

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order. Members please be in their seats. Be lead in prayer by the Reverend Krueger, the House Chaplain."

Krueger: "In the Name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Amen. Oh Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. Robert Louis Stevenson wrote; 'The world has no room for cowards. We must all be ready somehow to toil, to suffer, to die. And yours is not the less noble because no drum beats before you when you go out to your daily battlefield and no crowds shout about your coming when you return from your daily victory or defeat.' Let us pray. Oh Lord, our heavenly Father, we, Thy humble servants do give Thee our hearty thanks and praise for this day and for all the blessings in the life about us. We are grateful for our great privilege to share the democratic process of lawmaking. We are hopeful that our efforts may make a contribution to the betterment of government. And we pray that what we do here in this Illinois House of Representatives may be of lasting benefit for those we do serve. Direct us, oh Lord, this day to enact only such legislation as is good for the economic and social well being of the people of this State, not seeking praise, glory and emulation or any other transitory consideration, save that of satisfying knowledge, our efforts have been unto Thee. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Pledge of allegiance by ensign Sandquist."

Sandquist: "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: "Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate that, but I want you to know, I was a full lieutenant. I went above ensign. And I also would like to put on the record



... record of this House floor that on the day of September the 29th, in Champaign, Illinois, United States Naval Academy beat Illinois in football by a score of 13 to 12 and Representative McPike and I were both there to see that."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Lieutenant Commander higher than Lieutenant? Roll Call for attendance. I guess maybe we'd better not. The Rules Committee is meeting in the office so we'd better wait till they get out here anyway. You want to get on the Roll Call? Okay. Roll Call for attendance. Representative Schoeberlein, are you seeking recognition? Representative Walsh? Take the record. We'd better stand in recess. Call of the Chair. Special Session come to order. Be lead in prayer be the Reverend Krueger, the House Chaplain."

Krueger: "Let us pray; Almighty Father, we ask They guidance and direction as we meet this day for this Special Session to consider the legislation before the House of Representatives. Make us mindful of our duties and responsibilities to the people of this State that in all fairness and equity our dealings may be for their benefit and theirs alone. We ask this in the Name of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Pledge of allegiance by Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "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: "Special Session will stand in recess till the call of the Chair. Now we're back to Regular Session. Roll Call for attendance. Well, we'd better have a little more people here. Have you checked with Representative Yourell? The Order of Amendatory Veto Motions. House Bill 662. Yourell-Flinn-Lechowicz, motion with respect to 662. Take it out of the record?"



You should take a chance when I get back. 89 here.
 I see 89 out there. Supposed to 107. You want that
 out of the record? Out of the record. 716, Stuffle.
 Out of the record. ...93 Matijevich. Representative
 Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, even though you said you found
 107 out here, I'm going with the second motion on
 93 which is an override. It is so logical and
 I think the Membership realized that. House Bill
 793 (?) produced by Representative Schlickman and I
 because of what has been..... the poor implementation
 of the law on the books that there be printed on
 documents by the authority of the State of Illinois.
 The Senate applied an Amedatory Veto. It worked so
 closely with the Department to pass this legislation
 that I thought it was probably just an Amendment.
 tells me that the Governor, whoever advised him,
 must have looked at the synopsis and not the Bill.
 Because his Amendment... his Amendment and the Amendatory
 Veto would have not only subverted the intent of the
 Bill, but actually would have weakened the present
 ... present law. The problem as we know has been that
 in those agencies outside of the Department that
 print documents, there's been virtually no printing
 thereon that is printed by the authority of the State
 of Illinois and the number of documents and this Bill
 would allow the Department to make sure that when they
 contract with other agencies that that be included in
 the contract. And the Governor's Amendatory Veto would
 have been.. made it virtually impossible to have them
 include that in such contract. So, therefore, Mr.
 Speaker, I move that House Bill 793 pass, notwithstanding
 the Veto of the Governor."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question's
 on the Gentleman's motion that House Bill 793 pass, not-



withstanding the Veto of the Governor. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 82 'aye' and 33 'no'. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote I will need some help from the Members..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes 'aye'."

Matijevich: "Because we know that there's not enough here right now, but I want to stress upon the Membership that if .. if I went along with the Governor's motion on the amendatory, we would actually weaken the present law and the intent of the law all of us know is good because we think that to be accountable we ought to know how many documents are being printed. For example, when we get annual reports, we ought to know how many are being printed and not just those by one Department, but by .. Oh, I'm sorry. The Board's closed. Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Can you open it up? Mr. Clerk?"

Matijevich: "I wonder.. I know it's not within the rules..

Well, okay. Can we have another Roll Call?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah."

Matijevich: "And I urge the Membership to vote 'aye' so that we can..."

Speaker Redmond: "All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed 'no'..."

Matijevich: "... We can implement this law."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Oh. Okay.

Have all voted who wish? Requires 107. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've talked to some Members and they're under the impression that Vince Toolen is the one who is responsible for the Amendatory Veto and many feel



that knowing Vince and he does a good job, I've worked with him and his agency totally on this particular Bill. And I can assure you that Vince Toolen would be for a complete override as far as I'm concerned because there are.. there may be some other agencies that feel that that Department shouldn't be responsible. But I think you have to have one Department responsible. So I would urge the Membership, those who feel that Vince Toolen would not support this, I know that he would. And I would urge the Membership to give me just three more votes so we can get on with the ball game. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 107 'aye' and 33 'no'. The motion, having received three-fifths Constitutional Majority, prevails and House Bill 793 is declared passed, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. 841, Representative White. Out of the record. 961, Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House accept the Amendment #5 to.. motion #5 to House Bill 961. Yesterday there was some.. some discussion regarding the Governor's Amendatory motion with Representative Getty and we took it out of the record and at that time we've worked on it. And now we're in agreement and there's no disagreement as to the proper wording as to this motion and therefore I ask for a favorable Roll Call on this particular motion."

Speaker Redmond: "961."

Stearney: "Yes, motion #5."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Getty?"

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Gentleman is absolutely right. With the clarified language the Amendment... or rather, motion #5 I believe this is now



in proper form. I've been given to understand that the Governor would certify it in this form and I would join with the Gentleman in moving for the adoption of the Amendatory Veto."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question? Those in favor of the Gentleman's motion to accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 126 'aye' and no 'nay'. The motion, having received the Constitutional Majority, prevails... having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority, prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. 1769. Representative Yourell or Ralph Dunn?"

Yourell: "Mr. Speaker, yesterday I filed an override motion on House Bill 1769 and there was a great deal of discussion as to the funding of the Illinois Library Study Commission. That's the part of the Bill that the Governor used on.. used in the Amendatory Veto. That is out now and I move to accept the Governor's recommendations relative to the Amendment on House Bill 1769."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1769 by adoption of the Amendment?' All in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 128 'aye' and one 'no'. And the House... And the motion, having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority, prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. Ready on 662, Representative Yourell? 662?"

Yourell: "Yes. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I had filed the original motion again to override the Governor's veto relative to



House Bill 662 which is the mandate... reimbursement of state mandated programs to units of local government. And the problem with the Governor's situation is the setting up and the appointment of the Appeals Board. He thought perhaps it was a Constitutional problem involved with the.. with the way we had it in the Bill and I talked it over with the Minority Leader who is the Chief Co-Sponsor of the legislation. And the same Bill passed out of the Senate with the provision deleted that the Governor wasn't happy with and so I now move to accept the Amendatory Veto of the Governor as the Amendment to House Bill 662."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 662 by adoption of the Amendment?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 131 'aye' and one 'no'. The motion, having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority, prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. 1986, Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1986 simply is.. is a technical correction or carrying out of the reorganization of the Department of Law Enforcement that we approved a couple of years ago. There was some controversy when we passed the Bill before between the police .. state policemen themselves and the Department, but I was informed yesterday by the lobbyists for the police that that's been taken care of and they now agree and urge me to make the motion which I now make that we accept the Governor's 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 1986 by adoption of the Amendment?' All in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 135 'aye' and no 'nay'. And the House... this motion, having received the Constitutional Majority, prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations by a three-fifths Constitutional Majority and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation. 2228, Representative Yourell. 2228, Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "I thought we... I thought we did this yesterday. It seems there's two motions on the Calendar both to accept."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know. Did we take this yesterday, Mr. Clerk? It's in the... 2228."

Yourell: "Oh, I know now. We did.. We did put an effective date in the Bill to save the state some money relative to the mailing of the forms to Committee... campaign Committees and so forth and we discussed that yesterday. I now move to accept the Governor's recommendations as to change in House Bill 2228."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 2228 by adoption of the Amendment?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 133 'aye' and no 'nay'. The motion, having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority, prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. 2305. Representative O'Brien. Out of the record. 2355, Representative E.M. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if we could there's three Bills; 2355, 57 and



58 all relates to the same subject matter. They are all related to the Finance Act and we're going to accept on all three. I'd like to have them called together if I have leave of the House?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to consider 2355, 57, and 58 together? Hearing no objection, leave is granted."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 2355 we would accept the Governor's amendatory language. This Bill was enacted to provide additional flexibility to remove from the records one hundred or less and more than three years old certification by the Attorney General for such debts as uncollectable. We accept the language as given in the Governor's Amendatory Veto which would simply enhance what was being done in 2355. 2357 which originally changed the definition for various items in the Finance Act to comply with existing expenditure practice. The line items were commodities, printing and equipment and however in identifying the definition of commodity lines the Bill inadvertently excluded provisions of the electronic data process and that is the change dealt with in the Governor's Amendatory Veto and we will accept... we accept that change as suggested by the Governor. House Bill 2358 as enacted authorized the Comptroller to promulgate certain rules as it relates to contractual matters. The Governor's Amendatory Veto amendatorily vetoed the Bill to allow the Comptroller to require the general nature of information to be contained in certain contracts filed with that office. We also again accept the Governor's amendatory language for it simply enhances the intent of House Bill 2358. I would move, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, to accept the Governor's amendatory language as it relates to House Bill 2355,



2357 and 2358."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bills 2355, 2357, and 2358 by adoption of the Amendments?' Those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 142 'aye' and no 'nay'. And the motion, having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority, prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bills 2355, 2357 and 2358. 2719. 2719. Representative Getty. Getty, 2719."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have filed a motion to override the Amendatory Veto. It's my feeling that the Governor's Office unfortunately misunderstood at least part of the intent of this Bill. I'd like it clearly understood that this is a Bill that would have a tendency to do two things. One, it would tend to help business and the state through consolidating the business of lawsuits. Under present law, it is necessary that if the state wishes to file a claim against an individual or business, that would be filed in the Circuit Court. If the business man wishes to file in the same.. arising out of the same facts and circumstances an action against the state, it must be filed in the Court of Claims thus giving rise to a multiplicity of law suits. I believe that in the Amendatory Veto, although the Governor accepted one half of it, to permit the state to counterclaim against an individual filing in the Court of Claims, he failed to take into account the interests of the businessman who would likewise, be much better served as would the people of the State of Illinois, if the entire case could be heard in one forum. That's what



this Bill would do if the.. if the override is successful. And I would ask for your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 2719?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Katz."

Katz: "I had a question, Mr. Getty."

Speaker Redmond: "Ask Mr. Getty."

Katz: "Yeah, Mr. Getty, I'm concerned about the problem that the state might bring suit in the Circuit Court that was a very minor suit for \$100 for not paying sales tax in and...."

Speaker Redmond: "Pardon me. Pardon me. The motion is to override, not accept. I'm sorry.."

Katz: "That's right and that's the reason for my question..."

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah."

Katz: "Now the Governor was concerned that in that situation there might be a hundred million dollar counterclaim having nothing to do with the original suit in which the immunity of the state would be lost due to something that had nothing to do with the state's original action. Does your Bill limit the right of counterclaim to something that is related to the state's suit against the defendant or can the defendant bring in something totally unrelated and secure a judgment of enormous size having nothing to do with the state's original suit?"

Getty: "The rules of civil procedure would, or course, govern. It would be necessary that the counterclaim be germane to the issue of the original suit filed."

Katz: "As I understand it, I know that federal rules do not require a germaneness rule. As a matter of fact, I know the federal rules say that if you have a claim and you don't assert it, you lose the claim. I think



that the state rule is the same. So that it seems .. I think in the state, the only difference is in the federal courts you must counterclaim or you lose your cause of action. In the state court if you have any claim against the individual I think it is a permissive right to assert the counterclaim. So that the point the Governor makes in his veto message seems to me to be correct and accordingly, I would oppose the override."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, I am shocked that the Governor would leave in the part that permits the state to file a counterclaim against the citizen when a citizen sues the state. But he would take out allowing the citizen to sue the state as a counterclaim when the state sues the citizen. This is not equal justice. This is grossly unfair. I commend the Gentleman for moving to override this veto instead of accepting the Amendatory Veto and I strongly urge everyone to join him in the override."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am really sadly disappointed in some of the 'no' votes or the absent votes on the Board. The same people who year after year talk about free enterprise and the ability of the Legislature to deal with business problems when we have a chance in one Bill here to strike a real blow for free enterprise and strike a real blow for the business community in Illinois, there's a lot of 'no' votes and absent votes. And I just don't understand that. As Representative Pullen points out and as Representative Getty points out, this is a simple matter of justice. If the action is brought initially in the Court of Claims against the private citizen, against the businessman, by the State



Illinois, he has the right to use the same tribunal to bring whatever sort of cause of action he has back against the bringing party, in this case, the State. This is the case in the private sector universally. It's not the case because the State somehow thinks it ought to be immune from playing by the same rules that the private sector plays by. And if you really believe in private enterprise and you really believe that we ought to do things about improving the business climate of Illinois, not letting business run to the sun belt and so forth, a 'yes' vote on this is certainly a way to do it. And I'm really disappointed and frankly surprised some of the supporters of business in Illinois are voting 'no' or not voting on this Bill because they want to blindly follow a veto that really doesn't understand the facts of life in the business community today. I urge a 'yes' vote."

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

Leinenweber: "I had one question for Mr. Getty. Representative Getty, suppose the state sues in Circuit Court a private person... and a private person brings a third party action within the same suit against another private person, would the third party defendant be able to assert a counterclaim in that suit against the State."

Getty: "No."

Leinenweber: "Why do you say 'no'?"

Getty: "I don't see that in reading the Act that they would be able to so assert."

Leinenweber: "As I understand the Civil Practice Act it defines counterclaim as virtually any types of cross-claims or whatever."

Getty: "I don't think that this would give any right... specific rights for a third party to bring an action



against the state at all. This.. This speaks to the instance of the state suing and the right to counterclaim against the state or conversely where the individual sues the state and the state counterclaims."

Leinenweber: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "On this... this question there's 120 'aye' and 13 'no'. The motion, having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority, prevails and House Bill 2719 is declared passed, notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendations for change. 716, Representative Stuffle? Page nine."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. Yesterday there was some question about this particular Bill where two motions were filed, one amendatorily, one to override. At this time I would like to pursue the motion to override on 716. The question that arose yesterday dealt with the Governor's action concerning one of three Sections of the Bill which regard school consolidation. Under 11-1 of the School Code it's possible, in effect, for the a School District to steal territory without really taking children from the District and to do so I think is unfair. The Bill and the provisions we sent to the Governor provide that you cannot steal territories, that you have to act to in effect annex entire School Districts if you're going to do so to affect consolidation. For that reason, the Governor's action, I believe is wrong. I've discussed this with the people most affected by this Amendment which was put on in the Senate by Repres... by Senator Sangmeister, our former colleague. It is supported by Representative Leinenweber and the Members of the Joliet area representative contingency who are most affected by it. For those reasons and since that is the only action by the Governor to strike that Section, at this time I would move for passage of the Bill, the Governor's veto to



the contrary notwithstanding."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment was put on the Senate by Senator Sangmiester to deal with a specific problem which has already occurred in Will County, but could occur in many, many other areas. Under Section 11-1 of the School Code a new District can be organized.. School District can be organized including territory from an existing District by filing a petition to organize the District with the County Board of School Trustees of the county in which the greater amount of territory exists. So in effect a School District could be created with a majority of the property in one county and could, in effect, dismantle another District by taking a large amount of assessed valuation property from another county and the District affected, although they can't appear before... at the hearing before the County Board of School Trustees will not be able to even vote in the subsequent election. The only ques.. people allowed to vote are the people who reside in the District which is petitioned to be formed. This is a good... It was a good Amendment. The Governor's Veto Message indicates that he struck that out because he thought it might inhibit consolidations. Well, this isn't really what we're talking about. We're not talking about consolidations. We're talking about creation of new Districts which would include parts of another District. Now, all the provision the Governor struck out was that if you're going to take property from one District then you've got to take the kids. You can't just take the assessed valuation... the property that's going to bring the tax money into the District and leave all the kids to be educated by a District which has lost a significant amount of its assessed valuation.



I filed a motion to override the Governor and I would certainly urge everyone to support this motion and I thank Representative Stuffle for withdrawing his specific motion and accepting the motion that I filed to override this particular Bill. It's.. The provision's a good one. It's going to bring some equity that will prevent a vast amount of inequity from occurring. I urge an 'aye' vote on the motion to override."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Will the.. Will the Sponsor yield? Larry, in the portion of the Bill, and I'll be the first one to admit, I do not understand exactly what it is that's being done, except I do recognize the fact that I live in the area being fought over in the situation mentioned by Representative Leinenweber. I also know that my children will be the ones who will have to go to one School District or another. And the question that I want to ask is, does the provision that we're fighting over include some way for the voters affected by this - and here he is wrong when he says they don't want to take the kids because they will take my children who currently attend the Troy School District and if this occurs will be going to 'Manooka'- will it allow the people in my subdivision to vote on which District they want to become a part of?"

Stuffle: "If you pass the override, it would. And the problem is, Representative Kempiners, you've got to go back a step I believe and Representative Leinenweber is better equipped to answer than I because this was not my Amendment and not my area, but the best I can answer that is this way; the current law has two provisions for forming a District. 11-6 clearly has full due process powers, elections and so forth petitioning. 11-1 which we're dealing with here, allows on one hand,



stealing territory, although there's an election provision, but it doesn't have full due process provisions. The situation such that under 11-1 without this Bill you could steal territory, there might be very few voters in that territory. You've taken out the rich part of the District. Our problem is that you're not letting those people who live in the entire District that's affected, which might be stolen from, to have a chance to vote without the override."

Kempiners: "Well, the basic question that I've got is that if we.. if this passes with the Governor's Amendatory Veto accepted, will the residents in my subdivision be able to vote on it?"

Stuffle: "If you live... Now, I'm not trying to avoid your question. But if you live outside the territory that they're trying to ..."

Kempiners: "I live inside the territory that the 'Manooka' system would like to annex."

Stuffle: "I'm not... I'm not... Then I.. I'm not sure I can answer your question. Representative Leinenweber can however, because he's familiar with the legal description of the territory."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yes. Representative Kempiners, we do not change any of the provisions for creating a consolidated District except the provision as to what actually can be consolidated. Under the existing law, with the Governor's Amendatory Veto, in other words, that was the law as returned to the way it was, which would mean that if your property is included in the petition which is approved by the County Board of School Trustees, you will be allowed to vote on whether or not you will wish to create this new School District. If we override the Governor, and you are in the property which is to be consolidated or created... and the new District



is to be created, you will also get to vote. The only question would be that if they're going to include territory which is in another School District, then they have to take the whole School District. But the people would still vote who are going to be affected or.. not affected, but who are going to be in the new School District. They will still vote as they do under the current law which is what would continue if the Governor's Amendment is sustained. You do get to vote."

Kempiners: "Can I vote 'maybe?'"

Leinenweber : "You can vote absentee or..."

Speaker Redmond: "You ready for the question? Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not going to go through the whole dissertation that Leinenweber went through, but I just want to add my voice to his exhortation to vote 'aye' on this override. We have went through this about five years ago and subjected ourself to the.. to the viewpoint of the Department of Education and fortunately the Department of Education ruled in our favor. So, we don't want to have to go through this again and in answer to Representative Kempiners' question, yes, he can vote. The only difference is that all the people in both Districts affected get to vote on it and I would.. I would ask everyone within the sound of my voice who has a vote to please help us out in this and vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "A question of the Sponsor of the Amendment or the effort to make the override. Is it not true that under current law that when territory is taken from a District in annexation situation, that under current law everyone in that District has to vote on whether that will, in fact happen, not only the people in



the portion to be taken?"

Stuffle: "No, it's not true because you have two Sections of the law. That's what's wrong with this. In 11-6, that's absolutely true. Representative Macdonald, I believe, passed legislation. Representative Walsh had a similar Bill a few years ago that dealt with that subject where you had to have a vote in the entire affected area. This provision in 11-1 as the law is now and as the Governor would have you have it still, allows for a different situation where the entirety of the District doesn't have to be taken. You have a different situation under 11-6. What Representative Leinenweber was trying to say is the same people may be voting, but the situation's such that you may have very few people in one area that have a chance to vote and you're letting them steal the industrial territory from that area and you're not taking the whole District so you're going to leave that successor District with nothing in terms of a tax base under 11-1. That's what the Governor would have you do. Under 11-6 you can't do that. We want to put it into the situation in effect where 11-1 and 11-6 are basically the same."

Hoffman: "11-1 affects different kinds of Districts than 11-6?"

Stuffle: "You have different sets of situations in 11-1 than you have from 11-6 as I believe we discussed yesterday. "

Hoffman: "In 11-6 you're organizing community units Districts. In 11-1 providing for the authorization."

Stuffle: "11-1 deals with consolidations of Districts. 11-6 deals with formations of units as I recall."

Hoffman: "Alright. Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."



Reilly: "Larry, I understand the point that Representative Leinenweber has made and it makes sense in that situation. I have a little concern though as to whether we.. I'm just in doubt as to whether we want to put into the law a requirement that that be done. Might there not be... Larry? Might there not be other situations in which it would make sense to both Districts to only, you know, take part of the land depending on what population has happened and what movement there's been? Might there not be situations in which Districts would want to do a partial annexation?"

Stuffle: "Well, I think possibly we're mixing the issues here. You have situations where you can do that sort of thing now. But I think you've got to consider that, you know, you're talking about creating new Districts in one and in another you're talking about detaching, that sort of thing. You've got to consider what kind of situation you leave the School District that's a successor in. You're taking away their tax base and leaving them virtually with nothing in this situation."

Reilly: "But my question is.. I understand that and I'm in sympathy with that and as long as I was focusing my mind on that problem, I was inclined to vote for the override. Maybe I still will. Might there not be other situations in which that's not what they're trying to do at all? In which they're trying to do something perfectly sensible to both Districts? They're not trying to rape the District's tax base at all. But now the law is going to say they can't do that, that they've got to take the whole District or nothing. Maybe there are no such situations. That's my question."

Stuffle: "I don't know of any. That's what I'm thinking now. When we discussed this thing earlier, this is the only situation that I know that applied to this particular



11-1 situation at the current time."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is, 'Shall House Bill 716 pass, notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendations for change?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Davis, are you seeking recognition to explain your vote?"

Davis: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker. I was.."

Speaker Redmond: "Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 117 'aye' and 16 'no'. The motion prevails and having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority, House Bill 716 is declared passed notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendations for change. Is O'Brien on the floor? 841, Representative White."

White: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to accept the Governor's amendatory veto of House Bill 841. The language in the Governor's Message was clarifying language and that's basically it."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 841 by adoption of the Amendment?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. This motion, having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority, prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 841. Is Representative Giorgi on the floor? On amendatory veto motions with respect to House Bill 961. Representative Stearney is recognized."

Stearney: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as to motion #5 which was just adopted by the House, I'm going to make a motion right now to reconsider the vote by which that passed and then ask



that you adopt motion #4 which would just change the effective date of the Bill from January 1st, 1980 until March 1st, 1980 which would allow the insurance industry time to change their form that would be sent out to the consumer. So for that reason, at this time I ask to reconsider the vote by which motion #5 was adopted to House Bill 961."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Getty. Getty."

Getty: "I'm sorry. Maybe I wasn't paying attention when the Gentleman explained this. Is it that you adopted the wrong motion?"

Stearney: "Well at that time, Representative, the Governor's Office had said they could not certify a change in the date. They have just come to me moments ago and said that they could certify a change in date and motion #4, as I explained to you yesterday, had the change of date from January to March, but the same language was there."

Getty: "Alright. I have no objection to this."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion to reconsider the vote by which motion #5 carried. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The aye's have it. The motion carried. Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "This time, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the House adopt motion #4 to House Bill 961 which is completely verbatim as motion #5 except for the change of date. This is from January 1st, 1980 now making it March 1st, 1980, the effective date."

Speaker Redmond: "I take it that you're then withdrawing motion #5. Is that correct?"

Stearney: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on motion #4. And shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations



for change with respect to House Bill 961 by adoption of the Amendment? All in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 132 'aye' and no 'nay'. The motion, having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority, prevails and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 961. Representative ... On reduction item veto motions, which appear on page number eight, appears House Bill 2427. Representative Farley."

Farley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the motion that I filed on.. under reduction item veto motions is for an amount.. line item amount of \$565,000. This money is for a seed or start up planning cost for our fire exits for this building that we're in right now. We met yesterday afternoon with the Governor and we have an agreement with the Governor that we do in fact restore this money so that we can have planning money available to solve our problem as far as fire exits. I would suggest that we do in fact restore this money and I would request a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti?"

Conti: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I just want to add that I want to publically commend you for doing what you did in bringing in the State Fire Marshall here and showing that we do have some 60 violations up here on the south end of the state capital building and inadvertently the Governor did take the planning money out to make a study of a stairwell and he agreed that if we don't proceed with trying to make this an office building we can just go ahead and make it safety.. safe for our employees on the fifth and sixth floor; that he would restore the seed money for the planning of the stairwell



and to restore this so that it is in workable and a safe condition for our employees. I'd appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall the item on page 28 lines 13 through 16 of House Bill 2427 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yeah, I did want to ask a question before you... Representative Conti, can you answer a question? Is there any 'tartan' wallpaper involved in this expenditure?"

Conti: "It won't be Scottish rites."

Leinenweber: "It won't be? Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 114 'aye' and 3 'no'. The motion, having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority, prevails and the item on page 28 lines 13 through 16 prevails and the motion.. and House Bill 2427 is declared passed notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. 2427. 2427, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that we accept the.. I move that we override the item veto on House Bill 2427 on page 20 line 35 and page 21 lines 1 through 6. This ten million dollars is an authorization to the Capital Development Board for special education construction. At the present time, we have a forty-one point five million dollars in remaining authorization in the School Bond Construction Act and this is the appropriation which corresponds with House Bill 2204 which I have made a motion to override the veto. You probably received some correspondence from people connected with special ed requesting that you support these two motions. I believe that this is a proper use of the Capital



Development Board program. It's the proper use of the.. of a portion of the hundred million dollars that we set aside originally in the School Bond Construction Act which was passed and which I sponsored in the House in 1973. So I would ask for your support of my motion to override."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the item on page 20 line 35 and page 21 lines 1 through 6 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye' and opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 126 'aye' and 15 'no'. And the motion, having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority, prevails. And the item on page 20 line 35 and page 21 lines one through six are declared passed..... on House Bill 2427 is declared passed, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. 2427, Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, last year the Governor signed the authorization Bill to build a State of Illinois building in the urban renewal area of Rockford where there wouldn't have to be any land purchase. It only had to be an agreement with the city of Rockford. And to effectuate this contract, all we were asking for is 50 thousand dollars so that they can make the preliminary talks with the city of Rockford and the Governor's Office and in his message he stated the cost of the project and I must tell the Members of the General Assembly that the State of Illinois or the city of Rockford needs this building because we're paying exorbitant rents about 25 state supported agencies in the Rockford land area and we could build this building for one-tenth .. for one-tenth of what it's going to cost to build a State of Illinois building in the Chicago ... out of Chicago's loop where there's been some scandal connected



with the procurement of the property to begin with. There's going to be one hundred million dollars expended and the cost of that building is going to be ten times what it cost to build the same thing in the city of Rockford. Now the Governor in good faith signed the authorization last year and all we're asking is for studies to be made and talks to be continued with the city of Rockford and all we're asking for is \$50,000 to effectuate the contract. And I urge the support of this veto.... of the override of this veto."



Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is, 'Shall the item on page two, lines 27-32, on House Bill 2427 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Borchers, desires to be recorded as 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 85 'aye' and 61 'no'. This motion, having failed to receive a three-fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. 2578, Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the appropriation for the Department of Public Health. What the Governor has done is reduced it by 100,000 dollars, a sum which was put in there for prenatal clinics in small rural health agencies. We wanted to start up some prenatal clinics downstate so that we could capture some title 20 funds. The clinics that would be affected are in Rock Island County, Will County, Champaign County, the Egyptian Health Department, Pike County, Macon, Lee, Vermillion, DeKalb and sub-Cook County. Downstate, oftentimes, the pregnant Ladies are having the inability to obtain qualified medical attention prior to delivery and are delivering in the emergency rooms of the hospital. We're just starting to provide some prenatal clinic services and that's why this... these funds are essential. It's only \$100,000 and it affects a considerable amount of downstate Illinois. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote on this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the item on page 16..' Who do I hear? Oh, Representative Braun."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion. The paranatal clinics are very important, not only to downstate, but to the entire state. They provide services for high



risk mothers who.. to help bring the state's mortality rate down and I would point out to the Membership that Illinois' mortality rate is right up there with some Southern African countries and these credits go along helping solve that problem. I would urge your support for this very important service."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, just to add my voice if I might to that of Representative Darrow. We did support this and I am convinced that there's just some misunderstanding on the part of the Bureau of the Budget in terms of this particular line item. We had fought hard for this, both here in the House and in the Senate. In fact, went into Conference Committee because we had made a firm commitment to Representative Darrow and the people that were interested in order to get this money approved. I would urge that we follow Representative Darrow's lead in this matter. However, in the other matters that are coming up I would urge a very strong 'no' on all other items."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones."

Jones: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. In response to the previous Speaker, now I want the Members from Cook County area to understand what he just got through saying. He said simply that he's going to support this motion because it's going to help downstate. But the other motion that is to come is going to affect the city of Chicago and Cook County and I think it's very unfair of the Minority Spokesman on the Appropriation Committee to make a statement such as that, that is he will support the downstate area, but the impacted areas in city of Chicago, he said he's not going to support."

Speaker Redmond: "The question... Representative Braun."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, to the Minority... to the Minority Leader, I'd like to say with regard to the last remark.. alright. I'll wait. I'll wait."



Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall the item on page 16 line 28-32 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 126 'aye' and 17 'no'. The motion, having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority, prevails and the item on page 16 line 28-32 is.. of House Bill 2578 is declared passed, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. 2578, Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to hold on my first motion pursuant to.. regarding House Bill 2578 and go to the second motinn listed on the Calendar. That is a very specific motion relating to page 17, line 30 of the Public Health budget..."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute now. Which one do you want to take?"

Braun: "Reduction veto, page 17 line 30, the second motion listed on the Calendar under my name."

Speaker Redmond: "Oh, I see. 2578 the second.. which motion? Motion #1?"

Braun: "Pardon?"

Speaker Redmond: "Motion #1, is that the one you want?"

Braun: "No, motion #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Motion #2."

Braun: "Right. Motion #1.."

Speaker Redmond: "That's the first listing on 2578, is that correct?"

Braun: "I'm sorry. Motion 1."

Speaker Redmond: "Page 16 lines 28.."

Braun: "Motion 1. Motion 1. Motion 2 has.."

Speaker Redmond: "That's the one on page 17 line 30. Is that right?"

Braun: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Let's.."



Braun: "Alright."

Speaker Redmond: Proceed."

Braun: "This motion again relates to the same program that Representative Darrow talked about. It provides for tertiary care. The program is currently operating and it is.. it is a minimal amount of the total appropriation for perinatal care and I urge a positive vote on this motion."

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, if I may first inquire of the Sponsor, I got a bit confused Representative in the.. in the exchange between yourself and the Speaker in terms of what motion are on. Are we now on motion 2?"

Braun: "No Sir. Motion 1."

Speaker Redmond: "2578 is listed four times. This is the second.."

Braun: "This is the perinatal tertiary care grant.."

Peters: "\$500,000?"

Braun: "Exactly."

Peters: "Fine. Okay. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I.. I do this reluctantly but nevertheless, I think it should be pointed to the Members of the House that the \$500,000 of general revenue funds we have here were initially not requested by the Department of Public Health but were in fact added in the Committee and part of the problem that we had in this is that all the information that we can receive from the Department now. We are informed that there are no programs really developed by the Department in order to implement the spending of these funds. Now, there is no question that in terms of the level of care for women who have the possibility of premature birth and high risk pregnancies that both the state and the national government ought to be doing more. It's a question, though, however, I think of what programs are in place and whether in fact those funds can be ex-



pended properly and efficiently at this particular time and, in fact, go to aid and assist those people who are talking about aiding and assisting, rather than going to building up a new bureaucratic kind of program, which generally, as many of us know, end up eating most of the money in terms of putting programs in place rather than getting the funds out to those people we want to help. That is the reservation that we have in this particular time and I would urge that those Members of both the Human Resources Committee and Appropriations Committee and individual Members that are in fact interested in this program as we should all be interested continue to insist that the Department of Public Health develop the kind of programs that can quickly and efficiently implement the funds that are needed in this area. At this time however, I would.. I personally will vote 'no' on this and would ask of those who are of like mind to support that... my motion.. or my view in this particular matter and that of the Members of the Appropriations Committee..Republican Members."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, with all the deference to Representative Peters, I think there's some misunderstanding as to the line item that this particular motion relates to. This program is already in place and, in fact, serves people in the Quad Cities, in Champaign, in Chicago and in Carbondale, in Rockford, Peoria and Springfield. The Department had to come in for supplemental last time on this particular program because there were insufficient funds to follow through with the level of funding that had been ... with the level of services that had already been authorized. So this program is already in place, Representative Peters. This is not a new program. This is the tertiary care component of the perinatal care clinic. And for that reason, in light of the need of ... for these programs



for continuation of these programs and in order to avoid a supplemental appropriation in this line later on, I would respectfully disagree with Representative Peters and encourage that he take another look at this line item and give his support to this one."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite.."

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

Representative Braun, if I am reading the staff analysis correctly it indicates that this reduction by the Governor would put the level of funding below the original budget request, is that also your understanding?"

Braun: "That is my understanding, Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Then.. may I then ask of Representative Peters whether the Department overestimated its need when their request went into the original Governor's budget. How do we have this discrepancy now that the Governor feels that we can afford a reduction of four hundred million dollars over his original request? Mr. Speaker, could Representative Peters answer my question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "I'm not certain that we're talking about four hundred million dollars. In fact, I know we're not talking about four hundred million dollars. I think part of the problem, Representative Satterthwaite, is that ..."

Speaker Redmond: "I've been advised that that was occasion by the Governor being afraid that the motion to override his veto on the sales tax was going to come up again. But we fooled them. We have a supplemental plant downstairs that generates electricity. Yeah, Representative Peters, a very forceful Speaker."

Peters: "Representative Satterthwaite, does that answer your question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "If.. if I misspoke myself and said four hundred million, I'm sorry. The figure that I was really referring



to was four hundred thousand. Now it's ... it's my understanding that the original figure in the Governor's budget was four hundred thousand dollars higher than what he has approved by this amendatory veto. In addition to that he has also excluded the four hundred and forty-four thousand dollar line item for staffing and training for these programs and so, in fact, what he is now approving by this amendatory veto is more than eight hundred thousand dollars less than his original budget request. I feel that if we are going to have to wrap the staffing and training into this line item, we certainly ought to have the five hundred thousand dollar reduction restored. There's no way that we can provide the same level of service and incorporate these other responsibilities and still come up with a sufficient level of service for this line item and I would urge the Members to support the motion to override the reduction in this line item."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I hope the Members of the House did listen with great care to realize we had a commotion just before Representative Satterthwaite spoke. But I hope the Members did listen very carefully to her because the point that she made was so cogent. The fact is is that with the Governor's amendatory veto that is takes this program down beneath the level of the original request for this appropriation. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I also hope that the Members of the House will consider that this is the Department of Public Health who has an absolute famous or infamous record of being absolutely totally wrong relative to its priorities as it set for health spending. This line is a line that the Department of Public Health heretofore had to come in for a supplemental appropriation to pay for the debts that it had incurred for this.. this much needed program. I believe and I be-



lieve under the considerations of the current programs to amendatorily veto and take that amount beneath the original requested request for this appropriation, which took into consideration the supplemental that was necessary to provide the much needed current services in this area, is something that the Governor perhaps did not take into consideration when he amendatorily vetoed this line. Of the many programs that we have, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in the Appropriations Committee, this is one that I have received probably the most direct mail from hospitals across the state, not just in the northern area, but from across the state, asking that we make sure that we restore this small amount, and it is a small amount when you consider the overall appropriation for the Department of Health, to make sure that we restore this amount to insure that the much needed program of prenatal care for mothers across the state would be funded at the proper level to insure that we can carry out that program as it should be. I think in this case, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, that we should override the Governor's veto and insure that the proper amount of money is there to carry out this much needed program that would insure of at least that that the mothers, that the women that would have to take a part in this kind of care, that it would be available ... for them across the state and to insure that the money is there. This is not that much. Four hundred thousand and I think that in this case the Governor erred in reducing this amount, even to the point of it being below the level of necessary expenditure for the current year. I would urge you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, to support this motion and to override the Governor's veto notwithstanding."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Braun, to close."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I hope



that we do not lose sight of the purpose of the paranatal grant. It's to provide services for high risk mothers, from RH negative mothers, for mothers with hemophilia, for anemic mothers, for mothers whose babies might die if they don't receive the specialized care at delivery. That is the purpose of these grants. The Department came in with an appropriation that was.. came in for a supplemental appropriation last time. They tried to .. more accurately assess their needs with their request. We are only trying to restore the five hundred thousand dollars that was reduced and I urge a favorable vote on this motion. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall the reduced item of appropriation on page 17 line 30 be restored to its original amount notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this money is not earmarked for Cook County or the city of Chicago. This money is for the entire State of Illinois, for Rockford, Peoria, Champaign, Decatur, East St. Louis, the entire state. Now many of you go around and you are always voting prolife legislation. You are always voting against abortion. I'm one of those folks that is with you on that issue. But what are you going to do for these women who deliver babies and who are having problems in delivery? Now you're saying, 'Go ahead.' We're going to turn our backs on them. 'We don't care if you have problems in labor, if you have problems RH negative, if your child has an open spine, we're turning our backs on you. You can't have an abortion, but we can't give you any funds for those poor little babies and those mothers who are pregnant.' I think that during Respect For Life month, this month of October we should have more green lights up there and I plead with you who are prolife Legi-



slators to vote 'aye' on this issue."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have a personal interest in this motion override. I'd like to explain it. Nine weeks ago my wife and I had a baby and possibly... thanks. Approximately ten hours later he had pneumonia and his lung collapsed and they had to fly him over to the perinatal center here in St. John's Hospital and because of that... that work that they did on now Daniel Michael, he's alive today. And so, the kind of work that they do is not just always for somebody else. And speaking from one who saw what they did to my son, our son, and how they handled the situation, how every time you called them they were very friendly on the phone and always honest with you and sometimes kind of fearfully honest with you, I ask you to override this motion because of all the work that they seem to be doing nowadays with health, this perinatal center and others I'm sure, but especially the one here in St. John's, save lives and I'd ask you to override this motion."

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

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, first I have to... Are 107 votes needed for this? Alright. I'd like to add my word to that of Representative McClain's. There's another Representative here, Doc Capuzi, who would not have living grandchildren if this perinatal center of this type were not in existence. You have to understand. When a baby is born and weighs... three months prematurely, weighs only two pounds, then has to have open heart surgery, weighing less than two pounds, very expensive care is required. There has to be round the clock monitoring. There has to be total life support system. It's monitored just as you would be if you had by-pass surgery, heart surgery. It is expensive care. It is desperately needed to get these babies through



the first three months of their lives when they would normally be born. Thank you so much for those votes. Please keep those green lights up there. It is vital."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Speaker, you did indicate 107 were required?"

Speaker Redmond: "No, 89 on this one. Have all voted who wish? This motion, having received the Constitutional Majority, prevails in the item on page 17 line 30 of House Bill 2578 is restored to its original amount notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. Representative Braun, what's your pleasure on the other motions on 2578?"

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to pass motion #3.."

Speaker Redmond: "Withdraw 3?"

Braun: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay."

Braun: "And move to motion #4."

Speaker Redmond: "How about 1? Or 2 rather? You've got 2 on there."

Braun: "#2 was taken up in part by Representative Darrow's motion and in part by the motion that I just..."

Speaker Redmond: "So that is withdrawn. Am I right on that?"

Braun: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Then we're on motion #4, appears on page 9. Is that correct?"

Braun: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Braun in recognized."

Braun: "This is the.. this a part of the perinatal.. this motion relates to the perinatal staffing and training grants. It's four hundred thousand dollars. It is part of making this program a viable one and I would encourage your support for it."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to prolong this. People seem to have their minds, you know, made up on what they're going to end up doing for whatever reasons. Just that in



the estimation of the Bureau of the Budget it makes a lot more sense to operate, not in opposition to the staffing and training grants, but at least their position is that they would rather have the hospitals expend the money and then give the hospitals the money back as opposed to giving the money up front. So for that reason, I oppose this but I.. whatever happens is going to happen."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Currie. Representative McClain, please sit down."

Currie: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. As I understand it, Representative Peters, it's not just a change in where the money is going to be spent from, which line item, although that is part of what this.. what this issue is about, but, in fact, transferring the staffing and training to the tertiary care line grant item would have the effect first of all of making it unclear exactly how much money is to be spent for training and staffing, and it seems to me we ought to be concerned about how much money is going to that particular piece of the perinatal program. In addition the tertiary care line item was reduced for the next year as of the last. So, I don't think that..that suggesting that it would just make budgetary sense to change the place where the money comes from makes really good sense if we're concerned about offering adequate perinatal care to high risk mothers and infants. I would support an override of the Governor's amendatory veto.. line item veto on this issue."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is, 'Shall the item on page 18 lines 1-3 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Satterthwaite, to explain her vote. Mr. McClain, please sit down."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in explaining my 'yes' vote on this line item, here is a case where the Governor is expecting to have it both ways.



He has put into the budget less money for tertiary care than was used last year and at the same time is asking that that money be used for a new function that was not covered by that line item before. It appears that trying to track the money that would be expended for staffing and training through this tertiary care line item as the Governor suggests would be almost impossible. It will be a far better route of accountability if we put.. restore this money in a separate line item so that we know how much is designated for this purpose rather than for direct tertiary care. This way we will give the hospitals involved some indication of the level of support that they can expect to have in their staffing and training and will give them a much better means of planning for the delivery of service. I think this is an integral part of the care program that we ought to be funding and I urge your green vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "Parliamentary inquiry Mr. Speaker. How many votes does this one require?"

Speaker Redmond: "This is 107. Item veto."

Braun: "In that case I would urge all the people who voted before, in regards to maintain the perinatal center, to please put a green vote up there so that we can make certain that this program is operative. It's so important for the life of mothers and their babies who have problem pregnancies."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 100 'aye', 47 'no'. Representative Braun."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, poll the absentees please."

Speaker Redmond: "The Lady has requested a poll of the absentees. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees; Jane Barnes. Capuzi. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Dwight Friedrich. Garmisa. Grossi.



Hallstrom. Dave Jones. Kozubowski. Kucharski.
Margulas. McAuliffe. McBroom. McCourt. Meyer. Molloy.
Oblinger. Polk. Robbins. Schlickman. Schoeberlein.
Schuneman. Stanley. Telcser. Totten. and Vinson."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Braun."

Braun: "Postponed Consideration, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes 'aye'. Postponed
Consideration."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "What? Is it going... Mr. Speaker, will this... can this
go back to Postponed Consideration?"

Speaker Redmond: "If we have time, we'll go back to it, but
it has to be today."

Braun: "Alright. Okay. Thank you."



Speaker Redmond: "House Bill 2649. Postponed Consideration, yeah. Representative Hallstrom, are you seeking recognition?"

Hallstrom: "I wanted 'aye' on that 2578."

Speaker Redmond: "Does she have leave to be recorded as 'aye'? When it comes up again.. Objection has been raised by the Minority Spokesman. So when it gets back again ... Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I have absolutely no objection to it being in fact, to this being passed. But it appears to me that when some individuals get up and they get the vote and they ask for Postponed, that's over with. And they ought to follow the rules..."

Speaker Redmond: "I'm not for..."

Peters: "Like everybody else follows the rules. I'm not addressing this to you, Mr. Speaker. I'm addressing it to several Members, particularly on our side of the aisle who are very much for equal rights, but only for certain people."

Speaker Redmond: " Representative Matijevich? Representative Hanahan. No, Hanahan on 2649. I was wondering if Matijevich wanted to go to work."

Hanahan: "Are we going to change Speakers?"

Speaker Redmond: "Huh?"

Hanahan: "Are we going to change Speakers?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, we're going to put the first team in."

Hanahan: "Okay."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 2649 was a regular appropriation for the office and the contingent expenses of the Office of Education and a grant in aid appropriation of various items that the General Assembly funds for the various items of grants to local School Districts from various portions of education, from bi-lingual to gifted and to the other special education, voc-ed and the rest of the programs."



The Governor in his wisdom or lack of it, through the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget did reduce veto some items. And the motions that I have here are to be separated so that we will be voting on the first item on gifted education. The Governor reduced the amount passed by the General Assembly by half a million dollars from 5 million to 4 million five hundred thousand. As some of you Members will recall gifted education is coming in its own. There is a lot of respect for the programs of gifted education, what to do with the extra talented child in making sure that he or she does not become a future drop out just because there is no program to keep them in .. and encourage them to excel in educational programs in their local School Districts. In McHenry County we have a law suit, for example, demanding a greater gifted program in the local School Districts in McHenry County and I'm sure that other School Districts are looking at this law suit as it progresses through the courts as an incentive of encouragement to fund gifted programs even to a higher level. My first motion, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Speaker and Members of the House is to restore the five million dollars on the line item of page 23 line 30 of the gifted education appropriation so that the gifted programs will continue to grow and be stronger. I know some Members have come to me privately and said.. and encouraged me to propose this one item specifically in their behalf because they know of the benefits that gifted education.. the investment really that we make in the gifted child for passage of this half a million dollars which is a very meager amount in comparison to the return of that investment. And I move, Mr. Speaker, that page 23 line 30 be restored to five million dollars for gifted education."

Speaker Matijeovich: "The motion is by Representative Hanahan



that on page 23 line 30 of House Bill 2649, that it be restored to five million dollars. Is that correct, Representative Hanahan?"

Hanahan: "A half a million dollar inc... five hundred thousand dollar increase on what the Governor signed."

Speaker Marijevich: "Alright. Discussion on that motion?"

The Gentleman from Cook County, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, last Session we worked very long and very hard in trying to reach some agreements on the funding for education, both in terms of the formula and the various grants kind of programs. It seems to me to be absolute madness on the part of this Legislature and on the part of everyone who participates in any kind of those discussions to reach agreement at one stage.. to reach agreement on the basis that one part of the fund is increased because the agreement generally has been received that the Governor will reduce other line items so that we can still maintain some fiscal kind of stance and then come back into the override Session and undo all of that. It is, to me, a waste of time of the appropriation process. It's a waste of time of people on the Committee. It's a waste of the time of the Members of the House to try and get involved in any of this. Now, the gifted education line item, here's only five hundred thousand dollars. So what's five hundred thousand dollars? Not much out of an eleven billion budget. But all of these motions that the Representative from McHenry is going to produce a total of eleven million. We've already overridden some of eleven or twelve million. Here's going to be another eleven million. That's 22. And who knows how much further we're going to go, plus with the Senate? And then we're going to come back and end up saying we still have a surplus and we're going to come back and



end up saying there's money for Cook County Hospital. We're going to come back and say there's still money to give back to the taxpayers. And we're going to come back and still say there's more money for the old, for the young, for the tired, the abused and everybody else. You and I know that's baloney. You and I know that when you go back to your constituents and you make that argument, that's a bunch of crock and you know it and I know it. Let's at least, for once, be somewhat safe and stay with ourselves and say what we're doing. If you want to override, override because it's politically popular and let's say it. We're going to bow into the pressure of the gifted community or whatever kind of community it is, bi-lingual or impact employment or anything else. We're going to bow to those pressures, but don't start making the argument that it's fiscally sound, it's fiscally responsible and what we're doing for our constituents and there's still enough cash to take care of Cook County Hospital and the 5.2 million that's going to come up for the abused and 151 thousand that's going to come up with the deaf and everything else. It just ain't there. Somebody's going to end up getting short changed."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from..."

Peters: "Not..Not as yet, Mr. Speaker. At some point... at some point..."

Speaker Matijevich: "You're just catching your breath is that it?"

Peters: "A short breath because I don't intend to get up and speak on all of these, Mr. Speaker. It appears to me it's going to end up being a waste of time to go down on all of this. But there are a number of us and many on both sides of the aisle who worked very hard with the Teacher's Association, with the Bureau of the Budget, and with everybody else, including the Illinois



Office of Education, to come up with figures both in this budget and in the formula budget which were agreeable and everybody could live with. "To come back three months later and say we're throwing it out the window because we want to grab onto more, fine that's your right to do. But don't attempt to end up justifying it because now, all of sudden we need it. Those agreements that were made in June weren't worth a damn piece of paper they were written on. And the people who were involved in those agreements, their word, in my estimation, isn't worth as much either. And if we're going to end up doing that thing in the appropriation process, then we might as well forget about the process, forget about the negotiations, forget about working on these things in a manner and trying to work out any kinds of problem. Whether it's county hospital or anything else, bring it to the floor and whoever can shout and yell the loudest and scream the loudest, let that pass and to hell with what happens to the people in the end."

Speaker Matijevich: "An introduction from the Chair. Former Member, respected State Senator, at the Minority Leader's desk, Senator Meade Blatz. Meade, you want to wave and say hello to all? The Gentleman from McLean, the Majority Whip, Gerald Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, sometimes galls me to hear somebody on the floor of the House stand up and say there was an agreement and the Appropriations Committee worked long and hard and we agreed and it has been written in stone and I thought the political process and the legislative process would give the other 150 Members who are not Members of the Appropriations Committee to make some kind of a determination at a certain point in time that we do not have to buy what the Appropriations Committee said is written



in granite and we have to abide by that. I thought we had the opportunity on Second Reading and Third Reading and at this particular point in a Veto Session to make some kind of a change that we might think would be necessary in funding of some of the particular departments of State Government. That's what this... what Representative Hanahan is attempting to do. I remind the Gentleman that just spoke that last year when we were told that we had thirty million extra dollars a year ago at this time, to spend on education because they.. we'd appropriated more than they could spend, we changed the formula. And those people who were entitled to more money in the formula received more dollars. But those of us in some of our Districts in almost all the schools in my District, because of the change we made in the formula and then it was concluded that the thirty million dollars was not available. And I asked the Distinguished Chairman where the Appropriation Committee was that told us we had more money then we didn't have more money, where was that distinguished group at that time that cost the schools in my District money because you pro-rated and took away from the School District that I represent, their share of the supposedly thirty million dollars that wasn't available? And now you ask us to make.. to sell ourselves to the Appropriation Committee and believe in what they told us all over again. The School Districts I represent have an opportunity to receive some of the dollars that are in this particular motion. And I suggest that every downstate Member, whether he be Republican or Democrat, that has a unit District or a District that's on a Strayer-Haig formula or a flat grant District this is your opportunity to see that some of those schools receive some of those dollars that were taken away from us just a year ago when we made those changes,



when we were told there was thrity million dollars available and there really waan't. And we were pro-rated and we lost those dollars and the Distinguished Chairman of the Appropriations Committee knows very well what I'm talking about. Tremendous mistake was made. I urge every Member that has flat grant Districts, Strayer-Haig Districts, even unit Districts that because of the error we made a year ago, if for no other reason, to vote with this particular motion, to vote to override the Governor's veto, so that we will receive some of those particular dollars that we didn't receive last year, dollars that were really taken away. We were entitled to those dollars and I offered an Amendment and people said it might be the best Amendment offered on the floor of the House last year, but it takes money away from us. It's a fair Amendment, but I can't support it. Baloney."

Speaker Matijevich: "The..."

Bradley: "Let's... Let's .. I'm just getting my second breath..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Second wind again. Alright."

Bradley: "Let's support this. I'm not going to talk again on each separate issue... on each separate motion that the Gentleman is going to make. I simply say to you we lost more than eleven million dollars in downstate Illinois, in the Strayer-Haig Districts, in the flat grant Districts. This is our opportunity to regroup some of those dollars. And I intend to support and I urge every Member to support the Gentleman's motion on every motion that he's going to make here today. Thank you very much."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Assistant Minority Leader, from Cook County, Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm not quite as close to this issue as are the Members who have



spoken already. My recollection is that the entire House voted on this measure during the course of the Regular Session knowing full well that there would be a reduction in this portion of the budget so that other parts of the school aid formula could have larger amounts of money. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the prior speaker was simply involved in political rhetoric and political flim-flam. The Minority Spokesman on our Appropriations Committee, I think hit the nail on the head. We can't come here in a Session and one day be for tax relief and the very next day support every single motion to override which would go beyond the parameters and the constraints of the state's budget. This is a very point and the very example I try to make in my District regarding the question of tax relief. I don't recall who has been putting the motions today and yesterday regarding overriding gubernatorial vetos in relation to spending Bills. But I would bet that the majority of people who are putting motions to override the Governor, voted to override Mr. Thompson, on the sales tax. Now that's not being honest. The Gentleman from Cook, I think very succinctly addressed himself to the broader issue. And that is, we can't have it both ways. It's easy to go in our District and it's easy to always be for a worthy cause. All of us want to do that and yet not enough of us want to exercise fiscal constraint when the issue is before us. We talk about inplitudes; we talk about cutting the budget; we talk about not spending enough money, as long as it's the next person's interest that's being affected. But as soon as it's something in which you, individually, are interested in, you'll vote to spend the money. And that's why this entire issue of so-called tax relief was a political game. It was simply in my judgment using



our constituencies and I might add it was putting the re-elected chances of Members of the House far above the interests of their constituencies. One of things I think is wrong with this country today is that too many of us in public life put our party interests and our own self interests ahead of our constituencies. There's no way in the world we're going to be able to offer honest tax relief and at the very same time move to spend money far in excess of the budget's... of the money that's available in the budget. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, on appropriations, Minority Spokesman was correct. Somewhere there's got to be a broad perspective of how we're going to spend the money. Everyone feels that their own particular project doesn't mean anything in the budget. But if you put together every motion, every override, we're going to exceed the budget. And there's no way in God's green earth, whether it's five cents, four cents or one cent that we're going to be able to get tax relief. That simply isn't going to happen."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as all of you are aware I am a person who's been very supportive of education at every level. However, I do want to bring to your attention that last year's allocation for this line item was three million dollars. The Bill, as it left the House, called for a level of funding at four million dollars. It was by Senate action that it was increased to five million dollars. In this particular case, I feel that as a responsible Legislator, wanting tax relief, certainly, I have to be selective about which of these items I am going to support. Because the Governor's Message now leaves us at a level halfway between what was approved by the



House and by the Senate, I feel that the level that the Governor has allocated for this line item is a reasonable amount. It is still a substantial increase over their last year's appropriation and as a responsible Legislator, I feel that I must support additional funds for mandated programs rather than the non-mandated line items. And so, in this case, I reluctantly will oppose this motion to override the Governor's veto. We could use the money and I'm sure that it would do a lot of good for the gifted students. But as a matter of priority, I feel that this is a good level of funding for gifted children's education and I will not support this motion to override."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from LaSalle, Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I certainly agree with the last speaker. Even with the Governor's reduction veto on this particular line item, the gifted program still allows for a 43.3 increase over the '79 appropriation. So I urge defeat of this motion."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Mulcahey. Your light's on. Okay. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to oppose this motion to override this veto also. I think the comments that have been made in general have been correct in terms of the funding of education. In my judgment, the overall educational funding this year has been outstanding considering the circumstances that we thought we would be in. In our travels around the state we find people in our business most appreciative of the actions and the activities of this Legislature. I think, however, that when we start to discuss these



kinds of issues we ought to all stick to the issue at hand, and that is, we're looking at specific amendatory vetos. Once we stray into other areas, we have a tendency to .. we have a tendency to get caught up in a pool of ignorance. And we get involved in the process of sharing that ignorance with one another as if it were fact. This is not the time nor the place to debate those kinds of issues. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to oppose this specific amendatory veto and will also oppose all other motions to override the actions of the Governor."

Speaker Matijeovich: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

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

Speaker Matijeovich: "Representative Dunn has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed by saying 'nay'. And the 'aye's have it. The main question is put. Representative Hanahan to close."

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'd like to remind some of the speakers that have spoken in opposition to this restoration of five hundred thousand dollars, that if we paid attention to what they advocate to this House, we will neither have tax relief or programs. It seems odd that some of those opponents of this restoration also voted against tax relief saying that they wouldn't have enough money for a program. Now, they've got the money.... They saved the money for the Governor and now, all of a sudden, they're saying that we shouldn't restore the programs to levels that are adequate. Let me remind those speakers of agreements, that the agreements that the House and the Senate made,



sent this Bill to the Governor at a half a million dollars more than the amount of money that we're restoring. The House and Senate sent it through with the agreement that it would be at five million dollars. We did not have any agreement with the Governor at four million, five hundred thousand. We had the agreement of the House and Senate at five million. Let me further point out for those of you who believe in the Committee structures, believe in the advocacy that government works through the Commissions and Committees, and that all the recommendations of these experts should be taken and evaluated and judged upon, that the Office of Education, the State Board of Education that, we, the General Assembly, have put together and appropriate on behalf of, have recommended a six million dollar figure, not five million. Let's quit kidding ourselves and hiding around facts and figures because I'll tell you something, you're kidding yourself. Gifted education is an investment, not an expenditure. Seventy-five thousand children in this state need gifted education. Because they are specially talented. These are kids that are going to find the successful formulas for curing poli... or curing cancer and curing the common cold. These are the kids that are going to find out how to send rockets to Mars and Venus and all the other places. These are the kids that are going to break through in technological advances that are undreamt of in this generation. These are the kids that need to be encouraged and you're not doing it by cutting a meger five hundred thousand dollars from spending in behalf of gifted kids. Now let me tell you something, I want to hear from people all over this state saying, why do we spend money for special education for kids that will never meet this kind of potential for



future development in this state? We're going to expend millions and millions of dollars for kids with learning disabilities and special education programs and projects. And when we talk about spending five million dollars for those children that have extra talents that are complete above and beyond and need the encouragement of this General Assembly to find a level of education that they need, we're going to say 'no' for five hundred thousand. I think it's a silly kind of argument that we're going to save the taxpayers of Illinois five hundred thousand and maybe put off finding some kind of technological advances for a few more years for that paltry amount of money. I just suggest to each Member of the General Assembly makes his own record, but I'm going to tell you this, that when you go back home and you're talking to the Boards of Education, you're talking to the teachers' group, you're talking to the parents group, and you tell them that you voted against a half a million dollar increase in the appropriation for gifted, you ought to hang your head in shame. You vote your own switch up or down. I'm just asking you to use good judgment on a program that should be encouraged, especially by those who say that we can't afford tax relief, but because we need these programs, and then have the gall to stand on this floor and say that we.. we do not need the programs because somebody else is for tax relief. Quit trying to walk... vote both ways at one time. Wear your shoes on forward, not backwards and walk straight. Be right and at least have the courage of your convictions and say if you're against tax relief for a program, that this is a worthwhile program to invest in. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich : "Inquiry of the Chair from the Gentleman



Cook County, Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, this takes 89 votes, is that right?"

Speaker Matijevich: "That's correct. On the motion of Representative Hanahan's, the question is, 'Shall the reduced item of appropriation on page 23, line 30 of House Bill 2649 be restored to its original amount notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'nay'. This takes 89 votes, a Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's ... On this question there are 76 'aye's, 63 'nay's and 7 voting 'present'. And the Sponsor wishes a poll of the absentees. The Clerk will proceed with a poll of the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. Currie. Donovan. Flinn. Friedland. Garmisa. Harris. Dave Jones. Kelly. Kosinski..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Currie is 'aye'. Currie 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Kozubowski. Margulas. McAuliffe. McBroom. McClain. McCourt..."

Speaker Matijevich: "McCourt, 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "McMaster. Meyer. Molloy. Mulcahey..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Mulcahey, 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Oblinger. Polk. Richmond. Robbins. Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Slape. E.G. Steele. Van Dyne. Williams. Sam Wolf. And, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "Williams... Williams, 'aye'. Could we have the... Birchler? Birchler, 'aye'. Are there... Could you give me the tally now, Mr. Clerk? On this motion there are 80 'aye's and 60 'no's. Kelly? Kelly, 'aye'. 80...Yes. Representative Pullen, are you recorded 'no'? You're 'aye' up on the Board. Oh,



I'm sorry. Don Totten asked me that. I thought he meant it. I'm sorry. Van Duyne, 'aye'. I thought there was really something wrong. Speaker Redmond, 'aye'. Donovan, 'aye'. Sam Wolf, 'aye'. We have to get a tally now. Could I get a tally from the Clerk? The motion is 85 'aye's, 63 'no's. And the motion is declared lost. Representative Hanahan on motion number two, is it? Oh, that's right. The Assistant Majority Leader, Representative Taylor, from Cook County."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Today is a great day in our House here. One of our colleagues and I just found this out moments ago, is having a birthday today and claims he's 62 years old and that's our colleague that sits in the front of me, Representative Emil Jones. I wish my colleague from the 24th District Representative Carol Braun would sing 'Happy Birthday' to Representative Jones. Come on, Representative Braun, please."

Speaker Matijevich: "Braun. Ebbesen says that's against the rules. I'm not sure. We've changed the rules since Geo-Karis left. Is that still in our rules? Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think if you'll look, one of the first actions we took in the Eighty-First General Assembly was to pass that Resolution, no singing."

Speaker Matijevich: "That's one of the best things that Representative Geo-Karis has been responsible for. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the second line item is for fifty thousand dollars. I know this sounds like a great amount of money, I'd hate to try and figure out how many mills that is as person... eleven million people in the State of Illinois. But the gifted area centers provide assistance to local



district program coordinators in the planning, implementation and evaluation of the gifted programs and conduct the in-service training for the class room teachers. Centers also assist the State Board in monitoring the local programs and disseminating information and ideas and new trends and research in gifted education and serve as regional advocates for gifted education. They also have responsibilities for facilitating the establishment of low incident programs for the highly gifted. Teachers of gifted children... gifted program coordinators are the primary client group of area service centers. Each year approximately 2500 persons in these categories are served. In addition, talent searches are identified.. are identifying over 500 highly gifted children whom the centers serve. There are currently nine area service centers covering every county in the state. Most centers are staffed by two full time persons and operate on a budget of about \$63,000 per year. Area service centers are awarded contracts based upon specifications set forth in a request for a proposal. The service centers agree to perform various services including workshops, on site visits, monitoring of activities and clearinghouse functions. The disbursement of funds is made on a quarterly basis. The motion I make, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, is to restore fifty thousand dollars to the area service center budget which would increase it from 700,000 to 750,000 that was originally passed by the House and Senate, to the Governor as part of the program. I might point out that the Governor in his allocation had originally in recommendation had set the figure at \$713,000. So we're not restoring that much higher than the Governor's original allocation. The State Board's recommendation is \$843,000 and what we're doing here is restoring it up to \$750,000



which is a very meager amount and can be well used by the centers to help keep the programs of gifted moving along. I urge a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hanahan has moved with respect to House Bill 2649 to restore the reduced item of appropriation on page 24, line 1, to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor. On that motion, the Lady from Cook, Representative Braun. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just remind you that this particular appropriation is a separate line item which ties in with the preceding motion, which failed. I would urge that you maintain the position that you maintained on the last motion on this motion because it deals with the gifted program and I believe that, as was pointed out, the 44% increase in one year being all bad. Thank you very much."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite. Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I disagree with the previous speaker. Although this is somewhat related to the same subject matter, really the amount of increase that went into this line item was very small even for what we approved as it left the House and Senate. The \$50,000 restoration by the approval of this motion is something that we can certainly afford in the state and I would wholeheartedly support this motion to override."

Speaker Matijevich: "If there's no further discussion, the motion and question by Representative Hanahan's motion is, 'Shall the reduced item of appropriation on page 24, line 1, of House Bill 2649 be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of



the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'nay'. This takes 89 votes, the Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? The Gentleman from Cook County, the Assistant Majority Leader, Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, it's just been brought to my attention that there may be a number of Members who's switches are being voted. I think we'll be in for some verification if some of these motions do receive 89 votes. I would hope that Members would only vote their own switches."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Oh, I'm sorry. Record the Speaker 'aye'. Braun, 'aye'. On this question there are 82 'aye', 68 'nay', and the motion is declared lost. Representative Hanahan on motion #3."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, special education extraordinary services is a program that the purpose of this program is to provide educa... Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I was on the wrong page. Special education private school tuition; The purpose of this program is to insure that all handicapped children receive special education services when the public schools cannot make appropriate programs available. Such children may then attend a private special education facility and special education facilities owned and operated by County Government or public and private out-of-state schools that provide the necessary services required by the child. This reimbursement also applies to summer school programs for these kinds of special services. Progress of children attending private schools is monitored annually by local School Districts and through the State Office of Education. If the State educational agency approves local School Dis-



trit placement of these children, the District may be reimbursed according to the formula prescribed in Senate Bill... Senate Bill 395. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the amount to be restored is one million dollars from 15 million to 16 million. The fifteen million was advocated by the House and Senate. The State Board request was 18 million, 225 thousand dollars. I'd just suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that if we're to take into consideration the State Board's expertise in this unique field of education appropriation, that we're not even coming close by restoring this one million dollars to the veto and I ask for a favorable Roll Call to restore the one million dollars vetoed by the Governor on page 24, line 4 and restore it to the 16 million dollars passed by the House and the Senate."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan, has moved with respect to House Bill 2649 to restore the reduced item of appropriation on page 24, line 4, to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor. On that motion, the Gentleman from Cook, the Chairman of the Appro... the Minority Spokesman, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, not to repeat what I already did say, but in terms of all the children in the State of Illinois, in terms of all the School Districts in the State of Illinois, this House, both sides of the aisle, in discussion and in agreement was very, very generous to the School Districts and to the children of the State in increase over the previous year of 112.8 million dollars. That, I think, shows the interest and concern of this House, Democrat and Republican, and it shows the generosity of this House and the willingness of this House and the people of the State, as represented by the Members



of this House, to take care of education, but to take care of it efficiently, that dollars are spent properly and that more than is necessary is not appropriated because as all of us well know, the more you give to bureaucracy, the bureaucracy will end up spending it, finding ways of spending it and will be back next year for more. I ask for your continued support in terms of defeating these motions."

Speaker Matijevich: "If there's no further discussion, the quest... The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan, to close."

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to point out that since the federal law 94-142 went into effect on these kinds of programs, that we are now, if we stay with the Governor's recommended line item reduction, we would only be funding at 82.3% of what the law calls for. Now, I'd suggest that even with the restoration of the one million dollars, we will only be funding at 87.7% of what we say we should be funding this program. It seems to me that we shouldn't be trying to say that we're doing so much for education when, in fact, those that are voting 'no' and those that are voting 'absent' are only suggesting that we should fund at 82.3%. That isn't, to me, being generous. That, to me, seems to be a little short sighted on what special education services as the increased cost keep going up in your local School District has to make it up with real estate tax dollars, and that's the answer to the whole thing. They're going to provide the services they have to. So it's either that we provide the money here, out of general revenue, or your local real estate tax dollar by your negative vote on this motion, has to increase to provide these services which are mandated by law. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."



Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall the reduced item of appropriation on page 24, line 4, of House Bill 2649 be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'nay'. This motion takes 89 votes for a Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 91 'aye's, 48 'nay's, 6 voting 'present'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, if it has received 91 votes, I'd ask for a verification."

Speaker Matijevich: "Yes. Stearney. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Stearney. Record Stearney as 'no'. Give me the tally. Boucek, 'no'. Johnson, 'aye'. Griesheimer? The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Griesheimer."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "How is Representative Griesheimer recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Griesheimer: "Change that to 'aye' please."

Speaker Matijevich: "Change Griesheimer to 'aye'. Rea.. James Rea, 'aye'. Bill Harris, 'aye'. Clarence Neff, 'aye'? 'Aye'. Clarence Neff, 'aye'. George Ray Hudson..."

Hudson: "Mr. Chairman, just as a suggestion, could we in this case, dump this Roll Call..."

Speaker Matijevich: "No. We're going to proceed now because we've gone too far. George Ray Hudson, did you want .. You didn't want to vote?"

Hudson: "No, Sir."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. Any others to be... Sandquist, The Gentleman from Cook."

Sandquist: "Yeah, from 'present' to 'no'."



Speaker Matijevich: "'Present' to 'no', Sandquist. Could we.. Could we have the tally? Jim Keane, 'aye'. On this question there are 95 'aye's, and 49 'no's and do you persist in your request for a verification? Representative Peters persists in his request for a verification and Representative Hanahan asks for a poll of the absentees. Clerk will proceed with the poll of the absentees. Before you do, record Emil... Bullock as 'aye'. We start off with what count, Mr. Clerk? 96 'aye's and 49 'no's is the starting point."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. Jane Barnes. Christensen. Conti. Darrow. Donovan. Hwing..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Darrow, 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Flihn. Garmisa. Dave Jones. Emil Jones. Katz. Kozubowski. Leverenz. Margulas. McAuliffe. McBroom. McGrew. Meyer. Oblinger. Pechous. Polk. Reilly. Schneider...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Just one moment. McGrew, 'aye'. "

Clerk Leone: "Slape. Taylor. Van Duyne..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Van Duyne, 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "And, Sam Wolf."

Speaker Matijevich: "Wolf, 'aye'. Christensen, did you say 'aye'? No. I thought he was nodding 'aye'. Sam Wolf, 'aye'. Did you get Bianco? 'Aye'. Christensen did say 'aye' afterall. Christensen, 'aye'. Can we now have a count, Mr. Clerk? Jim.. Jim Taylor, 'aye'. 103 'aye' and 48 'no'. Did you still persist, Representative Peters? Representative Peters persists in a verification. The Clerk will proceed with the Affirmative Roll Call. Please be in your seats and answer to the Roll Call on verification."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the affirmative. Alexander. Balanoff. E.M. Barnes..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Representative Younge, for



what purpose do you arise?"

Young: "May I have leave to be verified?"

Speaker Matijeich: "Leave, Wyvetter Young to be verified?

Leave. Proceed with the affirmative Roll."

Clerk Leone: "Beatty. Bell. Bianco. Birchler. Bowman.

Bradley. Braun. Breslin. Brummer. Bullock. Burnidge.

Capparelli. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton.

Currie. Darrow. Davis. Dawson. Deuster. DiPrima.

Domico. Doyle. John Dunn. Ralph Dunn. Ewell. Farley

Virginia Frederick. Friedland. Gaines. Getty.

Giorgi..."

Speaker Matijeich: "One moment. Record Pechous as 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Griesheimer.

Hallstrom. Hanahan. Harris. Henry. Huff. Jaffe.

Johnson. Kane. Keane. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski.

Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leinenweber. Leon.

Macdonald. Madigan. Marovitz. Matijeich. McClain.

McCourt. McGrew. McMaster. McPike. Molloy. Mugalian.

Mulcahey. Murphy. Neff. O'Brien..."

Speaker Matijeich: "One moment. Tim Donovan, 'aye'.

Donovan, 'aye'. And Emil Jones 'aye'. McCourt, 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the poll of the affirmative."

Speaker Matijeich: "Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Piel. Pierce.

Pouncey. Preston. Pullen. Rea. Reed. Richmond.

Robbins. Ronan. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schlickman.

Schraeder. Sharp. Skinner. Stanley. Steczo. Taylor.

Terzich. Van Duyne. Vitek. VonBoeckman. Watson.

White. Willer..."

Speaker Matijeich: "Leave that Pechous be verified. Leave.

Okay."

Clerk Leone: "Winchester. Sam Wolf. Young. Yourell.

Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijeich: "Alright. Alright. We've completed.

We'll get to Peters. Before we do, I think that's former



Senator Jim Bell up in the balcony. Is that Jim? Good to see you. Jim Bell up in the gallery. I thought... I thought my eyes were still good. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel... What's the count, Mr. Clerk? 106 'aye's and 49? 49 'no's. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters... Before we do it, the Majority Leader, Representative Madigan, on an introduction."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, simply to introduce a group of students in the gallery from the Hubbard High School in Chicago. They are accompanied by their .. their Assistant Principal, Mr. Coze and Mr. Owens, from Hubbard High School in Chicago."

Speaker Matijevich: "Welcome to Springfield."

Madigan: "And I'd like to add that it's from the District represented by myself, Representatives Beatty and Kucharski."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters, on... Alright. The Clerk said he made a mistake. We start with 105 'aye's. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative: Peters. Gaines have leave to be verified? Leave..."

Peters: "No. No. Where is Representative Gaines?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He's.. He's leaving right there, in the front. Proceed, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Representative Terzich."

Speaker Matijevich: "Terzich?"

Peters: "I'm sorry. He's here. Okay."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright, on your side."

Peters: "Representative Stanley?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Stanley? I don't see him in his seat. Is he in the Assembly? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him from the Roll."



Peters: "I was going to say Skinner, but I see him. Representative Pullen? She's there."

Speaker Matijevich: "She's there."

Peters: "Representative Patrick?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Who .. He's up.. .He's in the back, yes."

Peters: "Patrick?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Patrick is way in the back. Yes."

Peters: "Thankyou. Representative Murphy?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Murphy's in his seat."

Peters: "Representative Mulcahey?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Mulcahey's in his seat."

Peters: "Representative Ralph Dunn."

Speaker Matijevich: "Ralph Dunn is not in his seat. Is he in the hall? I don't see him. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him from the Roll."

Peters: "Representative Doyle?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Ed Doyle? Is on the telephone, in his seat, yes."

Peters: "Representative Donovan?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Dunn?"

Peters: "Donovan."

Speaker Matijevich: "Donovan is, yes, in the middle aisle."

Peters: "Representative DiPrima. I see him."

Speaker Matijevich: "DiPrima's in his seat."

Peters: "Representative Dawson."

Speaker Matijevich: "Glenn Dawson? I don't see him. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him from the Roll."

Peters: "Representative Cullerton."

Speaker Matijevich: "Cullerton? I don't see him in his seat. How is he recorded? Cullerton?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him from the Roll."



Peters: "Representative Brummer?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Brummer's in his seat."

Peters: "Representative Molloy?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Molloy? I can't see him back there.

How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him from the Roll."

Peters: "Representative Piel?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Robert Piel? I don't see him back
there either. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him."

Peters: "Representative Watson."

Speaker Matijevich: "Watson? Yeah, he just waved his hand."

Peters: "Representative Bell? Tim Bell from Moline."

Speaker Matijevich: "We've got one up in the balcony and
we've got one down here, too. They're all here."

Peters: "Is Representative Bell here?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Yes, he's here."

Peters: "Representative Balanoff."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Balanoff? She's
upstairs where it's nice and cool. Proceed."

Peters: "Representative Bianco?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Phil Bianco's in his seat."

Peters: "Representative Christensen?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Christensen? I don't see Ray Christensen
there. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I can't see in the back there. Repre-
sentative Huff and Representative Henry."

Speaker Matijevich: "Henry is there. And Huff, over here."

Peters: "Okay. Alright. Representative Farley."

Speaker Matijevich: "Farley is right up in front here."

Peters: "Representative Ewell?"



Speaker Matijevich: "Ray Ewell? I don't see Ray Ewell.

Leave to have Taylor verified. Leave. Ray Ewell, how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him. Leverenz, 'aye'. Would you put Leverenz on the Roll Call?"

Peters: "Representative Winchester?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Winchester is in his seat."

Peters: "Representative Kosinski?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Kosinski? I don't see him in his seat. How is he recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him."

Peters: "Representative Hannig."

Speaker Matijevich: "Who was that?"

Peters: "Hannig."

Speaker Matijevich: "Gary Hannig?"

Peters: "Oh, he's present anyway. Okay."

Speaker Matijevich: "Cull... Please put Cullerton back on. And Monroe Flinn, Monroe Flinn, 'aye'."

Peters: "Representative Marovitz."

Speaker Matijevich: "Marovitz, are you here? He's over.. next to Preston."

Peters: "Representative Beatty."

Speaker Matijevich: "Beatty is up in front." "I don't see anybody in their seats. They're in everybody else's seat. Yeah, Marovitz is here."

Peters: "Representative Chapman is in the back. Representative Burnidge?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Burnidge? Burnidge, I mean. Yeah, way in the back. New Member."

Peters: "We verified.. Representative Gaines was... was.. Okay. He was verified. "

Speaker Matijevich: "Did we put Cullerton back on? Cullerton, yeah"



Peters: "Representative Catania."

Speaker Matijevich: "We've got word from Ellis Levine to put Cullerton back on. Catania is in her seat."

Peters: "And I just. . . Leinenweber. Leinenweber's here. Macdonald's here."

Speaker Matijevich: "Macdonald."

Peters: "Representative Chapman.."

Speaker Matijevich: "Chapman's in her seat."

Peters: "And Jack Davis, the only ..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Jack Davis is in his seat."

Peters: "That is all that I have, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "That's all. Could you give us a count, Mr. Clerk? On this question there are 99 'aye's and 49 'no's. And this motion, having received a Constitutional Majority, prevails and the item on page 24, line 4 of House Bill 2649 is restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor. Representative Hanahan on motion #4."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, take this same Roll Call. This is on special education extraordinary services. It's a half a million dollar restoration for this unique program that it provides educational services to children with complex or unique educational requirements due to serious deficiencies in intellectual, physical, and/or social, emotional development in the least restrictive placement possible. State reimbursement gives local School Districts financial assistance and providing for these extraordinary and costly services. Programs for children in extraordinary needs are provided throughout the state in local School Districts and in a cooperative manner through joint agreements. Enrollment in programs showed a 41.5% increase between fiscal year '77 and '78 and a 26.8% increase in this fiscal year '78--79. All applications for these programs are individually reviewed. Reim-



bursement is made quarterly for approved programs. Districts are reimbursed by the State for services provided during the previous school year. The statutory formula places a 2,000 per student limit on the amount of state reimbursement. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is one of those programs that the citizens have already been provided with. And our statute calls for the reimbursement for the programs that were given last year. And I'd like to point out that on this particular recommendation the State Board of Education allocation request was 20 million, 800 thousand dollars. The House and Senate agreed to 17 million. The House originally agreed to 18 million. And the Senate reduced that to 17 million and the Governor further reduced that to 16 million, five hundred thousand. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm going to point something out that all of you could feel a little comfortable in voting on this. The Governor's allocation recommendation was 16 million, 902 thousand dollars. We're so close to what the Governor himself has recommended, these are his figures, not mine. And we're asking to restore to the 17 million. a few thousand dollars more than the Governor himself recommended as the needed reimbursement. I might point out that percentages on this reimbursement and so once again, so everyone knows exactly what they're doing, if we do not restore this half a million dollars, we're funding this program at 79.3%. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is nothing you could go back home to your School Districts and to your constituency and say that you're sworn to uphold the laws of Illinois. You did nothing to change the law and all you wanted to do is to appropriate at a 79.3% level. Even with the restoration, we're talking about only funding at 81.7% restoration and this is money that's spent already



by your local School Districts. If you don't give them this money, you're telling your local School Districts you got to provide the services, but.. and we say under law we're going to give you so much money in return for providing those services, but we're only going to fund it by appropriation process at 79.3%. I sincerely suggest to you that to be honest to your constituencies, honest with the Governor's Office and every other commitment made, that we .. we still have to be a little bit ashamed of ourselves of only funding this with the support of this override, at 81.7%. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hanahan has moved with respect to House Bill 2649 to restore the reduced item of appropriation on page 24 line 8 to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor. On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this may have been what.. in line with what the Governor originally recommended.. or the budget originally recommended, but let us also remember that in the other line items we exceeded those requests by tens of millions of dollars and it does not seem exactly fair to point to the one line here and say this is now below what the Governor wanted. We're tens and tens of millions of dollars over to begin with and I repeat again, that these reductions were made on the basis of what was at one time a Gentleman's agreement in order to increase.. to increase the amount of money in the distributive fund so that all the Districts in the State could receive those particular funds. It would appear that.. Well, whatever's going to happen. Well, will happen. I would ask that the Members who are concerned about the Committee process, concerned about the process of agreement, who are con-



cerned about reaching some kind of resolution to difficult questions and having these resolutions to those problems stick, would end up voting 'no'."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen."

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

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

Pullen: "In special education there are several different line items that we're addressing today. Would you please review again precisely what this one is about?"

Hanahan: "This one is for the emotional and physical and intellectual deficient child's educational service that's provided by the local School District and the state law says we will reimburse up to \$2,000 for that kind of service for last year's services. And we're now... if the Governor's recommendation is upheld, it would be only at 79%... 79.3 %. If we override, it would be at 81.7% to help the deficient child, the palsy, the child with the... cerebral palsy and the epileptic and those kinds of children that really need that extra special service in the School District that, by law, we make the School District provide and we said we're going to reimburse them and then we're only reimbursing at these levels. That's what this does."

Pullen: "You mention the \$2,000 per year. Is this then tied in with the private school placement?"

Hanahan: "No, this has nothing to do with the private. This is now the public school service that is provided for these... It could have private, but it's generally in the public schools that are providing these services."

Pullen: "Okay."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Hanahan to close."

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, with all



due respect to the Minority Spokesman of Appropriation, I served with the Gentleman for many years and I know what he said may.. he may have meant well. But I have before me the Governor's allocation for these programs. And I'd like to point out specifically that the bottom line on these programs are five million dollars less than the Governor's recommendations for these programs. We are not.. We are not exceeding the Governor's allocation and recommendation on these programs and what... And I know it's tough to stand here as a Leader, trying to protect the Governor's budget and the Bureau of the Budget, how they could manipulate you, I know we had the troubles on this side sometimes. But the fact of the matter is that on these programs we are five million under the Governor's allocation for this. Now I'm not talking about the grant. I'm not talking about the school aid formula and all the rest of the things and any other expenditure for mental health or public aid, on these programs, we're five million under what the Governor had said he would accept. So, by restoring this amount of money, we are no where near, no where near an over appropriation of what the Governor wanted. Because the state... the Governor's allocation for example in this particular item was seven.. let's see. I'm getting myself mixed up. On this particular issue was seventeen.. sixteen million, nine hundred and two thousand, and forty thousand... 16 million, 902.4 thousand dollars. Now, the restoration will bring it to 17 million dollars, a very minimal amount of difference between the Governor himself said is necessary because if you don't restore this money and you don't give it to your School District, they have already spent it and it's being paid for out of real estate tax dollars.



And I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall the reduced item of appropriation on page 24...' The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters, for what purpose do you arise?"

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, just with latitude on your part, on a.. just a note of personal interest. I appreciate very much, Representative Hanahan, your reference to me as a leader on this side of the aisle. But I wish you wouldn't do that because the quickest way to destroy any effectiveness that I have here, is to say that I'm a Republican leader."

Speaker Matijevich: "And if you are, you want to get paid for it, right Pete? Shall the reduced item of appropriation on page 24, line 8 of House Bill 2649 be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor? All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'nay'. This takes 89 votes for Constitutional Majority. The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich, to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "The Gentleman from McHenry is quite within his rights in all of these motions. But I would suggest to the Body that if we have prolonged debate on all of these, someone's going to get left out this afternoon and won't get their motion called."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 89 votes... 47.. 89 'aye's, 47 'nay's and the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "In my capacity, Mr. Speaker, as .. just a Member, I ask to verify."

Speaker Matijevich: "And Representative Peters has asked for a verification of the Roll Call. And Representative



Hanahan has asked for a poll of the absentees. This is where the ten add-ons come on. Poll of the absentees. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees;.."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Hoxsey, 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Proceeding with the poll of the absentees.

Bradley. Breslin...."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Kane, 'aye'. Yeah, Kane, 'aye'.

Breslin, 'aye'. Bradley, 'aye'. Hallstrom, aye'.

Hallstrom, 'aye'. Fr  d  rick, Virginia Frederick, 'aye'.

Can we get some more so Peters can sit down? Cullerton, 'aye'. "

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the poll of the absentees.

Ralph Dunn. Ewell. Ewing. Flinn. Gaines. Garmisa.

Giorgi. Dave Jones. Katz. Kozubowski. Macdonald.."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Macdonald, 'present'."

Clerk Leone: "Margulas. McAuliffe. McBroom. Meyer.

Molloy. Oblinger. Pechous. Polk...."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Flinn, 'aye'. Flinn, 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Schneider. Simms..."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Simms, 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Skinner. Slape. E.G. Steele. Watson.."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Giorgi, 'aye'. Giorgi, 'aye'. Leave

for Giorgi to be verified. Leave. Van Duyne?

The Gentleman from Will, Representative Van Duyne."

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

I was just thinking of Dwight Friedrich's comment

about Representative Hanahan with all of his motions

and I.. I'd like to turn it around a little bit. All

these verifications aren't doing anything to hurry

this along either, are they, Pete?"

Speaker Matijeovich: "Proceed with the verification... or

the poll of the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "E.G. Steele. Watson..."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Watson, 'aye'. Give up, Pete?"



Clerk Leone: "Williams. Younge. And, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Mr. Speaker, 'aye'. He's in the back room. Okay, what's the count? Same as the last one.

99 'aye's, 49 'nay's. And Mr. Peters, persists.

The Clerk will proceed with the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative; Alexander. Balanoff. E.M. Barnes. Jane Barnes...."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Birchler, 'aye'. One hundred. Oh, you were already on. The.. Representative Birchler, for what purpose do you arise, the Gentleman from Randolph?"

Birchler: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be verified."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Leave to be verified. Leave."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the poll of the affirmative; Beatty. Bianco. Birchler. Boucek. Bowman. Bradley. Braun. Breslin. Brummer. Bullock. Burnidge. Capparelli. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton. Currie. Darrow. Dawson. Deuster. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Dyer. Epton. Farley..."

Speaker Matijeovich: "One moment, Mr. Clerk. Change Kosinski from 'no' to 'yes'.... or 'present' to 'yes'."

Clerk Leone: "Farley. Flinn. Virginia Frederick. Friedland. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Griesheimer. Hallstrom. Hanahan. Hannig. Harris. Henry. Huff. Jaffe. Johnson. Emil Jones. Kane. Keane. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kulas. Laurino. Leon. Leverenz. Madigan. Marovitz. Matijeovich. Mautino. McClain. McGrew. McMaster. McPike. Mugalian. Mulcahey. Murphy. Neff. O'Brien. Patrick. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Rea. Reed. Reilly. Richmond. Ronan. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Schraeder. Sharp. Steczko. Taylor. Terzich. Van Duyne..."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Leave for Dawson to be verified? Leave."

Clerk Leone: "Vitek. VonBoeckman. Watson. White. Willer.



Winchester. Sam Wolf. Yourell. And, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? We start out at 100 'aye's, 49 'nay's. Questions of the affirmative vote, by Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Farley asked to be verified so if you might mark that down. Yes."

Speaker Matijevich: "And Representative Younge, record her as 'aye'." "Proceed, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Might I just indicate because Representative Hanahan was interested in my comment in regard to Republican Leadership, that didn't refer to any individuals. It just referred to a tendency on our side of the aisle to sometimes be cannibalistic, regardless of who that Leader is and I think that happens to be true. Bianco?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Bianco is in his seat."

Peters: "Bianco is here?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He's in his seat, yes, Sir."

Peters: "Watson."

Speaker Matijevich: "Watson's in his seat, on the telephone."

Peters: "I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman. Watson?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He's in his seat."

Peters: "In his seat. VonBoeckman?"

Speaker Matijevich: "VonBoeckman? I don't see him in his seat. Jim VonBoeckman? I don't see him in the hall. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him."

Peters: "Leverenz? I see him."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leverenz is there."

Peters: "Marovitz?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Marovitz? Bill Marovitz. Oh, right in front. There you go."

Peters: "Richmond?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Bruce Richmond. Bruce Richmond is not in



his seat. He's not in the hall. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him."

Peters: "Representative Terzich?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Terzich? He's.."

Peters: "I see him."

Speaker Matijevich: "Over here."

Peters: "Representative Ronan is there. Representative Winchester?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Winchester's standing up proudly."

Peters: "Representative Bradley. "

Speaker Matijevich: "Bradley? Gerald Bradley? He's not there. Remove him until he comes back. Remove Bradley."

Peters: "Representative Bowman?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Bowman? Woods Bowman? Put Bradley back on. How is Woods Bowman recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him... Put him back. Here he is, right here."

Peters: "Bowman is back?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Yeah. Put Richmond back."

Peters: "Richmond back?"

Speaker Matijevich: "You're back, Woody."

Peters: "Representative Boucek?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Boucek? I don't see him in his seat. Emil Boucek, how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich : "Remove him."

Peters: "Representative Friedland? Oh, I see him. Okay."

Speaker Matijevich: "Friedland's standing up."

Peters: "I've got him. Deuster is here?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Deuster is here."

Peters: "Representative Dyer?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Dyer. I don't see her in her seat. How is Representative Giddy Dyer recorded?"



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

Speaker Matijevecich: "Remove her."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, again I can't see in the back.

Representative Burnidge?"

Speaker Matijevecich: "I can't...."

Peters: "Okay, I see him waving. Alright."

Speaker Matijevecich: "Alright."

Peters: "And.. alright, I see Representative Huff. Represent-
ative Neff?"

Speaker Matijevecich: "Clarence Neff? I don't see him in
his seat. Clarence Neff in the hall? I don't see him.
How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevecich: "Remove him."

Peters: "Representative Reilly?"

Speaker Matijevecich: "James Reilly? He's not in his seat.

How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevecich: "Remove him and put VonBoeckman back.

Restore VonBoeckman to the Roll."

Peters: "Oh, Catania's here. Okay. I believe that.. Did
I say Watson? I think I did."

Speaker Matijevecich: "Yeah and he's here too."

Peters: "That's all that I have, Mr. Chairman."

Speaker Matijevecich: "Could you give us the count? 95 'aye'
and 49 'no'. And this motion, having received a Consti-
tutional Majority, prevails and the item on page 24,
line 8 of House Bill 2649 is restored to its original
amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor.
Representative Hanahan on motion #5."

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the, you
know, criticism that was leveled a few minutes ago
that I'm talking; too much time here on explanations,
and it seems that the time that happens to be taken
up is not the explanation or the debate, but the veri-



fiction. So at this time I'd like to move that we take all the rest of the motions on one Roll Call and vote on the one Roll Call on one verification if that would speed things up. Then we'll take the last Roll Call with unanimous consent and pass it right on if that's going to be objectionable to too many people. But I understand, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that there is objection to that and I won't persist in it. I honestly think that there are some areas here where people have an honest disagreement on the appropriation and it should be addressed. But to just take up the time of the House through verification, when people are here seems silly. I mean I just wish we could get on with the Roll Call and where the ones that are real important and have to be defeated, let them do their job and have them walk at that time. You've got Members going out like a revolving door here. They vote 'aye' and they're absent on the verification and I'd sooner suggest that either they stay off or stay gone and we don't have any verifications and get this over with..."

Peters: "Representative Hanahan, I couldn't agree with you more. If you want to have these all in one motion, I have no objection to that."

Hanahan: "No, there's other objections I have here, so I know better.."

Peters: "I have no objection.. I.. solve a lot of problems..."

Hanahan: "It would take... up front..."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Representative Friedrich, did you want to..."

Friedrich: "Just to say, Mr. Speaker, my criticism was not aimed fully at the Sponsor, but to those who had lengthy debates on both sides of the question."

Speaker Matijeovich: "I don't think the debate has been our



problem today so far. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is an important item of restoration. This is one of the more important ones and I could say to the Members of the House, you could go on in long debate. But this is the special education personnel reimbursement, the same exact philosophy on this issue as on the last. We have mandated to School Districts to provide the teachers and... for performing the service of special education teaching. We say we're going to reimburse the School District after they provide this service and then we turn around and we say that we will not reimburse the state's level of the services already provided for back home last year. We're not talking about a lot of money. We're talking about one million dollar restoration from 118 million to 119 million. I might point out, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that in the original request by the State Board it was for 120 million dollars. The House action was 119 million. That was before it went to the Senate. The Senate action was at 119 million and the Governor reduced it down to 118 million. This is one of the allocations that the Governor had a lower amount in his allocation. He added 116.95 million. We're talking about a very minimal amount in the percentages difference on the providing of the restoration of this money that has already been spent by local School Districts. Under law, they had no choice. The General Assembly made them spend it and then we're saying we're not going to reimburse them to any level that they have spent. I just suggest that an 'aye' vote on this Roll Call and let's get over it. We could debate other issues a lot better. This should be supported by everyone in the House. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."



Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hanahan has moved with respect to House Bill 2649 to restore the reduced item of appropriation on page 24, line 13 to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, on that issue. Is that correct?"

Skinner: "Right. I don't understand it. Representative Hanahan, could you try again? My head is a little thick on this issue. If he's got the wrong line, maybe we ought to take it out of the record."

Hanahan: "No. No, I haven't got the wrong line. This is line.. page 24, line 13.."

Speaker Matijevich: "13."

Hanahan: "Special ed reimbursement. The Governor... The Legislature passed 119 million. The Governor approved 118 million. This is a one million restoration for special ed personnel which means the persons that are teaching special education back in the local School Districts were supposed... that School Board was supposed to be reimbursed up to \$5600 per teach... \$6,250 by the state would pay for that teacher's salary. It doesn't pay their total salary, just that percentage for teaching special ed."

Skinner: "Well, how much will it work out to?"

Hanahan: "Probably work out to about 6000. In other words, we're short-changing every School District percentage wise, 98.3%."

Skinner: "Well, not being an expert in the education formulas I am a little confused because I'm certain that the Governor promised to fully fund the education formulas."

Hanahan: "Not only the Governor, but let me tell you..."

Skinner: "And I know I did..."

Hanahan: "Representative Skinner, every Member in this House took an oath to swear to uphold the laws of the State of Illinois. To uphold that law, you'd have to



fully fund. And it's an honest opinion that we violate that oath every time we fail to obey the law that we passed, that's on the statute books, and not one Member here tried to reduce it, not one Member introduced a Bill to say that the law was wrong, and now we come to the point of truth of appropriating the money and the reduction is, by the Governor, not fully funding special ed personnel and that money was spent and if we do not restore the money, every School District in the State that has special ed programs, receives less money than they spent and it's made up with real estate tax dollars at the local level because that money had to be spent by our law."

Skinner: "Well that means that if... That means that if we vote to override there will be potentially a lower property tax rate in our local districts."

Hanahan: "That's absolutely the God's truth. Absolutely, because the local School Districts have to bring this money in and if the state doesn't give it, it has.. it has to come in by real estate tax laws. We have no other manner of bringing it in."

Skinner: "I just have a hard time understanding why the Governor would want to raise local taxes."

Hanahan: "I have a hard time understanding some of the negative votes on these overrides over that."

Speaker Marijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Well, Mr. Speaker, like both the previous two Gentleman, I also have a very difficult time. Let me just indicate that the... In relation to the oath that we took, we did take an oath to support the Constitution and that Constitution says that we should not expend in excess of revenue and the Special Ed Formula Act also says that although we do say we shall fully fund the school, the Act does provide for the fact that



if there are not sufficient dollars to fund that formula, that formula shall be pro-rated and that is what we have been doing for some period of time. I again, urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Hanahan to close. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Just to make the one observation. I concur with Representative Peters on his observations of what the Constitution calls for in the statute and I might point out, there's a half a billion dollars of unappropriated funds sitting there. So I'm going to obey my Constitutional oath of office and I'm going to fund well within the Constitutional directive and we'll have plenty of money left over after we're through. And I suggest, really, this is an easy vote for every Member of the House. And I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Matijeich: "The question is, 'Shall the reduced item of appropriation on page 24, line 13 of House Bill 2649 be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'nay'. This takes 89 votes, a Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 80 'aye's, 43 'nay's, 5 voting 'present'. And the motion is declared lost. Oh. I'm sorry. The Gentleman was asking recognition before it was declared lost. Shall we have a poll of the absentees by the Clerk? Henry, 'aye'. Bill Henry. H-E-N-R-Y. Henry, 'aye'. Kosin'ski, 'aye'. Boucek, 'no'. Bianco, 'aye'. Who? Leon, 'aye'. John Leon, 'aye'. Who's that back there? I can't see. Who? Somebody's waving their hand. Oh. Alexander, Ethyl. I'm sorry. I couldn't.. Speaker, 'aye'. Alexander, 'aye'. Speaker of the House, 'aye'. Jack Davis



'aye'. Matijevich 'aye'. And Giorgi, it's your fault. Giorgi. That's .. Burnidge, 'no'. I want to...

'No'. Peters? Ray Christensen, 'aye'. Continue with the poll of the absentees. James Taylor, 'aye'. Douglas Huff, 'aye'. Here comes Adelaine Geo-Karris. Record her... Record her as 'aye'. "

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Abramson. Bell. Bullock. Conti. Cullerton. Daniels. Ralph Dunn. Ewing. Friedland. Gaines. Garmisa. Hoxsey. Dave Jones...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Dave Jones, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Katz. Kozubowski. Margulas. Mautino. McAuliffe. McBroom. McMaster. Meyer. Mollyg. Mugalian. Neff. Oblinger. Patrick. ."

Speaker Matijevich: "Patrick, 'aye'. "

Clerk O'Brien: "Pechous. Polk."

Speaker Matijevich: "Could we interrupt for an announcement? The Senate is all done. Pete. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Pouncey..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Pouncey, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Reed. Robbins. Schneider. Slape. Stanley. E.G. Steele. Watson. No further."

Speaker Matijevich: "The tally is 95 'aye's. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters?"

Peters: "What is the tally, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Matijevich: "95. Alright. On this question there are 95 'aye's and how many 'nay's? 45 'nay's. This motion, having received the Constitutional Majority, prevails and the item on page 24 line 13 of House Bill 2649⁹ is restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor. Representative Hanahan on motion #6. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, page 24, line 22 has special education orphange tuition. Once again,



the statute provides and requires that Districts providing special education classes for children in orphanages, children's homes, foster family homes and state agencies and state residentiary units be reimbursed for retaining such classes. School Districts within whose boundaries residential care facilities are established, provide services to 2,280 children in '76, 3,000 in '77, 4,000 in 1978 and about 4500 in fiscal year '79. Currently 200 Districts are serving children in School District facilities and 34 Districts are providing programs for children in various on-site facilities. As a result of recent legislation, reimbursement is paid for claims on a quarterly basis for current year expenditures. Reimbursement cost for this program is determined by the actual cost of maintaining classes. I can just suggest, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that this restoration is a half a million dollars. It's one of those heart tuggers because I don't know how many have ever seen the orphanages that need ... or the orphan children that need special education. It's a real tough one. I support it. Some people may not have as much charity in their heart or think that their constituency does not have that much charity, that they'd like to reimburse the education of orphan kids. I'd suggest that the Governor's... The State Board had requested 15 million, 500 thousand and the Senate and House agreed at 14 million, 100 thousand, and that the Governor reduced that to 13 million, 600 thousand. I ask for a favorable Roll Call on this issue. It's something that each one of us will have to look ourselves in the mirror when we shave or put our makeup on tomorrow on how we feel about special education for the orphan kids. There's nobody here going to speak for them except us. And I think that this is one of



the issues that we just have to search our hearts and our consciences of whether or not we can afford this extra 500 thousand dollars for reimbursement of this particular program. I might point out that on the orphan's tuition that the percentage of reimbursement without this override is at 87.7% of what the law called for. If we override, we'll be at 90.9%. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevid: "Representative Hanahan has moved with respect to House Bill 2649 to restore the reduced item of appropriation on page 24, line 22 to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would just ask a vote in opposition."

Speaker Matijevid: "The Gentleman from Henry, Representative McGrew. Your light's on."

McGrew: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Matijevid: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan, to close. On this question..."

Hanahan: "I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Matijevid: "The question is, 'Shall the reduced item of appropriation on page 24, line 22 of House Bill 2649 be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'nay'. This takes 89 votes, the Constitutional Majority. Those who are voting let's get on it now so we don't have to go through what we have in the past Roll Calls. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 90 'aye's, 47 'nay's, 5 voting 'present'. And this motion, having received the Constitutional Majority, prevails and the items on page 24, line 22 of House Bill



2649 is restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor. Representative Hanahan on motion #7."

Hanahan: "This is a toughie and I recognize it and I won't be long. It's philosophical that I support bi-lingual programs and the Chicago bi-lingual program, the passage of the Bill out of the House and the Senate for the Chicago Bi-lingual and it's tied directly percentage wise to the downstate bi-lingual. You may as well recognize that once again, services are provided. The Senate action was at 14 million dollars in Senate and the House. The Governor's action reduced that one million, four hundred thousand to 12 million, 600 thousand. The State Board request; I might point out, for Chicago Bi-lingual was at 16 million. We're not anywhere near close to what the bi-lingual requests were from the State Board of Education. Fourteen million dollars seems like a lot of money, but it we could help those citizens, those young Americans that are trying to cope in our society without the advantages of cultural advantages of being able to speak our language and read and write our language, and need that kind of help to have bi-lingual education in their classrooms around the State. And it's just not Hispanic and it's not just Spanish speaking. There are neighborhoods with the Greek speaking and other kinds of help that is noted, certainly, in our communities around the State for citizens who do not read and write the English language that this money is needed for. And I ask for a favorable Roll Call on this line item on page 24, line 30 from 2...12 million 600 thousand of the Governor to restore it to the 14 million the House and Senate had sent to him. "

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hanahan has moved with respect to House Bill 2649 to restore the reduced item of appropriation on page 24, line 30 to its original



amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor. On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kosinski."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicated he will."

Kosinski: "Tom, if I understand this correctly, we, the Members of the House Appropriations Committee, reduced sizably the bi-lingual appropriation. It then went to the Senate and the Senate restored a great portion of that. Now, in turn, the Governor in agreement with the House Appropriations Committee, attempted to reduce that just a little bit more. Is that correct?"

Hanahan: "Not quite. The House and Senate agreed at the 14 million dollar level. We voted on the 14 million dollar level. The House and Senate.."

Kosinski: "But didn't I... If I remember correctly, we reduced it about 8 million dollars in the House Appropriations Committee. And then it went to the Senate. They restored a greater portion of that... "

Hanahan: "You're right that the House Appropriations Committee and the House of Representatives sent to the Senate a figure of 8 million dollars for the Chicago Bi-lingual..."

Kosinski: "And if I remember correctly, you did not oppose that in the House Appropriations Committee."

Hanahan: "That's right. And then the..."

Kosinski: "Thank you, Tom."

Hanahan: "And then the Senate sent it back at 14 million, we concurred."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, the only thing wrong with the reduction veto is it didn't take it down to zero. If we really want to help people get along in the United States, we should not be having bi-lingual education,



just period. Now I don't speak from my own experience, I speak from the experience of a native Hawaiian, actual not a native Hawaiian, but someone who was born in Hawaii, who is now a lawyer. He worked with native Hawaiians trying to protect their legal rights. In fact, he was head of legal defence in Hawaii. He tells me the Hawaiians who made it, the native Hawaiians who made it are not the ones that went to the schools that taught native Hawaiian language. The Hawaiians who make it in Hawaii are those that go to schools that teach English. And I think we are doing a disservice to the entire Hispanic community by allowing bi-lingual education period. And I would speak in opposition to Representative Hanahan's motion."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hanahan to close."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, once again, the House and Senate sent to the Governor by our actions the sum of 14 million dollars for Chicago Bi-lingual. I ask to restore it to that amount."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall the reduced item of appropriations on page 24, line 30 be restored.. of House Bill 2649 be restored ... Just one moment. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Now, Mr. Speaker, just before the vote is taken, Representative Hanahan does make an extremely persuasive argument in regard to this particular item. I find myself as the spokesman, whatever that means, to be in a tenuous position. I would.. I would have to end up voting however, my responsibilities as the spokesman of the Committee, but I'm sure that the Members of the House will.. will vote their conscience on this issue as they voted their conscience on the others."

Speaker Matijevich: "That sounds like an 'aye' vote to me. The question is, 'Shall the reduced item of appropriation on page 24, line 30 of House Bill 2649 be restored to



its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'nay'. This takes 89 votes to Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters, wants a poll of the absentees. That is no vote. Go ahead, Representative Peters."

Peters: "No, Mr. Speaker. It's just.. It does seem a little strange to me that after passing all the others that some people find this one particularly objectionable. But as I said, we all vote our consciences."

Speaker Matijevich: "Why don't you vote yours?"

Peters: "I did."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 47 'aye's, 87 'nay's, and this motion, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Representative Hanahan on motion #8."

Hanahan: "Motion #8 is on the downstate portion of the bilingual program. The House and Senate sent to the Governor a figure of 4 million, 600 thousand and the Governor reduced it to 4 million dollars. I suggest to the Members of the House that once again, you'll vote your own conscience. You answer to your constituency on how each of these votes are taken. It gives room for your opponents sometimes in contests, room to criticize if they were there what they would have done to certain elements of your constituency. I could say to those people that if some fear of some bi-lingual programs that the.. if you took a few minutes of your time to study what it provides and as long as they're administered properly, that they are good programs, that there wouldn't be such a skepticism of funding these programs. But the rule of the House is certainly going to be evident,



so I'd just move that we accept... I move to restore the four million, six hundred thousand dollar figure on line.. on page 25, line 2 for the downstate bi-lingual program."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hanahan has moved with respect to House Bill 2649 to restore the reduced item of appropriations on page 25, line 2 to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor. The question is, without discussion, 'Shall the reduced item of appropriation on page 2...page 25.,line 2 of House Bill 2649 be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'nay'. 89 votes, Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 48 'aye's, 74 'nay's, 6 voting 'present', and this motion, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Representative Hanahan on motion #9."

Hanahan: "Motion #9, Mr. Chairman.. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, really, probably should have sponsored by one of the business oriented Legislators that like to say what we're doing in order to help keep and attract business in Illinois. This is to restore 100 thousand dollars to the high impact training for economic development program for the State of Illinois. The high impact training for economic development program will provide incentives to stimulate industrial development in the State of Illinois. Specific activities will include grants to public, and private eligible recipients, to plan and development training programs which are cooperatively designed and administered by an educational institution in a specific industry. Job training programs will be designed to meet the specific needs of the industry. The results of the program will be to



reduce unemployment and to create new jobs through expansion and/or by attracting new business and industry to Illinois. The population to be served includes unemployed youths, under employed workers, senior citizen employees requiring retraining, chronically unemployed individuals, and disadvantaged population including minority and handicapped persons. Institutions will be reimbursed for the actual costs incurred in planning and conducting job training. Grants to eligible recipients for planning and conducting such programs will be provided through the request for application process. These will be issued statewide and all funds will be distributed. This program is presently funded at a minimal level of 300 thousand dollars with federal bulkhead funds some CETA discretionary monies. Program development is a cooperative effort between the Illinois Chamber of Commerce, the State Department of Business and Economic Development, State Board of Education and the Illinois Board of Higher Education and the Illinois Community College Board. The high impact training... The final appropriation for the high impact training program will necessitate a major reduction in incentives to stimulate industrial development in Illinois. The original request of 2 million dollars would have enabled the Office to support as many as 200 programs, potential training 2,000 new employees. The final appropriation of 400 thousand will allow the Office to fund approximately 40 programs and to train an estimated 400 new employees. The office has had to increase the training up to 1,000 employees under one contract. We could not support a program of this magnitude with the available funding. Now I don't suggest that the additional 100 thousand dollars are going to solve all the problems in the business community of job training, but it would be at least a step in the right direction. And with the high unemployment



that we're now starting to experience, I think that this would be a good investment to help create job incentive, job retraining, and a work ethic to some of the citizens of this state that have to be upgraded in training, for their place in our society so that they're taxpayers instead of taxeaters. To vote 'no' on this, the alternative means more public aid, more unemployment compensation, for citizens that cannot cope with the highly industrialized society that they're forced to work in in today's society. I suggest that it's a good investment. It's only 100 thousand dollars. And that we at least get this program running on track in a time of crisis of high unemployment. It really is a business oriented type of proposition. Those of you who have spent many times, many days on the floor of the House telling me and telling Members of the House how bad the economic climate is for business in Illinois, here's your chance to stand up for a proposal that does something to help business. the business climate of Illinois and ask for a favorable Roll Call on restoring the 100 thousand dollar appropriation that was deleted on page 25, line 6 on the high impact training from 400 thousand of the Governor's veto to 500 thousand the House and Senate sent to the Governor."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hanahan has moved with respect to House Bill 2649, to restore the reduced item of appropriation on page 25, line 6 to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor. On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor of this Amendment..."

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will. Proceed."

Huskey: "Well, Representative Hanahan, I sort of resent some of the remarks you made about business. Has not business been taking these students from high schools for years



under the DO and the DE's and all these other programs and teaching their trades without any state monies? And they've been doing this on a volunteer basis? Paying these children to learn?"

Hanahan: "Yes. And they have come now to the State of Illinois the Department of Business and Economic Development has asked to help, minimally help, the business community in providing this job retraining on programs set up under this here grants, the grant for high impact training. And without this aid, they'll be many companies that cannot and will not just economically be able to provide this high impact training. They have asked for this. I'm suggesting. I'm not critical of the business community by support of this. I'm very supportive of it. Because it helps train kids and trains citizens to cope in today's highly industrialized society. Unless we provide the tools for that retraining and the training, we're going to be faced with higher unemployment and more public aid for those citizens who can't cope. So either we provide this money, or we say, you know, we've got a bad climate in Illinois and do nothing about it."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak a minute?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Huskey: "... to the Amendment. Mr. Speaker, for many years now private industry, small businesses mainly, large businesses also have been doing this work for free. They've been taking the students from the high schools and teaching them to be machinists, be secretaries, to operate the automated machinery, the various things the various industries and they've been doing it and they've been paying the minimum wage to these school children while they're teaching them, without any benefit of state or federal monies other than the monies



the teacher and the school receives for assigning them to these various diversified occupations. So I think this money is just being slightly. The 2 million dollars is still going to stay on the budget. I feel it's unnecessary. I think you're going to start spending this kind of money and showing there's a lot of money for this kind of thing. Industry says well heck, if the government's going to do that, there's no need of us doing it. We'll just out of the picture and you're getting back into a bureaucratic mess again. I think it's working very good. It should stay as it is."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Wayne, Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as industry moves out of the State of Illinois due to our things, we must have this money so that we can set up training programs to retrain people or they won't be able to collect their RTA funds from the Federal Government. This money here, most of it is not used to train the others. It's just used to say that they are eligible to get another federal rip-off."

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

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Beautiful. The Gentleman... You didn't have to though because nobody else was asking for attention. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan, to close."

Hanahan: "Very briefly, I think some of the more conservative Gentlemen are missing what this program is all about. And I, too, sometimes question some of the federal and state programs on handouts. This is to avoid the hand-out. Let me explain by right here in Springfield. If Fiat Allis has specific high.. highly technical jobs to fill in its industry, they could go to the local



community college or the local high schools and apply for a specific, a very narrow field of endeavor to have as a high impact training program. And they apply for this. And all this does is helps set up the program. It doesn't fund it. The business is still going to have to invest a lot of money, but at least the skills that the young person or the retrainable person is acquiring will help the business community of this state. I am against the federal hand out, against the bureaucracy that you're talking about and I join you. But on this program, if you're against it, don't complain about the poor business climate of Illinois and at the same time refuse to do a damn thing about it. This is a step in the right direction I see of getting people off of those programs and into the private sector employment, not onto a public aid roll or an unemployment paycheck, but into the private sector as a taxpayer instead of a tax eater. You're not going to get young people into those programs unless they have had some training on the highly technical types of jobs that certain industries are looking for skilled people. I've heard Members of this House say to me, there's five pages of want ads in the Chicago Tribune and we pay all these people unemployment compensation. Why? And this is the answer why. The answer lies on your vote right now. A lot of people who are collecting those unemployment checks cannot fill those jobs. You might. You might. But a lot of people can't fill those jobs because they've never had the experience level. They've never had any training. They've never had the ability to learn what those jobs can do or whether or not they could fulfill them. If we step up the high impact training, this is a business proposition. I think it's the right step and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."



Speaker Matijevich: "Thanks a lot Huskey for all of that.

The question is, 'Shall the reduced item of appropriation on page 25, line 6 of House Bill 2649 be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'nay'. 89 votes, a Constitutional Majority. The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Borchers, to explain his vote."

Borchers: "I'm going to vote 'no' for a simple reason. I know some of these schools and I find in them young men and women who go .. become professional job trainers. And they go from training school to training school and actually all they're doing is drawing a pay check."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 66 'aye's, 67 'nay's, 3 voting 'present'. And this motion, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Representative Hanahan on motion #10."

Hanahan: "Motion #10, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, is on page 25, line 11. It's the amount of money that the .. the program provides for the state supported transportation services for pupils who reside one and a half miles or more from an assigned attendance center or vocational school."

Speaker Matijevich: "..."

Hanahan: "Alright. The regular pupil transportation reimbursement formula provides for payment of the difference between the district's allowable cost and the local's qualifying amount which is determined by district's assessed valuation. The minimum claim amount is sixteen times the number... sixteen dollars times the number of eligible pupils transported. State reimbursement for transporting vocational pupils is four-fifths of the allowable cost. The line item was reduced to 53



million, 500 thousand dollars from the amount that the House had sent to the... and the House and Senate had agreed to it, the figure of 54 million, 500 thousand dollars. The request of the State Board of Education ... had requested 58 million, 500 thousand and the House and Senate, like I said, had sent .. the House had sent to the Senate 55 million dollars. The House and Senate agreed to a lower amount of 54-5 and the Governor reduced it down to 53.5. So in this case the House had maintained in its deliberation a much higher level than even we're requesting now on this override. It is for one million dollars and it's to repay monies that have already been expended and I might point out again that in that ... in that figure we're talking about 91.4% of the money that we said the School Districts that we wanted you to spend by providing transportation. So once again, it's the argument that we told the School District to spend and transport. We said we'd pay you back. And we have the money to meet the Constitutional requirement and not spending more than what we have in our till and we're now only appropriating under the Governor's level 91.4%. If the override takes place it will be at 93.1%. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hanahan has moved with respect to House Bill 2649 to restore the reduced item of appropriation on page 25, line 11 to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor. If there's no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the reduced item of appropriation on page 25, line 11 of House Bill 2649 be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. This take 89 votes, the Constitutional Majority. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, to explain his vote."



Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I was in Boone County about a month ago and north Boone School Board Member came up to me and asked when we were going to fully fund the state education formula for transpor.. bus transportation. And I said never. They're not enough rural Schools Districts. Now that's the only reason the Governor is not fully funding the formula. It's not fair. Now I've got an idea that might work in Boone County. We're going to try to convert the school buses to straight alcohol and just tell the State Governor to basically to go kiss off. If they don't want to give us the money that's fine. We'll find that we'll produce our own fuel out of agricultural waste from the Green Giant plant. But it really isn't fair not to fully fund it."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Just one moment. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, there's not a Member here that doesn't understand I hope, that this is money spent already. And I plead with you to give us the extra two votes now that we need. This is important to our School Districts and I ask for a poll of the absentees so that we have the 89 votes. It's too important to leave to go down the drain."

Speaker Matijevich: "87 'aye', 53 'nay'. The Gentleman has asked for a poll of the absentees. The Clerk will call the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees; Balanoff. . ."

Speaker Matijevich: "Balanoff, 'aye'. Danny O'Brien, 'aye'. Daniel O'Brien, 'aye'. Emil...Larry Bullock, 'aye'. Alright. He's already on."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the poll of the absentees; E.M. Barnes. Bianco. Christensen. Conti. Davis."



Speaker Matijevich: "Davis, 'aye'? 'Aye'. Conti, 'no'. Hallstrom, 'aye'. Bianco, 'aye'. Oh... Your countryman said 'aye'. Bianco meant 'no'. "

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the poll of the absentees. Deuster. Ewing. Gaines. Garmisa. Harris. Hoxsey. Katz. Kozubowski. Margulas. McAuliffe. McBroom. Meyer. Molloy. Mugalian. Oblinger. Pechous. Piel. Polk. Sandquist. Schlickman..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Sandquist, 'no'. Sandquist, 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Schneider. Schoeberlein. Stuffle. Terzich. Wikoff. Winchester..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Winchester, 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "J.J. Wolf..."

Speaker Matijevich: "That complete? Will the Clerk give us the count? On this question there are 92 'aye', and 55 'nays' and this motion, having received the Constitutional Majority, prevails and the item on page 25, line 11 on House Bill 2649 is restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor. We will now ask for the excused absences. The Minority Leader, George Ryan on the attendance... the excused absences today."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Let the record so show on the illnesses. Does anybody know who the Democratic illnesses are yet? Alright. We'll get to that later. Alright. Representative Hanahan on motion #11."

Hanahan: "Education transportation is the motion that I ask for restoration to the 40 million dollars that the General Assembly had approved. To refresh your memory, the State Board requested 45 million, 500 thousand as their estimate that is needed. The House and the Senate agreed both ways and sent to the Governor the figure of 40 million dollars, a reduction of 5 million,



500 thousand from the request. The Governor further reduced this amount to 38 million, 500 thousand... 500 and 70... 38 million, 570 thousand dollars. The purpose of the program is to assist districts in meeting the cost incurred transporting handicapped pupils with special educational ... special transportation needs. Approximately 20% of the state's mentally and physically handicapped pupils require special transportation services to and from special education programs. Because of the nature of the severity of their handicap they cannot be transported in the regular school buses. The state program pays four-fifths of the district's allowable cost for transporting special ed pupils. Allowable costs do not differ significantly from costs allowed for regular transportation reimbursement. Districts are reimbursed quarterly on this... for their prior year's claims Mr. Speaker, I might point out that on the transportation on special ed that we're... the Governor's veto has maintained it would be at 84.6% of what the state has said under law should be expended to provide the special ed transportation package. If we override the Governor's veto and restore the funds that the House and Senate sent to the Governor, the 14 million, 100 thousand dollars, we would still only be at 87.7%. I suggest to meet the Constitutional requirement that we have in the budget at the present time, far in excess of this amount, that we would be upholding our oath by providing this override so that we could at least fund special ed transportation nearer to a more reasonable level, if not where we should be at the 100% level, at least more reasonable at the 87.9% level. Ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: " Representative Hanahan has moved with respect to House Bill 2649 to restore the reduced item



of appropriation on page 25 line 16 to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor. If there's no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the reduced item of appropriation on page 25 line 16 of House Bill 2649, notwithstanding the... be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'nay'. This takes 89 votes, Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Yeah, the lack of opposition lends credence to the rumor on the House floor that the administration had agreed to the override of all of these items. The restoration..."

Hanahan: "Not all of them. Not all of them..."

Skinner: "Not all of them? Was this one of them?"

Hanahan: "I think so, yes. "

Skinner: "This was one of them?"

Hanahan: "That's why I hate to see guys making.. you know, voting 'no' and them going home and have to explain his 'no' vote....."

Skinner: "Well, the rumor is that the Governor's going to stick it to Jack Davis because of what he did on the sales tax override. And I would think that the Republican Spokesman would be arguing strenuously against this if that rumor were not true."

Speaker Matijevich: "To clear up the rumor, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I would just want to indicate to the Gentleman from our side from McHenry that I don't see the AP or the UP here and if he wants to make those statements, he can go down to the press room."

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



Skinner: "I'd rather make them for the record."

Speaker Matijeich: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 94 'aye's, 49 'nay's, 4 voting 'present'. And this motion, having received the Constitutional Majority, prevails. And the item on page 25 line 16 of House Bill 2649 is restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor. Representative Hanahan on motion #12."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly, the Illinois free lunch and breakfast program is the next line item. It's on page 25, line 26. The Governor was sent the appropriation of 14 million. He approved it at 13 million, 500 thousand. The... Through the reimbursement program schools and other designated Sponsors are encouraged to provide free breakfast and required to provide free lunches to eligible needy children attending public and nonpublic schools. Eligibility for this program is determined by applying the income level guidelines of the National School Lunch Program. Over 800 attendance centers participate in the free lunch program. Nearly 500 of these are in the Chicago metropolitan area. Schools and other designated Sponsors submit monthly claims to the State Board of Ed for reimbursement. Up to 15¢ reimbursement is authorized for each free breakfast and free lunch provided. And at this time, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I ask for the restoration of the 500 thousand dollars for the school food program on page 25, line 26 be restored from 13 million, 500 thousand, to 14 million, line item."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Hanahan has moved with respect to House Bill 2649 to restore the reduced item of appropriation on page 25, line 26 to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor."



On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative J.J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to ask the Sponsor a question. How the program that cost 14 million dollars ever get to be called the 'free lunch'? I always thought there ain't no such thing as a 'free lunch'."

Speaker Matijevich: "You stole the words right out of my mouth... mouth of the next person. The Gentleman from Macon..."

Wolf: "I have a question.."

Speaker Matijevich: "Oh..."

Wolf: "And I'd like to know why you want to stop there? If you put another 14 million dollars you can give them a free supper and maybe a midnight snack. I think the whole program is a 'free lunch'."

Speaker Matijevich: "I thought it was rhetorical. Representative Borchers, from Macon County."

Borchers: "I would just like to point out, let your conscience be your guide. Under the present conditions there are a lot of children, white collar workers, and people and blue collar workers and people who are actually doing... have less .. less good and proper lunch that they take to school than these children. And I think there's a great deal of unfairness in the whole situation. Because the people that should have some help are really the people that are paying the frieght and they're not getting it."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall the reduced item of appropriation on page 25, line 26 of House Bill 2649 ...' Oh, you got on late. The Lady from Cook, Representative Catania. I missed her light."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."



Catania: "Is any of this money reimbursable from federal funds?"

Hanahan: "Well, you know, before these guys get carried away and thinking that we're spending an awful lot of money at this level, I might point out that the Federal Government reimburses us 127 million dollars for the public schools, 5 million, 700 thousand for the private schools and for the school milk in.. Oh, this is ours. And ours comes to 14 million dollars. That is what we spend in the schools in the State of Illinois. So for those of you that were worried about the 14 million figure, I don't know where you're getting your .. you are getting all excited about. We've got a lot of school kids in school that need nutrition and you don't learn on an empty stomach. And that's what the Federal Government in its wisdom is saying, that they're willing to spend 127 million if we spend 14 million."

Catania: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall the reduced item of appropriation on page 25 line 26 of House Bill 2649 be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'nay'. This takes 89 votes, Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 60 'aye's, 69 'nay's, 8 voting 'present'. And this motion, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Representative Hanahan on motion #13."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, vocational educational materials is on page 25, line 30. The House and the Senate had sent to the Governor the figure of 1 million dollars. It was reduced to 500 thousand. This amount of money is to be utilized for those voc-ed centers in the purchase of equipment and materials



that is so desperately needed to meet the training of the vocational education centers' programs. I witnessed with my own eyes and I know I'm joined with other colleagues that have visited the voc centers such as in Lake County and around the state, where I've witnessed where typewriters' and beauticians equipment and carpentry materials were not available, just absolutely not available in order to train our kids. We use this line item as an encouragement to make sure that we not only have the program of vocational education, so that our young citizens will have the training and the education to cope with getting a job in our society, but that they'll have the materials provided to them and for them in these voc centers so that they could adequately learn the job skills that are necessary. My own eyes, I've witnessed in one school in Cook County, in the suburb of Cook County, typewriters that were manual typewriters training young citizens, young kids how to type on manual typewriters. And I said to the instructor, 'My God, where are these kids going to use the manual typewriter in employment today?' They're training them with .. and the instructor said, 'I'm sorry, but we don't have the money for that kind of upgrading and training that the kids need.' Now it doesn't do us a bit of good to have voc-ed in our society if at the same time we're not providing some of the materials that are so desperately needed by these schools. It's not a lot of money. It's really a business oriented asset. It helps train kids properly for their future and I ask for a restoration of this 500 thousand dollars for voc-ed materials for the vocational education of young citizens of Illinois."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hanahan has moved with respect to House Bill 2649 to restore the reduced item of appropriation on page 25, line 30 to its original



amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor. If there's no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the reduced item of appropriation on page 25, line 30 of House Bill 2649 be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. This takes 89 votes, Constitutional Majority. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti, to explain his vote."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't know how many Amendments this Gentleman has, but it's certainly disturbing to me because in the last couple of days I had to make a pretty rough decision on how to vote on that sales tax. In the last couple of months I witnessed something back home that was alluded to several times in the last couple of days about the tax Bill, the average tax payer in Elmwood Park received a \$300 increase in their tax Bill. Only 2,000 people came out to vote out of 16,000 registered voters to increase an educational tax rate in the village of Elmwood Park on a referendum. And when they received their tax bill, they came to the city hall with a brand new rope. Unfortunately we have a large oak tree in front of the village hall and they were going to hang me from that rope. The same people who were behind that referendum and passed that referendum wanted a one million, 300 thousand dollar tennis racket court. And the same people one month to the date after they received their tax bill, got behind a school strike and now the village of Elmwood Park in Unit District 401 has the distinct honor of having the highest paid teachers in the State of Illinois. And today, and yesterday and maybe tomorrow, whenever we get through with the sales tax relief on food and drugs, we're going to hear the same cry, that we're not taking care of the



poor people back home. But we've been standing here for 45 minutes and in 45 minutes we've increased the appropriation over 3 million dollars. The same hypocrites that are voting for all these increases are going to go back home and say, 'Well I'm on record. I'm on record. I tried to take the sales tax off of food and drugs. I tried to give you a one billion and a half million dollar sales tax relief.' But then I turned around- I'm not going to tell you this- I turned around and I added over 3 million dollars on House Bill 2649 in the last 45 minutes."

Speaker Matijevich: "Keep up your good work. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are ... The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan, asks for a poll of the absentees. 81 'aye's, 51 'nay's, and request for a poll of the absentees. Oh, record the Speaker 'aye'. Keep forgetting. The good news is there's only a few more motions left, Elmer. The bad news is they may carry."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "E.M. Barnes. Jane Barnes. Capuzi. Cullerton. Ralph Dunn. Friedland. Friedrich. Gaines. Garmisa. Hoxsey. Huskey. Dave Jones. Kozubowski...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Huskey, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Leverenz. Margulas. Mautino. McAuliffe. McBroom. Meyer. Molloy. Mugalian. Neff. Oblinger. Pechous. Peters. Polk. Reed. Rigney. Ronan. Schlickman. Schneider. Schoeberlein. Skinner. Stanley. Stearney. E.G. Steele. Telcser. And, Williams."

Speaker Matijevich: "On this question there are 82 'aye's, 55 'nay's, 2 voting 'present', and this motion, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority,



is hereby declared lost. Representative Hanahan on motion #14."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, vocational education is on page 26, line 4. The appropriation request of the .. of 29 million, 500 thousand dollars was agreed to by the State Board, the House, the Senate and was sent to the Governor at that figure. the Governor reduced it 500 thousand dollars to 29 million. Vocational education in this state is still far, far away from the needed level of appropriation to make it adequate for the training of our young citizens in the State of Illinois. I toured around the State of Illinois to the voc centers and surprising to me, that some of the Members who voted 'no' on the last Bill, could go back to their areas and say to those voc-ed centers that you don't need the money that you're requesting in this appropriation. The State of Ohio expends almost twice as much money as the State of Illinois for vocational education. If you wonder why we.."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment Tom. The lights are on. The T.V. has permission to take some general shots. Proceed."

Hanahan: "If you wonder why we've got high unemployment and high public aid roles, you can look back on the failure of generations ago of not having adequate vocational education being provided our citizens of this state. Those of you who come to me and say, 'I'd like to get a kid in the carpenter's union or the electricians' union or the plumbers' union; I'd like to get a kid to become a brick layer or cement finisher a machinist a tool and die worker,' I don't know where you think these kids are going to grow if we don't provide at least some basic education so that they can become skilled trademen, so that they can compete for



those high paid, high skilled jobs. The fact remains vocational education is the alternative to the higher education. Now we spend hundreds and millions of dollars for higher education, for those young adults who want to go on into .. to become lawyers and doctors and engineers and all sorts of other degree programs. And we're spending here right now, 20 million... 29 million dollars according to the Governor's request for vocational education. Well, my God, we should have our priorities put in order. There are a lot more of our children who are going to be out there trying to eke out a living, working for that living, in an industrial plant or in a construction job than there are going to be teachers and lawyers and doctors. We should provide some of the basic educational work incentives in appreciation of the kinds of skills it takes to be those kinds of tradesmen that only vocational education will provide for them in the schools. Those of you hold onto your vocational education centers, only have to stand in awe to see the kinds of training that we now provide. But it's still short. It's still not meeting the high standard that we should be at that we expect to be at in higher education, that we should be providing our young kids so that they could go out and get a good job. I suggest this is another investment, not an expenditure. It's an investment in our future of our youth. It's an investment in .. and a bet that these kids will be trained enough to get a job so that they won't be on public aid, they won't be in your correctional institutions and having the taxpayers spend 11 and 12 thousand dollars a year to keep them in jail or keep them in a reform school when they've had the opportunity to learn something about vocational education in job training. I plead to you to use your best judgment on this vote. It's not



a lot of money, but it continues the emphasis that we started a few years ago, that we're upgrading vocational education, that it's no longer the drop out segment of our schools and our public high schools and our private high schools, that the only kids that go to voc-ed are not the dummies and are not the kids that can't cope in class, that they're going to be highly skilled trademen. They're going to be the people that build this country and pay the taxes and this little half a million dollars that I'm asking for to be restored is a step towards that direction. And I plead with you to restore this half a million dollars for vocational education."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman has moved with respect to House Bill 2649 to restore the reduced item of appropriation on page 26, line 4 to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor. The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, all I can say, if this will get you in the plumbers union in McHenry County, they've got it a little easier than it is in our county."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, I've gone around to a few of these vocational schools myself and I can't say that I was overly impressed except that some of the operators were on a damn good salary and would naturally want to keep those salaries coming in and some of the people taking the vocational training that I saw were professional vocational trainers, you might say, from job to job, from school to school, and I think the unions with their own programs are able to very adequately train carpenters and cement finishers. I'm not a cement finisher but I sure learned by going out and working around how to finish cement and I do it



all the time. Getting ready to pour a little bit as soon as this is over. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall the reduced item of appropriation on page 26, line 4 of House Bill 2649 be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. This takes 89 votes for a Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 76 'aye's, 56 'nay's, 5 voting 'present'. And this motion, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Representative Hanahan on motion #15."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the next line item that I'm asking for restoration is on page 26, line 31, the regional superintendant's salaries. I don't know what happened with the Bureau of the Budget. I think it was an error that they recommended this reduction because I don't have any say nor do we. We passed the Bill... to set the salaries for regional superintendants. They're authorized by law to receive that money and this is the appropriation for it. It's going to take 3 million, 757 thousand dollars. That's what it adds up. But somehow the Governor reduced that down to 3 million, 457 thousand, a 300 thousand dollar reduction and it's in error and it should be restored and I ask for unanimous support."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hanahan has moved with respect to House Bill 2649 to restore the reduced item of appropriation on page 26, line 31 to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor. On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am delighted at this point to rise and to agree totally with the comments made by Representative Hanahan."



The Bureau of the Budget, not the Governor, the Bureau of the Budget did make an error and that error, they and we now admit to and the regional superintendants certainly are entitled to this on the basis of the legislation we passed. And I join with Representative Hanahan in asking for a full support in overriding this reduction veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall the reduced item of appropriation on page 26, line 31 of House Bill 2649 be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'nay'. This takes 89 votes to Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 124 'aye's, 21 'nay's, no 'present'. This motion, having received the Constitutional Majority, prevails and the item on page 26, line 31 of House Bill 2649 is restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor. On House Bill 26... Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker, I was on the phone. May I be recorded as 'aye' on that?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Record Van Duyne 'aye'. House Bill 2649, appears motion 1.. Same way for Schisler. House Bill 2649 on motion 1 relative to item vetos. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, I move to table the first Amendment dealing with inter-District incentives. I move to withdraw..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Move to withdraw motion #1, is that correct? Motion #1. Proceed with motion #2."

Hanahan: "Motion #2 is with the tax equivalent grants on page 27, line 5. Under the School Code of Illinois, Section 18-4 when a state institution is located in a School District where the state owns one-eighth or



more of the total land area of the District and there are pupils who are members of families employed in the institution who attend public schools in the District, or when any state institution is located in a School District, having not more than 250 pupils enrolled and five percent or more of the pupils are members of families employed in the institution, the District is eligible for the filing of a claim for a tax equivalent grant on or before August 15th of each year. The grants shall be equal the amount of taxes based upon the tax rate for school purposes in the District which would be paid if the land was privately owned. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I don't know and I can't understand the reason why after the statute clearly calls for this appropriation, why this line item was vetoed in total. I suggest that the amount of money, 578 thousand dollars, is owed to the citizens of the Districts that meet this qualification of Section 18-4 of our School Code. I didn't hear a Member of the General Assembly on either side of the aisle come before the General Assembly with a Bill abolishing this Section of the School Code. And it seems to me hypocritical that if nobody wants to kill this Section of the Bill, that after we have a law on the books, that somehow we should not be fully funding that portion of the law through the appropriation process that we owe to that School District. And I don't buy any argument that you could punish some Legislator or some group of Legislators by vetoing a Bill that belongs to the citizens of a community school I think that's in error. I think the somebody will rue the day when they think that they can use those high-handed tactics to bring people in line with that kind of tactic. I suggest that this restoration which needs 107 votes... I know I'm up against a big one, but I sure hope that there's



enough Members on the floor of the House that remember that if it's going to happen to a couple of Members of this House on this issue, it could happen to them. And let me tell you, brothers and sisters, Ladies and Gentlemen, that next time may be your turn, that somebody will want to get you in line by fooling around with your community. I suggest that this override should be unanimous and let's send a message that nobody in the General Assembly, no Member of this House is going to knuckle under to some threat that we're going to punish citizens in the community because of an action of a Member of this General Assembly concerning their vote on any issue. And I resent, I resent the fact that any message is going to be sent to any Member of the House on either side of the aisle for that explicit purpose. I think all of us are men and women enough to stand up to that high-handed tactic of vetoing a measure that pertains to the citizens of Illinois to get even with some Legislators because they didn't knuckle under some guise of rule. I suggest very strongly 177 votes ought to go up on the Board on this override."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hanahan has moved with respect to House Bill 2649 to override the Governor's veto of the item at page 27, line 5 and on that motion, the Gentleman from Will, Representative Davis."

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I want to thank Representative Hanahan for presenting this motion. There's an identical motion to it filed after this sponsored by Representative Leinenweber, Representative Kempiners, Representative Van Dwyne and myself, which is identical to this since it affects a School District, the only tax equivalency District left in the State of Illinois which happens to be in Will County in a little town of 'Cresthill' north



of Joliet. Now I don't know the Republican Member of the Legislature from McHenry County alluded to the fact that the Governor's out to get Jack Davis. I'm not sure that's true. I haven't seen any hard core evidence of that. I suppose that will be seen on the vote. I don't think he's out to get Representative Leinenweber, Van Duyne, or Kempiners or anybody at this point. But only time will tell. But let me give you a few of the facts. Representative Hanahan was quite correct. There is a provision in the School Code for a tax equivalency grant for those Districts which are impacted to a great deal by state institutions. This little elementary School District that has two schools: in it has over 52% of its area is Stateville Penitentiary. Great number of the guards live in mobile home courts on that ground and go to that school. Consequently there is no tax base for those people. In protracted negotiations for two years with IOE the School Districts have been trying to take advantage of this grant. IOE this year worked very hard with myself and other Legislators and the School Districts and their Board to come up with the proper qualifications, the proper assessment, certified procedures to exactly follow the letter of the law. IOE supports this Amendment fully, introduced this Amendment in the Appropriations Committee. Representative Peters and Barnes can both tell you it passed unanimously. It passed in this House unanimously. It passed the Senate Education Committee... or Appropriations Committee unanimously. It passed the Senate unanimously. And curiously enough, Ladies and Gentleman, Representative Kane had a Bill last year to do what Hanahan said, to do away with tax equivalency Dsistricts because there weren't thought to be any left. However, he amended that Bill to make that abolition two years hence. So the



law is still the law. And curiously enough, the Governor chose not to amendatorily veto that Bill, but to leave the law as it is for two more years and then chose to veto the money. Now, let's.. to the Republican Members please pay attention on this side of the aisle. You may think you're voting for a restoration or an override, of 578 thousand dollars. You are not. That's a grant figure, but that grant figure is off-set by a loss of resource-equalizer money in the area above 400 thousand dollars. Because this small District will have to shift from resource equalizer to Strayer-Haig to take advantage of the grant. So what you're voting is an override of about 150 thousand dollars for the residents of 'Crest Hill'.. Now I believe the Governor of this state, at this point in time, a former prosecutor and upholder of the law, wants to follow the law. And I believe that this is a miscommunication in the Governor's Office that the Bureau of the Budget made a mistake, the Illinois Office of Education add every Member, every Member of the House and Senate, 236 people said yes, they should have this and by a miscommunication within the Bureau of the Budget to the Governor's staff, then vetoed this appropriation. So I suggest to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that it's fair, it's equitable. The law says it's fair. It is not a great deal of money. Bear in mind, it is not 578 thousand. It is about 150 thousand. So for God's sake, get those 107 votes up there. Thank you very much."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I happen to be in Leadership position on this side of the aisle and some serious accusations were made here and I'd like to ask the last speaker a question. Mr. Davis, are you aware that this was vetoed before the



sales tax came up or do you have any facts at all that the Governor is punishing you for this line item veto?"

Speaker Matijeich: "Was it before Transportation too? Answer it fully.."

Conti: "It was before Transportation too. Are you..."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Davis."

Conti: "No, I want to ask him..."

Davis: "Representative Conti, apparently you weren't listening."

I have seen no indication that that is the case. I think the vote will probably indicate that..."

Conti: "Well, I heard you. I was listening, Mr. Davis. I just want the rest of the Members to hear it because Mr. Hanahan has a very forceful voice and he makes himself understood and he puts his point across very well and I think it's an insult to the Leadership on this side of the aisle to even have them allude to something like this unless there's some basis of foundation for his accusations."

Davis: "Mr. Conti..."

Conti: "And I have the utmost respect in any Governor or anyone" "No one.. No one would.. I still think I've got the floor..."

Speaker Matijeich: "One moment. Representative Conti. Conclude and try..."

Conti: "I'll conclude immediately..."

Speaker Matijeich: "And try not to"

Conti: "I've served over several Governors and I know that Governors are smarter enough to know that there's more than one Bill in the House introduced every year. And I don't think there's any Governor that sat on the second floor that would be foolish enough to single out any Member and I don't... There's 35 freshmen Legislators in this House this year on both sides of the aisle..."

Speaker Matijeich: "Too many..."

Conti: "I don't want them to go home saying that that's the



way they are treated when they don't go along with the program."

Speaker Matijeich: "Alright. Let's try to.. Yeah. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan, on a personal privilege and Representative Conti has violated the rule that we all do that we should not mention a Member's name in debate. Go ahead."

Hanahan: "Representatives, would you just take a moment now? I want to tell you something. I want to tell you something from the bottom of my heart. What I alluded to is a fact. On my oath as a Member of this House I was approached to have his... this line item withdrawn by the Republican administration of this state, on the floor of this House. Now you vote your conscience on this and when I tell you that it could happen to you next, I know where I'm speaking. And I went to Jack Davis and I told him that and I want all of you to know that I don't know who was man enough to stand over there to say that they came to me and asked me to withdraw the motion. One of your staff did. Speaking in behalf of the Governor, and I'm not ashamed to say it on the floor of this House. I never have to be ashamed to tell the truth and that's my point, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. And I'd like you to vote now on this issue."

Speaker Matijeich: "I think you made it. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber, to try to get back on the subject matter."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, yes, the issue here is very clear. The Gentleman, my colleague from Will put it, it really doesn't have anything to do with retaliation like that. It has to do with whether or not a law of this state ought to be followed through, a law which was considered by this very General Assembly and by the Governor and chose



to keep on the books. And that is, this tax equivalency grant district, the only one of which is still in Will County. It's still on the books by conscious act on the part of this Legislature and on the conscious act on the part of the Governor. So we ought to go through and fund this relatively modest sum of money as Representative Davis pointed out. It may sound big, but 400 thousand of this will come right out of the .. the regular school aid formula so you're only talking about 100 and some thousand dollars. We have a district there that I believe 50% of the students there are impacted by the State of Illinois through Stateville Penitentiary. There's tremendous merit for this. Why it was vetoed, I don't know. That's not the issue here. The issue is whether or not the veto ought to be overridden. I urge my colleagues, let's forget about anything but the issues here. And I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote on the motion to override."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Van Dwyne."

Van Dwyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very briefly, please let's not get embroiled in any argument that sort of obscures the real issue here and that is the need for this money. Even though it is a small amount of money in the difference, it's very important to this School District that they get this money and I would hope that anybody that has any seriousness of thought for their own School District will bear in mind one thing that Representative Hanahan said and that is that one of these days, it might be yours. So I exhort everyone to give us an 'aye' vote and override this veto."

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, just to shed a bit of light so that



people do not go out of this place with some kind of feelings. But I do suggest first to the.. my distinguished friend from McHenry County that I am amazed in all the years that he has been in the Legislature that it is the first time that someone came up to him and asked him a question on a motion he may have had. I'm sure that never happened under any other administration, but times do change. Just to shed again some light, Mr. Speaker, so that the Members know, as always in some kind of intent to .. to bring some things out and to find out where people stand, the Gentleman that spoke to the distinguished Representative from McHenry, was the Chief of my Appropriation staff, Phil Gannette. The question was asked... was asked of all the motions that you have, which of those motions are absolutely necessary in the estimation of IOE for the continued operation of the Illinois Office of Education? The answer given us was, page 24, line 41 special ed private tuition, special ed extraordinary services, special ed orphanage tuition and regional superintendant salaries. Next question; What about the rest? We'd like the rest, but they are not absolutely necessary. Will you.. No, that's our question. The next question; Would there be some consideration for tabling any of these motions? Answer; no. End of conversation. None of the Representatives mentioned were singled out for any kind of retribution and frankly, sometimes Representative Hanahan, I hope that our side of the aisle would work that way because I think we'd be further along the road in winning more elections. But that's a whole other kind of story and I hope that clears it up and as far as my information from the Bureau of the Budget is, they indicate that it is their feeling that the District in question is entitled



to some dollars. However, at this point, they are not willing to agree to the payment of those dollars until that District provides whatever kind of documentation is required in order to substantiate this case. I am assured by the people in the Bureau of the Budget that should the District come up with this, the Bureau so to speak will sign off and that they will make a .. this a part of whatever supplementary appropriation has to be made in order to pay it and certainly Representatives Davis, Leinenweber, Van Duyn, Kempiners and whoever else is there, can end up sponsoring the Bill with everyone's full and wholehearted support and then it ought to get 177 votes. However, at this point until I do receive that word from BOB I will have to oppose it."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative ... No. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Davis, to close."

Davis: "Well, I'm not the maker of this motion..."

Speaker Matijeich: "I thought it was joint.."

Davis: "Suppose it's a small point of personal privilege.

I never finished answering Representative Conti's question. I don't impugn anybody at this point. I think the votes speak for themselves. I can only tell you it was a misunderstanding. All the documentation had been furnished and certified by the assessors in Will County and by the County Clerk. The man standing down in the well, Bob Leinenger, Deputy Superintendent, worked three months on this project with me. The documentation has been furnished. There are no political considerations in this as far as I'm concerned. This is on the merits of the School District that is entitled under a conscious law effort by this General Assembly, ratified by 236 Members and vetoed by a Governor with poor information. It's as simple as that, Ladies and



Gentlemen."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. Representative Hanahan to close."

Hanahan: "In order to close on such a volatile issue I'd just like to point out that what Representative Davis said is true. The School District has provided the information necessary for this payment. BOB should remove its objection and we should go on and pass this Bill.. this appropriation. Because the Act very clearly allows only that amount of money that is actually documented for reimbursement so we are fully protected that no matter what amount of money we appropriate, only that amount that is genuinely and truly owed will be expended by the State Treasurer and the Comptroller of this state. I might point out that when I said that each Member will know when somebody wants to make a threat and carries out that you'll... that some day will come to roost. I'd like to give you an example. Part of the conversation, Representative from Chicago did not continue to say, is what was the interest of the Sponsor of these 15 motions. And specifically my answer was the vocational education materials and the vocational education. I noticed very succinctly that after I purposely.. purposely said I would not withdraw the override of this motion from being presented to the House and my support of it, that voc-ed which has been enjoying the support of this General Assembly overwhelmingly in the last few years all of a sudden just didn't quite get enough. Isn't that odd how fast it happened? And you want to know something, Ladies and Gentlemen? I'm not the loser. You know who the loser is? The kids and that's what we're talking here. Just like if this motion on this item fails, you know who's the loser? A couple of hundred families, a School District that we guaranteed the kids



quality education to learn. They're the loseers so you do what you want. But I'll tell you, I've been there a long time and what goes around, comes around. I've been here long enough that when you push, you get shoved. And I've also been enjoying the Session when I see people twisted and turn and performing in all sorts of gyrations trying to keep their integrity back home and doing something here. It's a good motion and it should be overwhelmingly supported. Because it is not only within the law, it's got the safeguards that each and every one of us would demand of an appropriation of this General Assembly, that's expected of the Comptroller and the Treasurer, that none of this money will be expended until it is fully justified according to the law. It's a good motion. There should be no objection and I hope to see 177 not just 107 votes on that Board."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall the item on page 27, line 5 of House Bill 2649 pass, notwithstanding the item.. the veto of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'nay'. This motion takes 107 votes, Constitutional extraordinary Majority... three-fifths Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 126 'aye's, 5 'nay's, 3 voting 'present'. And this motion, having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority, prevails and the item on page 27, line 5 of House Bill 2649 is declared passed, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. That concludes 2649."

Hanahan: "Thank you Mr. Chairman..."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Hanahan Road Show..."

Hanahan: "And the Members of the House for their patience..."

Speaker Matijevich: "We are now on the order of Total Veto Motions on page 5. House Bill 2192, Farley. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten, for what pur-



pose do you arise?"

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, I have sat here patiently now for almost two Sessions of trying to call a matter of at least considerable interest to the Members of this General Assembly. The Chair has thought it untimely that I be recognized for that purpose. The actions not only of the General Assembly on the sales tax override, but what we have overridden in money have indicated to me that it is timely. I would like you under Rule 10-E to move to the order of business of Constitutional Amendments, Third Reading."

Speaker Matijevich: "Mr. Totten, you weren't recognized for that purpose..."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Because... Mr. Totten, will you bear me out? Bear me out. Frankly I have felt like many of you felt through the long hours on this past Bill that has been the reduction vetos and the item vetos and I really think that so much time was taken on that and maybe some of it unnecessarily, as some have said, and maybe not. But because of that, we have put the other Members in a position where we may not get to their Total Veto Motions, override motions and I think that would be very detrimental to every Member who has such a motion. I don't have one, but I think because of that, I am now going to.. we're in the order of Total Veto Motions and I'm now going to proceed. Representative Farley..."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Matijevich: "And I do that respectfully to you, Representative Totten. Yes, proceed. Proceed, Repr..."

Totten: "I recognize that we also have a considerable amount of business to do. I am prepared as I think many of us are to stay till we get it done. But I have watched as this.. the Chair has been manipulated and I'm not including



yourself when I say that, as to what order of business we have been on. I choose then to take the other course that's available to me under the rules. And let the Members decide whether they would like to hear this matter or whether they would like to continue on the other matters before the House. And the other course that's available to me under the rules is to allow the Members under Rule 10-B to.. by 89 votes determine whether they want to change the order of business..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Totten?.."

Totten: "I have filed that motion and under the Rule, we should hear it and I ask you that we hear the motion that I have filed with the Clerk of the House on that motion.."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Totten, at the moment I have not seen a written motion so we are now going to proceed on Total... That's alright. But when I recognized you, I had not been apprised by anybody, including you, that there was a written motion so we are now proceeding on the order of Total Veto Motions. On that, Representative Farley. Is he here? The next Bill, 20.. House Bill 2204, Gene Hoffman. The Gentleman from DuPage, Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I ask your support for override of the Governor's veto on House Bill 2204. This amends the School Bond Construction Act. And let me just very briefly tell you what this does. This Bill, contrary to what is suggested in the Governor's veto message, was the result of some work we did at the direction of Governor Thompson who asked the State Board of Education and the Capital Development Board in April of 1977 to jointly review the capital assistance program which we passed and I was the House Sponsor of it in 1973. The report presented to the Governor in October of '77



recommended that special education construction be brought under the provisions of the capital assistance program. Presently, special education building reimbursement programs simply generate \$1,000 per professional worker and it has no direct relationship to actual construction cost. Placing special education building programs under the capital assistance program will ensure that state funds for construction will be directly related to actual construction costs rather than to personnel employed. Now, what this Bill does is amends the School Code and the capital assistance program to do the following; It provides that the special education building fund as amended to provide that no further reimbursement meaning \$1,000 shall be made after the last school year '78-'79. This morning we passed 120 to 15 an override of an amendatory veto on House Bill 2427 to the tune of 10 million dollars to fund this particular program. We then amended Section 1931 to permit districts to qualify for a state special education building grant and levy the tax which is presently in Section 17-2.2 A to issue bonds for the construction purposes to help meet the local share of the cost of financing the project under the capital assistance program. By the way, Section 17-2.2 A still has the eight year limitation for levying the tax that has always been in .. was appointed some discussion last year. The existing 100 million dollar bond authority under the capital assistance program for debt service is reduced to 90 million and the 10 million is then transferred to establish a bonding authority for special education construction purposes for those districts which have participated in the special education building reimbursement program. We also amend the capital assistance grant index to provide or for the purposes of a special education school



construction project and we have included in that the reduction of the amount of state grants to tie in with the amount of construction funds received in prior years under special education reimbursement program. In other words, the money that they have earned.. that they have accumulated on \$1,000 per professional worker is dealt with and we say we will reduce it by that amount. It's our understanding that there are in excess of 200 local districts which might be eligible for this reimbursement. It's needed to meet mortgage commitments and to complete projects that were started at a time when the Legislature was appropriating funds for reimbursement. So that somewhat lengthy introduction to this override, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move that we approve House Bill 2204 notwithstanding the Governor's veto. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I might also add, Mr. Speaker, that you have received.. or many of us have received numerous communiqués from special ed folks who are interested in this program."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hoffman has moved to override the Governor's veto with respect to House Bill 2204. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2204 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'no'. This motion takes three-fifths Constitutional Majority, 107 votes. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will...The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 100... Capparelli, 'aye'. Terzich, 'aye'. Collins, 'aye'. Stuffle, 'aye'. Slape, 'aye'. On this question there are .. a bunch. Eddie Kornowicz, 'aye'. 117 'aye's, 24 'nay's, and this motion, having received the Constitutional three-fifths Majority, prevails and House



Bill 2204 is declared passed, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. We'll revert back. I missed a Bill. Representative Macdonald on ... What's your number, Virginia? 2200. House Bill 2200 Virginia Macdonald has a motion."

Macdonald: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Because 42 people were absent when this very important conservation Bill was called yesterday, I filed a motion to hear it again today in hopes that we can clarify any questions and provide the needed votes to protect over 400 species of nongame wildlife which is contained... is constantly without adequate protection in our state. We spend only about \$30,000 on nongame species while the Department of Conservation spends millions on our game wildlife management programs. Our House Bill 2200 is strictly a voluntary freedom of choice system that would not increase any taxes and would merely allow a taxpayer the right to check off a donation in an amount up to \$10.00...."

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

Kempiners: "Yes, point of order, Mr. Speaker. We just finished House Bill 2204 and then we.. we're going backwards onto a Bill that we've already considered a motion on?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Well, I told that to Virginia Macdonald and she went back to talk to the Speaker and evidently said I was in error.. I don't know. Representative Macdonald proceed."

Macdonald: "Well, Mr... I think there was some mistake. The Speaker had not realized that there was a second motion and he just looked at the number and not realized that I had filed a second motion. But to continue with the debate and I'll try to make it short...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Well, Virginia, as long as there's



objections, I'm sorry. I think.. I think I now have to go forward with the proper order. I was going to let you go, but those are legitimate objections. Somebody stole my Calendar. It was Madigan. The next Bill on the order of Total Veto Motions is House Bill 2234. Jaffe. House Bill 2237, Satterthwaite."

✓ Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, the piece of legislation before you now is one that was accepted overwhelmingly in June. It had 131 'aye' votes here in the House. This Bill is one that gives a provision for the County Fair Associations to make application through the Department of Agriculture for the construction grants. The Bill includes provisions for a ceiling on the amount of grants that they can apply for and also requires matching local funds to compound that local fair association in order to make sure that the Fair Association is just not asking for a free ride, but had a legitimate need for the building that they are proposing. The Governor's message indicates that there is no provision set up for the standards that would apply. However, we purposely left it so that the Department of Agriculture would do the screening and would be better able to make the decisions as to who's request had the greatest priority. The provision also would be that the Department of Agriculture has to make a request for that funding for their following year's appropriation. And so it seems to me that the safeguards that the Governor felt were lacking, are indeed, built into the system. Certainly the Department of Agriculture is not going to grant every request it receives. The Bureau of the Budget is not going to accept an exorbitant request from the Department of Agriculture and the Legislature is not going to pass an excessive appropriation for this purpose. All of these steps have to be taken along the

✓



way in order for any funds to be appropriated. Remember that this Bill does not expend any state dollars. It provides a mechanism so that we will not have to continue with the haphazard kind of way in which we have done funding for fair buildings in the past. It is not clear to me that the Governor's veto will in any way affect the disaster funding that has been available in the past, although word from the Governor's Office has been that the Governor plans not to approve any more funding even in the case of the loss of a building by disaster. I would hope that we will override the Governor's veto on this measure in order, both to provide this necessary mechanism, and also to indicate to him that we feel that his determination not to give disaster aid is an inaccurate one. And I urge your support for an override of this veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Satterthwaite has moved to override the Governor's veto with respect to House Bill 2237. On that question, the Gentleman from Stephenson, Representative Rigney."

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it isn't often that they'll find me standing up to question or speak against an appropriation for local fairs. And the only reason why I'm doing this is that if you will recall in this last Session, we passed legislation sponsored by Representative Ryan and McBroom to substantially increase the grants that are going to local community fairs. And I guess probably the only question that comes is, you know, when is enough enough? And I feel that as far as this Session of the General Assembly is concerned we have done very well by our local county fairs. We have provided them with substantial new monies and it just seems to me that perhaps we're overdoing it somewhat to talk about still another major Bill for funding county fairs."



Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates that.. She indicates she will."

Vinson: "Do you feel, Representative, that this is the most important thing for us to spend money on, or just that we have so much that we can spend it on anything?"

Satterthwaite: "Representative, there is no money in this Bill. I tried to explain. This Bill does not expend one single dollar. It simply sets up a mechanism so that if there is to be money expended in this field, there will be a way of screening the applications. In response to the question of the additional money that we have put in to county fairs, let me indicate to you that the other Bill that the Governor did approve would only increase from 7 thousand dollars to 10 thousand, 500 dollars a year the amount of money that a fair would get for rehabilitation. This amount of money they need just for the ongoing upkeep of their buildings. My Bill would not relate to that. My Bill relates to capital expenditures that they need either to reconstruct major buildings, grand stands, other types of facilities that they need. This Bill does not expend any money. There is no provision for the expenditure of this type of construction grant unless this Bill passes."

Vinson: "That was my only question."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, my light... My seat light has been on for several minutes now and I appreciate your noticing it. My remarks do not pertain to this Bill. I would like to be called on when it's finished."



Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. When I get ready, Penny.

You be ready. The.. Oh, I see Hoffman's light's on.

But he's not here. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 22...' Alright. The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite, to close. I thought that was the close."

Satterthwaite: "Now, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, may I say that although there has not been statutory provision for doing it, we, in the past, have a number of times, given financial aid to fairs where there was a need for construction money. Unfortunately, the money only goes to those who have enough political clout to get some kind of special consideration. There has not been a formal screening process set up. Several times in Appropriation Committee I have had to sit and listen to requests for funds. I have not felt that I had any expertise in deciding sitting in a Committee room here in Springfield which fair associations really needed the money, which ones could really document the necessity of having that money. If we do not provide this kind of a screening mechanism what will happen is that we will continue with our inequitable unfair procedure of the past where somebody does enough log rolling to get what they want, but not necessarily putting our state dollars where it is most needed and I urge your support for this override."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2237 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'nay'. This will take 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 75 'aye's, 51 'nay's, 2 voting 'present'. And this motion, having failed to receive a Constitutional three-fifths Majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill 2240, Dawson. I don't



see Dawson here. Oh, there he.. I'm sorry, Glen. I was looking right next to you. Glen Dawson on 2240."

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 2240 is known as a 'Buy-American' Bill, which requires all products and materials purchased by any public agency shall be manufactured in the United States with preference given to Illinois manufacturers. It does not apply to any contracts under 500 dollars or if the materials made in the United States would increase the cost by 15%. This Bill passed the House 143 to 1 and passed the Senate 30 to 17. I believe that this Bill would enable ... to create more jobs in the State of Illinois and the United States of America and I ask for a favorable Roll Call on this piece of legislation."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Dawson has moved to override the Governor's veto with respect to House Bill 2240. If there's no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2240 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All in favor signify by ... The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich..."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'm sure most of you heard impassioned pleas by the steel workers yesterday for this Bill. I told them when I went to their parking lot and didn't find any Toyotas and Volkswagons on the parking lot of the steel workers place of employment, then I'd be glad to go along with their Bill. I'm for this 100%. But the biggest offenders in this country of buying foreign made products are the union members themselves. And I told them to clean up their act and I'll go all the way with them."

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

Leinenweber: "I think we're moving a little fast on this."



I've got a question for the Sponsor. We just..."

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

Leinenweber: "We just accepted some amendatory changes to I think it was House Bill 662 of Representative Yourell which sought to require that all mandated programs in local governments be paid for by the state. Now that's going to be law probably January 1 unless it had an earlier effective date. This probably will be law at the same time. Now if we mandate that units of local government pay or accept a higher bid because of the fact that it's an Illinois manufacturer, or a domestic manufacturer, what is the obligation of the State of Illinois under House Bill 662 to fund the difference between the low bid and the bid which would be required to be accepted in House Bill 2240?"

Dawson: "Well, Harry, on this here, it has the 15% override on it. If it's 15% over then they have .. it's open to any bid at all."

Leinenweber: "Well, what I'm saying is that we mandate a local... a unit of local government to pay that extra 15% because the State of Illinois bidder under Yourell's House Bill 662 which we just finished acting on today, which will be in effect probably on January 1, what are the obligations of the state to reimburse local government?"

Dawson: "Harry, to be truthful, I couldn't give you the answer on that one right now."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is one of the problems with the Bill. We have preached high and low here that we shouldn't mandate costly programs of units of local government that we're not willing to fund. Matter of fact, we just finished acting on House Bill 662 which I thought was kind of a bad Bill actually anyway. But, anyway, that's going to be in law January 1, I think. It's my understanding



that under the terms of that particular Bill unless we do something to change that law, that this Bill here which mandates units of local government pick up extra costly... to pay extra , accept higher bids from Illinois manufacturers that Illinois is going to have to pay the difference. The state will have to pay the difference. I think that's .. Unless the Sponsor can absolutely assure us this won't happen, this could be a real problem for the State of Illinois and a costly venture indeed."

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

Dawson: : "Mr. Speaker, Yourell's Bill does not affect anyone until after ... programs till after 1981."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had to ask my seatmate if this Bill really means what I think it means and she said that it does and I remember this Bill. And I can't believe that only one person on the House floor is against this. This... Are we really likely to override a veto of this Bill? If anyone has had any economics training at all, he knows that a protection as policy is nonsense..The only way to have a prosperous economy is to have free trade and protectionism is the most ignorant, most ignorant economic policy ever thought of. It's not a policy. There is not one economist who has a degree from any school or college that would advocate a protectionist policy. You must have free trade. And in this day and age when we're worried about inflation, here we have a Bill that mandates a 15% increase in our prices. 15% increase to be paid by public bodies and with the silence around here, I have the impression that maybe it's going



to sail out of here. So I thought I had to say something. It's incredible that educated men and women would even consider such a terrible Bill on any kind of economic analysis that you want to give it."

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

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, it just... I don't know how this one got by before. I can understand where the Sponsor.. what he intends, but it just seems to me that this is a restraint of trade which has been declared unconstitutional in the past. If you recall a few years ago we had the Illinois Coal Act which was basically the same thing which required that our governmental units would purchase Illinois coal to the exclusion of all others, unless the price exceeded a difference of 10%. The Attorney General gave us an opinion that it was unconstitutional. It was later struck down by a three Judge Federal panel. So whether it passes or not, I think we're just spinning our wheels. I think it's blatantly unconstitutional. It's obviously a restraint of trade."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I certainly want to associate myself with Representative Wolf and Representative Mugalian's observations. This is clearly the most anti-consumer, anti-taxpayer Bill in the Veto Session. All it can do is raise the cost to consumers and to taxpayers. And we ought to reject it solely for that reason. There's a federal mechanism in place to take care of any unfair competition problems in the steel industry. They're subject to special benefits, special unemployment compensation, special training provisions, and they can freeze out foreign steel when it's unfairly subsidized."



That's where that problem should be taken care of. All this is is an anti-taxpayer, anti-consumer Bill. It ought to be defeated."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. One announcement before we continue. The Clerk has advised me that they are going to press in about fifteen minutes with the last Supplemental Calendar. So if there's anybody with any motions on veto override that you still want to proceed with, within the next fifteen minutes advise the Clerk here so they can proceed with their printing of the last Calendar. The Gentleman from Wayne, Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have to try to do something to take care of our people because we can't afford to have to pay too much unemployment insurance. This is a fair Bill because with the.. in the newspaper today I read where the pipeline across the southern part of the United States to run Alaskan oil will not be built because the 700 permits cost 50 million dollars so therefore this is going to help make your gas prices higher. We are pricing ourselves out of the market in relation to foreign products. It's time we realized it and this Bill, in effect, says that people in Illinois should have the right to work instead of having their jobs transported out of the state and out of the country. Let's realize where we are and let's go ahead and do what's right and vote for this Bill so that we can go ahead and let our people work."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Willer."

Willer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?" Representative Dawson, I think I heard your answer to Representative Leinenweber. But would you repeat it to me about



its affects upon the units of local government?"

Dawson: "I said, Representative Yourell's Bill would not take affect to any program till after 1981."

Willer: "So after 1981 which is barely a year away, this would affect units of local government. And that's only about 16...15 months away. So that units of local government...."

Dawson: "Any program that in implemented now would not be affected by 667. (sic)"

Willer: "So it's clear then that this would not affect units of local governmamt. As far as what they buy, we would not have to reimburse them."

Dawson: "According... Yes. According to ..."

Willer: "Well..."

Dawson: "Representative Yourell's Bill."

Willer : "Okay. Alright. Thank you."

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

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Sandquist has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. And the main question is put. Representative Dawson, to close."

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I feel that if this country wants to keep putting everybody on public aid and relief and unemployment, that this is one way that the people of the United States don't want to spend the rest of their lives and I believe that a piece of legislation like this would create employment for our people and give jobs to them. Thank you very much."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Dawson has moved that the.. to override the Governor's veto with respect to



House Bill 2240. And the question is , 'Shall the .. House Bill 2240 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. This takes 107, the Constitutional Majority... extraordinary Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the re.. take the record. On this question there are 84 'aye's, 46 'nay's, 3 voting 'present'. And this motion, having failed to receive the Constitutional three-fifths Majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill 2309 I understand O'Brien does not want to proceed. House Bill 2416, Bowman-Kempiners, are they ready with that? I don't see anybody ready with that. House Bill 2440. Terzich. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2440 amends the Sanitary District Code which exempts laborers from civil service examinations. The Governor's veto stated that the exempting laborers from competitive examinations constitutes an abuse of merit principles and leave the door open for abuse of the patronage system. However, the Bill does not provide for any abuses of any merit system. The Bill only provides that the laborers would not be subject to a written examination. Now, the existing Civil Service Act mandates competitive examinations, that is, they must rank the candidates in order of relative fitness. Ranking in order of relative fitness cannot be done since it is not possible to give a valid examination of laborers.. Laborers jobs are so simple they can be learned in a few days and therefore tests cannot make enough distinctions between ability to perform the the work. Now, there have been a number of people who are in favor of this. The Bill does not undermine the merit employment as the veto message indicates.. The vast majority of laborers are civil service



employees and their status will not be affected. The Bill merely eliminates conventional testing and makes job performance during the probationary period the real test. If the applicant performs satisfactorily during the probationary period, he is granted civil... full civil service status. Many of you have received a letter from Local 7 as well as 'Mr. Gurston', commissioner who is recommending passage of this Bill and I would sup.. urge your support of House Bill 2440 and vote 'Aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Terzich has moved to override the Governor's veto with respect to House Bill 2440. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Epton. Epton. You've got your light on."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I must concur with remarks by Representative Terzich. This is a situation where President 'Nellis' has been very accomodating to both sides of the aisle on many issues. Civil service is entrenched in so many areas that it's almost impossible to move out incompetent employees. Certainly at this level, some leeway should be given. And I believe that this is certainly a bi-partisan issue that we can all join in and help pass this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Matijevich : "Indicated he will."

Borchers: "What I was curious about is, now they hire the laborers and then they are employed, I believe it says, a year. Now if they want to move up to a higher position they then, I presume, take a civil service examination to go into that higher position. Is that correct?"

Terzich: "That is correct, such as a technician, an electrician, whatever trades. This is only for laborers positions only."



All others would be subject to written examinations."

Borchers: "I see. Okay."

Speaker Matijeovich: "I'd like to introduce a good friend of mine, former Representative 'Joe Fennessey'. Joe Fennessey. If there is no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2440 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All in favor of. I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Matula, on the motion. I didn't see. Matula."

Matula: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Matijeovich: "Indicates he will."

Matula: "Representative Terzich, when you're talking about laborers are you talking about menial jobs as far as they're concerned?"

Terzich: "That is correct. And we did pass similar legislation that the Governor signed, for example, excluding GETA employees from taking written examinations. You know, there's only.. it's only laborers doing menial type work."

Matula: "Are they having a problem getting this type of workers?"

Terzich: "Well, it's not necessarily the problem of getting these type of workers. But needless to say, that there's many jobs available to... for labor work. It's just that there is really no way of testing a laborer. If the person is too smart, he's unsatisfied doing laborers work and psychologically they move out and they have difficulty retaining these types of individuals."

Matula: "Then I take it that they're having a problem getting this type of workers. Is that it?"

Terzich: "Well, it's not getting laborer workers, it's the retention of these types of individuals that if they did test at the... they would feel that the job is too menial to perform that type of task and they would have difficulty replacing those people after they train



them. They leave and then they'd have to get someone else."

Matula: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2440 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'nay'. This question takes 107 votes, the Constitutional extraordinary Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 117 'aye's, 27 'nay's, 2 voting 'present'. And this motion, having received the Constitutional three-fifths Majority, prevails and House Bill 2440 ... Marovitz 'aye'... is declared passed, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. The last Bill, Representative Bowman was right down in the well and I didn't see him. House Bill 2416, Representative Bowman, on Total Veto Motions. Woods Bowman from Cook County."

Bowman: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2416 was one of a package of four Bills which was introduced into the General Assembly by the Committee to study long term state debt. The other three Bills were either signed or in one case, there was a technical amendatory veto which I plan to accept when it comes over from the Senate. For some reason, this Bill was vetoed. After reading the veto message of the Governor, it is not clear to me at all why the Governor would sign the other Bills and veto this Bill. Let me simply read a couple of the points that the Governor made in his veto message and .. and rebut them because it seems to me that they are very easy to... to argue against. The first one says that the Bill exempts from coverage in the capital plans project, which we are requiring the .. the Bureau of the Budget to develop a capital plan...



The message says, 'The Bill exempts reconstruction financing loans, or architectural planning.' However, the definition of the ... in the definition Section of the Bill which is on the first page of the Bill, it says, 'Capital expenditure means money spent for replacing, remodeling, expanding, or acquiring facilities, buildings or land.' So, it seems to me that right there in the definition Section the Governor's first objection is satisfied. Other.. Other points he raises, he says it is unclear whether revenue bond authorities and highway programs to be covered by capital planning. I don't think it's unclear at all. In the companion legislation to this, revenue bond authorities are treated separately. They are not state agencies as contemplated by this Bill, whereas the transportation program certainly is. And I think it's appropriate for the Governor to give us some ideas of what he plans to spend his transportation money on. After all, he's been promising the 'Freeport By-Pass', he's been promising highway 51 for years. It seems to me that we ought to .. to ask the Governor to go on record with a three year capital plan to show us what he plans to spend his money on three years hence so that we can make our own plans accordingly. And then as the Governor makes any promises to us about where he's going to put highways, we would have an opportunity to get.. to enforce those promises by making sure that they get in the capital plan and then we can thereby rally support for .. for the appropriations when the time comes to enact those plans into law. So it seems to me that this piece of legislation is necessary to pass so that it.. the total package of the Long Term Debt Study Committee can be implemented. And it seems to me that we ought to put the Governor on record with a three year capital plan so we know



what to expect in the way of these authorizations and appropriations before the budget books gets dropped on our desks in early April. Thank you very much.

I ask for an affirmative Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Woods Bowman, has moved to override the Governor's veto with respect to House Bill 2416. On that, the Gentleman from Will, Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is an unique experience for me because this is the first Bill that I've been Sponsor of or Joint Sponsor of that any Governor has vetoed. So I'm not quite sure how to address this. However, as a Joint Sponsor of this Bill, I think I'd like to point out that this does not require that these three year plans be set in concrete. That doesn't mean that we can't change them or that the agencies can't change them or that the Governor can't change them. But it is to give us some idea as to what long range planning the state agencies have with regard to capital construction. If we're ever going to try to get a handle on long term bonding in the State of Illinois, bonding that costs us a dollar and seventy cents for every dollar that we bond, we have got to have some idea, a road map, as to where we're going. I join with Representative Bowman in asking for an affirmative vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2416 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'nay'. This take 107 votes, a Constitutional extraordinary Majority. Has anybody got the McClain Roll? Jeannie Chapman? Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will ask. The Gentleman from Marion, Representative



Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Point of inquiry. How many votes does Representative Schneider get?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Well, he's... I asked him to hit my button. I think I'm here."

Friedrich: "He hit about eight more so that's what I was wondering. I didn't begrudge him yours."

Speaker Matijevich: "Must have been an environmental protection Bill. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 124 'aye's, 21 'nay's, 1 voting 'present'. And this motion, having received the Constitutional three-fifths Majority, prevails and House Bill 2416 is declared passed, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. House Bill 2566. The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."

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

House Bill 2566 truth in taxation requires local units of government in the State of Illinois to notify taxpayers when they're budgets approved for the following... proposed for the following fiscal year would, other things being equal, require a raise in the levies. The Governor vetoed the Bill though he said, indeed, the purpose is worthwhile. His grounds have not to do with the problem of this Bill, but with the problem of the budget process as it affects some local government units in the State of Illinois. That is, there are a few local government units in the State of Illinois whose budget process is so confused under the state's statutory requirements having nothing to do with this Bill, that indeed, they do pass a levy before they propose and adopt the budget. My view is that since most of the local governments in the state are thoroughly covered by House Bill 2566, that we should override the Governor's veto on this issue and come back next Session, not with a new truth



and taxation proposal, but with Amendments to the Budgetary Act that in fact, confused the budget... the budget procedures in those few local governments which will not therefore be covered by 2566. Of the six thousand, three hundred and twenty local units of government in the State of Illinois, this Bill will, in fact, affect most of them. The Governor's concern is a reasonable one, but I think it was inappropriate of him to veto this particular Bill. Rather, we should override his veto of this Bill, come back next Session, and make sure that budget processes in those few local governments are more sensible ones. I urge an override of the Governor's veto of House Bill 2566."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Currie has moved to override the Governor's veto with respect to House Bill 2566. If there's no discussion the question .. Alright. The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Thank you. I would like to ask the Sponsor a couple of questions."

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

Pullen: "What kind of notice is required in this Bill?"

Currie: "Thank you. When the local unit of government proposes its budget, if the amount of its budget taking into account levies and changes in the property tax rolls over the previous five years, suggests that the proposed budget would require an increase in the levy, at that point, in the course of its regular budget hearings the local unit of government must make that notice.. notice that there is likely to be an increase in taxes should that budget pass, be available to all the residents and taxpayers. We are using with this Bill the budget provisions that already apply to most of the local units of government in the state. That is, we're not requiring every local unit of government to engage in an entire new hearing. They already have



budget hearings. But we're requiring of them that they post loudly, plainly and clearly the information that this particular budget is very likely to mean an increase in the local taxes."

Pullen: "What is the form of their posting loudly and clearly that this is likely to take place? What form does the notice take?"

Currie: "We did not specify that it had to be three inches large in each of the local newspapers. The Bill merely requires that they do make the information that this budget augers an increase in taxation part of their budget notice. We would hope that the local governments would for their own protection make sure that they make that information available and generally accessible to the public."

Pullen: "Do you think that if..."

Currie: "The Governor.. Oh, pardon me. I just wanted to say that the Governor's veto is not involved with this issue at all."

Pullen: "Well, I am..."

Currie: "Fine."

Pullen: "Interested in it. Do you think that the public that is not now interested in attending budget hearings would be any more interested in attending a tax increase hearing?"

Currie: "Representative Pullen, I certainly hope so. My view is that we, in the Legislature, can offer people additional opportunities to participate in budget making processes at the local level... at the local unit of government level and it seems to me our responsibility is to give them as many opportunities and as much information prior to the own individual decision whether to participate or not. That's the point of this Bill. We're not forcing people to pay special attention. My reading of the current tax revolt is that



in addition to a concern with raises in taxes, people are legitimately concerned about accountability and responsibility in government. It seems to me appropriate for this Legislative Body to insure that access to accountable, responsible government is available. We certainly can't drag an individual out to public hearings if they chose to stay home, but we can offer them an opportunity to participate and that's, I think, what this Bill's about."

Pullen: "I think the opportunity is already there. Thank you."

Currie: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall ...' The question .. Oh. The Gentleman from McClean, Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Two questions of the Sponsor. I see on the synopsis we have at.. on the last line it says, 'when the budget appropriations based on property tax exceeds certain percentages.' What are the certain percentages?"

Currie: "I think it was .. It was not an actual percentage. It's an amount exceeding the average annual increase over the previous five years. So, it's based on a kind of average since it's impossible to tell for sure what the property tax levy will be since it's not just the budget that affects what the tax rate for an individual home owner will be, Representative."

Bradley: "Do you have a penalty in the Bill if the..."

Currie: "There is not.. Yeah. There is not at this point, a penalty. We thought about including one and I think we were hopeful that the local units of government would understand that, in fact, this Bill offers them an opportunity to explain what they are about to their people and would be so quick to take advantage of it that we would not fact the issue of penalties. But I'm happy to come back next Session and.. and if it seems as if we're running into that problem, propose



frugal penalties, if you like for those local units of government that do not abide by House Bill 2566."

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if I might speak to the Bill very briefly. I think it might be.. might not be the answer to the needs of the people who are finding themselves over assessed, higher rates, and over taxed at the local level. But it certainly is a beginning and I'm certainly willing to support it wholeheartedly and hope that we can improve upon this next year as the Sponsor suggests. As I say, it may not be the complete answer, but the way that our assessors are over assessing the property and the rates stay the same, we're going to be forcing people including senior citizens and everybody else right out of their homes. This is a beginning and I'm happy to support it and I hope we get the necessary 107 votes."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as I said when we first passed this Bill last spring, and my good friend and colleague that sits in the aisle here with me says that we're cluttering up the state statutes pretty much. There isn't a local government... or agency in the Cook County that I don't know of now that doesn't have budget hearings, doesn't print and pay for the printing of the budget and the appropriation in the tax levy in the local newspaper and sends a copy to every library in the area. And this is another duplication. There's no penalty on it. All you're doing is inserting, saying that your taxes are going to be raised in the last five years and certainly they can tell by the total amount of dollars because what we do is we publish the 1977 fiscal year with.. and compare with the 1978 to show the difference and we're doing that now and this is only going to



clutter up the state statutes. I vote.. I urge you to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2566 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'nay'. This takes three-fifths Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie, to explain her vote."

Currie: "Yeah, actually I didn't get to close. I would just like to say this is an important Bill. It does offer the kind of accountability and responsibility in government that the people in the state are looking to us to provide. I don't understand all those red buttons up there. I'd certainly not like to be in the position of somebody who leaves this Session of the Legislature and goes out on the campaign trail and says, yes, I voted against accountability in government. Yeah, I'm not in favor of responsible government. No, indeed, I didn't support the single Bill that passed this House 143 votes to 3 that says to the local units of government it's up to you, babies, to let your people know when you're playing hog with their property taxes. And I sure wouldn't want to be one of those great red lights up there when people come out and say I'm for responsible government and your Representative voted 'no' when given an opportunity to support a fine Bill. The Governor's complaint, I would remind you about this Bill, is not a complaint of 2566. His complaint and it is a real one is about the way in which some of the budgetary processes of local units of government in the state operate. I ask you, does it make sense for some of these governments to pass the levies before they even begin to look at the budget issues? That problem has nothing to do with 2566. And most of the local units of government.. Mayor



Conti's unit of government...."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Have all voted?..."

Currie: "Mayor Bluthardt's unit of government, they are well covered by House Bill 2566 and I was saying to Mayor Conti and Mayor Bluthardt that if you want to be accountable to your people, let's see your green lights on this Bill.."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 68 'aye's, 54 'nay's, 2 voting 'present'. And this motion, having failed to receive the Constitutional three-fifths Majority, is declared lost. On page 4, Total Veto Motions, House Bill 18... Huskey: I don't see him ready to proceed. House Bill 326, Representative Eugene Barnes. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 326 is a Bill that is a product that was recommended to us in the appropriations process by the .. by the ~~Governor's~~ own task force, by the Auditor General, by the Comptroller, and by all of the .. by all of these areas ... authorities that exhibit any authority over the Finance Act. What this Bill, in fact, says, without going through all of the particulars, is that the Department of Public Aid cannot pay for expenditures out of previous years over and beyond the lapse period of spending. Now that's a fact of life in the Finance Act for everyone else. The Department of Public Aid has been doing that and this Bill was a Bill that as was recommended in the audit report from the Auditor General and the ~~cross~~ ^{cost} control task force of the Governor that recommended that that practice would be stopped. This Bill addresses that situation. It also addresses the situation of the ... of the special public fund that the Department has,



that public special purpose trust fund, that set out general... general revenue funds outside of the process.... outside of the appropriation process. This Bill in the future will prohibit that. Those monies that have totaled up to somewhere in the neighborhood of 14 to 15 millions of dollars at various times, would now, with this Bill, have to come through the normal general appropriations process. I can say with some assurance that since this veto took place apparently there was some misunderstanding within the Bureau and as it relates to the recommendation of this Bill, the department itself has come to me and advised me to advise you here in the General Assembly of the necessity for the overriding of this veto. The department would be hampered in a number of ways if this was not accomplished. There was a Bill in the Senate which the Senate has already taken action on and with that action in the Senate if we do not take the necessary action of overriding this veto, the Department of Public Aid would be hampered to the point that one of their programs of general assistance would not be able to be accomplished in this fiscal year. So I urge you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly, to override this veto and.. so that that department can function in the manner in which the statute sets out for it to function."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Barnes has moved to override the Governor's veto with respect to House Bill 326. On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters. 'Peters.'"

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I join with my colleague, Representative Barnes, in urging the action of this House in terms of overriding the veto... the Governor's veto. He had stated the case properly. The Bureau of the Budget and the Office



of the Governor are now properly informed as to the intent of this legislation. It is, I think, a keystone piece of legislation to which we owe our gratitude to Representative Barnes and the Members of the House who support it and I join him and urge the Members of the House to vote to override the Governor's veto on House Bill 326."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 326 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. This motion requires three-fifths Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 147 'aye's, 1 'nay', and this motion, having received the Constitutional three-fifths Majority, prevails. And House Bill 326 is declared passed, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. House Bill 450, Steczo. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Steczo."

Steczko: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 450 was introduced by myself, Representative Yourell and Representative Hoxsey and to our dismay and the dismay of the township officials in the State of Illinois, it was vetoed by the Governor. I should point out that in the Governor's veto message there were a number of erroneous statements and I would like to point some of those out to you. First, he mentions that the aid to the medically indigent program is currently administered by the townships in downstate counties. That statement in itself is not correct as townships ... 30 suburban townships in Cook County have to administer the program. The city of Chicago does not. The Illinois Department of Public Aid already picks up the bill for AMI cases in the city of Chicago. This Bill passed the House and the Senate almost unani-



mously and the problem with the aid to the medically indigent program is that there is currently problems with township officials in townships as to residency. If a person from one township or one area in the State of Illinois has an accident or is hospitalized in one township that township where that person is hospitalized has to pay the tab for the hospital bill. Thornton Township, for instance, in my area has AMI bills... had AMI bills last year up to the tune of about \$162,000. And as AMI and general assistance are both .. both provided for in the same tax levy, townships are faced year after year with a Russian roulette type of situation where they can appropriate the proper amount of budget time because they simply do not know how much money they are going to need for AMI. In addition to that the townships do not have the staff available to determine residency and eligibility. Hospitals under the Hill-Burton Act are supposed to provide aid to medically indigent. We find more and more that those hospitals simple kick the bills over to the townships and require the townships to pay those bills. The Illinois Department of Public Aid upon assuming this program would have the resources available to determine eligibility. In addition to that we also find that some townships supervisors across the state have expressed opposition toward the transference of this program. We do know and they were basing their opposition on that fact that up until recently there was a five day rule which said any bill sent to the townships by hospitals etc. had to be submitted within five days or those bills could be denied. Under a recent court case Meyer vs. Niles Township that five day rule has now been inoperative which means that townships are going to be spending even more money for the AMI program. The Governor's veto message also mentioned that this program



would cost approximately 17 million general revenue dollars. That is false. The estimate by the Department of Public Aid last year said 7.5 million. His veto message says there is no federal Title 19 reimbursement available. That is also false. According to my sources, they say that if the program is run the proper way through the Illinois Department of Public Aid, there is Title 19 reimbursement available. What this Bill attempts to do is provide for uniform administration of the.. of this aid to the medically indigent program. It's a vital program. It's an important program. The township officials last spring when the Bill was going through the General Assembly supported the program and I would appreciate your vote to override the Governor's veto of House Bill 450."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Stezco has moved to override the Governor's veto with respect to House Bill 450. On that, the Lady from LaSalle, Representative Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, too, would ask you to support this override. This is one of the most unfair burdens on local government that now exists. The medically indigent people who are in the hospitals, the bills go to the townships. It's very unfair. This is a Public Aid responsibility. There's no doubt in my mind that the state can much better afford to take care of these people and their bills than the local townships. I ask you to support the override on this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 450 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'nay'. This vote takes 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 124 'aye's, ... 25 'aye's, 14 'nay's, 2 'present'. The motion, having received the Constitutional three-fifths Majority, prevails and House Bill 450 is declared passed, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. House Bill 460.. The Majority Whip, Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I'll be very brief. In the Governor's comment he praised the .. the Bill 460 and for spurring as he said his interest in the problem. And what we did with 460 was to abolish the advance payment system and to speed up with the collection of taxes. And the Governor took care of the situation with the advance system ... the advance payment system administratively by effectively waiving the system October 1st, '79. And he also said with the new computerized business taxpayers' system now being implemented and I quote, 'It will ultimately result in automatic assignment of credits to retailers and eliminating necessity for issuing of these credits.' And I applaud the Governor's action in doing that. However, what I feel is going to happen and I don't think the Governor would really have any great objection, if we'd put it back in the statute and Mary Lou Kent amended the Bill and he was.. I think if we would put it back in the statute and take away from this Governor or any other Governor the possibility of speeding up the collection of taxes simply by regulation and you and I and everyone on the floor knows we fight regulation after regulation through... from all the different governmental agencies... And I just think and I'm happy with what the Governor did. He is absolutely right. We don't have the problem that we did have. He admitted that the fiscal state of the state is in much better shape than it was in 1975 when we had to speed up the collection of taxes for Governor Walker. It's not



necessary now. But let's put it in the statutes so that a Governor will have to come to the Illinois General Assembly to have the... to give him the right to speed up collection if that time becomes necessary again. I think it's something that we ought to be doing. And I've talked with Representative Kent and I think that she agrees that we ought to put it back in the statutes and I think we'll all feel better and we won't have to be arguing with some agency about regulations. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Monroe Flinn in the Chair."

Speaker Flinn: "If not, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 460 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed vote 'nay'. It takes 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 118 voting 'aye', and 15 voting 'nay'. And the motion prevails. This Bill, having received the Constitutional three-fifths Majority, House Bill 460 is passed, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. House Bill 462. Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 462 is an effort to allow School Districts to pay for increasing utility costs. As everyone on this House floor knows, the price of fuel and subsequently the price of utilities have gone up at least twice as fast as the rate of inflation over the last five years. And in more and more School Districts in Illinois, we are having problems paying these utilities. House Bill 462 allowed the School District subject to vote of approval, to allow... to a levy of 20.... 0.2% tax to pay utility costs. Now I emphasize once more that this is with voter approval."



It's a referendum taken to the people. The Governor vetoed it and .. and said for three reasons. First, he said that the overwhelming Majority of School Districts could accomplish this under the current statutes. And that is, by raising the level of their operations buildings and maintenance funds. Well that's simply not true. As most of you know, the great Majority of School Districts are already at their maximum without referendum and are at their maximum with referendum in that fund. They simply do not have any monies to spare. So they can't accomplish it that way. The second thing the Governor says is that there is no point in creating a new School fund. And on that I would disagree. I would not say that we need to proliferate the number of funds ad infinitum. But certainly when, in our society, we see a need for a change, I think the Legislature should respond to that. And I think this is a typical example. The utilities are the only things that have really gone out of sight in the last few years and I think it's important that we allow School Districts to address themselves to that single issue and that is paying for the cost of heat and light. And finally, the Governor says that if we want to accomplish this we can simply raise the maximums in the other funds. But no one from the Governors' Office, in fact no one on the House floor this year has put in any Bill to authorize this. And so, since that is not an accomplished fact, I say the choice left to the School Districts is two-fold; one is to have increased state aid and the other is to be all... is to allow the citizens of that District to vote on the particular referendum. And that's what House Bill 462 does. It allows those School Districts who want to allow the voters to vote, those voters that want to pay for utilities out of their own taxes after voting on it, can



do so. And so, with that, I would move that the House Bill 462 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Bower, is recognized."

Bower: "Will the Speaker yield?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Bower: "Is this by a front door or a back door referendum?"

McPike: "Front door. There's no back door referendum involved. They have to go directly to the voters."

Bower: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman, is recognized."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much. Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Flinn: "Indicates he will."

Hoffman: "Do you have knowledge of School Districts by number or name who, in fact, are at their maximum rate by referendum in the building and maintenance fund?"

McPike: "No, I do not have that figure. I can only speak from first-hand knowledge in my District and a number of School Districts within my Legislative District are in that situation and have asked.. specifically asked me to do this. In fact, during the Revenue Committee there were other Members on the Committee that said the same thing, that it would affect their District similarly."

Hoffman: "I would... Thank you very much. I would suggest to the Sponsor of this Bill and other Members of the House that there maybe a number of many School Districts who are at their maximum in their building rate on a non referendum basis. However, I do not know specifically of any School District who have come to me or to the Commission and suggested that they were above or were at their limit in the building and .. building and main-



tenance fund. One of the complaints raised on an earlier Bill was the large number of local governmental units that we have and when we compound that by the number of funds that are available to these.. within these School Districts, it gets very, very confusing for the taxpayer. I would suggest possibly that the point... the second point made by .. by the Governor in his veto message might be a very applicable one. The saving grace of this Bill of course for those of you who want to support it is the fact that it's done on the basis of the referendum. It's done specifically in that one area and that is, the increased.. the increased energy costs. And both of those I think are valid points and points which stand on the side of the Sponsor. However, to suggest that the Governor's veto message was without merit I think is inaccurate. Thank you very much."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, is recognized."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I don't see anything wrong with this Bill. It doesn't do a heck of a lot that can't be done now, but it doesn't hurt anything either. And if a School District is short of money, and wants to make a special appeal for money to buy oil or to pay the gas bill or pay the electric bill, I don't see what the harm is, why we shouldn't allow them to do it. I would point out that the highest... the fastest rising part of any governmental budget is the energy part. So if this solves the problem in Representative McPike's District, why don't we let him solve the problem?"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative... Representative McPike to close."

McPike: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Perhaps I would agree with Representative Hoffman and say that the Bill should stand on its own



merits. It is, indeed, very confusing to a voter when they go to vote on an issue that they don't understand very clearly. And I think this is about as simple as we could make it. A School District.... Many School Districts in the state are hurting for monies and they want to go to the taxpayer and have a fair chance at that taxpayer understanding what they want and what they need. And I don't think anything could be much simpler than to look at the average taxpayer who's fuel and gas bill, oil bill, has gone up probably four to five fold in the last five years and to say to them, 'Look, we're in the same situation.' We need monies to pay for utilities. Nothing else. We're not asking you to fund a new program or to build a new building or to increase teachers' salaries. We're asking you very simply to allow us to pay our utility bills because they have sky-rocketed out of sight. It's a front door referendum. And I think it's the thing... It's the kind of Bill that this Legislature has stood for this year. And I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 462 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Hoffman, to explain his vote."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and thank the House for the indulgence of my second comment on this Bill. Some information has come to my attention I didn't have. There are nine... In 1977 there were nine Elementary Districts and four Unit Districts in a state of over 1,000 Districts that were at their maximum statutory rate in the building fund. Nine Elementary Districts and four units."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 87 voting 'aye', 21 voting 'nay'."



And this motion, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority.. three-fifths Majority, is declared lost. House Bill 512, Representative Murphy, is recognized."

Murphy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker . House Bill 512 was put in the hopper because in my District I had a school teacher on a County Board that ran into a problem with a new Superintendant. And what this Bill does is put teachers under the same basis as everybody, that they have a right to be elected and then serve their constituents. I don't think teachers should be put into a position where they are second class citizens. They are not double dipping. She just had her time off to go to her county meetings. What I am afraid of is that they're worried about somebody with a little intelligence that can pay attention to what's happening in County Government. I just can't see why the Governor would veto a Bill like this and place the teachers as second class citizens. I urge a green vote for it, Sir."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 512...' Representative Walsh. Had you covered up, Bill. Sorry."

Walsh: "Elbow, Monroe, I'll bet."

Speaker Flinn: "Right."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to oppose the Gentleman's motion. We opposed this Bill when it came before us in the Regular Session and I hope we have better luck now because it is, indeed, a bad Bill. There's no reason on earth why a County Board or a village Board or city Board or any other kind of Board should give special treatment to employees who happen to be teachers. And there's no reason why they should be given an opportunity to serve when other people are not given that opportunity. For teachers to



allowed to serve on County Board and the School Board be required by us to give them a leave of absence is absolutely wrong. It's.. It would be wrong for a city, for a village, or for anybody else. I urge you, Mr. Speaker, not to give teachers this consideration where other people are not given it and would ask you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Murphy to close."

Murphy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the County Board is going to be just run by businessmen, this is where our problem arises. It seems to me that they are afraid that somebody with a little intelligence might look into it. I can't understand why somebody would deny them the right when they're not asking for anything else. They're just asking for a right to serve the people. You can't serve them at night because they hold the meetings in the afternoon. I urge you to give me a green vote on it, Sir."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 512 pass, notwithstanding the Governor's veto?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'nay'. Representative Birkinbine."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to oppose this motion rather as the Sponsor says, we'r making second class citizens out of teachers, on the contrary we're making a special class for these people. We don't have a Bill in law in effect now that says that somebody who has worked for a corporation or in a law firm or in a real estate company for a certain number of years must be granted a leave of absence so that they can work on the County Board, or so that they can be a Member of the General Assembly. This makes a very special case and I don't think it's right. I urge you to oppose it."



Speaker Flinn: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, unlike the previous speaker, I think it is very necessary that this Bill pass. What happens in private industry is that they can give a leave to anybody they want. The problem with school teachers is that they only have the rights that are given to them under state statutes. Since we have not specifically indicated that they have this right, unless we pass this piece of legislation, many of the School Districts are denying it. It's not a matter of free choice as industry or any other private employer has to grant leave or not to grant leave as they please. This is necessary. If our County Boards would agree to meet at night when most people are free from their working situation anyway, it would make it an advantage not only to participation by teachers, but by every other working class person. It would also make it more available for the general public to go to see what's happening at those County Board meetings. But many of them are very restrictive and will not change their practice of meeting daytime. Until the County Boards change their ways, I think we need to provide additional legislation to allow teachers to participate and not disenfranchise them from being County Board Members."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this motion there are 85 voting 'aye' and 44 voting 'nay'. The motion, having failed to receive the Constitutional three-fifths Majority, is hereby declared lost. We're going to change the order of business right now for a few moments. Well, just for a few moments. This... Take it easy Billy. Wait till you hear what I'm going to do. We're going to convene the Third Special Session in order to have a couple of Bills first read and then



we will adjourn that to a given date. Representative ... Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I move now that the Regular Session recess for five minutes."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the Regular Session be in recess for five minutes. No objection. The Regular Session is recessed. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "All in favor say 'aye', 'aye'..."

Speaker Flinn: "'Aye'."

Lechowicz: "The motion prevails. We're on Third Special Session, Sir."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. On Third Special Session, First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill #1, Skinner, a Bill for an Act to exempt food from human consumption... for human consumption, prescription, nonprescription medicines, drugs, medical appliances, diabetic supplies for ..."

Lechowicz: "Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. "

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Lechowicz, state your point."

Lechowicz: "I don't believe that that matter is within the call. There was a ruling on it yesterday as far as what is in the call and I believe the Speaker ruled that there was only one Bill on the call and it's constrained to that matter."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Daniels, for what purpose do you arise?"

Daniels: "I think that the Gentleman is in error. We questioned the Speaker at some length over the call. Maybe you want to bring him out and have that issue clarified. This is certainly within the call. It deals with the issue of sales tax relief which was the purpose of the Bill previously introduced and the Speaker has said that he would entertain introduction of legislation on that Order. And I think if you would bring the Speaker out. He's in his office..."



Lechowicz: "Would you also ask the Parliamentarian to come out on the rostrum..."

Speaker Flinn: "We're sending for the Parliamentarian now. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I think Lee Daniels knows I'd like to agree with him. I was on the podium when I did make the.. the opinion that the only Bill that could be considered was House Bill 20.. 27.. whatever it is..."

Speaker Flinn: "96."

Matijevich: "2796. However, I don't think that precludes anybody from introducing any Bill. And just to show you how ridiculous the Governor's Proclamation was because he doesn't state in that Proclamation that we consider House Bill 2796 introduced in the Regular Session, Eighty-First General Assembly. There would be really nothing precluding anybody from introducing 2795 Bills. And then, introduce 2796 in the Third Special Session. That's how ridiculous that Proclamation was. But, I think what I'm saying is that Representative Lechowicz is right in that that is the only Bill that can be considered. However, Representative Daniels is correct, too, in that other Bills can be introduced."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Substitute Speaker, where is the real Speaker who might give a broader interpretation than you might?"

Speaker Flinn: "He'd get it from the same source I did, right on my right here. "

Skinner: "The same source, eh? Well, I certainly would urge you to rule that the .. that Bills can be introduced in this Session if only to save the Legislative Reference Bureau a prodigious amount of work. Because if you're not willing to accept Bill #1 and Bill #2, and then I guess that Representative Bowman and I



shall have to go to Legislative Reference Bureau and ask them to develop .. how many Bills is it? 2,282 Bills, so that we can come up with House Bill 2282. I would argue that the comments made by Representative Deuster yesterday in our debate on whether or not to adjourn sine die are totally relevant to your consideration here today and that I would argue that the Governor does not have the power to limit a Session to a particular Bill. He only has the power to limit a Session to a particular subject matter. The subject matter is obviously sales tax relief. That is what my Bill deals with."

Speaker Flinn: "I'm advised by the Parliamentarian that I should not make a ruling at the time as to whether...to the question on the call, but that we should allow these Bills to be introduced. There is a serious question as to whether they're in the Governor's call and can be legally considered. And... But we're not at that point right now. Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Bless you. Yes, Mr. Speaker, despite your intention not to make a ruling, I would like to put something into the record at this time. Regarding House Bill 2 of the Third Special Session, which I have introduced jointly with Representative Daniels, because House Bill 2 contains... has two distinguishing features about it. First of all, the paragraph in Sections of the Code which are being amended correspond exactly to the paragraphs of Sections of the Code which the Governor's Bill .. which he mentioned in the call, is amending. Secondly, the short Title of my Bill is identical to the short Title of the Governor's Bill. Those.. Those two characteristics are the tests which we usually use for germaneness in adopting Amendments to a Bill. I think that therefore my Bill would be within the scope of the call. Because if it were in an



Amendment form, it would be .. capable of being amended into the Governor's Bill. Therefore, if it is capable of being amended into the Bill, it should be able to stand on its own as a separate piece of legislation. I understand your reluctance to rule on this matter. I understand furthermore that this has been referred to Committee. I think, however, that there is a Constitutional issue involved here and I would like this to put into the record. Because I think that if a piece of legislation is sufficiently germane to be amended into a Bill which is provided for in the call, it should be capable of standing on its own in the Special Session that also provided for in the call. Thank you very much."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just want to take a minute to point out something that ought to be obvious and shouldn't need to be said. We were entertained last night by a considerable debate over the extent of the Governor's call and whether it was proper and whether it was necessary. And frankly, even though I generally support the Governor, it seems to me that the call was probably not necessary and I think that from that point of view that debate was well taken. But I would gently remind the people who oppose the Governor's program that exactly the same reasoning leads as the night follows the day to the conclusion that all of this maneuvering they are doing over whether these Bills are going to be considered in the Special Session, is equally meaningless. I mean, as an attorney, I'm kind of entertained by all this debate over these sort of Parliamentary questions and I'm perfectly willing to sit here and listen to them. But they don't get us anywhere. If they seriously want to consider these Bills by far the



easiest and the most productive way to do it is as Dave pointed out last night, to go ahead and move them in the Regular Session. We have Committees functioning. They can function on their Bills just as they, themselves, pointed out last night, could be done with the Governor's Bills. We spent a long time last night counting the number of angels on the head of a pin. We appeared to be prepared to do that for the next couple of weeks. I've just gently suggested it's a waste of time and that we get on with the business of the House."

Speaker Flinn: "The ... Alright. The Chair has made the ruling on the advice of the Parliamentarian and the ruling I will restate again is that the Bills could be introduced, but that we are not ruling upon whether or not they are then within the call of the Governor. And so, first Bill... First Reading from Third Special Session."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill #1, Skinner, a Bill for an Act to exempt food for human consumption and prescription and nonprescription medicines, drugs, medical appliances, and diabetic supplies, for human use from state and local use and occupation taxes with local authority to reinstate local occupation use taxes. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill #2, Bowman, a Bill for an Act to exempt food for human consumption and prescription and nonprescription, medicines, drugs, medical appliances, and common household remedies for human consumption from certain taxes. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives, the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolutions, and the adoption of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House



of Representatives to wit; Senate Joint Resolution #1, adopted by the Senate October 18th, 1979. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Lechowicz for a motion... adjournment motion."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that the House do adopt Senate Joint Resolution #1 which adjourns the Third Special Session. The House. Till Tuesday, October the 30th, at twelve fifteen p. m."

Speaker Flinn: "You've heard the motion. All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed. The 'ayes' have it and the Third Special Session is adjourned. Back to the Regular Session. We have a couple of introductions there. Regular Session, First Reading of the Bills."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2822, Lechowicz et. al., a Bill for an Act to reduce state occupation use taxes on food for human consumption and to exempt prescriptions and nonprescription medicines, drugs, medical appliances, and common household remedies for human consumption from state, county, municipal and regional transportation authority occupation and use taxes and to replace revenues lost by counties, municipalities and regional transportation authority as a result of the elimination of the tax on medicines and medical materials. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2823, Pierce, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Inheritance and Transfer Tax Law. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "On the Calendar under Total Veto Motions, appears House Bill 652. Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I wish to withdraw the motion as to House Bill 652. I'd also like to state at this time that as to House Bill 2564 we continue to be a few votes short on that. I do not plan to call any motions pertaining to that legislation today. Were we to call it, however,



I wish to state that Representative Getty, Representative Yourell, who were unable to vote last week... or last time we called it, would vote to override the Governor's veto I am told. So, those folks who have been waiting around on the sales tax override, can go home, and we can proceed from there."



Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the...oh, you withdrew...withdrew your motion. Okay, on the same order of business is House Bill 6...wait a minute. The one we passed up a while ago. The Sponsor was off the floor. On page 5. House Bill 2192. Rep...is he on the floor now? There he is."

Farley: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do apologize to... to the Members for being off the floor, but House Bill 2192 is attempting to, and, in fact, does increase the bonding authority of the Chicago Park District from .75 to 1%. This would, in fact, be able to generate money that is very desperately needed for facilities, for recreation, for the overall picture of the Chicago Park District. The Governor did, in fact, veto this because of the referendum. I think I have talked to many Members here on the floor and explained that referendum in Chicago is a very costly situation. I think that this money is, in fact, needed. I think that the Chicago Park District should be able to...be able to try and raise these funds, which they desperately need for all the programs which they try to promote, and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this would treat the Chicago Park District differently than all of the other park districts within the state, and, historically, some years ago they were treated differently and were permitted to issue bonds up to a half of one percent of their assessed valuation without referendum. It was changed, oh, not too long ago, so that all park districts were permitted to issue bonds up to one percent of their assessed valuation exactly double what was permitted before. Now that should be plenty, Mr. Speaker, for the Chicago Park District as well as other park districts in the state. What I fear is that if



we permit this...if we permit an increase in the issuance of bonds by the Chicago Park District without referendum, we're certainly doing no service to the people of Chicago. But, what will happen a year from now or two years from now is that the Association for Park Districts will say, 'Well, why should they be treated differently than any other park district in the state? Why should they be able to double the bonds without referendum that we have...the rest of the state?' So, I suggest to you in the interest of maintaining uniformity and in the interests of the park districts where I live not being permitted to do this, please vote 'no' on the Gentleman's motion."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As you know, the General...General Assembly approved House Bill 2192, which would have maintained approximately the same level on which the Chicago Park District can issue park improvement bonds. The Governor apparently felt otherwise. In his veto message, the Governor indicated that the taxes should not be raised without a referendum. The Governor obvious...obviously was misinformed about the purpose of the Bill. When the personal property tax on corporations was declared unconstitutional, the ceiling on which the Chicago Park District could issue public improvement bonds dropped by approximately 27%. This immediately blocked many improvements including four improvements that were under construction and field houses in four different neighborhoods, and it also prevented stoppage of the plans on the renovation of the Soldiers Field. House Bill 2192 would really...merely replace most, but not all, of the lost bonding power. Again, we lost approximately 27% of the bonding power within a Chicago Park District when it was declared unconstitutional as far as the personal property tax on corporations. I strongly urge you to vote in favor of



the override on 2192 and providing that these four projects may be completed and the renovation of Soldiers Field could be completed as well. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, then Representative Farley to close. Representative Farley. Do you wish to close, Representative Farley? You do. Turn him on."

Farley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry for holding up the House, but I...I do, in fact, think that this is money that can be used for a lot of worthwhile proposals. We can talk about gang problems. We can talk about violence. We can talk about promoting sports. We can talk about a whole lot of things. I don't want to take the time of the House to go into all those programs, but I think that this money is going to be well deserved and well used, and I would just ask for a favorable vote. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2192 pass notwithstanding the Governor's veto?' All those in favor vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'nay'. Representative Beatty to explain his vote. One minute."

Beatty: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the...part of the money that's going to come from this is going to go into my area. We've been looking for a field house for a long time. Park's out of money, and I'd appreciate a vote so my neighborhood can get a field house."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Matijevich to explain his vote. One minute."

Matijevich: "Explanation of my 'aye' vote. This is in behalf of Pat O'Malley, the guy's name I forgot the other day."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Ronan."

Ronan: "I...I sure hope we get some more green votes on the board. It's very important for the...for the people of the City of Chicago that this Bill be...that this override



be enacted. One of the key problems we're facing is gang crime, and if we don't provide an alternative for the youth of the City of Chicago, the problem is not going to go away. It's encouraging to see...thank you very much."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'aye' and 36 voting 'nay', and this motion having received the Constitutional three-fifths Majority prevails and House Bill 2192 is declared passed notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. Back to our other line where we were at before I interrupted us is House Bill 685. Representative Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have filed a motion to override on this Bill as much to clarify it to the people of the General Assembly as anything else. In the veto message it said that this Bill was a direct assault upon Mr. Abraham Lincoln. Now, the gist of the Bill in response to the local School Board was that they could let the children out of school on the 12th or another day, depending on when most of the parents were working. Now, it's my opinion that children running around the streets unsupervised would be better off in school on the 12th of February paying attention to the fact that it was Abraham Lincoln's birthday. So I totally object to the veto message and I would ask you to support an override on this Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 685 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 74 voting 'aye', 35 voting 'nay'. And the motion, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill 739, Representative



Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, Representative Pechous has requested me to handle this Bill for him because of the death of his mother this morning. So I'll do the best I can and I hope that you will consider that I am pinch hitting on something.. on a Bill that I have not pinched hit on before. Now, the... Representative Pechous wishes to override the Governor because he feels it's time that we, as Americans, and we, as Illinoisians, do something about protecting our own children, our own people from invasion in all ways of life of illegal aliens. And I must confess, I agree with him. Now this Bill that he proposed which passed this House and the Senate for lisencing of illegal aliens for driving of cars on our highways. Now the Governor evidently thinks that we would be interfering with Constitutional law and the Federal Government. Representative Pechous and I both disagree with the Governor in this matter. After all, the Governor does... the Federal Government does take care of the illegal alien problem. But it's also the duties of the states. Now the roads belong to us. It is our right and our responsibility to decide who we give in our state or any other state a license to drive on our highways. So I feel that's the explanation. of an event that the Representative Pechous told me this morning in his own home town of two illegal aliens who were picked up for running a red light in his home town. They turned... When the police found they were driving a car without an Illinois license they simply called... turned them over to the immigration authorities of the United States. They, in turn, took the proper steps to send them back to Mexico, which happened to be the country from which they came. Now some will note that Representative Pechous gave me a word that in the identification



cards for tourists of aliens with the green card for example. Now all aliens have to have a green card. Now they have.. they have permanent residence but they have permanent resident status in our country. Students have a card. They have a permit. So there's no reason why since all legal aliens, students, tourists, permanent residents, have cards identifying them, there's no reason since they're an illegal alien cannot get a card, we cannot refuse to give them a license... a card having a license to drive on our highways. Now, it was alleged that the Secretary of State was against this. Representative Pechous assures me that the Secretary of Illinois took no position whatsoever. In fact, the Secretary of State indicated that it also.. the State Government itself should aid the Federal Government in controlling the problem. Now, take an analogy in relation to cars. Illinois employment application forms will indicate.. do indicate that you are a legal alien... you are a legal person to have an employment card. Voter registration has to be a legal citizen of this state. Gun registration, you must be a legal citizen in this state. The whole office, right here everyone one of us.. one of us on our applications to .. to run for office, we have to swear we are legal residents of the State of Illinois. Library cards is same. There's no reason why the State of Illinois cannot demand that the .. before an alien or a person receives a drivers license, they should not have the citizenship of our country. Now in Chicago I read not too long ago and if I'd known this would be my responsibility, I would have certainly brought up and cut out of the Tribune some months ago the article where a couple of children were killed in the streets of Chicago by an individual who was an illegal alien. Most of them don't have insurance for their



cars and therefore, when they take off there's no means of making anyone responsible for their illegal or legal actions, whatever they may be. Now, saying a thing or two for myself, there's some of the things I would like to take up in due time later on in another Session of the Legislature, if I run again, I want to point out again that the problem in this country is getting very severe in relation to the illegal aliens. I repeat, as I have before, over.. I have . got these figures from the immigration authorities of the United States. There are in Illinois right now half a million illegal aliens in our state. We are having an invasion of over 100,000 a month in our country. No other country on earth would permit what we permit for illegal aliens and let them get away with it. It's time that we take some sort of action in every way we can with what we consider the rights of our state to protect ourselves and our children and our state in the future. Because this is an ever growing problem and no one seems to be taking any action. So I request that when we take this vote that you do help Representative Pechous and myself to overcome and override the Governor's veto. I feel that we.. somewhere we've got to start taking action on an ever growing problem. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, I hope you're paying attention. This Bill was debated at great length at Third Reading on the floor of the House and passed after a very lengthy explanation of vote procedure. The Governor's absolutely right to have vetoed this Bill and I wish you would take the time to take a look at his veto message. It is the duty of the State of Illinois to determine what residents of the state are qualified to drive. That is the duty of the state, to determine whether a person



knows how to drive, knows the rules of the road, knows the stop signs. And any of you who have taken the test, can.. whether or not you can pass the test, it's the duty of the United States Government to determine who has a right to be in the United States, who has a right to live here. It's not the duty of the State of Illinois to make this determination. The Governor rightfully points out that the Federal Government's interpretation of the Immigration and Nationality Act is in a constant state of flex. And at one particular time a person may qualify as a resident alien, another time he may not. This is a question... purely for the Federal Government to resolve and not the Secretary of State's Office. This is a bad Bill. It wasn't a good Bill when it passed out of here narrowly. The Governor is right to have vetoed it and I urge you to support his veto by voting against the Gentleman's motion."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich. Representative Friedrich, got your light on? Representative Pullen. You've got your light on. Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am distressed to hear my distinguished colleague who just spoke agreeing with the Governor on this excellent piece of legislation. It's unfortunate but it's true that the State of Illinois cannot afford to place border guards along our borders with the other states to take care of enforcing the laws that the United States is unwilling to enforce. And I do think that we should have some opportunity to determine who is a lawful resident of the State of Illinois. If someone is an illegal alien which means they neither have citizenship nor legal alien status, why should we afford them the privilege of driving a car in the State of Illinois? There have been many efforts made in this



Legislature to restrict the so called rights and I would call them privileges, which should not even exist, of illegal aliens. Many of these have been unsuccessful. This is the one Bill that has been able to pass both Houses. It was an excellent piece of legislation when we debated it last spring and it is just as excellent now. And in Representative Pechous's absence I certainly ask you to please vote to override the Governor's unfortunate veto."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield to a couple of questions?"

Speaker Flinn: "Indicates he will."

Leverenz: "Representative, the Secretary of State has gone to great lengths to streamline providing drivers licenses to those that go into drivers license examining stations. Would you explain what procedure or how an examiner would be able to know whether he had an illegal alien or she had an illegal alien in front of her?"

Borchers: "It's obvious that they would not know cause they could be easily lied to. But if some serious accident occurred, I'm sure that the police would check up to see what license was issued and they found it was, it would just be another charge. I'm not a lawyer, but I'm sure there would be a charge for the counterfeit lisenace in addition to the murder or the homicide or the hit and run, whatever. I'm sure it would be just anothe charge."

Leverenz: "How would they know?"

Borchers: "They would have to check up as they do on all sort of cases the background of whoever perpetuates whatever it might be.."

Leverenz: "Would this then take us back to the way it was before where the licenses would be delayed for two weeks or four weeks or six weeks before a person got their license?"



Borchers: "I wouldn't be able to answer that question. But I would know one thing, the very fact that an illegal alien might not have a license would help perhaps in the apprehension and sending them back to where they come. No one can predict, but this would be... if I would be able to help send one illegal alien back, that's all I care about. I'll be satisfied with that one...."

Leverenz: "Well if they put 'yes' that they were a citizen, would they then have to go home and get something to bring back to show them"

Borchers: "They have whatever..."

Leverenz: "They had to make a second trip back to get a drivers license so that they could prove with another piece of paper which is probably a phoney document? You don't think an illegal alien is going to write down on something that he's not a citizen, do you?"

Borchers: "I'm sure they do everything they can to stay here. If we have half a million now in this state, I'm sure they're doing all they can to stay here."

Leverenz: "Do you recall in the last Spring Session that we had a couple of Bills and the movement now is to take the U.S. citizenship requirement out of the statutes? Is that true?"

Borchers: "I cannot help what some people think. Here in this House, the Congress of the United States, all I know is I'm American. And I intend to try to keep from my children and my children, grandchildren this country. And if the actions you're taking in the direction you're going is going to counter.. going to make a counter cause that could lose us our old country.. I would like to quote to you that I have read the enviornmental impact population study which I have at home in my possession and they predict that by 1984 the descendants, the illegal aliens and their descendants right in this country, right now will equal our black



population. And I think, for one, that if anybody has the right to this country like the whites, it's the blacks that were here from 160..19 are the same as ourselves. And here this... Here is an alien population, illegal alien, population coming in that's going to outnumber people that have as much right as we have. Well, if they ever come to the point they throw us out, I haven't a word to say. They have the right."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question."

All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The previous question is moved. The Sponsor, Representative Borchers, is recognized to close."

Borchers: "The roads of Illinois belong to us. Not to the Federal Government. They belong to us. We have the right under our state's rights and should demand and protect our rights as.. and our state's rights that the roads are ours to make decisions on. If illegal aliens are picked up or use our roads, that's up to us to make, whether they have the right or not, it's up to us to make the decision. If we catch them we can turn them over to the Federal Government and let them do as they please with them. That's no concern of ours at the moment. I believe it should be a concern and we should help, but somewhere we've got to stop the invasion of illegal aliens taking our jobs, going on our welfare, doing all the things at our expense, and we pay their medical bills. It's time somewhere we call a halt. And I, for once, say here's one chance to do it. So I solicit your support."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 739 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All those



in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'nay'. Representative Van Duyne is recognized, to explain his vote."

Van Duyne: "Well very briefly, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'm one of the Co-Sponsors of this Bill and I'm only sorry that Representative Pechous isn't here, but as you all know, his mother died this morning and he had to go home. But he was very convinced that this Bill would some type of a vehicle to address... help us address ourself to an ever increasing problem of locating these illegal aliens. Now I want to point out only one thing, that we're not talking about the justifiable Mexican people who come to this country, whether they be aliens with papers, or whether they be actual citizens of the State of Illinois. And it's only a simple little vehicle for us to be able to locate these people and report them to the proper authorities. I don't really think my composition isn't going to make much difference, but nevertheless, I still think it was a valuable tool and I think we're making a mistake."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Hudson, to explain his vote. "

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In explanation of my 'yes' vote I am a little bit confused by the argument presented here by the Governor that he does not believe the Secretary of State employees should be in placed in the position of enforcing federal law. Well if this becomes a principle on our considerations, then I suggest there will be many other cases where this principle will become into.. will come into play. If we are in violation of federal law, I got to wondering if somebody might not present a case if they felt they were being .. their rights were being infringed upon under the guarantees of the Civil Rights Act, if they couldn't bring that to an Illinois court and the Illinois courts would be in a position where they would have to uphold and enforce



the federal law. I'm not sure. But it seems to me they would. So I'm unimpressed with this argument. It also seems to me that if we take the position that we, as the State of Illinois, are under no obligation to enforce or to recognize federal law, we are at the same time placed in the position where we are arguing that we can with impunity ignore the federal law, turn our eyes the other way, and let our citizens do what they will, will... federal law be damned. I'm not sure that this is exactly the posture that the State of Illinois should take. It's an interesting question and on that basis, I am voting 'yes' to override and furthermore, I see no reason why illegally people that are here in this country, illegally should be entitled to a privilege that many of our citizens who are here legally and doing the best and many of these are prohibited from getting licenses for various reasons and yet we extend this privilege to those who have not satisfied even the first basic tenet of our federal..federal laws. It seems to me that there's a miscarriage of justice here and I do therefore vote to override the Governor's veto."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Robbins to explain his vote.

I let Representative Hudson talk beyond the one minute because he had his light on considerable time before it was cut off. But all the others are going to be one minute. It's obvious which way this Bill's going. I think we ought to speed the thing up."

Robbins: "I think it's too bad the Bill's going the way it seems to be because this means that we, as the Legislature, believe that it is alright for people to be in our state illegally and that we are willing to contribute to keeping them there by supplying them a license to drive and which they can use to get a license to vote which they can use to control districts where they are not even citizens. Now, it looks to me like



that somewhere along the line that we should try to either get these.... make these people citizens or we should not license them. The Legislature is supposed to try to make laws which lead people to keep the law, not to break the law. And if you think that it is right for an illegal citizen... an illegal person who has not applied for any papers or anything to have a drivers license, then what's the use to have any kind of law? Now, I don't... I'd better. My minute's up..."

Speaker Flinn: "Yes, it sure is, Sir.."

Robbins: "I'd better finish what I'm saying..."

Speaker Flinn: "Thank you. Alright. Have all voted who wish? Yes, you can have one minute, Mr. Sponsor. Representative Borchers is recognized for one monute."

Borchers: "I would like to take you one step further in the enviornmental impact study of population in this country. This may surprise you or shock you. You can believe it or don't believe it. I could care less. But on the basis of the present increase in population of births, by 2030.. 2030 the descendants and the illegal aliens unless we do something to stop it now and start now, the descendants of the illegal aliens and the illegal aliens at that date in our country will exceed the total population of the white and the black... what I consider the real owners of this country. And they will be in control of this country. So think about your grandchildren a little bit and begin to do some action to help protect the future."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 62 voting 'aye', 70 voting 'nay'. And this motion, having failed to receive the Constitutional three-fifths Majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill 742, Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yes, Sir. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen



of the House, in reference to House Bill 742 which was given to me early in the Session and I handled and passed out of here with a handsome vote, I have to refer back to the last Session when House Bill 2229 passed repealed the limitation prohibiting policemen who were 36 years of age or more when first.. or more when first appointed at age under 21 years from joining the policemen's pension fund. Now, with the influx of members joining the pension fund the pension fund is a little bit in distress so now what my Bill, House Bill 742, does is it restores the maximum age and minimum age limitations for participating in the policeman's pension fund. I would appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate.. House Bill 742 pass, notwithstanding the Governor's veto?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 74 voting 'aye', 34 voting 'nay', and this motion, having failed to receive the Constitutional three-fifths Majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill 829, Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 829 is a product of about three years of work. The Co-Sponsors of the Bill are Representative Madigan, Representative Giorgi and Representative Jane Barnes. The Bill has no fiscal impact. We had Amendments on the Capital Development Board appropriation and authorization and both those matters were vetoed out and we decided not to deal at all with money. What this is is a substantive Bill which sets up a program whereby private higher educational facilities may receive grants 75% from the state, 25%



matching, in order to comply with certain health safety codes and handicapped codes that the State and the Federal Government mandate. Now, I've offered the Governor to take the Bill and give it to somebody else. So there's no pride of sponsorship on this Bill. The Bill, I think, is very important to private colleges throughout the State of Illinois. Ten years ago the enrollment for private colleges was 117 thousand. Now enrollment for private colleges is 119 thousand. We have increased the Illinois State Scholarship Commission grants, but those grants money should go for operations. All this is talking about is setting up a substantive program whereby we can start paying for some of the capital improvements that we mandate by state law. This has no fiscal impact. This Bill only gives the Board of Higher Education, the Capital Development Board, a year to start preparing the documentation and the applications for applications for these kinds of improvements and I humbly ask you to vote 'aye'. I believe strongly in the Bill. There's no pride of authorship. It's just something I really believe that the State of Illinois ought to do and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 829 pass, notwithstanding the Governor's veto?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'nay'. Representative Slape, would you vote Flinn and Birchler 'aye'? We're both down here. Representative Walsh to explain his vote. One minute."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise as an advocate of private colleges. I feel that we should definitely do far more than we are doing relative to what we are doing for higher education generally. But I reluctantly oppose this benefit. I don't think that this is the time in an era when we should be considering less spending and



lower taxes that we should be expanding to this extent the issuance of bonds by the Capital Development Board. Seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we have all we can do to finance public institutions. We have, for example, a great need in the prisons that everyone is aware of. I don't think that at this time we can expand the issuance of bonds and I would urge the defeat of this motion."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Reilly to explain his vote. One minute."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I reluctantly disagree with Representative Walsh. As an advocate of private higher education, it seems to me that we ought to pass this authorization Bill. It requires no funding this year. It's a mistake to think that it involves funding this year. All that it does, all in the world it does, is allow the private colleges to present to the Board of Higher Education and ultimately to the Legislature next year a request that we begin this kind of program. We have created the problem by the regulations that we've imposed on the private colleges and on the kind of buildings they must build and so on. It seems to me it's up to us if we want a healthy system of higher education to solve the problem."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 92 voting 'aye', 48 voting 'nay'. And this motion, having received the.. having failed to receive the Constitutional three-fifths Majority, is hereby declared lost. Representative Swanstrom."

Swanstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of Parliamentary inquiry. Today we have voted to spend millions of dollars here in the State of Illinois, but we have failed to discuss any type of tax limitation. And I would like to know when you'll be moving to the



Order of Third Reading on Constitutional Amendments to consider Representative Totten's tax limitation proposal."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, not right away. We're trying to get down the list of things that's got to be done today here and we seem to be moving a little better than we were. So that you don't think I'm not partial to it, I'm going to vote for it when it does come up.. with it."

Swanstrom: "Okay."

Speaker Flinn: "The next Bill is 8... House Bill 884.

Representative Capparelli. I don't see Capparelli here. We'll skip him. Representative Brummer, 922."

Brummer: "Yes, House Bill 922 raises the rate of reimbursement to state employees for mileage reimbursement when they were driving in the course of state business. At the time the legislation was introduced the state travel Board provided for 13¢ mileage rate reimbursement. The Bill provides that the various travel Boards should set the rate of reimbursement but in no event should that rate of reimbursement be less than 17¢ per mile. As all the Members of the General Assembly are aware of, we are individually reimbursed at the rate of 20¢ a mile. Certainly since the time the Bill was introduced some six months ago, the price of gasoline has increased. The price of purchase of an automobile has increased. And I feel it is only fair that the minimum rate of reimbursement should be 17¢ a mile. I might add that there are some 11 travel Boards which control state travel in Illinois. Effective July 1st, the Governor's Office raised the travel allowance with regard to that travel Board to 16¢ a mile. The Board of Higher Education raised theirs to 16¢ a mile. But the other ones I think have not raised theirs. The other state travel Boards, they are still at 13¢ a mile. The Legislative Council is 20¢ a mile. Recently the IRS, Internal



Revenue Service, issued a new schedule with regard to the amount of travel costs that could be deducted from .. from income tax. Previously the IRS had allowed employees when they drove in the course of business and were not reimbursed to deduct 17¢ per mile. They recently conducted a study.. or a study was conducted by the General Services Administration and they determined that the average cost for travel was 18.5¢ per mile and the IRS is now allowing 18.5¢ per mile as a deduction for travel. So, I feel that the reimbursement rate of 17¢ a mile is a fair minimum . In fact, if it's not fair, it maybe on the low side but that was the way the Bill was introduced in March. And I would urge that we override the Governor's veto with regard to this matter. "

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I'm delighted to find a Bill I agree wholeheartedly on the Governor with... or with the Governor on..or something like that. Do we want to encourage the use of private automobiles? Because if we do, we ought to vote for this. I thought we were trying to fight an energy crisis here. You don't do that by raising the incentive to use one's private automobile. You do it by having the Governor issue an administrative... an executive order ordering state employees to take trains instead of cars. He hasn't done that yet. You do that by telling them not to take planes when trains go where cars would go if the Gentleman... if the Bill is successful in being enacted. This union that is in favor of this Bill if I'm not correct flew in its international president to hold a press conference in Springfield to propagandise and denounce the sales tax phase out Bill, the override attempt on that Bill. These are the primary taxeaters in the entire state. They regularly get incredible raises. In fact, I think



there was one contract the Governor signed which allowed them to bet on the come and they won because the .. because the surplus ended up higher than Director Mandeville suggested it would. Where there were four votes against this last time, come on. Let's make it five this time."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further... further discussions? If not, Representative... Oh, Representative Slape? Representative Mike Slape."

Slape: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to take some exception to some of the statements that were made by the previous speaker. This Bill is not to encourage travel. This Bill is to reimburse state employees who, to do their duties, and to perform the duty of the State of Illinois, must use their own personal car. At a time when gasoline is over a dollar a gallon and a quart of oil is over a dollar a quart, it seems inconsistent with the State of... for the State of Illinois not to give its own employees a right.. reimbursement for their own private use. If the state had to have .. furnish cars for these people, we'd find it would be a much greater sum. I think we owe it to the state employees and I'd encourage a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "If there's no further dis... Representative Robbins, you wish to speak? Representative Robbins is recognized."

Robbins: "I think we should look at what the gasoline costs at the pumps. I think we should look at the state directives which have gone out from several of the departments to not replace cars and to force their employees to drive their own cars. And in our end of the state, we don't have a good mass transit system like Skinner has up there by Chicago. We do good to even have a railroad that has half rotten ties under it



and no passenger trains on it. So, we have... if you're going to have state employees to go out and do their work in our end of the state, they're going to have to have some way to get around and they can't afford it on the allowance that they're being paid at the present time. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm supportive of mass transit, but there are great limitations. No one from Champaign would be able to get to Springfield if we had to rely on mass transit. There is no mechanism available to get us here. One of the things that causes unrest among the public is to see that legislative Members have some benefit that is not equally available to them. We, in the State Legislature, increased our mileage rate a few years ago and we now get 20¢ a mile. It is not even bringing these state employees up to the same level as us, but certainly would be a step in the right direction. This is what undermines faith in government when we give ourselves something that we are not willing to extend to others in the same boat. It is no more justifiable for us to receive 20¢ a mile than it is for state employees to receive that. We can't go all the way because the Bill didn't originally provide 20¢. But we certainly can override the Governor's veto and get closer to that and I urge your support."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Brummer to close."

Brummer: "Yes, I think it's up to the various state agencies to control the amount of travel their employees do. And the agencies ought to properly in their cost determinations make those decisions as to whether they're going to require their employees as a prerequisite for their course of employment to use their private automobiles for travel. Once that decision is made, I think it is not



fair for the State of Illinois to ask their employees provide the automobile and then to ask the State of Illinois.. to ask their employees to subsidise the State of Illinois with regard to the operation of that automobile. With regard to the Governor's veto message, he said he did not think these reimbursement rates should be set by statute so as to not deprive the agencies of the opportunity to act quickly to adjust those rates to assure that they are adequate. I might point out that the Bill didnot set the rate statutorily. It merely set the minimum statutory rate so that the agencies have the same right to react as they've always had. However, various state travel Boards are still sitting at 13¢. Some of them are at 16¢. We are not depriving them of their right to react to ... and adjust their rate of reimbursement. We are only asking that we not require the state employees to subsidize the State of Illinois when they are required as one of the responsibilities of their employment to drive their own private automobiles in state business. 17¢ is a fair adequate minimum amount and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 922 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'nay'. Representative Borchers, one minute, to explain his vote."

Borchers: "In explaining my vote, my 'yes' vote, I feel it's my duty to tell Representative Satterthwaite that she has another means of transportation from Champaign to Springfield. She could take the freight train that runs once a day to Decatur and then transfer to another freight train to Springfield and reverse it the next day. It alternates each day and I think she should know that so that she has an alternate means of getting back and forth if she really has to do it."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Representative



Mautino. One minute to explain his vote."

Mautino: "Thank you. I would like to point out that I'm voting red on this issue because I think that that four months change that can be done now by the Governor's Travel Control Board is a lot quicker than trying to change the statute. I respectfully disagree with my colleague because changing statutes around here in many cases takes a couple of years after it's enacted. And I wonder if we're doing the right thing in this area."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Brummer to explain his vote."

Brummer: "Yes, in explanation of my vote and I thought I made that clear during debate, we are not setting the rate. We are merely setting the max... the minimum so that the agencies can adjust that upward at any time as rapidly as they want to. If they want to go to 18¢ or 19¢ or 20¢ they can. We are just putting in a floor. So we are not setting a maximum. We are setting a floor so that the employees are not required to subsidize state operations."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 107 voting 'aye', 24 voting 'nay'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional three-fifths Majority, is declared passed, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. House Bill 944. Representative Cullerton is recognized."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill concerning criminal law. It's a very simple Bill. It got 135 votes the first time it came through. What ... The state wants to bring a person to trial, they have two methods. They can first go to the Grand Jury or they can go to a preliminary hearing. And at that preliminary hearing there can either be a find of probable cause or there can be a find



of no probable cause. If there's a find of no probable cause, the state can then bring the case before the Grand Jury. And the Bill addresses that situation. All the Bill says is that when the State's Attorney brings the case to the Grand Jury they have to tell the Grand Jury that there was a find.... that there was a previous finding of no probable cause. And the Governor's message really kind of missed the point I feel. There was concern about a mini trial within the Grand Jury system and that's just "wouldn't happen at all. All the State's Attorney has to do is say that there was a finding of no probable cause at .. in front of a Judge. And I think that the Bill would have a good effect on an overcrowded court docket. I would ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Slape, is recognized."

Slape: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Flinn: "Indicates he will."

Slape: "Representative Cullerton, as an attorney, if you had a client in trial... on trial would you expect any previous convicted... convictions he might have to be used in that trial against him?"

Cullerton: "I'm not sure if I understand your question."

Slape: "Well let's say you had a client on trial. Would you allow prior convictions to be used as evidence against or to be introduced in the testimony?"

Cullerton: "Sometimes it can be used and sometimes it can't."

Slape: "Right. But don't you think the ideal that just because information has failed and if you allow this information to be brought before the Grand Jury who are usually not people who are trained in the legal profession, that this might predispose them to believe the man is already innocent or the person, the subject is already innocent before the Grand Jury even starts the debate?"



Cullerton: "Well, I think the goal of the Grand Jury is to provide enough information to them and provide all the information to them so they can make a decision. And recently the Grand Juries have just sort of like been a rubber stamp and all this does is allow them to be aware of the fact that there previously was a finding of no probable cause. It doesn't... It won't predispose them. You know, there's no defense attorney in a Grand Jury. The State's Attorney will then proceed to present all the evidence. I don't think there'll be any problem with predisposing them."

Slape: "Alright. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 944 pass, notwithstanding the Governor's veto?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have... Representative... I'm sorry. Representative Johnson, I overlooked you. I knew your light was on."

Johnson: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I wish rather than the Sponsor presenting this Bill, I would have an opportunity to ask questions of the red votes because I really don't understand one reason why any Legislator would vote against this Bill. The state wants to proceed by way of preliminary hearing and information, they can do that. If they want to proceed by way of going directly to the Grand Jury, they can do that. Those are alternative methods. This simply allows a relevant determination in the course of the proceeding of a criminal case to be brought before those people who have to determine whether to bind somebody over. The tests that a court uses in determining at a preliminary hearing whether it's probable cause to bind them over to the Grand Jury is a scintilla of evidence and that's a very .. a very



slanted standard of evidence in favor of the case. If they find the smallest scintilla of evidence that the individual in fact committed the offense charged, the smallest scintilla of evidence, they'll find probable cause and bind them over to the Grand Jury. So all this says is that they didn't even find the smallest scrap of evidence that that fact is relevant and can be... and can be revealed to the 24 people that serve on the Grand Jury. This is not... To vote 'no' on this is not being a law and order Legislator. It's being a Legislator who wants to turn their eyes to the facts of the judicial process and allow someone to go to the expense and agony of a Grand Jury proceeding and a trial when a Judge early on the scale has found that there isn't the remotest scrap of evidence to bind them over. I think that's totally unreasonable. I don't understand why the Governor vetoed it and apparently people are going to fall blindly in line and vote 'no' when the veto actually has no substance at all to it. I urge you again to look at the Bill and Representative Cullerton's explanation and at the veto message whatever it is and vote 'aye' on this motion to override."

Speaker Flinn: "Now, since I overlooked Representative Johnson, he was entitled to talk that long. And now we're on explanation of votes. Representative Breslin. Breslin. Turn Breslin on."

Breslin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to add my voice with the previous speaker in support of this Bill. I think a lot of people don't realize that there are some Grand Juries in this state that are run by the State's Attorney. The State's Attornies run for re-election. Sometimes they get a very difficult case or a case that has a lot of publicity potential to it, but it doesn't have any substance and as a consequence



there's been a no find... there's been a finding of no probable cause. But it goes to the Grand Jury anyway, just to get the publicity. All this Bill does is says, if you go the Grand Jury you at least have to tell them that there was no finding of probable cause. Maybe that will make them think a little bit before they come out with their decision. That's all it does. It doesn't mean that the State's Attorney can't continue to go to the Grand Jury. He just has to give them all the information available, all the information is pertinent for a Grand Jury to make an intelligent decision. This is done in other states. It should be done in Illinois. I don't think the Governor appreciates the significance of this Bill and I believe that we should override. Thank you. You will note that many of the Members who are voting in favor of this Bill are Members of the Judiciary Committee. They are law and order Members and they are I believe had all the facts in front of them when they passed it out of.. in the first place. Thank you."

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

Vinson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. One of things that alarms me is looks to me like there's a lot of switches being hit on this Bill where the Members aren't present. I think this has been badly misrepresented. What we're saying is, the Grand Jury, if you vote red on this, you believe the Grand Jury ought to look at the evidence and make a decision on the evidence. If you vote green on this what you're saying is, the Grand Jury ought to be influenced and bound by how somebody else looked at the evidence. I urge a red vote and I particularly urge, Mr. Speaker, to try to get some of the proponents of this not to push people's switches who aren't here."

Speaker Flinn: "Everybody knows what the rules are in that regard. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted



who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 110 voting 'aye', 32 voting 'nay'. And this Bill, having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed, notwithstanding the Governor's veto. House Bill 1052. Representative Marovitz is recognized."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1052 created the Legislative Advisory Committee on Aging and I was advised by the Governor that he was going to sign the Bill. There was no money involved with this Bill at all, no appropriation. Due to staff error the Governor advised me that the Bill was vetoed and it was due to staff error. It was his intent to sign the Bill and only through an error was it vetoed. And the Governor's Office is totally supportive of an override on this legislation due to that error."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Telcser. Art Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Representative Marovitz is correct. The gubernatorial veto regarding House Bill 1052 was an error within the Governor's staff. The Governor upon reflection would have signed the Bill and I recommend a vote to override the Amendment regarding House Bill 1052.... overriding the veto."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is one of those times when maybe the Governor's made an error that was right. The proposal is to create another Commission to advise the Committee... or the Department on Aging. What we certainly don't need in the state is any more Commissions and if the Governor's staff has made an error the error in my mind or in my perspective was correct and this veto should not be overridden. Let the error stand."



Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall the House Bill 1052 pass, notwithstanding the Governor's veto?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Marovitz to explain his vote."

Marovitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I said before, there is no money involved in this. The Governor... Originally there was a \$25,000 appropriation. The Governor vetoed the appropriation and in discussions with me said, would you accept the legislation without the appropriation? And I said yes and he said, fine, then you'll have your Commission. What this does, it takes the legislative Members from the Council on Aging who really don't participate very much in the Council. There are far more public members and puts them in the Advisory Committee... er.. Commission on Aging so that we could better deal with senior citizen problems and investigation. It's not going to cost the state, the taxpayers anything. And since it was due to a staff error, I would appreciate some more green votes up there."



Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 86 voting 'aye' and 38 voting 'nay', and this motion having not received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. House Bill 1211. Representative Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 1211 is a Bill that provides railroad companies shall inspect and test all signs and signals, automatic crossings, gates at...at certain railroad-highway grade crossings. We're talking about a quarterly inspection. There are approximately 16,000 railway...railroad-highway grade crossings in the state. Of this number, about 6,000 have some form of automatic protection, and of these, 2,000 are...are protected upon the order of Illinois' Commerce Commission. The other 4,000 were protected by the railroad companies without having being ordered to do so. In other words, there is 16,000 crossings have some type of protection. Every malfunctioning signal is a hazard. You can save lives and your family to make our railroad crossings safer in...and support House Bill 1211 to override the Governor's veto. In the message of the Governor, the Governor mentioned while I allowed the intent of promoting safe, secure grade crossings...in other words, he's still interested to make our crossings safe. The annual cost of the...of the inspection is 143,500 dollars. I ask you for your support to override the Governor's veto. It's been agreed with the...in regards to discuss with the Commerce Commission in regards to the Bill...Senate Bill that was passed. Senate Bill 157 provides money for the administration of House Bill 211 (sic). There's a fiscal impact in this Bill and of 1211 effectively administered. At least one additional person is needed to audit the inspection reports to respond to the public complaints and to conduct a few random inspections. I ask you for



your full support in regards to House Bill 1211."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I...I rise in full support of Representative Kornowicz in...in this effort to...and...and...and to House Bill 1211. I am not sure that this is the best way to accomplish what he's trying to do, but I am sure that something has to be done. If there's anymore arrogant industry than the railroads, I'm not aware of them. If there's anymore...any industry that is more insensitive to the needs and protection of the public than the railroad, I have never encountered them. In my own town of Calumet City they killed over 13 people over a period of years and...and refused even to put gates in, much less inspect them, and since they've put them in, they've let them go to pot, and...and half the time they don't work. This is an industry that has to...we have to come to grips with and have to do something about. I have to congratulate Representative Kornowicz for trying to do something that is very much needed in his community, in my community, and throughout this state. I would urge every Member of this House to get behind him and say to these people that we're sick and tired of you rolling your stock over the public of the...of the State of Illinois. We're sick of you killing people, and all we're asking you is to inspect your own equipment. Something has to be done to bring these people down and to hold them accountable to the public. I think that this Gentleman is handling one of the most important and significant Bills, because he is trying to save lives of the people of the State of Illinois from one end of the state toward the other. I implore every Member of this House. Let's put a green light up there. Let's vote to override the veto on House Bill 1211 and tell the railroad industry that we're tired of the carnage that you are committing on your tracks. We talk about the



highways. At least the driver usually doesn't want... doesn't want to kill. The railroad doesn't care. They don't care about the public, and I urge every one of you to vote for...for the override on House Bill 1211."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "A question or two of the Sponsor. Representative Kornowicz, there's a recent Illinois Supreme Court decision that uses the Public Utilities Act and premises punitive damages in this case and in a companion case and multi-millions of dollars based on the violation of any provision of that Public Utilities Act. This seems...and...and the railroads have introduced legislation trying to reverse this. This...this would seem to me to really be adding insult to injury by adding a...not only a bureaucratic morass, but also by...by setting up a whole new series of requirements on which we can premise punitive damages. Do you have any response to that?"

Kornowicz: "Well...well, the only thing that I can tell you, that I am interested in the lives and the limbs of the people, and I want to make our railroads more safer... our railroad crossings more safer, and that is the...the answer in regard to your..."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I understand what Representative Kornowicz is trying to do, and...and I sympathize with that. But, one of the problems is that we're facing today is that railroads, passenger lines and freight lines both, are really facing an economic crisis in which lines are having to be shut down. We're trying to encourage the use of trains. We're trying to use...encourage the use of mass transit generally for both freight and...and for passengers, and it would seem to me that the more bureaucratic regulations and costs we add, the more that we...that we instigate to premise excessive jury verdicts on, including attorney fees which



highways. At least the driver usually doesn't want... doesn't want to kill. The railroad doesn't care. They don't care about the public, and I urge every one of you to vote for...for the override on House Bill 1211."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "A question or two of the Sponsor. Representative Kornowicz, there's a recent Illinois Supreme Court decision that uses the Public Utilities Act and premises punitive damages in this case and in a companion case and multi-millions of dollars based on the violation of any provision of that Public Utilities Act. This seems...and...and the railroads have introduced legislation trying to reverse this. This...this would seem to me to really be adding insult to injury by adding a...not only a bureaucratic morass, but also by...by setting up a whole new series of requirements on which we can premise punitive damages. Do you have any response to that?"

Kornowicz: "Well...well, the only thing that I can tell you, that I am interested in the lives and the limbs of the people, and I want to make our railroads more safer... our railroad crossings more safer, and that is the...the answer in regard to your..."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I understand what Representative Kornowicz is trying to do, and...and I sympathize with that. But, one of the problems is that we're facing today is that railroads, passenger lines and freight lines both, are really facing an economic crisis in which lines are having to be shut down. We're trying to encourage the use of trains. We're trying to use...encourage the use of mass transit generally for both freight and...and for passengers, and it would seem to me that the more bureaucratic regulations and costs we add, the more that we...that we instigate to premise excessive jury verdicts on, including attorney fees which



I suppose the lawyers in the Legislature should support, it seems to me we're really discouraging the use of our railroads and discouraging the use of energy conserving means of transportation. And, for that reason, even though I know Representative Kornowicz is sincere in his efforts here and for the reasons set forth in the stated reason of the veto message, I would urge a 'no' vote on this motion to override."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Slape."

Slape: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As a hyphenated Sponsor of this Bill, I'd like to speak on it, but first an inquiry of the Chair. Was Representative Collins in favor of this Bill?"

Speaker Flinn: "Yes, he was. He spoke in favor of it."

Slape: "All right. I couldn't tell. I just wanted to know.

I think the most important thing in this Bill that points ...that Representative Kornowicz is trying to point out is that the railroads, when State Representatives or other public officials are notified that they are not taking care of crossings, that they leave crossings in disrepair, is when we get in touch with these individual lines, or when we get in touch with these companies, they do not respond. They sent us a letter or they send out somebody to tell us they just simply don't have the money. We notify our local fire departments that we're sorry that the gates are left down. Most of the gates are in blind corners. People get used to them being down. They pull up, and they almost automatically go around them, because they don't suspect the train's coming because the...the gate is always down. This Bill is not...is not an anti Bill. I'm sure Representative Kornowicz would not do anything to hurt the railroad industry or try to impede the energy program in the State of Illinois, but the Bill is definitely need...needed for the public safety. It is needed to force the railroads to take care of their own



property because they have showed us over the past years that they have no intention to do it on their own, that these neglected railroad crossings will go on neglected unless the State of Illinois forces them to do something and I would ask that we all join Representative Kornowicz and get this fine Bill passed out over the Governor's veto. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Right now in Illinois two of the major railroad carriers we have are bankrupt, Rock Island and Milwaukee Road. The Illinois Central teeters. are on the edge of bankruptcy. And if we have a serious recession this winter, the auto industries disrupted at any point, the Illinois Central is going to slide into bankruptcy. We're facing a situation where the entire Midwestern railroad system is in exactly the same position as the Penn Central was a few years ago. Now, we have provided virtually no, in fact, no tax relief for railroads this year facing that and there is no new federal aid available for the railroad system. In fact, the one thing going on in the state that affects railroads of any magnitude is the construction of a new lock and dam²⁶ at Alton. All that's going to do is take more business away from the railroads. What we're talking about is destroying a railroad system and by this Bill, we contribute to that. Now, from the point of view of safety, if this Bill really improves safety, then I'd say maybe it's something necessary despite problems the railroads face. But look at the Bill. What the Bill forces the railroad company to do is give equal attention to every signal device and every sign that it has. What it ought to focus on are the important ones. At the very time when a railroad's out inspecting a sign that there's no problem with, there's been no complaint about, there's probably another one that there is a problem with that they ought



to be focusing on. Instead of requiring that kind of system, instead of deluging the Commerce Commission with a stack of reports that nobody is ever going to have time to look at, we ought.. we ought to be trying to do something to build this industry back up to put some profit into it and yes, correct some of the management deficiencies in the industry. But this Bill isn't going to do anything except harass the industry longer. They're a good target for harassment. They are arrogant. They are badly managed. It's good politics, but it's bad economics. It's not going to improve safety and I would strongly urge a 'no' vote on this. Because of the importance of this Bill I want to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that I would seek a verification if it gets the requisite number of votes."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce, is recognized."

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

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed say 'no'.

The 'ayes' have it. And the Sponsor's recognized to close. Representative Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "Well, the only thing that I can tell the Members of the House is things that the railroad industry should have been doing. I'm talking about to make sure that the railroad crossings, the crossing gates are not malfunctioning. This is a big item. This is a big item in my district. I have a district, the 25th District. I have a high school there where the crossing gates are malfunctioning. The high school students grab a two by four and raise up the gates and they go around the tracks. And this is something that I feel that is unsafe and one of these days they'll be many lives gone at that railroad crossing. So I ask you for your support to override House Bill 1211."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1211 pass, notwithstanding the Governor's veto?' All those in favor



vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Originally I opposed this Bill because it created enough paper to fill every pot hole in the State of Illinois. He's cut it down from a monthly report to a quarterly report now. And let me tell you the need here and the arrogance of the Chicago Northwestern Railroad. In Crystal Lake within sight of the ticket agent is a gate that was down for absolutely weeks and the railroad employees, they didn't need a special inspector to find it. All they needed was for somebody to stick their nose.. well their face out the window in the right direction. The trains went by it everyday. They didn't notice it. The only way I got it fixed was by calling the Illinois Commerce Commission and the Illinois Commerce Commission called the Northwestern Railroad and that's all these railroads understand, raw power. And as far as the Gentleman from DeWitt's comment that these railroads need to make profit, my heavens, doesn't anybody remember the headline in the Tribune that said, 'Railroads make 7 million dollar profit from the Regional Transportation Authority,'? Now come on. You can kid some of the people some of the time, but these railroads have been raping all the people since they started in existence 100 years ago. There's no change in the mentality and the robber baron mentality of the railroads in this country."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Hanahan, to explain his vote.

One minute. The timer's on."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I stand in support of this veto override motion of Representative Kornowicz. I concur with Representative Skinner, in our district the problem. Something else ought to be said that, you know, when you fund the RTA and you give all the monies to subsidise these railroad crossings and the equipment of the RTA District, they certainly should have enough money left



with the horrendous amounts of money we're giving them to at least have safe equipment. Now as far as the comments the Governor in the Governor's statement on the veto, is that the Governor further states that he would rather see limited government resources directed towards the problem. The fact is that the Commerce Commission didn't come in here with suggestions and legislation to say that we should have a 12 hour repair Bill or make any other suggestions to the General Assembly. I charge them a dereliction. If they want to regulate the railroads and tell us what we could do in order to help make safer crossings in this state, they should encourage legislation, not come in with hindrance and encourage a veto and encourage Members of the General Assembly to vote against safety. And that's what this is all about. We don't have an alternative right now. At least Representative Kornowicz had the gumption and the guts to put a Bill forward that has some validity in maintaining the gate crossings with some requests of notification, of some requests of inspection. That's all this Bill does. I think it's a good Bill. It's a good Bill for the kids that are crossing at all those grade crossings that somehow get out of wack and for weeks they stay that way. I urge an override on this Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I do not like to stand in opposition to Representative Kornowicz's motion on this issue. But I feel that I must because even though his intent may be good, the legislation is poorly drafted and is going to cause a very serious problem that I think that he did not realize until just recently. But to give you some facts that have not been pointed out.. the federal government has studied this issue, studied it in length and they have determined that it is not necessary. The railroads now make inspections and all this legislation will do is create more paperwork



for both the state and the railroad. It will create government bureaucracy, more bureaucracy that none of us want. It will require an additional state spending of up to 143 thousand dollars for five new employees and we've only got an appropriation for 60 thousand dollars. It will put an unduly burden on the railroad industry which I might add, is barely holding its head above water because of over regulation and it does not really add to the public safety. But more importantly, there is a real serious conflict in the language of this Bill and the Sponsor's intent for what it would do. And I might point out on page five of the Bill, where it says, 'railroad company shall immediately take such action as may be required to protect the public from hazards arising from the malfunctions and shall within 12 hours after receiving such notice, restore such signals, automatic crossing gates to good working order or.. or take the appropriate action to protect the public.' Now right below that.."

Speaker Flinn: "You're on your third minute.."

Winchester: ^{II} Failure to take the immediate protection required by this paragraph and failure to restore the signals..! We're talking about requiring them to do both things, not one or the other and they're going to be fined \$250 a day and they cannot afford it, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Robbins, to explain his vote."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker, my green vote is up there because I don't know anything I can do to bring back those two people who were killed in Wayne city about two weeks ago trying to go around a malfunctioning set of gates. The young man that was killed by.. Elwood, by Mt. Vernon this last month because the weeds weren't to where he could see the train coming. I think it is time that if the railroads can't do it, that we.. that the Department of Transportation in the State of Illinois sees that these crossings are safe for the people."



Speaker Flinn: "Representative Brummer, to explain his vote."

Brummer: "Yes, I guess I'm just adding additional testimonials to what Representative Robbins has just said. I.. my only regret in voting for this Bill is I do not have the opportunity to vote for it and it had.. had it become law some two, or four, or six years ago, I do not know how many lives we would have saved as a result of requiring that malfunctioning railroad crossings signals be corrected. I know there were two people killed at Beecher City, an elderly couple who crossed a gate that had been flashing continuously for some 36 or 48 hours before that. Everybody was crossing it because there were no trains in sight for 48 hours and the lights were continuing to cross. Unfortunately this couple crossed one time when there was a train there and they're dead now and this Bill isn't going to bring them back. In addition to that we have a terrible problem in the city of Effingham in that the gates are frequently down and there are no trains in sight and people would drive around the gates repeatedly as a result of that. They cannot.. there's no point in sitting there. The gates are not going to go up. Recently a school administrator's son was severely injured. He was in a coma for some period of time and I do not know his exact medical status, but I only wish this legislation had passed two or four years so that the gates would not cause a problem, it would not cause the definite injuries that have occurred in the meantime."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Terzich, to explain his vote."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would think that if anybody received a reply from the railroad within two years of the date they made their request, there would be 177 votes up there. The railroad industry gives a usual reply and I would say that they're approximately ten years too late replying to this type of legislation. I know that Representative Kornowicz has shown an interest and requested cooperation



from the railroads, but they always give you the same negative reply that 'we're out of money. It's no concern of ours.' Like Representative Skinner said if they put their nose out the window they could see railroad crossings malfunctioning throughout the state. We do have, we should not be proud of the fact that we are the biggest killers in the United States of railroad crossings and I don't think that's a record we could be proud of. So I would urge your support in giving Ed the necessary votes to override the Governor on this veto."

Speaker Flinn: "I don't want to join in the debate, but as probably the only railroader on the floor of the House, former railroader, the gates are always down when a train goes by. They can look out the window all they want. They'd better be down. Any further explanation of votes? Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Last June in Illiopolis, Illinois, on a crossing, two young men were killed by a train and they were torn to pieces. I was asked to write a letter, which I did, to the Northwestern Railroad. I received back a form letter. Now this is already .. oh, two or three months ago and I've heard nothing from them further. I suspect that I will not hear anything from them further. So I sent a copy to the Lady who was a Chairman of a Committee to see what they could do about it. As far as I have heard, nothing has been done and the situation is as it was. But the two boys were torn to pieces and they're not coming back. So, I would urge a vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further explanation of votes? If not, the question is, 'Shall House Bill...' Okay, he cancelled out. 'Shall House Bill 1211 pass, notwithstanding the Governor's veto?' We've already said that. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "Poll the ansentees, please."



Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman requests a poll of the absentees.

Representative Friedrich, you wish the floor now?"

Friedrich: "I wanted to explain my vote, but apparently I.."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, I thought you cancelled out. I saw you waving me off."

Friedrich: "Well, I've been waving for a half an hour and you didn't see me."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. Go ahead and explain it."

Friedrich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in the first place there are only 105 people here. And in the second place, even if we admit we've got a problem, if you think putting two guys employed on the Illinois Commerce Commission is going to solve it, you have to be out of your head. We've got 237 Members of the Legislature run all over the district and Representative Skinner said that if we will watch and call the Commerce Commission it'll solve it and I can guarantee you that'll do a lot more good than putting two more payrollers on the payroll."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Pouncey, for what purpose do you airse?"

Pouncey: "I would like to change my vote from 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Flinn: "Change it from 'no' to 'aye'. Okay. Is that is that all the changes? If not, how many votes have we got? 106 'ayes'.. We're going to poll the absentees.

Grossi, 'aye'. Change him from 'no' to 'aye'. Poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees; Abramson. Capuzi. Davis. Ebbesen. Epton. Ewing. Friedland. Garmisa. Hoffman. Katz. Klosak. Kozubowski. Mahar. Margulas. McAuliffe. McBroom. Mugalian.."

Speaker Flinn: "Mahar 'aye'.."

Clerk Leone: "Oblinger. Pechous. Polk. Richmond. Ryan. Satterthwaite. Schlickman. Schneider. Schoeberlein. Stanley. Stearney. E.G. Steele. Telcser. Totten. Walsh. Wikoff. and Mr. Speaker."



Speaker Flinn: "108 'aye' and 33 'nay'. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "I'd like to request a verification, Mr. Speaker, of the affirmative Roll Call."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Breslin. Breslin."

Breslin: "Leave to be verified please?"

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady have leave to be verified? She does. Breslin. I've had a suggestion that we might dump the Roll Call and try again. Would that be shorter than the verification? Proceed with the verification."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative.. Alexander. Balanoff. E.M. Barnes. Jane Barnes. Beatty. Bell. .."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Collins, for what purpose do you arise?"

Collins: "I have a Subcommittee meeting with Representative Leinenweber. May I be verified?"

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman is verified."

Clerk Leone: "Bianco. Birchler. Borchers. Boucek. "

Speaker Flinn: "Jane Barnes 'aye'. Sam Wolf, what purpose do you arise? Representative Sam Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, may I be verified please?"

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman asks to be verified. He's verified."

Clerk Leone: "Boucek. Bower. Bowman. Bradley. Braun.

Breslin. Brummer. Bullock. Burnidge Capparelli.

Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Collins. Conti.

Cullerton. Currie. Darrow. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico.

Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Dyer. Ewell. Farley.

Flinn. Virginia Frederick. Gaines. Getty. Giorgi.

Goodwin. Greiman. Grossi. Hallock. Hanahan. Hannig.

Harris. Henry. Hoxsey. Huff. Jaffe. Dave Jones. Emil

Jones. Kane. Keane. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski.

Kucharski. Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leon. Madigan.

Mahar. Marovitz. Matijevich. Matula. Mautino. McGrew.

McPike. Meyer. Molloy. Murphy. O'Brien. Patrick.

Peters. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Rigney. Robbins.



Ronan. Ropp. Sandquist. Schisler. Schraeder. Sharp.
 Skinner. Slape. Steczo. Stuffle. Swansrom. Taylor.
 Terzich."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Chapman wants to be verified.
 You're verified. Proceed. McPike wants to be verified.
 McPike is verified. Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Van Duyne. Vitek. VonBoeckman. Watson. White.
 Willer. Williams. J.J. Wolf. Sam Wolf. Woodyard. Younge.
 and Yourell."

Speaker Flinn: "Schoeberlein 'aye'. Beatty wants to be verified.
 Representative Beatty wants to be verified. You're verified.
 Any questions of the Affirmative Roll Call? How many have
 we got? 109 'aye'. 33 'no', to start with."

Vinson: "Did you say 109, Mr. ..."

Speaker Flinn: "109, right."

Vinson: "Representative Balanoff."

Speaker Flinn: "Balanoff, I don't.. there she is. There she is."

Vinson: "Representative Barnes."

Speaker Flinn: "Gene Barnes? Or Jane?"

Vinson: "Gene."

Speaker Flinn: "Gene Barnes. He's not in his seat. Is the
 Gentleman on the floor? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him off the Roll."

Vinson: "Representative Bianco."

Speaker Flinn: "Bianco. He's back in his seat."

Vinson: "Representative Boucek."

Speaker Flinn: "Boucek is right.. well just a minute. Over here
 on the right side where he belongs. Representative Macdonald,
 for what purpose do you arise?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "How is the Lady recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'no'."

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

Speaker Flinn: "Macdonald 'aye'. Further questions."



Vinson: "Representative Brummer."

Speaker Flinn: "Brummer, Representative Brummer's in the back."

Vinson: "Representative Capparelli."

Speaker Flinn: "Capparelli, I don't see the Gentleman in his seat.

How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him off the Roll."

Vinson: "Representative Cullerton."

Speaker Flinn: "Cullerton, I don't see the Gentleman in his seat.

Is he on the floor? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him off the Roll."

Vinson: "Representative Darrow."

Speaker Flinn: "Darrow. Representative Darrow, I don't see the

Gentleman in his seat. There he is, way in the back. Farley's seat."

Vinson: "Could you have him stand up? It's awful dark back there."

Speaker Flinn: "I didn't hear you. Stand up. There he is."

Vinson: "Representative Dawson."

Speaker Flinn: "Dawson, Glen Dawson. There he is over there on

the other side."

Vinson: "Representative Domico."

Speaker Flinn: "Domico. I don't see Domico in his chair. Is

he on the floor? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him off the Roll."

Vinson: "Representative Donovan."

Speaker Flinn: "Who was that last one?.. He's here."

Vinson: "Representative Doyle."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Doyle's in his seat as per usual."

Vinson: "Where does he sit?"

Speaker Flinn: "Right there in front of Birchler and he's always

in his seat too."

Vinson: "Representative Ewell."

Speaker Flinn: "Ray Ewell was not in his seat. Is he on the

floor? How is the Gentleman recorded?"



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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him off the Roll."

Vinson: "Representative Kelly."

Speaker Flinn: "Who was that, Kelly? The Gentleman is not in his seat. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him off the Roll."

Vinson: "Kosinski."

Speaker Flinn: "Kosinski, the Gentleman is not in his seat. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him off the Roll."

Vinson: "Representative Kulas."

Speaker Flinn: "Kulas, he's back there in the back in his seat."

Vinson: "Laurino."

Speaker Flinn: "Laurino. Representative Laurino. The Gentleman is not in his seat. Is he on the floor? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him off the Roll."

Vinson: "Mahar."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Mahar is right by his seat down there."

Vinson: "McGrew."

Speaker Flinn: "McGrew. Was standing here at the well a minute ago. There he is."

Vinson: "O'Brien."

Speaker Flinn: "O'Brien, down here in the well. Which O'Brien? Jack? No."

Vinson: "No."

Speaker Flinn: "Danny O'Brien is not in his seat. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him off the Roll."

Vinson: "Representative Ronan."



Speaker Flinn: "Who was that?"

Vinson: "Ronan."

Speaker Flinn: "Ronan. The Gentleman is not in his seat.

How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him off the Roll."

Vinson: "No further questions of the Affirmative Roll."

Speaker Flinn: "Give us a count. On this question there are 95 'aye' and 32 'no'. And this motion, having failed to receive the three-fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost... House Bill 1508, Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, in 1969 and nearly every year thereafter until now I have put this Bill and passed it to the House and Senate and it has been vetoed by the Governor because of pressure from the EPA. Now I talked just this morning to the analyst, Don Ettichsen. He was told to rewrite his first analysis of the Bill. It was favorable. He felt that it was a very good Bill. But he was... it was inferred to him that he should rewrite it and he did. The arguments are always the same, that it is dangerous for people to rescue metal at the face of a land fill. Now what does this Bill really do? It permits the EPA to make the rules for recovery of metal. They have every right to make the rules of this recovery. Only things that can be recovered are metal. The person recovering the metal must be a paid employee of the land fill. Now, this is a perfectly reasonable Bill and I'm well aware of how this works. Now it's alright to recover metal if you recover the metal away from the face of the land fill. But it goes against all human nature. People bring trucks to a land fill and they load the trucks from whatever they pick up to be brought to a land fill. They haven't got time



enough to incline ... The people that drive the trucks are not inclined to very carefully pile all the lead or the iron in a pile and so on. They just load that truck so they can get out and unload and go on about their business. So, hardly any, in fact, as I never heard of anybody deliberately unloading a truck and then having to load it back up again to take to the face of a land fill. It just isn't done. Now I have the prices here of gold yesterday. The gold yesterday was \$392 an ounce. Of course, you're not going to throw gold into a land fill unless you've lost your mind. But nevertheless, under the rules of the State of Illinois if you drop off an ounce of gold at the face of a land fill, you have to bury it, notwithstanding a possible diamonds or silver. The rule is the same. It just is beyond belief the amount of money ... the amount of valuable metal we're throwing away. For example, it's perfectly okay to recover bottles. Now you've all read about the recycling of bottles. But you cannot recycle and I'd like to read you the present prices: I distributed this a couple of days ago but I suspect by this time it's gone. For example, cast iron two days ago was selling for \$80.00 a ton. brass 35¢ to 50¢ a pound, copper 70¢ a pound, aluminum 20 to 25¢ a pound, iron \$30 to \$50 a ton, lead 30¢ a pound. Now all of this valuable metal is, by our rules, not our rules, the rules of the EPA, being buried every day by the tons in this state. Now the total amount .. I did have and I'm sorry to say I can't find it, an estimated amount of recovery possible in the State of Illinois by I believe it's called the 'Amalgamated Metals of America'. It would amount to hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of tons of all kinds of metals in the State of Illinois, throughout the State of Illinois in relation to the



recovery of the various types of metals. Now on approximately October the 1st, at one of the land fills in Decatur the metal that was recovered at the face of the land fill, the face of the land fill, was sold. It was a collection of several months. It brought nearly \$2,000. If they had not picked it up and recovered it, it would have been buried under the rules of the EPA of Illinois. Now the basis of this rule is they say it's dangerous. Now remember it's only metal, it's not picking up old clothing or mattresses and so on that might make someone sick. It's not that at all. It's strictly metal. Now they base again part of this background on some things that I've looked into in the past. For example, part of the argument in the danger was the fact that in 1947 a fellow got run over in Missouri by a bulldozer. Well I found out that he had been drunk. Actually a bulldozer makes a little noise and the ground shakes. He had to have been drunk. In 1954, '55 there was a bulldozer, a load dumped on one of the operators that was working at the face of the land fill. They had to dig him out. Now about the last year, the year before last, we had an explosion that killed a couple of truck drivers. But it had nothing to do with the collection of metal. It was a drum that exploded. So, you cannot count that against the recovery of metal. I just feel that it's time that after all these years, every... and I'll keep on if I'm defeated cause I know from actual knowledge that our state is losing .. and the people are losing metals beyond belief in its value in this state that we should recover the same as bottles. My God, is it more important to recover copper or is it more important to recover bottles? I just don't see the logic. And I assure you that the EPA is absolutely wrong in basing it on the danger and loss of human life. There is no



such thing. I agree with them and they have the right under this Bill to make any law... any rule they want to see that you and I and people that have nothing to do with the land fill cannot be at the face of the fill. But a paid employee can. And we should not allow all these millions to be buried as we have since 1971. Before... 1971... Before that date we could recover metal. After that date, you could not. Though it's being done, notwithstanding, in many land fills in the state. And this is not mandatory. It's permissive, if they want to. If they want to put a paid employee to do it, and it has to be done under the rules and regulations that the EPA would be authorized to make ... to protect in your life, if there was any danger. And just one last point. On the same logic of argument, we should close up every railroad that we've been talking about in the last Bill, if a brakeman is killed because he gets crushed by the cars. You see that far more often, by far than anyone being killed or hurt in a land fill. We should close up the railroad because surely somebody is more likely to be killed by a railroad accident coupling up the cars than they are in a land fill bringing in the various materials thrown into a land fill. I would appreciate an override of the Governor's vote because I'm going to keep right on if you don't, as long as I'm in this House trying to save this metal to be recovered for the use of the people of this state and this country instead of being buried which is perfectly idiotic."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1508 pass, notwithstanding the Governor's veto?' Was somebody trying to... Representative Mautino, you .. were asking for the floor."

Mautino: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I just had a comment to make to Represen... the previous



speaker where we can solve probably a couple of his problems. In California, I think this law is enacted now and what they have is... and I think that Representative Rigney can verify it on examination, which he accompanied us, they have illegal aliens that do this so we could probably solve both your problems at once."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1508 pass, notwithstanding the Governor's veto?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Borchers, to explain his vote. One minute. The timer's on. I'm going to stick with it."

Borchers: "In explaining my vote, I want to point out that it passed unanimously in the Senate. It passed unanimously and in the House the vote was 148 to 10 I believe it was. I don't have it down here. It was 148 to 10 as I recollect. I think that's a good recommendation. But I... You really should pass this Bill because it's stupid, it's idiotic, to bury all this metal in this state. It isn't common sense. "

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this motion there are 80 voting 'aye', and 20 voting 'nay'. And the motion, having failed to receive the Constitutional three-fifths Majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill 1692, Giorgi, Darrow, or Hallock. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, this is the raffles and chances Bill last... of this last Session and you've heard the Governor say that in his veto message that he wanted to sign the Bill. I think what happened is the deadline on the... the deadline on the Bill was the day that the Mayor of Chicago talked about gambling casinos and it was the day that that Lottery Control Board appointed by the Governor decided to go to a daily lottery. And I think if he had signed this Bill I'm afraid he was



worrying about his prosecutorial image and didn't want to be considered a supporter of the gambling issue. If you look at the reasons for the veto when it says the exceptions are too broad... The Bill states that a city and county may license not-for-profit corporations solely for raffles and chances. There will be no gambling devices used whatever. He talks about no limit on numbers of lengths or games or prize distribution and in the Bill it says Section 10; total prizes from the operations of raffles and chances shall be determined by the local licensing authority issuing the license. Not sufficient guidance of those of local enforcement authorities. I think that the local law enforcement authorities are really the people that know who the inhabitants of the cities are and the counties are and they know if some nefarious individuals are getting into the gambling business. Section 28 of the Criminal Code is covered in the Section 12 of the Bill. I don't see any reason that he vetoed the Bill except of the day that he.. the Mayor of Chicago made an utterance about casinos and that was the day that the Lottery Control Board decided to go to daily lottery games. And I'm afraid this Bill was caught in the cross-fire. In the Governor's message he admits that everyone in this room has probably bought raffle and chances and he says that we should have a law to take care of the custom so that people, especially people that are associated with not-for-profit corporations, shouldn't be charged with a felony for selling a raffle. So I'd like the support of the Assembly in the override of the veto. I think we'd take the Governor off the hook."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of this Bill in order to save the Governor embarrassment of having to



shut down the travelers aid lottery in the Amtrack Union Station in Chicago in front of which he signed the Bill to extend the voting hours. It was on T.V. The picture was in the Sun-Times. Clarence Neff was standing in front of this illegal lottery. And I'm certain that if we do not override the veto that the Department of Law Enforcement will be in Union Station tomorrow shutting down the travelers' aid lottery of a car. And that... We can't have inconsistent law enforcement like this. Either we're going to have a law and we're going to enforce it.. I mean especially when the chief law enforcement officer of the state, who I assume is the Governor since he's head of the Executive Branch, is in Union Station. I'm amazed it's still going. Certainly it ought to be.... it ought to be .. the veto ought to be overridden or else the hypocrisy in this state should end."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Perry Representative Ralph A. Dunn, is recognized.. Who?"

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

I would urge that we sustain the Governor's veto and that we vote against an override. If you read the veto message one paragraph says, 'The Bill must be vetoed for several reasons. It provides too broad an exemption. It's vague and uncertain. It is not drafted to take into account the carefully defined language of the Criminal Code.' If we're going to legalize any games of chance or anything, we certainly should take into account whether this gets into the criminal element of our state or not and whether it would be operated by them. So I would urge that we vote to sustain the Governor and vote against the override. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, Representative Giorgi, to close."

Giorgi: "The Bill allows cities or counties to license local..."



to license not-for-profit corporations. They don't have to license them. They can refuse to license them. They can write any ordinances they want. The Bill specifically prohibits any apparatus whatever. There's no gambling apparatus allowed in the execution of this Bill. All it allows is raffles and chances as we know them, a slip of paper in a hat or in a box and somebody draws a number and somebody wins. I urge your support just to save the Governor a lot of embarrassment and I really feel that he wouldn't have vetoed the Bill had those two things not occurred the same day."

Matijevich: "In the words of Giorgi, take a chance."

Speaker Flinn: "The question.. The question is, 'Shall House Bil 1692 pass, notwithstanding the Governor's veto?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Darrow to explain his vote. One minute. Timer's on."

Darrow: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what Representative Skinner's is discussing about the Traveler's Aid Society happened in Rock Island County. The State's Attorney ruled that all these raffles were illegal and they've put quite a few people out of business, including the Lion's Club and the local Boy's... -no, citizens..for Darrow don't do this- but quite a few other organizations were put out of business. This was an honest attempt to allow raffles to be legalized in Illinois. It appears we're going to fall short of the votes we need, but I would hope if we can't have them in Rock Island County, the rest of the counties couldn't have them either, including Chicago and Cook County and that the Traveler's Aid would have to close down. Then we'd have the pressure to pass this. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the



House, I've been downstate like many of you who live in downstate and I very often hear on Bills like this downstaters preach against this type of Bill. I'm not ashamed to admit that I believe downstate you can have raffles. I think that some downstate close their eyes to this type of thing. It's illegal and there you are in the Bible belt and you know that raffles are going on. You know that. Now, I think there was some merit to what Representative Skinner said, that we allow a raffle .. a public raffle. Why shouldn't non profit organizations legally have a game of chance, a raffle? Why not? It's a matter of hypocrisy especially when we know in that many areas of the state and I know when I was traveling for example, on one of the election subcommittees, I've been known to go to a bar a few times. I could go in a bar and there were jars there. You put your whole . hand in raffles.. and keep pulling them out as long as your hand could get in that jar and you had some money to put. Those are games of chance. That was illegal. And it wasn't just in one area that I saw it. I saw it in a lot of areas. Let's admit it. It is happening. Let's not be hypocritical about it and what are we doing it for here? For the non-profit organizations, I think it's right and I think, therefore, we ought to override it so that we aren't hypocrites."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 103 voting 'aye', 30 voting 'nay'. And the motion, having failed to receive the Constitutional three-fifths ... Representative Neff, 'aye'. Boucek,. Representative Boucek."

Boucek: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If this gets 107 votes, I want a verification."

Speaker Flinn: "Was there any other changes before I go on to



the announcement of what happened to it? On this question there are 104 voting 'aye' and 30 voting 'nay'. And the motion, having failed to receive the Constitutional three-fifths Majority, is declared lost. House Bill 1776, Representative Schisler is recognized."

Schisler: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that House Bill 1776 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. This is the third time that I've had this Bill, as Representative Friedrich says, warmed up and served over and for some reason the Department of Conservation or the Governor's Office sees fit to veto it. But I'm going to continue to bringing it up because I feel that this is a tourism in reverse Bill. It's keeping the people home, where we need them and also with the energy crunch people can't travel all over the state and out of the state for their recreation and I feel that this is for electrical service for two campsites in Fulton and Tazwell County. And I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate (sic) Bill 1776 pass, notwithstanding the Governor's veto?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this motion there's 86 voting 'aye', 29 voting 'no'. And the motion failing to get the Constitutional three-fifths Majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill 1784, Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I want to thank you very much for your patience. We've had a long day. This is a very brief Bill and I won't take a lot of time to reexplain it. What it does in counties where there are more than one county that a Regional Superintendent has jurisdiction on.. over, presently when a problem arises that he needs legal representation, the



statute does not give him any direction as to who to turn to. This Bill merely states that the State's Attorney in the county where a problem arises shall be his legal representative. In the Governor's veto message it was my opinion that his explanation was not as clear as it might be. And I believe then that if it was more clearly understood that he would have supported it. The Governor questioned whether one county should have the financial burden for the State's Attorney to provide representation in matters affecting other counties in the region. In my particular District, most of the problems occur within one county as it pertains to border disputes and so really that particular concern would not be a major problem. I urge your support in overriding this veto because a number of counties throughout the state have this very problem as we get downstate where a Regional Superintendant has responsibility for more than one county. Your favorable consideration would be most appreciated."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1784 pass, notwithstanding the Governor's veto?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Ropp to explain his vote."

Ropp: "Yes, Sir. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a serious question in our particular area. It has to do with an individual who actually does not know who to turn to. There is some question as to whether or not the State's Attorney will be overburdened. And I'm not questioning whether or not this would be an overburden. It would be an additional responsibility. The people throughout the whole District do provide the funds to support the work of the Regional Superintendant and I'm sure that he needs to have someone that



he can turn to. He is a public official and I know all public officials don't have a State's Attorney to work with them. But it does have to do with school concerns and I appreciate and thank you very much for your vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Getty, to explain his vote."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I just want to emphasize the permissive nature of this Bill. I think it's actually a very good idea. It permits the State's Attorney's services to be utilized to where the Office of the Regional Superintendent are located. But it clearly says that a State's Attorney outside of that county's services would be utilized where the problem is solely within that jurisdiction. I think this is a good idea. It's an intelligent utilization of public resources and I think this should be overridden."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Brummer, you still wish to explain your vote? It looks like ... Alright. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 120 'aye's and 7 'nay's. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, three-fifths Majority, is hereby declared passed, notwithstanding the Governor's veto. House Bill 2014, Representative Meyer. He's not on the floor. House Bill 2129, Representative Chapman. Representative Chapman is recognized."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 2129 requires the Illinois Department of Public Health to develop and promulgate a formula for the distribution of its annual grants in aid to local health departments. I'd like to emphasize that we are not laying a formula upon the state department, but we are requiring that they develop such a formula. Up until last year, the allocations to local health departments were quite arbitrary with little regard for local effort towards programs and



services. They have been working toward developing a rational formula and have made great progress last year and this year. In working with the health departments in Chicago, Cook County and downstate, and with the Department of Public Health, we have a Bill that everyone supported that went to the Governor's Office. The problem seems to be that whoever did the veto message for the Governor must have been reading a different Bill. I'm happy that the Governor says that House Bill 2129 sets forth a laudable concept of distributing the public health dollars. He is wrong when he says that the proposal is not feasible. There is no hardship in executing this formula because we are not requiring a specific formula. We are simply asking them to develop and promulgate a formula. This is a good Bill that is going to set the stage for a rational... for a continuing rational distribution of funds. For this reason that the Department of Public Health, not only supported the Bill in both the House and the Senate, but also asked the Governor to sign the Bill. I'd ask you to join me in overriding the veto so that the state dollars going to local public health departments will be based on a reasonable formula that the Department of Public Health has developed and promulgated."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is,... Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Governor did veto the Bill for what appears to me to be very good reasons. In his veto message he supports the concept of an equal.. equitable distribution of grants but he contends that such an approach is not feasible under the current appropriation level. Apparently what would happen either Chicago would end up with more than downstate, or vice versa. So someone is going to be cheated on this. And I think we ought to think twice before we enter into this



particular morass."

Chapman: "If Mr. Leinenweber is asking a question, Mr. Speaker..."

Leinenweber: "That was not a question, Mr. Speaker. That was a statement.."

Chapman: "I'd be glad to respond."

Leinenweber: "That was not a question."

Speaker Flinn: "He didn't ask to question you. Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2129 pass, notwithstanding the Governor's veto?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Chapman to explain her vote."

Chapman: "Mr. Leinenweber, in speaking against the Bill was simply reading from the Governor's message. Very clearly Mr. Leinenweber hadn't had an opportunity to read the Bill. Because if he would have read it, he would have discovered that we are not imposing a specific formula as the Governor seems to think. But we are merely asking them.. requiring them to promulgate their formula which they are doing now. The formula is in place. This is why the Department of Public Health is supporting the Bill. So the reading from the Governor's veto message really doesn't do a thing to shed any light on this. But a reading of the Bill and noting the support of the Illinois Public Health Association and the Illinois Association of Public Health Administrators, who have indicated that they would like to do anything they could to support the Bill, are, I think, is what we should look at in helping to see that we have a rational allocation of public aid dollars. There is going to be absolutely no hardship in supporting this Bill . As a matter of fact, what we are going to have is equity and we have the formula in place now. It is not going to have any



effect at all on the dollars that are spent this year. The Governor is entirely incorrect in the statement which he makes."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Well reading the Governor's message, I find it rather interesting. I'm not acquainted with all the details of the Bill, but it says the Bill would set forth a laudable concept of distributing local health monies equally and fairly. But we can't do it. You know, it seems to me if the Bill does set forth a method of distributing those dollars equally and fairly we ought to do it. And somehow we will overcome the problems of doing so. He indicates that either downstate will get harmed or Chicago will get harmed I suppose one or the other is the case and he indicates that somehow they aren't being distributed fairly and equally at the present time. If the concept is there to distribute this equally and fairly, we ought to do it and we ought to pass this legislation."

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

Representative Chapman, for what purpose do you arise?"

Chapman: "Poll of the absentees, please, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady has a right to poll the absentees.

Clerk will poll the absentees. Yes, first we'd better find out if everybody's voted who wish. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. We're starting out with 90 'aye's. So poll the absentees, as soon as the paper comes out."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees; Ackerman. E.M. Barnes. Jane Barnes. Borchers. Davis. Dawson. Deuster. Ebbesen. Epton. Ewing. Garmisa. Hoffman. Hoxsey. Dave Jones. Kane. Kornowicz. Kozubowski. Kucharski. Margulas. McAuliffe. McBroom. Neff. Oblinger. Pechous. Peters. Polk. Richmond. Sandquist. Schlickman. Schneider. Schuneman. Stearney. E.G. Steele. Totten.



Williams. Winchester. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "On this question there are 90 'aye's, and 48 'no's. And the motion, having not received the Constitutional three-fifths Majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill 2132. Representative Chapman again."

Chapman: "Well, I seem to be having a lot of trouble with the Governor writing messages about my Bills that don't correspond with the Bill. I don't know if they're reading different Bills or not. But in the case of 2132 the Governor indicates that he has vetoed the Bill because it requires local School Boards to grant teachers a leave of absence for child care purposes. And this is totally inaccurate. If you look at the Bill, which I'd recommend rather than looking at the veto, or if you'd look in your School Code, you will see that very clearly this fits into a Section of the School Code which is permissive, which merely grants the authority to local School Boards to grant teachers leaves of absence for various purposes. And we have specified that they may, not must, may grant leaves of absences for the purpose of child care. In addition the Governor indicates that he's opposed to the Bill because the leave is not specified, the length of the leave. Again, if you will look at the School Code, you will see that none of the leaves that are authorized in the School Code have times specified. This is a decision that should be mutually agreed on by School Boards and teachers. The Governor is completely off base again. His people have written a message for him that does not relate to the Bill which he's vetoing. It's a good Bill, a permissive Bill and I ask for your support of the override."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2132...' Why don't we do it on an



explanation of votes. Because it will speed it up. We're pretty close to adjournment here. Representative Pullen is recognized for ten minutes."

Pullen: "I'm not going to speak for ten minutes. But I would like to ask the Sponsor a question."

Speaker Flinn: "She indicates she will yield."

Pullen: "Does this Bill say that if one is given a leave for this purpose that one is entitled to return to the same position or approximately the same position at the end of the leave without losing any benefits?"

Chapman: "Thank you, Representative Pullen. The Governor is incorrect again when he indicates that one would be permitted to return to his or her former position. This is not accurate. What it says is to a teaching position for which he or she may be eligible. That is, to a position, but not necessarily to the same position. However, he is accurate when he says that the rights and benefits of the teacher will be protected and will not be abrogated simply because of the leave. However, it is a permissive Bill and the leave must be agreed upon by the Board. The Board in no way is required to grant the leave and definitely they are not required to return the teacher to the same position."

Pullen: "But they would be required to...."

Chapman: "The Governor is wrong."

Pullen: "Return the teacher to a teaching position?"

Chapman: "This is in the Section that relates to the city of Chicago. And it was carefully worked out with the attorneys of the Chicago Board of Education and it does specify that it would be without any loss of rights and benefits to which the teacher may have been entitled prior to having been granted such leave. Not for the leave itself, but prior to having been granted such leave and is the kind of language that is



used for leave generally."

Pullen: "Does this Bill permit the granting of child care leaves to male teachers?"

Chapman: "Yes."

Pullen: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is one more effort to infringe on the rights of teachers. We shouldn't be mandating how teachers are treated under state law this way. This ought to be a matter for collective bargaining, freely decided on so they're treated like first class citizens. I'd urge defeat of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "The question.... Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Very simple question of the Sponsor. Doesn't the Board currently have authority to grant leave of absence for this purpose? The statute seems to say that the Board can grant leave of absence, mutually agreed upon between the teacher and the Board. It seems to me that they have that authority currently."

Speaker Flinn: "Turn Chapman on please."

Chapman: "Representative Brummer, you are correct. The Board has the right to grant leaves mutually agreed upon. What we have done is to specify that child care leaves may be granted to a teacher to him or to her and what we do specify is that the rights and benefits will not be abrogated. But I believe that outside of making it more specific, that the Board at the present time does have the authority to do what this Bill says, which makes the Governor's message all the more ridiculous."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2132 pass, notwithstanding the Governor's veto?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Is Representative Epstein within the



hearing... my hearing? If so, I'd like to talk to him on the podium. Epstein. Representative Epstein. Have all... Have all voted who wish? David Epstein, not Representative. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this motion there are 69 voting 'aye', 43 voting 'no'. And having not received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. House Bill 2146, Representative Keane."

Keane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2146 increases the annual incentive to certified assessors in Illinois from \$300 to \$500. The Governor vetoed the Bill on the basis that there was no funding for the 'Stipend', the assessor Stipend, in the 1980 budget appropriation. House Bill 2146 does not require an increase or an appropriation in 1980. The Bill was effective January 1, 1980 and under present procedures, payments will be made after September 1, 1980 from 1981 appropriations. I move that the House Bill 2146 pass, notwithstanding the Governor's veto."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Slape."

Slape: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill as a former tax assessor myself. The only way the State of Illinois is ever going to have equity in assessment is if we can get as many assessors as possible to go to school and to the training institutes. And the only way to get the assessors there is to make a .. give them compensation. A raise in compensation of only \$200 a year is not going to bankrupt the state by any means. And I think that Mr. Keane has an excellent Bill here and I would urge everybody to vote to override."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this override. As has been very



clearly expressed by Representative Keane that the Governor vetoed this based on the fact that an appropriation was to cover the cost for the 1980 budget, which is not necessary. It doesn't begin till 1981. And as you know we passed several Bills trying to up-grade the assessors in the past Session of the Legislature. It's supported by the township officials. I've talked with the Leadership on this side of the aisle, the Minority Spokesman for the Appropriations Committee and also the Revenue Committee and I would urge every Republican to vote for this on this side of the aisle."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? Representative Keane to close."

Keane: "I would just ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2146 pass, notwithstanding the Governor's veto?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 133 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'nay', and this Bill, having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. House Bill 2167, Representative Bullock is recognized."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I hear some bombers over there. They're missing all around me here. This is a simple Bill, non-controversial. I move that the House override the Governor's veto of 2167."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is... Representative Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in total opposition to this Bill. I think most people understand that this is mandating collective bargaining in the public sector. The Governor's amendatory veto is absolutely correct. This



Bill was an abomination and I would urge a vote to sustain the Governor."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Bullock to close."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I regret that Representative Simms doesn't understand that this is a House of charity. This Bill is a simple Bill and it's good for all of the citizens of Illinois. It will create a lot of jobs in the state. It's good for Motherhood, takes care of maternity leave. It's good for civil rights. It takes care of FEPC. And it's good for business."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2167 pass, notwithstanding the Governor's veto?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Piel to explain his vote."

Piel: "I'm not going to.. you know, explain my vote. But if it does by some quirk of fate reach 107, I think we ought to verify."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. I'll watch for it. I'll keep an eye out for it. Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "I don't think I need to explain my vote. I think Representative Bullock gave all the reasons to vote against it."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this motion there are 59 voting 'aye' and 68 voting 'no'. And the motion, having not received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Are there any other veto motions that we have not heard that the Sponsor wishes to call? Representative Macdonald. What's the number?"

Macdonald: "Well, this morning we discussed 2200, House Bill 2200 and it was my understanding that after we had gone through all of the other Bills, if they indeed had all been considered, that we would then go back to this motion, as.. because I am a hyphenated Sponsor..."



Speaker Flinn: "We have arrived at that time. So you are recognized to discuss House Bill 2200."

Macdonald: "Thank you. I appreciate the courtesy. And I do move that House Bill 2200 pass, notwithstanding the veto... the Governor's veto. Because there were so many people absent yesterday and we're not in much better shape today, but I thought it was very important because of this conservation Bill that I file a motion to hear it again today and hope that we might clarify any questions and provide the needed votes to protect over 400 species of nongame wildlife which is certainly without adequate protection in the state. We spend over 30 thousand dollars on nongame species while the Department of Conservation spends millions on our game wildlife management program. House Bill 2200 is a strictly voluntary freedom of choice system that would not increase any taxes and would merely allow a taxpayer the right to check off a donation in the amount of up to \$10.00 on his tax refund to protect these animals. The Bill passed the House 142 to 14 and the Senate 43 to 10. While the Governor has stated that he opposes the Bill and objects to it because of the method we are using and he claims that the legitimate government programs should not be supported by donation. The contradiction lies in the fact that the lottery indeed does generate funds in this state by voluntary action of the people of this state. The funds will not only benefit nongame wildlife, but will certainly enhance living conditions for all the wildlife and also further enhance land restoration. Such prestigious organization as the Forest Preserve District of Will County, the Audubon Society, the Illinois Wildlife Federation, the Sierra Club, the Illinois Environmental Council, all support and have actively worked to see this .. this legislation enacted into law. Yesterday Cal and I passed



out this very beautiful poster and many of you thought it was so wonderful that it was worth hanging in your offices. They can be gotten from the Conservation Department. As you look at it again today, just remember that the endangered species depicted cannot speak or organize for themselves. They're counting on each one of us to save them. Please join Cal and me in voting to override this veto."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Now, I want to save my comments until I hear what opposition there is to it. I can't imagine anybody being against it. So I'll wait."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, the Lady stated that this Bill deals with nongame wildlife and I would urge support because I think she's talking about Calument City."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank .. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that as much as I love and respect the Sponsor today in contrast to yesterday and as much as I love and respect the bald eagle, even when it's behavior is incontinent, I have to rise to speak against this Bill. I think Representative Currie accurately, honestly and responsibly portrayed it yesterday as an anti consumer Bill and it is. It's an anti taxpayer Bill. It's a mess. We have to defeat this Bill. If you look at that list of endangered species, there's rats and snakes on there. What's wrong with endangering them? This is a proper Bill to finish the Veto Session with and we ought to properly sustain the veto."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Macdonald to close. Oh.

I overlooked someone. Representative Barbara Flinn Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I just



want to say that my opposition to the Bill is not because I disapprove of saving endangered species, which you might suspect from Representative Vinson's comments, the.. my opposition is based on the fact that I don't think the state should involve its own resources in developing voluntary contributions for what is, in fact, a very worthwhile purpose. I think the state should expend general revenue funds to make sure that we can develop conservancy projects for these endangered species, all of them on the pretty charts that we saw yesterday, including perhaps as Representative Yourell suggested, Republicans and Democrats too. But my opposition is not to .. the purposes of Representative Macdonald and Skinner, but only to the way we're doing it. The tax check off is not state money we're talking about. A lot of individuals will think it's like the Presidential check off that they use on their federal income tax return. In fact, it's their own money that they'll be spending. Only those individuals who are owed money by the state will have an opportunity to participate in this rate. The state should spend its own money for useful, nature purposes. This is one of those purposes and I think we should do it a different way."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Macdonald, to close."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think there has been quite enough debate on this Bill. I would disagree for all the attempts that there have been through the years, we have simply not been able to fund the nongame species and I would urge that you would join me. I think this is a freedom of choice Bill. It is not a new tax. It is a freedom of the people that choose and I would ask you to join me and Mr. Sk... Representative Skinner in overriding this veto."



Speaker Flinn: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2200 pass, notwithstanding the Governor's veto?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'nay'. Representative Brummer to explain his vote."

Brummer: "I'm sure this is a lost cause since it lost previously, but I find it amazing that some of the opponents would say this is an anti-taxpayer Bill. If anything, this is a pro-taxpayer Bill. The Governor's veto message says that we should not rely on donations. But instead he is going to support appropriations, taxpayer dollars next year to do this and not to do it with donations. I think it's far more admirable to do it with donations than doing it with taxpayer dollars and we ought to have 177 green lights."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The... Representative Borchers wants to explain his vote."

Borchers: "All I want to say is I voted for the blue birds that used to be in our fenceposts that I haven't seen since.. my God, 40, 50 years. So I vote for them."

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

Vinson: "Verification."

Speaker Flinn: "Might be faster for another Roll Call. Representative J.J. Wolf."

Wolf: "I just want to be verified."

Speaker Flinn: "Oh, we may be.. We'll just ... Will the Sponsor go for another Roll Call or you'd rather have this one verified or what? Dump. Verified? You want to verify it? Alright. She's agreed to dump the Roll Call and let's just push your own switch please because it's going to be verified if it gets enough and let's make sure they're here. Alright. The Clerk will take the record. I mean, you've got to vote. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take



the record. On... We didn't save much time that way did we? Poll the absentees. Representative VanDuyne votes 'aye'. Christensen votes 'aye'. Mahar votes 'aye'. Birkinbine 'aye'. Oh, I'm sorry. Birkinbine's already on there. You caught up Clerk? Hallock is 'aye'. Anybody else before we start polling the absentees? Poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees; E.M. Barnes. Jane Barnes. Beatty. Bluthardt. Capparelli. Capuzi. Dawson. Deuster. Domico. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Epton. Ewell. Ewing. Flinn. Garmisa. Getty. Grossi. Harris. Hoffman. Jaffe. Emil Jones. Kane. Katz. Kelly. Kent. Klosak. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Kucharski. Leinenweber. Leverenz. Margulas. McAuliffe. McBroom. McCourt. Meyer. Mugalian. Oblinger. O'Brien. Pechous. Polk. Preston. Richmond. Rigney. Sandquist. Schlickman. Schneider. Schuneman. Stearney. E.G. Steele. C.M. Stiehl. Stuffle. Totten. Walsh. Williams. Winchester. Yourell. And, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ann Willer."

Willer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I evidently pushed the wrong button. I'm on 'no' and I want to be 'yes'."

Speaker Flinn: "Change Willer from 'no' to 'yes'. Representative Dwight Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Would you change me from 'yes' to 'no', please?"

Speaker Flinn: "'Yes' to 'no' on Friedrich. Representative Stanley."

Stanley: "Change me from 'aye' to 'no', please."

Speaker Flinn: "Change Stanley from 'aye' to 'no'. On this question there are 99 'aye's, and 16 'no's. And the motion, having not received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Is Representative Braun on the floor? Oh, there she is. Representative Skinner, for what purpose do you arise?"

Skinner: "Well, just to alert the press corp to the most



recent snow job in the State of Illinois. I would direct your attention to Illinois Department of Conservation press release number 268-79 in which the Governor's forces are attempting to portray the Governor as a lover of wildlife. I find that somewhat ironic."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Braun, you wanted to call off of Postponed Consideration 2578. Is that right?"

Braun: "That's correct, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. You're recognized for that purpose."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this motion seeks to override the Governor's veto regarding part of the perinatal care item in the public health budget. There was a lot of confusion about this... about this program. All I would say at this time is that I would appreciate your vote in the affirmative. The program is necessary. It is essential. It serves a good purpose. The money is well spent and it's not a lot of money to restore to the budget. It is only consistent with the request of the department in its initial budget request. I would appreciate your affirmative vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 20...'"

Braun: "This is motion number four."

Speaker Flinn: "Motion #4 on page 18 and lines 1 and 3 on House Bill 2578... Should pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor? It's on page nine of the Calendar if anybody's looking for it. All in favor will vote 'aye' and those opposed will vote 'no'. Representative Currie."

Currie: "In explaining my 'yes' vote, this is training and staffing money for the ^{perinatal} paranatal program. The paranatal program comes back regularly to this Legislature because it is seriously underfunded. The Governor's decision to put the training and staffing item under



the tertiary care grant line is a way of expressing his lack of commitment to the ^{primary} parantatal program. That..

That grant line is funded ~~seriously~~ ~~underr~~ levels even for last year, levels that were insufficient then.

I would hope that we would make sure we have accountability in the departments of the training and staffing money can be distinguished from money spent for actual care and I would urge more green votes on the Board."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Skinner, 'aye'.

Somebody punch Skinner's 'aye' there, will you? Punch me 'aye'."

Currie: "It costs only about 400... less than 450 thousand dollars. That's all we're talking about, a very small drop of money. It's peanuts, peanuts."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Darrow to explain your vote. One minute, timer's on."

Darrow: "This is probably a losing cause, but again I'd remind you that this is not a Chicago appropriation. This is for places like Rockford, Peoria, Champaign, East St. Louis, the other metropolitan areas. This is money for the babies, the infants, who are born with some type of defect. We heard Representative McClain earlier today discuss this. We passed additional legislation. This is necessary to continue these programs. This is for the small children and their families. I had a few in my district. No matter what income level you come from, whether you're wealthy or not, this is extremely expensive care for these parents. The insurance does not cover the entire cost. You cannot insure against it. This is the only way these people can afford this care to keep these children alive and well and maturing up to adulthood. I guess we're not going to make it tonight. Maybe some other time."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Representative



Mautino, to explain his vote."

Mautino: "Yes, to take one more second of the.. of the General Assembly's time.. I read an article yesterday I believe it was in the Sun-Times, in explaining my 'yes' vote, that the Department of Public Aid was going to support and pay for an illegal alien's I think it was cancer, type of very rare cancer, but it cost between 600 thousand and 100 thousand dollars. I would like to point out that this type of grant for perinatal care is for those working people who are supporting all other areas of health care. I think if we can do this for an alien who has a rare form of leukemia, we can do it for those new born infants that do have a problem here in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all... Representative Willer to explain her vote."

Willer: "No, I won't come on.."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady has a right to explain her vote."

Willer: "I want to say one thing."

Speaker Flinn: "One minute."

Willer: "I haven't spoken before. The people who wear red roses on their lapels are.. many of them are voting against this. They're only a few hours old when they're born and now you don't care about keeping them alive and I find that really very strange."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 85 'aye's, 29 'nay's, and the motion, having not received the Constitutional three-fifths Majority, is hereby declared lost. Alright, Representative Lechowicz for the purpose of a.. some motions and try to wind up."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The purpose of these motions is so we can do some of the work that would normally take about a half hour to forty7five minutes



on the House floor in a Perfunctory Session. And I would hope that the Membership would go along with the motion to suspend Rule 34-A to permit those Bills on Second Reading, First Legislative Day, to be read a second time today. And it's our intent to do that in Perfunctory Session. Also on the Calendar there's Representative Collins' motion on House Bill 2813, pursuant to Rule 31-B, he would like to move to sus... to advance to Second Reading without reference to a Committee on House Bill 2813. And then it would be the intent to read all the Bills on Second Reading and hold on Second Reading. Amendments to be taken up on Tuesday, October the 30th, advanced to Third Reading and passed that day. That's what this motion is ... encompasses. I ask leave to use the Attendance Roll Call so we can go on to Perfunctory Session and do the work of the House."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "What are the subject matters of the Bill?"

Speaker Flinn: "They're on the Calendar on your desk."

Skinner: "What page?"

Speaker Flinn: "Page two. Top of page two. And there's a supplement. .. We're talking about all the Bills on Second Reading, Cal. All we're trying to do is move them under Second Legislative Day and hold them there, amend them on that day. "

Lechowicz: "You will have every opportunity on October the 30th on that subject."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "No, I'll yield to Tom Hanahan because he..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, there's a motion on here, Representative Redmond, on 2818 and then 2811."

Speaker Flinn: "2811 is not going to be called today..."

Hanahan: "They're motions..."



Speaker Flinn: "No."

Hanahan: "Neither 2818 nor 2811..."

Speaker Flinn: "No, we're only moving to Second Readings here with the motions here, but including the Collins Bill. Now..."

Hanahan: "I want to know if either one of these two Bills, because if Representative Redmond.. Speaker Redmond said to me he was not going to ask for those motions to be called."

Speaker Flinn: "They are not going to be called, Tom. They are going to be sent to the Committee....in the regular process..."

Hanahan: "That's right. That's the agreement."

Speaker Flinn: "That's right. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, those motions are the Speaker's motions and I understand that he had to leave for another meeting someplace and there's no... going to be... Representative Hanahan? There's not going to be..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ryan is addressing you so..."

Ryan: "Those were Speaker Redmond's motions and he had to leave for a meeting and he has no intention of calling. We're going to take that up when we come back. Speaker Redmond."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Yeah, I talked to Speaker Redmond about a half hour ago. But I don't want their read on Second Reading you know, now. That's the only thing ... I was questioning whether these were included ..."

Speaker Flinn: "They're not on the list."

Hanahan: "Okay..."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. Is there leave to use the Attendance ... Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I'd rather have the clarification because I.. Could he restate his motion? Because they are on the Calendar to advance and I thought his motion was to move



those Bills that are on the Calendar. So, I think we'd better clarify it, use the numbers if you want, but clarify it so those ... those usuary Bills are not included."

Speaker Flinn: "Alright. The only... The only Bill that's included is the Collins' Bill, the election Bill and we're moving to Second Reading without reference to the Committee. 2813 is the number and all the rest of them are on page two of your Regular Calendar and that's all we're talking about. Alright. You want them enumerated, I'll call them off for you but they're right in front of you."

Matijeovich: "As long as you.. I didn't hear Regular Calendar."

Speaker Flinn: "Repre.. Ronan won somebody. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, so there is no question, let the Clerk read the Bills that appear on the Regular Calendar, put them in the record."

Clerk O'Brien: "On page two of the Calendar, House Bills, Second Reading, First Legislative Day, House Bill 2789, Polk- Bell, a Bill for an Act to amend .. or making appropriation to the Capital Development Board, to the Capital Development Fund for certain projects. House Bill 2790, Chapman, a Bill for an Act making appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Board of Vocational Rehabilitation. House Bill 2794, Bowman, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act making appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Children and Family services. And House Bill 2798, Bell-Polk, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Capital Development Bond Act. The Bills appearing on House Bills, Second Reading. House Bill 2792, Giorgi, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. House Bill



2795, Taylor, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for certain claims against the State of Illinois in conformity with awards made by the Court of Claims. House Bill 2797, J.J. Wolf, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Environmental Protection Agency. House Bill 2799, Bowman-Collins-Bluthardt, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. House Bill 2800, Daniels, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code. House Bill 2804, Yourell, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Real Estate Transfer Tax Act. House Bill 2805, Yourell, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Department of Revenue. And appearing on Supplemental Calendar #3, House Bill 2813, Collins, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, is there any objection to using the Attendance Roll Call on those that were reiterated? I believe, Mr..."

Speaker Flinn: "Leave to use the Attendance Roll Call. Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, simply a question..."

Speaker Flinn: "Yes."

Satterthwaite: "Yesterday we were not permitted to deal with a number of Bills that had not yet been printed and my question relates to Representative Collins' Bill which everyone else seems to know what it's about, but I don't. And I don't find a copy on my desk. Now I'm wondering whether I should give unanimous consent to move any Bill that has not been printed when several of us were not accorded that courtesy yesterday."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, to make things easier I'd be happy to explain the Bill. You'll all remember the



House Bill that Representative Dyer and I were Co-Sponsors which had a number of provisions on them, one of which was the availability of computer tapes by election authorities to election committees. In one Section of that there was an erroneous reference to County Clerk when it should have been stat... it should have been Board of Election Commissioners. This merely corrects that language. It was heard in the Rules Committee this morning and came out without dissent."

Speaker Flinn: "Is there leave to use the Attendance Roll Call for Representative Lechowicz's motion? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. It will be done."

Lechowicz: "I have also been informed that the Clerk has on his.. by the podium there a number of slips that people requested to be changed on their recording of the votes. Is there any objection if the Clerk has the authority to do that? I would like to use the Attendance Roll Call for that as well."

Speaker Flinn: "Is there leave for those vote changes? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Attendance Roll Call be used. "

Lechowicz: "Now, Mr. Speaker, I now move that the House stand in Perfunctory Session for half an hour. I'm sorry.. There will.. I'm sorry. What?"

Speaker Flinn: "Messages from the Senate first. "

Clerk O'Brien: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary, Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives, the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolutions, the adoption of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit; Senate Joint Resolution #72, adopted by the Senate October 18th, 1979. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. "

Lechowicz: "Are there any Resolutions, Mr. Speaker?"



Speaker Flinn: "We need to move to adopt that I believe.

The Gentleman moves to adopt the Resolution... Joint Resolution."

Lechowicz: "Any Resolutions on the..."

Speaker Flinn: "Can they .. Can they adopt this?"

Lechowicz: "In perfunct?"

Speaker Flinn: "We want to adopt the Agreed Resolution in perfunctory is there's no objection to that. Representative Friedrich, Dwight Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding we were going to move at least one Senate Bill on First Reading to Second Reading without reference. I made that motion and I thought there was no objection to it. We cleared it with the Leadership on both sides."

Speaker Flinn: "We could do it now or Tuesday, it doesn't really make any difference. We were just trying to wind it up here with what had to be done today, Dwight. You want.. .Do you want to do that now, we will do it. "

Friedrich: "If there's no objection, I will. Senate Bill 1439 is a Bill to make a supplemental appropriation to the Auditor General for.. to conduct some audits that will be reimbursed for the Federal Government. It's .. In fact, we will be reimbursed more than 100% and it is important that we have this money that we can proceed with those audits."

Speaker Flinn: "Is there leave to use the Attendance Roll Call to advance without reference to Committee? Leave is granted. It shall be done. So we clear up a little confusion here, Representative Lechowicz. You moved the adoption of the adjournment Resolution, correct? Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Move that the House do adopt Senate Joint Resolution #72, which is the adjournment Resolution. That has the House reconvene October the 30th at 12:00



noon. Move for its adoption."

Speaker Flinn: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion.

All in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'.

The 'aye's have it. The Amendment's (sic) adopted.

Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 491, Kornowicz, 492, Kornowicz, 493, Hudson; 494, Schraeder, 495, McClain, 497, Molloy, 498, Swanstrom, 499, Meyer, 500, Lechowicz, 501, Ralph Dunn."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Kornowicz's 491 notes a golden wedding anniversary, 492 recommends a 75th jubilee, now 493 by Representative Hudson, does he want that read? Representative Hudson? Representative Hudson wants this read. Will the Clerk read 493 please?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Whereas, the date of October 11, 1921 might have gone unheralded as a Memorial date in the long march of history, had it not been for the birth of our esteemed colleague and friend, Charles M. Campbell, and Whereas, upon his birth, it was at once apparent that an exceptional event had occurred, for example, it is the only instance in the recorded history wherein the newborn infant immediately required. . . inquired as to a quorum in the delivery room and having ascertained such to be the case, moved that the surgeon proceed with the business at hand. Also it is the only case on record wherein the infant having been administered a breath inducing slap by the surgeon, returned the blow, decking the surgeon and throwing the delivery room into total confusion, and Whereas, the precocious acts of this early manifestations of Chuck's gifts of articulation, physical strength, and leadership and Whereas, these early signs of greatness were harbingers of the colorful and illustrious career, and Whereas, this career includes; 1; his marriage



of 36 years to his loving devoted helpmate, Marge, who claims him to be the finest and noblest husband in the world, Representative Campbell, commenting on this, modestly agrees, 2: his stirring World War II record as a destroyer escort, naval gunnery officer, where he was dubbed , 'the devilish, dastardly, and indestructable destroyer from Danville by the Japanese enemy, downing many of their planes and earning the silver star for his valor, 3: his association with big time professional baseball, having at one time a picture with the Dodgers, 4; his successful career in the field of politics, being first elected to the Illinois General Assembly in 1962, and 'Outhouser' after losing at large election in 1964, is declaring as did General Douglas McArthur, 'I shall return', subsequently making good on that promise and serving continuously until this date, by his persistent and hard fought battles for his district, earning in one especially, protracted and bitterly contest battles the nickname of 'Mr. Middle Fork Reservoir', and Whereas our colleague, Chuck Campbell has a deep love for life and remarkable ability by the grace of God to cheat the Grim Reaper on several occasions including a near miss by flaming kama-kazi plane, a near fatal heart attack in June of 1976, and a precariously close call when only incredible leap skyward saved him from an onrushing car, and Whereas seemingly and indestructable and irrepressible man, is at heart a warm and loving husband and father and a proud grandfather of three lovely granddaughters, Christine and newly arrived twins, Kelly Beth and Katie Ann, and Whereas at one point in time, it appeared as if the Legislature might be in Session on our colleague's birthday, October 11th, but such not being the case, we must extend our well wishing . Therefore, be it Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eighty-First General Assembly of



the State of Illinois, that we extend our heartfelt birthday greetings to our colleague, Chuck 'Nine Lives' Campbell, wishing him and his family a belated but most happy birthday and be it further Resolved that a suitable copy of this Resolution be forwarded to Margery Campbell, the gracious and loving wife of Charles M. Chuck Campbell."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't know who's deviltry this is, but I certainly enjoyed it and appreciated it and I thank you all."

Speaker Flinn: "I'm going to recognize him right now. Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Mr. Speaker, I must confess I'm the devil referred to in this case, I guess. But I would.. I would move adoption of this Resolution. At the same time, request permission from the Chair that each and every Member here be...-What should I say?- considered a signatorie to this Resolution."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Hudson..."

Hudson: "Unless there's objection of course."

Speaker Flinn: "Represe... Any objection? Is there leave for all Members of the House to be on here as Sponsors? Okay, leave. Representative Giorgi joined by Representative Hudson moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. You've got a couple more?"

Giorgi: "494 by Schraeder marks an Eagle Scout award, 495 by McClain heralds a 90th birthday, Molloy picks School Principal of the year, Swanstrom signals a Masonic Lodge in 'Pecatonica', 494 by Meyers measures the 14th year, Lechowicz's talks about a golden anniversary and Dunn talks about a marriage. I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye'



those opposed. The 'aye's have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Representative Lechowicz. We have a Death Resolution.."

Lechowicz: "Death Resolution?"

Speaker Flinn: "Yes. We have a Death Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 502, Domico et. al, with respect to the memory of Mr. James J. Ryan, House Resolution 496, McClain et. al. with respect to the memory of John. G. Fishter."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption. I just want to point out to the Membership that Jim Ryan served in this Body. I don't know if many of you remember him or not, but he was a Gentleman to his last day. And I know that many of the older Members probably remember Jimmie Ryan. He was respected as a Member of this House and in his retirement he was a welcome sight to see in city hall and all other units of Local Government. He was an advisor to many of the people who serve in this Body now. He was an advisor. He was a very close personal friend of George Dunne's. I know that not only do we miss him personally, I know what a tremendous loss it is for his own family, but especially for many of the people that he helped on a day to day basis. And with a deep reluctance I move the adoption of the Death Resolution."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Lechowicz has moved for the adoption of the Death Resolution. All those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Those opposed. The 'aya's have it. The Death Resolution is adopted. Further Death Resolutions?"

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 503, Republican Leadership, Whereas the House is deeply saddened at the recent death of our good friend and former colleague, the Honorable Jack E. Walker of Lansing, Illinois. And whereas, Jack Walker was born July 15th, 1910 in Dehenda, Illinois,



attended the I.O.O.F. Orphan's Home School in Lincoln, Illinois, Galesburg High School, the University of Illinois, Knox College, and John Marshall Law School, where he received a 'Judis Doctorate' degree in 1940, and whereas, Jack Walker served six terms in the House of Representatives, and was Majority Whip during the 75th General Assembly, Majority Leader during part of the 76th General Assembly, and Speaker of the House during the 76th General Assembly after Speaker Ralph Smith was appointed to the United States Senate. And whereas, Jack Walker was subsequently elected State Senator and served in the Senate during the 77th and 78th General Assemblies, whereas Jack Walker's trademarks of a warm smile, gravelly voice, firm handshake, and straightforward manner, will long be remembered. 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 grief in the death of our former colleague, Jack E. Walker. And be it further Resolved that we extend our sympathies to his family and friends and be it further Resolved that a suitable copy of this Preamble and Resolution be presented to Mrs. Pearl Walker, his widow."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I have leave to include all the Membership of the House in Jack Walker's Death Resolution. I know I see many of the Membership there at the wake. I know I probably speak for many of the Members in expressing the deepest regrets to his wife, Pearl and his family on a man who, not only be missed in his area of the state, but an imprint that was put on by Jack Walker to everyone of us when he served in this Body and as the Speaker you could always drop in and say hello and it was always a friendly smile. And that warm welcome that was pointed out in that Death Resolution."



Jack Walker to his .. in fact, I saw him about a month before he passed away. He still had the will and the total desire to help his fellow man. I know that Walker in his own right will never be forgotten to anyone who met him. And, Mr. Speaker, it's with deep regret that I move the adoption of the Resolution."

Speaker Flinn: "Do we have leave to add on all the Membership as the Sponsors? Leave is granted. Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Representative Lechowicz I think said it quite adequately when Jack Walker died we all lost a very dear friend. And he said and as the Resolution said, no one who met him can forget that raspy voice and the pervasive good humor and the warmth of the friendship that he extended to everybody. We all know that Jack Walker went through good times and bad, but whatever, up or down, he never let his spirit be broken. As a matter of fact, that good humor still exuded from the man. We all lost a good friend, when he was buried. I was at his funeral. And Steve Sargant, who we all know, gave the eulogy at that funeral and he quoted Jack. Jack had a favorite expression when he'd have some kind of confrontation or debate with someone. He'd always say the so and so's are lucky to have known me. And Steve said and I agree that that's very true and I'm very happy to stand here and say that indeed, we were all very, very lucky to have known Jack Walker."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of the Death Resolution. All those in favor say 'aye'..."

Collins: "I'd like to defer to Elmer Conti, was..."

Speaker Flinn: "Oh, I'm sorry, Elmer."

Conti: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's ironic that I stand here tonight before you asking to adopt both of these Resolutions on Jim Ryan who



served many terms before I got here, but served all three terms while I was here. And Jack Walker was my freshman classmate when we first came down. Any many nights tempers flared days and nights on this floor, but his jovial character and his keen sense of humor brought this back... this House back into order. And he will be greatly missed and there are 35 freshmen as I've said so many times this Session that .. I know that are going to emulate to Jack Walker and bring to this House the order and the keenest sense of humor and the tremendous job that Jack Walker gave the State of Illinois when he served in this House. I move for the adoption of the Resolution."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is one of those moments where you remember all of the fine people with whom you have served in this great House of Representatives. I ^{serve} second Jack Walker's leadership and got to know Jack fairly well. Jack was a very hard driving human being. He was tough. He was hard. He played hard and he worked hard. And yet he had a great heart. I can see Jack right now. He used to sit just to the left of where Dwight Friedrich is on the aisle. He was serving the Leadership when Ralph Smith was the Speaker and when Bill Pollock was the Majority Leader. I remember when unexpectedly and suddenly we lost Bill Pollock. Bill and Jack were very close dear friends and I'll never forget Jack Walker handling Bill Pollock's Death Resolution. And as hard as he appeared to be, I remember the tears flowing down his cheeks when he offered Bill Pollock's Death Resolution. I will always remember Jack Walker as I will all of the fine Members who I've served with. And, Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to move the adoption of the Resolution."

Speaker Flinn: "The motion is to adopt the Death Resolution."



All those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Those opposed. The 'aye's have it and the Death Resolution is adopted. There is no further business the House will after a 30 minute perfunctory Session, will stand adjourned till October 3rd at noon. (Sic) Representative Friedrich? You have further business?"

Friedrich: "I just have a question. Is it not contemplated there will be Committee meetings on the morning of the 30th?"

Speaker Flinn: "Yes, it is."

Friedrich: "Could Revenue and in Banks and Savings and Loan?"

Speaker Flinn: "Yes, I think there will be notices sent to those affected. House will stand adjourned after a perfunct Session. House is in perfunctory Session now."

Clerk: O'Brien: "Introduction and First Reading of Bills; House Bill 2824, Lechowicz, Flinn, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unemployment Insurance Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2825, Preston, a Bill for an Act to reduce state occupation and use taxes on food for human consumption. First Reading of the Bill... House Bills, Second Reading. House Bill 2789, Polk-Bell, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the Capital Development Board for the Capital Development Fund for certain projects. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2790, Chapman, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense for the Board of Vocational Rehabilitation. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2794, Bowman, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Children and Family Services. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2798, Bell-Polk, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Capital Development Bond Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2792,



Giorgi, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2795, Taylor, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for certain claims against the State of Illinois in conformity with awards made by the Court of Claims. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2797, J.J. Wolf, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense for the Environmental Protection Agency. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2799, Bowman-Collins-Bluthardt, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2800, Daniels, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Municipal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2804, Collins, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Real Estate Transfer Tax Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2805, Yourell, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Revenue. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2813, Collins, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Those Bills will be held on Second Reading. Messages from the Senate; Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills, the following title and passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit; Senate Bills # 1436, 1438, 1439, 1443, 1444, and 1445, passed by the Senate October 18th, 1979 by a three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of the following Joint Resolution to wit; House Joint Resolution #65, concurred in by the



Senate October 18th, 1979. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Senate Bills, First Reading. Senate Bill 1436, Redmond, a Bill for an Act making supplemental appropriation for the expenses of the Senate in the Eighty-First General Assembly. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1438, Weaver... Excuse me, Johnson, a Bill for an Act making supplemental appropriations to the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1439, Friedrich, a Bill for an Act making appropriation for the Office of Auditor General. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1444, VanDuyne, a Bill for an Act making appropriations of certain federal funds to the State Board of Education. Second Reading of t.. Excuse me. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1445, Kane-Peters, a Bill for an Act making supplemental appropriation to the Board of Higher Education. First Reading of the Bill.... A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills of the following titles, the veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding, and the passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House to wit; Senate Bills #547, 87, 111, 147, 250, 260, 296, 307, 310, 420, 459, 468, 492, 798, 809, 883, 884, 909, 910, 1137, 1223, 1229, 1314, 1328, 1334, and 1406, passed by the Senate by a three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed the Bills the following title, the Governor's specific recommendations for change to the contrary notwithstanding, and the passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House to wit: Senate Bill #790, passed by the Senate October 18th, 1979 by a



three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has accepted the Governor's specific recommendations for change to Bills of the following title, the acceptance of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House, to wit: Senate Bills # 32, 48, 50, 58, 65, 93, 133, 176, 228, 244, 293, 294, 359, 362, 419, 438, 495, 511, 514, 642, 666, 674, 696, 732, 800, 801, 802, 828, 950, 990, 1000, 1040, 1061, 1341, 1344, and 1396, action taken by the Senate. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has restored items reduced by the Governor which in Bills of the following title and the restoration of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House to wit: Senate Bills # 318 and 590. Action taken by the Senate Kenneth Wright, by a three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed items in the following Bills, the item veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding and the passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House, to wit: Senate Bills # 157, 356, 578, 581, and 891, passed by the Senate by a three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives, that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of the following Joint Resolutions, to wit: House Joint Resolution # 65, concurred by the Senate October 18th, 1979. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Motion pursuant to House Rule 10-B. We move that the order of business



be changed to Constitutional Amendments, Third Reading.
Don Totten. No further business. The House... The
House now stands adjourned."



LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
OCTOBER 18, 1979

PAGE 1

HB-0326 VETO	PAGE	152
HB-0450 VETO	PAGE	154
HB-0460 VETO	PAGE	157
HB-0462 VETO	PAGE	158
HB-0512 VETO	PAGE	163
HB-0662 VETO	PAGE	7
HB-0685 VETO	PAGE	176
HB-0716 VETO	PAGE	14
HB-0739 VETO	PAGE	176
HB-0742 VETO	PAGE	186
HB-0793 VETO	PAGE	3
HB-0829 VETO	PAGE	187
HB-0841 VETO	PAGE	21
HB-0922 VETO	PAGE	190
HB-0944 VETO	PAGE	195
HB-0961 VETO	PAGE	5
VETO	PAGE	21
HB-1052 VETO	PAGE	200
HB-1211 VETO	PAGE	202
HB-1508 VETO	PAGE	218
HB-1692 VETO	PAGE	222
HB-1769 VETO	PAGE	6
HB-1776 VETO	PAGE	227
HB-1784 VETO	PAGE	227
HB-1986 VETO	PAGE	7
HB-2129 VETO	PAGE	229
HB-2132 VETO	PAGE	233
HB-2146 VETO	PAGE	236
HB-2167 VETO	PAGE	237
HB-2192 VETO	PAGE	173
HB-2200 VETO	PAGE	239
HB-2204 VETO	PAGE	126
HB-2228 VETO	PAGE	8
HB-2237 VETO	PAGE	130
HB-2240 VETO	PAGE	134
HB-2355 VETO	PAGE	8
HB-2357 VETO	PAGE	8
HB-2358 VETO	PAGE	8
HB-2416 VETO	PAGE	143
HB-2427 VETO	PAGE	23
HB-2440 VETO	PAGE	140
HB-2566 VETO	PAGE	146
HB-2578 VETO	PAGE	27

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
OCTOBER 18, 1979

PAGE 2

	VETO	PAGE	244
HB-2649	VETO	PAGE	41
HB-2719	VETO	PAGE	10
HB-2789	2ND READING	PAGE	260
	MOTIONS	PAGE	249
HB-2790	2ND READING	PAGE	260
	MOTIONS	PAGE	249
HB-2792	2ND READING	PAGE	260
	MOTIONS	PAGE	249
HB-2794	2ND READING	PAGE	260
	MOTIONS	PAGE	249
HB-2795	2ND READING	PAGE	261
	MOTIONS	PAGE	250
HB-2797	2ND READING	PAGE	261
	MOTIONS	PAGE	250
HB-2798	2ND READING	PAGE	260
	MOTIONS	PAGE	249
HB-2799	2ND READING	PAGE	261
	MOTIONS	PAGE	250
HB-2800	2ND READING	PAGE	261
	MOTIONS	PAGE	250
HB-2804	2ND READING	PAGE	261
	MOTIONS	PAGE	250
HB-2805	2ND READING	PAGE	261
	MOTIONS	PAGE	250
HB-2813	2ND READING	PAGE	261
	MOTIONS	PAGE	250
HB-2822	1ST READING	PAGE	171
HB-2823	1ST READING	PAGE	171
HB-2824	1ST READING	PAGE	260
HB-2825	1ST READING	PAGE	260
SB-1436	1ST READING	PAGE	262
SB-1438	1ST READING	PAGE	262
SB-1439	1ST READING	PAGE	262
	MOTIONS	PAGE	252
SB-1444	1ST READING	PAGE	262
SB-1445	1ST READING	PAGE	262
HR-0496	3RD READING	PAGE	256
HR-0502	3RD READING	PAGE	256
HR-0503	3RD READING	PAGE	256
SJR-0072	3RD READING	PAGE	252

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
SPECIAL SESSION # 3

PAGE 3

OCTOBER 18, 1979

HB-0001	1ST READING	PAGE	170
HB-0002	1ST READING	PAGE	170
SJR-0001	3RD READING	PAGE	171

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
OCTOBER 18, 1979

PAGE 4

SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REV. KRUEGER - PRAYER	PAGE	1
REP. SANDQUIST - PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	2
3RD SPECIAL SESSION CONVENED	PAGE	2
REV. KRUEGER - PRAYER	PAGE	2
REP. LEINENWEBER - PRAYER	PAGE	2
3RD SPECIAL SESSION RECESSED	PAGE	2
REGULAR SESSION RECONVENED	PAGE	2
REGULAR SESSION RECESSED	PAGE	166
3RD SPECIAL SESSION CONVENED	PAGE	166
DISCUSSION-INTRODUCTION OF NEW BILLS IN 3SS	PAGE	166
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	170
3RD SPECIAL SESSION ADJOURNED	PAGE	171
REGULAR SESSION RECONVENED	PAGE	171
CHANGE OF VOTES	PAGE	251
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	251
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	253
PERFUNCT SESSION	PAGE	260
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	261
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	262
MOTION ON H.R. 10 (B) READ	PAGE	263
HOUSE ADJOURNED	PAGE	264