equal to the Executive branch. I think we ought to look at ourselves as individuals and answer both to the people that elected us and determine whether or not we are co-equal Legislators. When a Special Session is called and it is limited to one Bill with one Sponsor then suddenly we are no longer co-equal Legislators. The people that elected me do not have the same voting power as the people that elected the individual who is sponsoring that Bill. They are in effect, disenfranchised. No one is up here representing them. No one from my district has a chance to introduce a Bill. No one from any district on this House floor has a chance to introduce a Bill with one exception and that is the exception that the Governor choses. Now if you decide to



give the Governor the power to take away your rights as a Legislator then I think that you are disappointing yourselves and the people that voted for you. We are here to represent those people that put us here and we cannot do so if we allow the Governor to take away our powers."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Just a point of order, an inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. Did I understand the rules to include that there would be no T.V. recording during explanation of votes ..."

Speaker Redmond: "Their light is out. Sir."

Yourell: "Well, they're still recording up there."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, shame on them. Representative Huff."

Huff: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise on a point of inquiry, Mr. Speaker. I want to know if this is the nickle defense to the 2¢ solution."

Speaker Redmond: "Is this what?"

Huff: "I want to know how this maneuver if it prevails, and I think it might, how would it be categorized? Might it be categorized as the nickle defense for the 2¢ solution?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't understand. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of governmental branch privilege. I do not think it is fair, whether it's Constitutional or not, for any Governor or indeed, I believe the precedent was started by legislative Leaders, Speaker Blair and President Harris, to limit any Special Session to specific Bills. I resent that very deeply as a Member of the Legislative Branch. I think this has nothing whatsoever to do with impuning the integrity of the Sponsors of the Bill in question. It just isn't right that we should only be allowed to act on one Bill. If the Governor wants to say.. wants to call us into Session to consider sales tax relief, God bless him. I'd be happy to consider that issue, but unless we want to next vote for a Constitutional Amendment to abolish the





Legislative Branch, there must be some change in this call of Special Sessions and I think this is the best way to deliver the message."

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

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I listened to the debate probably the most outstanding debate on the Proclamation call ... authority.. Constitutional authority of the Governor and the state that this Body has ever experienced. But I'm a little confused when I see all the red votes up there and I see how the floor is being worked by the Majority Leaders and then I looked at the Bill, 2796, to find out that it's Representative Madigan's Bill, the penny Bill, the one that he wants for the sales tax and then I'm no longer confused because now we see the Governor of the State of Illinois calling a Special Session for a Democrats Bill when your party killed the real sales tax relief yesterday and now we know what the issue is. And I'm going to do what some of you did yesterday and I'm not going to vote on it. And I'm going to let you decide!"

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

Borchers: "The only thing I have to say about this is very simple. The red lights and the green lights show those who are willing to defend the rights of this Legislature, which is our duty to do. The red lights show either one of two things, either just complete gutlessness, for one, or sheer politics for the other. So why don't you, for once in your lives, get off your duff and vote as you should, what is right for the people and who you represent because, sure as hell, you're not."

Speaker Redmond: "Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 62 'aye' and 95 'no' and the motion fails. Now that we've decided that you might be interested to know



that I was with a lot of other people in the Governor's Office today and he was commenting on Special Sessions and he indicated that the purpose of it was for the drama of that and that's the exact words that the Governor used so... it isn't because it was legally necessary or Constitutional necessarily, but it does afford far more drama. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the Special Session be adjourned to.."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute. What have we done with the Bill? Have we .. where is it now?"

Madigan: "The Bill is currently assigned to the Committee on assignment."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. You move the.."

Madigan: "And it's been announced, Mr. Speaker, that it's expected that the Bill will be assigned to the Revenue Committee and that a hearing will be established for the next Tuesday, October 30th, 11:00 a.m. in the morning."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Yeah, parliamentary inquiry... when was that Bill assigned to that Committee? It didn't come out of the Third Special Session. It came out of the Regular Session then, is that correct?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Veto Session. It's in the Committee on assignment is where it is. And they can make the assignment to the Revenue Committee."

Williams: "Doesn't that action have to be taken in the Third Special Session?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I think according to the practice, and I don't happen to like it, I think it's a pretty bad practice, but I think we have done this before and I think that... Representative Madigan..."

Madigan: "I think the answer to the Gentleman's question is that the Bill will by operation of rule is referred automatically to the Committee on Assignments."



Speaker Redmond: "We adopted the rules of the Second Special Session so according to the rules we have, Representative Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to raise the point again if not... if I'm wrong, I'll be glad to admit it. I've been in a Minority many times, so I'm not uncomfortable being there. But I don't like something to be done without at least having some indication of what's being done. Am I correct that Representative Madigan introduced a Bill in the Regular Session, had it assigned to Committee on assignment and now he is using that Bill as a Bill of the Third Special Session, leaving it in the assignment of assignment Bills Committee and that's going to be the vehicle? Mr. Chairman, I think that is completely unconstitutional and I would like that to show on the record. Now, would you answer my question? Can he legally do that, even if it's been done in the past?"

Speaker Redmond: "I believe the procedure is proper. Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "I was just looking at the Calendar. I don't know if there's any reason to explain it, but on the Calendar for the Third Special Session it says the next House Bill # is #1. Now if I want to introduce a... the next Bill for the Special Session after while, can I introduce House Bill #1 in the Special Session? "

Speaker Redmond: "It would be #1. We've got a new Arabic system of counting."

Brummer: "Am I free to introduce House Bill #1 in the next five or ten minutes or 30 minutes or however long we're in Session?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well the problem is whether it's within the call. That's the real problem. See, it could only be within the call. That's alright. Now, you know the Pirates are going to win the fourth game. Representative Kane."



Kane: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that I heard the Majority Leader right. He said that the Bill was now in Special Session, it had been assigned to the Committee on assignment of Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "Pursuant to the rules that I guess were adopted when Representative Matijevich was on the podium."

Kane: "Now then, he also said something about it being assigned to Revenue Committee and setting a Revenue Committee hearing."

Speaker Redmond: "I think he said that he talked to Representative Pierce and Representative Pierce indicated that he would try to accommodate him and have a hearing on it on whatever that date was."

Kane: "But before that can happen the Committee on assignment of Bills must meet.."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, that's correct.."

Kane: "And must assign the Bill to Revenue..."

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct..."

Kane: "And then the Chairman of Revenue must set the hearing date. Is that correct?"

Speaker Redmond: "That's correct."

Kane: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything else? Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Along with that, Mr. Speaker, if we're not here, wouldn't they have to waive the posting rule.. the posting rule is 6½ days or 5½ days and if we're gone next Saturday.."

Speaker Redmond: "My Irish Grandmother said, 'Never bid the Devil good morning till you meet him.' You've got a lot of iffy things in here."

Van Duyne: "Yeah, but they're assuming..."

Speaker Redmond: "Let's let the Committee on assignments do their job. Let's assume that the very competent Chairman of Revenue knows what his job is and that things will be done in the Constitutional way. Well, he's a Harvard, so he does things right. Where are we now? Representative



Madigan, have you moved to adjourn this Special Session?"

Madigan: "Yes, I did, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. On that question, those in favor say 'aye'.. 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. What time was it, Representative Madigan?"

Madigan: "10:15 tomorrow morning."

Speaker Redmond: "10:15 tomorrow. Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Inquiry, when does the Democratic task force meet? Tonight after adjournment, Mike Madigan's Office."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll meet in the Governor's Office tomorrow morning: Special ... We're back in Regular Session now. Don't go home. What time is the Rules Committee, Jack? 9:30. Rules Committee 9:30 tomorrow morning. What do you got Jack? I just thought I'd call your attention to the fact that we have a mighty long day tomorrow. There's many Members whose measures have not yet been reached, so I would urge you to be here promptly at 10:00 o'clock and be prepared to work a long time. I think in fairness to the Members that have a motion we should make every effort. But I'm going to start, and don't cry if the attendance is not sufficient to be considered. Blame your colleagues. Don't blame the Speaker. Representative Madigan for adjournment of the two minutes perfunctory."

Madigan: "Are there any announcements, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't think so. Any announcements? Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, Human Resources Committee is having a recessed meeting in room 311 at the State House Inn."

Speaker Redmond: "Any other announcement?"

Madigan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, did you wish to announce a meeting at your think tank?"

Speaker Redmond: "A meeting of what? "

Madigan: "Of your think tank.."

Speaker Redmond: "I think we ought to have Representative Kane



go to a think tank. And take me with him. Anything else?"

Madigan: "Mr. Skinner doesn't have anything to do right now.

He went up to leave."

Speaker Redmond: "Let him go to the Human Resources ."

Madigan: "He likes your company."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan has moved that the Regular Session adjourn after 2 minutes prefatory until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries..... now stands adjourned."

Clerk O'Brien: "Introduction and First Reading of Bills... House Bill 2821, Winchester, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill.. Committee reports; Representative E.M. Barnes, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations II to which the following Bills were referred, action taken October 17th, 1979. Record the same back with following recommendations; 'Do pass' House Bills 2790 and 2794. 'Do pass as amended House Bills 2789 and 2798. No further business. The House now stands adjourned."



1.

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave for Postponed Consideration. Hearing no objections, Postponed Consideration. On the Calendar under Total Vetoes appears a motion to override the Governor's veto with respect to House Bill 430. The Gentleman...on the motion, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 430 is the... strictly a safety Bill. It's a Bill that will provide inspections and regulations of carnivals and amusement rides and equipment. This is to provide safety for the public. In the House, previously, we received 126 votes to 10, in the Senate it went over with 48 votes to 4 and 1. It's a Bill that the Governor vetoed and I ask you to override the Governor's veto. He states in his statement that it does not provide for inspection staffs that's large enough. I discussed this Bill with many amusement people and they feel it's time that we should have some type of regulations in the State of Illinois. In regard to the State of Illinois, there is no regulations to regulate these amusement parks and I ask you for a favorable vote. And before I turn it over I'll call on my Co-Sponsor, Mr. Johnson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill passed out of the House in the Spring by an overwhelming margin and likewise out of the Senate by an overwhelming margin. This Bill is the result of five years study by Representative Kornowicz and two and a half years study by myself and Members of the Republican staff, to come out with a workable Bill. It's a bit confusing to me as to the stated reasons of the Governor for opposition to it. He indicates on the one hand that there isn't sufficient staff provided under the Bill to assure safety of carnival rides and at the same time that there's going to be some sort of bureaucracy created by it. It seems to me to be a fairly mutually inconsistent position. The number of accidents in connection with amusement



park rides, and particularly the transient carnival rides, has really been shocking. Four young children were nearly killed in the 'Sunnycrest' Shopping Center in Urbana about a year and a half ago, someone electrocuted in Kane County about a year and a half or two years ago, two people killed in the St. Louis area, two or three other areas in various shopping center carnival rides...serious injuries result and so forth. The list can go on and on. The fiscal impact of this Bill will be zero after we get going on it because the inspections and licensing fees, which are spread equitably among the carnival rides and operators will pay for the inspection process. The inspection process is fair. We provide for 33 percent of the board, namely one out of three, to be manned or womaned by a...by a representative of the amusement park business. Also one from the Department of Labor and also one who is a registered professional engineer. This Bill directs itself to the most problem, one of the most serious problems we have with respect to life safety in Illinois. And that is that young children, people under the age of 12, are least able, in fact not able at all, to assume the risk of rides that in many cases are very unsafe, go at extremely high rates of speed and really provide for very definite threat to the life, health and safety of children in Illinois. All you have to do is use your own experiences in life and go out to your local shopping center, or the local county fair in some cases, depending upon the people there, to see the terrifically dangerous condition that these rides are in. This isn't going to create a bureaucracy. The Department of Labor didn't and to my knowledge doesn't oppose the Bill. I've had communications from the reputable carnival and amusement park people who support this concept. There's one other very important thing, let's say your five or six year old child or even an adult goes out to a carnival or an amusement park and is injured. So what if you get a judgement for 100,000 dollars or a judgement for a half a million





3.

dollars or a judgement for 5,000 dollars for personal injury or death or serious bodily harm, you have a penniless defendant. This requires that you have some standards for insurability, that you have some insurance set up before the gypsy operations can come into your local shopping centers and provide for rides that are dangerous, that are going to injure people, and have no...no pool of money to be able to provide compensation for people who are seriously injured. I don't know what the basis for opposition by the Governor is to this Bill. I don't know what the basis, in fact there was almost no opposition when this Bill came before the House before. If you think that it's unnecessary you're going to create a bureaucracy when people are electrocuted, when four children are nearly killed in an accident downstate, when people are threatened with a very serious dangerous type of activity and with no protections at all. They regulate horseshoers, they regulate every conceivable type of thing and in my opinion unnecessarily regulate them, but one of the most dangerous activities known to people in Illinois and around the country is totally unregulated. We have no federal law, we have no state law, and outside the City of Chicago we have no local law. This Bill is modeled on the Michigan and the Iowa and the Ohio Statutes. It's come up with a very reasonable, middle ground approach to the problem and I think it's something that ought to be supported by every Member of this House. I think as soon as we have discussions and questions Representative Schneider is going to close."

Schneider: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Morgan, Mr. Reilly."

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

Reluctantly, I arise to oppose the motion of my friend, Representative Kornowicz, to override the Governor's veto. Frankly, I think the Governor, in his Veto Message, was not his own best advocate. The problems with this Bill are not, I think, well stated in that. The Bill, as it came into the House, as originally introduced, I think was probably a pretty



good Bill and it was indeed modeled on the Michigan Statutes. But a couple of things happened along the way that make me think that the Governor's phrase that the Bill would create the impression that we are regulating and meaningfully controlling the hazards in this industry without the reality of that, make me think that that's a valid charge. First of all, the board that deals with this and that regulates...that oversees the regulation is just a 3 member board. First of all, the Director. Second of all, an operator. That is someone who must be a member of the industry being regulated. And third of all, an engineer, who may be and probably in all probability would be someone who worked in that industry. Now, you know, I have reason that those kind of people shouldn't be represented on the regulating board, but surely, if we're really going to give the public any kind of protection at all, if we're going to make sure that somebody really cares about the public interest, there surely ought to be a larger board with the members who have no vested interest in the regulated industries and people who's only concern is safety in that industry and not the profitability in that industry. It seems to me, that's a major weakness and frankly I tried to talk the Governor into an Amendatory Veto of this Bill, which I could have supported, but I failed in that...that effort. Second of all, in a more...somewhat more minor point, the Bill requires as amended that all the inspectors be graduate engineers. Now that's just a...the Governor makes the point that the staff that would be provided within the Bill simply isn't large enough to do the job that's needed. This makes it even worse. We're going to have to have graduate engineers for a lot of inspecting jobs that wouldn't require that. I...I guess the point I'm trying to make, and I think the Governor did not make very well in his Amendatory Veto, if we're going to regulate the carnival industry, and I agree that we should and must, then let's really do it. Let's not create a cardboard image of regulation. Let's not let the public think that we're regulating them when in fact we're not. Let's not satisfy the public's demand, pretend to satisfy the



public's demand for regulation when we don't give it. I think the Governor's Veto should be sustained."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Adams, Mrs. Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could I ask a question of the Sponsor?"

What will be the state's liability if we have the regulatory board and there is an accident?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Kornowicz, please."

Kornowicz: "Yeah, it provides insurance. It's 100,000 dollars for bodily injury to...or death of one person any accident, and also, 300,000 dollars for bodily injury and 500,000 dollars for injury or destruction of property."

Kent: "This is from...paid for by the state? It's an insurance policy of the state?"

Kornowicz: "It's by the operator."

Kent: "But what will be the liability of the state?"

Kornowicz: "There's no liability. The insurance...the insurance takes it. There's no liability."

Kent: "Oh, I think there might be."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've been listening to the discussion on House Bill 430 and the override of the veto. And I've heard some say that we should do nothing because this isn't the best Bill that we should have to regulate carnivals. This isn't the first time we have tried to pass this type of legislation. And I'm afraid if we do not override this veto we will have nothing. Even if it is not perfect, I think we must proceed on this very important issue. Some of you may have recalled the injury...the accidents that involved deaths at Six Flags in St. Louis. It was a week after that tragedy that I was at the Marriot's Great America in Gurnee. Any my wife and myself and my child were walking through the carnival, or the grounds, and one of those sky rides stopped and was motionless for about 20 minutes. Luckily, it wasn't a windy day and nothing did occur, as happened in Six Flags.



About an hour and a half later we were still there and one of those rides that...one of those fast ones and I can't remember the name of it were...again had stopped. And there were those people hanging up there and somebody walking up precariously to correct that situation. We have nowadays so many of the carnival type rides at the shopping centers all over the State of Illinois. Because of the heavy volume and the...so many shopping centers asking for those types of carnivals at...to try to bring business we find that some of them are not of the highest quality. So we had better now get into regulating it. If we do we ought to feel within ourselves some guilt of those injuries and of those deaths that might occur. I think we must do something now and I applaud and commend Representative Kornowicz for what he's attempting to do and by supporting him we should override the Governor on this veto."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Ewing: "In the Bill how frequently will these rides be inspected, if any?"

Kornowicz: "At least once a year."

Ewing: "At least. They don't have to be inspected each time they're put up?"

Kornowicz: "No."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "The Bill, Representative Ewing, authorizes the board to promulgate rules and regulations for the inspection of these rides. Our... our anticipation is, with respect to those that come in and out of shopping centers and so forth, that before they can be...they can receive a permit to operate they'll have to be inspected. So as to those, those that are...are in and out, we provide for a scheduled inspection to permit these in Section 7 of the Bill. And that protects against the gypsy operations that come in and...and do nothing except operate and hurt people. As far as the permanent places are concerned, those are again according to a schedule set up by the board's rules and regulations and



it would have to be done at least once a year. The real problem is not with the Great America's and Six Flags, by and large. The problem is those that come in and out of the shopping centers and sometimes the County Fairs who just have absolutely no concern for safety and no concern for children's lives."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, another question. What department is going to handle the inspection?"

Johnson: "The Department of Labor."

Ewing: "Any what type of qualifications do you expect an inspector of a complicated ride would have to have. Would he have to be an engineer?"

Johnson: "Well this Bill again authorizes the board to designate various inspecting agencies or inspectors, I would presume the people who would inspect rides would have some sort of...mechanical engineering background or at least some experience in having dealt with carnival and amusement park rides. I suppose the same question could be posed, you know, who do we designate to inspect boilers?...you know, people who know about boilers."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't question that the motives of the Sponsors of this legislation is the highest. There probably is a problem here. The number of deaths and the number of injuries which have been brought up here probably, if there's a percentage of those people who ride or take advantage of these amusement parks, it's probably much lower than walking on one of our streets today. There is no guarantee that we can protect all of our people from the cradle to the grave. I think that there are other ways that we can get around this. I think that we can make insurance requirements and should have insurance requirements for these types of itinerant amusement dealers that come into our state, come into our communities. I don't think this Bill is the proper form. I think the Governor's veto is very well placed and I think we should sustain his veto. We don't want to put a cruel hoax on mothers and fathers around this state by



tacking on a machine that has been inspected when in fact it can't be kept inspected properly under the terms of this legislation."

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

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, with respect for the sincerity of Representative Kornowicz, nonetheless, I would urge all of you to vote 'no' on this. I happen to have Great America in my district in Lake County and they have...many of the Members of this House have visited that fine park. They have about 38 rides. They have a big staff of engineers and people who inspect those rides daily. In fact, they go out with x-ray equipment to make x-ray tests of the parts of the various pieces of equipment that come under stress. We would, without deceiving the people of the State of Illinois, have to hire an army of engineers and inspectors to go out and adequately do what Great America and many other reputable ride operators are doing right now. As it is right now, when you buy a ticket to Great America part of that ticket price goes to pay their staff, which includes these engineers and these people who are inspecting those rides on a daily basis. This Bill, the philosophy of this Bill is well intentioned but instead of confining itself to licensing or requiring insurance it goes on to plunge into the deep water of total inspections. I want to, at this time, at the same time that I am expressing opposition to the Bill as it is and my hope that you will all vote against it, I do want to express, as a Representative from the county in which Great America is located, my desire to work conscientiously and closely with Representative Kornowicz in the spring, as the Governor suggested he would support too, a Bill that is workable and a Bill that is not excessively involved with bureaucracy and costs. Lastly I'd make the point that Cook County is one area under the homerule powers where if they wanted to regulate and do this...do it, they could do everything again in this Bill. And I don't know any



county or any municipality that doesn't have the authority to require a permit and to insist that even the fly-by-night carnivals that come in conform to local requirements, which can be as stiff as the locality would like to impose. I do think there is some need but this Bill goes too far and the statement, or at least the implication that reputable operators are for this Bill is absolutely false, at least with respect to Great America, with whom I have been in touch as late as this morning. We...they recognize the need for a Bill. They're willing to work cooperatively with the Sponsor, but this one would cost too much money, it would mislead the public and as I said earlier, we would almost have to hire an expensive army of engineers to do what Great America and other reputable operators are doing right now on their own initiative. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider, to close."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I don't know if Mr. Ewing, Reilly and Deuster ought to go into writing with the kinds of imagination that they have demonstrated in criticism of the Bill, however, I should point out and I think Representatives Johnson and Kornowicz have already done this prior to my speaking now...that the provisions in the Bill do allow for standards to be set by those individuals who are part of the board. We do not have...if Great America was concerned about the proposal earlier they certainly didn't talk to us after the Bill had been sitting in the House for two or three years. It's interesting that they would call this morning and acknowledge that they would like to have some kind of Bill but this isn't the Bill. But aside from that I think some of the items that we ought to be concerned about is, number one, that anybody that's been in this Legislature 6 months knows..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Schneider. Give the Gentleman some order."

Schneider: "Anybody that's been in this Legislature for 6 months knows that



we don't put kinds of restraints on bodies that are statutory. We allow some of the agencies hopefully to judge...make judgements and discretionary decisions based on the time that they are involved. Certainly Mr. Reilly knows the value of modification and compromise and the Bill, as in 1377. Certainly Mr. Ewing's going to be concerned about modifying the loan rates that are going to go on...before us, I'm sure, within the next couple of weeks regarding listing the ceiling. He wouldn't want a standard 12 percent in there in statutory language. I don't see why we all of a sudden are going to choose to play games with people's lives. If Mr. Reilly has a concern about the legislation, I think Johnson and Schneider and Kornowicz are willing to work with them. If Mr. Ewing wants to put in statutory language I'll talk to him about it and I still think it's a bad idea. But...and if Mr. Deuster thinks Great America is going to be negatively effected, I think we can work with them as well. What's at stake is that there are young people that ride those rides when they go into a situation that they're into that might be unsafe and they come out as a child who is maimed or injured and possibly a child who will not come out of an accident. I think we're willing to say in the State of Illinois that what we need now is proper restrictions on those kinds of operations that jeopardize the health, the welfare and our children. So I would suggest that on this vote, to the Members of the Assembly, this is indeed a beginning step. And I think we're always open to make alterations and changes in the proposal and it's this kind of beginning that I like say that the Illinois House had an impact on and I would ask that we give the required 107 votes to override the Governor's veto."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall House Bill 430 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kornowicz, to explain his vote."





Kornowicz: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. In regards to some of the quotes of the previous speakers, I discussed...I discussed with the people from Mid America, about an hour ago and the Mr. Deuster mentioned that he discussed this with them and that they're against this... An hour ago they told me they were very satisfied with the Bill as long as we can sit down in the Spring Session and see if we can get some Amendments to it. It's...it's a Bill, as mentioned previously, it's a starter. It's a Bill to get these...get these out of the State of Illinois. This is not on the...on the people like Mid America or other amusement parks. It's on the gypsies that come in for two or three days at the shopping centers. They have nothing in safety minded...they're not safety minded at all. So I ask you to support this Bill and... and override the Governor's veto."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster's name was mentioned in debate."

Deuster: "Well I...the name of the group in my district is not Mid America, it's Great America. And since my name was mentioned in debate, I just spoke a moment ago with Ron Johnson, who is the manager and...you know, it really shouldn't effect our votes one way or another but since the suggestion was made that they're for it I've got to say that they're absolutely against it. And they feel we can wait until the spring and we will work together and write a good Bill and write it the right way. And...and I'm going to request a verification on this in the event it does get 107 votes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What about if it gets 177." The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Well I looked at the Roll Call a few minutes ago with the other Sponsors of the Bill and compared it with the Roll Call now. I don't know what's changed between last spring and now other than the fact that we've had a couple or three more accidents in Illinois, two resulting in very serious injuries, in the operations that Representative Kornowicz is directing himself towards. People who operate these are people who are



from Florida and New Mexico and Oregon and everywhere else. They have no connection with Illinois, no concern about Illinois and no concern about anything other than coming into the shopping center for 3 days, doing whatever is necessary to make...turn over a quick dollar and then leaving and never seeing the area again. We've indicated to everyone that we're willing to work with Great America. I talked to their lobbyist just about 15 minutes ago, at the appropriate time to make sure that a very safe operation, which they are, is not unduly regulated. But we're directing ourselves to a problem that's a very serious problem and one that's going to come back to haunt you time and again and again. There's probably 50 Legislators in this room, on this House floor who've had injuries or accidents or deaths in their legislative districts. Two years from now there will be another 25 or 50. And when it hits so close to home, as it has in the 52nd District, it has in Kane County and other areas, then you realize what a sloppy operation they're running and the reason we need some meaningful and moderate regulation in this area. I urge a 'yes' vote."

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

The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 111 'aye', 39 'no', 8 recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster...wants a verification. Mr. Kornowicz, Schneider and Johnson want a poll of the absentees. I'm not going to call your Amendment. Poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. Collins. Davis. Garmisa.

Hudson. Margalus. McAuliffe. McBroom. Meyer. Mulcahey. Oblinger. Peters. Polk. Reed. Schlickman. Schuneman. Stearney. Telcser. Totten and Winchester."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The absentees have been polled. Does the Gentleman persist in his verification? Do you persist in your verification, Sir? The Clerk will proceed to verify the affirmative vote."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the affirmative."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Poll of the affirmative vote, please."



Clerk Leone: "Alexander. Anderson. Balanoff. E.M. Barnes. Jane Barnes. Beatty. Bell. Bianco. Birchler. Borchers. Boucek. Bower. Bowman. Bradley. Braun. Breslin. Bullock. Capparelli. Capuzi. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton. Currie. Darrow. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Dyer. Epton. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Gaines. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Hanahan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stearney, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Kindly record Mr. Stearney as 'aye'. He has leave to be verified. Mr. Stanley as 'aye'. He has leave to be verified. Please continue. That's 113."

Clerk Leone: "Hanahan. Hannig. Harris. Henry. Hoffman. Hoxsey. Huff. Jaffe. Johnson. Dave Jones. Emil..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mrs. Younge wants to have leave to be verified. Mrs. Younge. Leave is granted."

Clerk Leone: "Emil Jones. Kane. Keane. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Kucharski. Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leon. Macdonald. Madigan. Marovitz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Mr. Anderson requests leave to verified. Mr. Anderson...Mr. Deuster... Leave is granted. Marovitz... Leave to be verified. Mr. Marovitz. Okay."

Clerk Leone: "Matijevich. Matula. Mautino. McClain. McGrew. McMaster. McPike. Molloy. Mugalian. Murphy. O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Rea. Richmond. Ronan. Ropp. Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schneider. Schoeberlein. Schraeder. Sharp. Slape. Stanley. Stearney. Steczo. Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich. Tuerk. Van Duyn. Vinson. Vitek. VonBoeckman. White. Wikoff. Willer. Williams. Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Friedland. Kindly record Mr. Friedland as 'aye'. Mr. Tuerk. Kindly record Mr. Tuerk from 'aye' to 'no'. Mr. Woodyard. Kindly record him from 'no' to 'aye'. Woodyard is 'aye'. Anyone else?"



What's the count, Tony? We're starting off at 113 to 39.

Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Alexander."

Speaker Lechowicz: "She's here."

Deuster: "Anderson..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Anderson asked leave to be verified and it was granted."

Deuster: "Barnes, E.M."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Barnes is here."

Deuster: "Beatty."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who?"

Deuster: "Beatty...Beatty."

Speaker Lechowicz: "John Beatty?"

Deuster: "John Beatty."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Beatty. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Mr. Beatty? Remove him."

Deuster: "Boucek."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Boucek. Mr. Boucek. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Boucek. Remove him."

Deuster: "Bowman. Oh, there he is."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Bowman is here."

Deuster: "Bradley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Bradley. Mr. Bradley. How is the Gentleman re..."

Excuse me. John... Okay. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Deuster: "Capparelli."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Capparelli is here."

Deuster: "Chapman. Chapman..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Chapman? Mrs. Chapman."

Deuster: "Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry she's here. Okay, I will not question her. Christensen."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Christensen. Put Mr. Beatty...he's there and put



Mr. Beatty back."

Deuster: "Is Cullerton?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Cullerton. He's here."

Deuster: "Darrow."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Darrow is here."

Deuster: "Dawson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Dawson. He's here."

Deuster: "Doyle."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who?"

Deuster: "Doyle."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Doyle, always here."

Deuster: "John Dunn."

Speaker Lechowicz: "John Dunn is here."

Deuster: "Ray Ewell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ray Ewell. Mr. Ewell. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Mr. Ewell."

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman in the chamber? Mr. Ewell. Take him off the record."

Deuster: "Farley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Farley is here."

Deuster: "Flinn."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Flinn? He's there."

Deuster: "Giorgi."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Giorgi. Mr. Giorgi. He's here."

Deuster: "Hoffman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hoffman. Mr. Hoffman. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Hoffman in the chamber? Remove him."

Deuster: "Hanahan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hanahan is in the chamber."

Deuster: "Henry."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Henry is here."

Deuster: "Huff."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Huff. Mr. Huff. He's in the chamber."

Deuster: "Emil Jones."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Put Mr. Hoffman back on please. Mr. Jones is on the floor."

Deuster: "I don't see Kane."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kane is in his chair, maybe that's why you don't see him...And Mr. Keane is right in the back over there."

Deuster: "Keane... Mr. Bell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Bell. Where is he at? Mr. Bell. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mr. Bell in the chamber? Remove him."

Deuster: "Mr. Kulas."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kulas is there, as always."

Deuster: "Laurino."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Laurino is here."

Deuster: "Madigan's there... McClain."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. McClain. Mr. McClain. Mr. McPike... He's here...McClain is right here. He's right here..."

Deuster: "Did you say McPike was here?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "McPike is over here too."

Deuster: "All right. Mugalian."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's here."

Deuster: "Patrick."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Langdon Patrick?"

Deuster: "Langdon Patrick."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's here. He's here."

Deuster: "Ronan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ronan. Mr. Ronan. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's right and he's on the floor."

Deuster: "Sharp."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Sharp? He's here."

Deuster: "Slape."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Slape...Mr. Slape. Mr. Slape. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's right here."



Deuster: "Stanley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Stanley was recorded and verified. He had leave to be verified and it was granted."

Deuster: "How about Stearney?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Stearney's the same request."

Deuster: "Steczo."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Steczo? He's there."

Deuster: "Steczo, yes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who? I'm sorry, who did you ask for?"

Deuster: "That was Terry Steczo."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's there, he's in his chair."

Deuster: "Okay, that's fine. Tuerk."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Tuerk, he's in his chair."

Deuster: "Van Duyne."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Van Duyne, he's on the floor."

Deuster: "VonBoeckman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He is here."

Deuster: "Jesse White."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He is here."

Deuster: "I don't have any further questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the count, Tony? Kindly... The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Mulcahey. Kindly record Mr. Mulcahey as 'aye'. Mr. Laz Murphy...I'm sorry. Put Murphy on, I can't hear him. Mr. Murphy, please."

Murphy: "May I be verified, Sir?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leave is granted and put Mr. Boucek back on and Mr. O'Brien wants to be sure he's still on the Roll Call. What's the count, Mr. Clerk? There's 112 'aye', 38 'no'. This motion, having received the Constitutional three-fifths majority prevails and House Bill 430 is declared passed, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor."



DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
OCTOBER 17, 1979

HB-0108 VETO	PAGE	81
HB-0128 VETO	PAGE	59
HB-0150 VETO	PAGE	87
HB-0190 VETO	PAGE	90
HB-0211 VETO	PAGE	62
HB-0233 VETO	PAGE	94
HB-0292 VETO	PAGE	110
HB-0316 VETO	PAGE	120
HB-0339 VETO	PAGE	63
HB-0348 VETO	PAGE	124
HB-0430 VETO	PAGE	128
HB-0472 VETO	PAGE	64
HB-0493 VETO	PAGE	13
HB-0516 VETO	PAGE	69
HB-0551 VETO	PAGE	6
HB-0657 VETO	PAGE	6
HB-0700 VETO	PAGE	44
HB-0716 VETO	PAGE	70
HB-0723 VETO	PAGE	74
HB-0961 VETO	PAGE	75
HB-1025 VETO	PAGE	9
HB-1031 VETO	PAGE	10
HB-1100 VETO	PAGE	11
HB-1110 VETO	PAGE	12
HB-1139 VETO	PAGE	37
HB-1184 VETO	PAGE	14
HB-1244 VETO	PAGE	19
HB-1258 VETO	PAGE	21
HB-1334 VETO	PAGE	22
HB-1345 VETO	PAGE	22
VETO	PAGE	79
HB-1350 VETO	PAGE	23
HB-1382 VETO	PAGE	25
HB-1526 VETO	PAGE	25
HB-1676 VETO	PAGE	26
HB-1677 VETO	PAGE	32
HB-1693 VETO	PAGE	29
HB-1718 VETO	PAGE	29
HB-1733 VETO	PAGE	30
HB-1769 VETO	PAGE	32
HB-1774 VETO	PAGE	38
HB-1777 VETO	PAGE	38
HB-1802 VETO	PAGE	40



## LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
OCTOBER 17, 1979

PAGE 2

HB-1812	VETO	PAGE	41
HB-1914	VETO	PAGE	42
HB-1919	VETO	PAGE	43
HB-1975	VETO	PAGE	43
HB-2012	VETO	PAGE	44
HB-2111	VETO	PAGE	48
HB-2200	VETO	PAGE	162
HB-2207	VETO	PAGE	49
HB-2228	VETO	PAGE	49
HB-2367	VETO	PAGE	54
HB-2467	VETO	PAGE	52
HB-2540	VETO	PAGE	53
HB-2746	VETO	PAGE	54
HB-2789	MOTIONS	PAGE	149
HB-2790	MOTIONS	PAGE	149
HB-2791	MOTIONS	PAGE	149
HB-2792	MOTIONS	PAGE	153
HB-2793	MOTIONS	PAGE	195
HB-2794	MOTIONS	PAGE	149
HB-2795	MOTIONS	PAGE	153
HB-2797	MOTIONS	PAGE	153
HB-2798	MOTIONS	PAGE	149
HB-2799	MOTIONS	PAGE	153
HB-2800	1ST READING	PAGE	161
	MOTIONS	PAGE	153
HB-2801	MOTIONS	PAGE	152
HB-2802	MOTIONS	PAGE	181
HB-2803	MOTIONS	PAGE	188
HB-2804	MOTIONS	PAGE	153
HB-2805	MOTIONS	PAGE	153
HB-2810	MOTIONS	PAGE	189
	MOTIONS	PAGE	194
HB-2811	MOTIONS	PAGE	206
HB-2812	MOTIONS	PAGE	190
	MOTIONS	PAGE	217
HB-2813	MOTIONS	PAGE	201
HB-2816	MOTIONS	PAGE	195
HB-2817	1ST READING	PAGE	148
	MOTIONS	PAGE	219
HB-2818	1ST READING	PAGE	148
	MOTIONS	PAGE	211
HB-2819	1ST READING	PAGE	149
HB-2821	1ST READING	PAGE	246

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
OCTOBER 17, 1979

PAGE 3

SB-1444	MOTIONS	PAGE	200
HR-0459	1ST READING	PAGE	3
HR-0462	3RD READING	PAGE	4
HR-0470	1ST READING	PAGE	3
HR-0475	3RD READING	PAGE	4
HR-0490	3RD READING	PAGE	4

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
SPECIAL SESSION # 3

PAGE 4

OCTOBER 17, 1979

HR-0001 3RD READING PAGE 221

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX  
OCTOBER 17, 1979

## SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
PASTOR JUSTICE - PRAYER	PAGE	1
REP. DYER - PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	2
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	2
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	2
APPROVAL OF JOURNALS	PAGE	5
EXCUSED ABSENCE	PAGE	27
3RD SPECIAL SESSION CONVENED	PAGE	57
GOVERNORS PROCLAMANTION FOR 3RD SPECIAL SESSION	PAGE	57
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE FOR 3RD SPECIAL	PAGE	58
3RD SPECIAL SESSION RECESSED	PAGE	59
REGULAR SESSION CONVENED	PAGE	59
ANNOUNCEMENTS	PAGE	160
REGULAR SESSION RECESSED	PAGE	220
3RD SPECIAL SESSION RECONVENED	PAGE	220
3RD SPECIAL SESSION ADJOURNED	PAGE	245
REGULAR SESSION RECONVENED	PAGE	245
PERFUNCT SESSION	PAGE	246
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	246
HOUSE ADJOURNED	PAGE	246