

1.

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."

Reverend 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. William Arthur Ward said; 'What you believe is more important than what you possess. What you live is more lasting than what you profess. Whom you inspire is more significant than whom you impress.' Let us pray. Almighty, God, our Heavenly Father, who in Thy great mercy makes provision for our needs and provides us a path of life both to emulate and to follow. We do extend to Thee our hearts of joy. Enable us, Oh, Lord, to serve the people of this State of Illinois with significant merit, indisputable concern, and more expanse of love that will inspire within them a firmer belief and understanding of representative government. May never the nobility of the actions and enactments of this House of Representatives be suspect or reduced to partisan expediency. Keep us, Oh, Lord, ever mindful of the cherished ideals to which we aspire. Through Jesus, Christ, our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Capuzi on the pledge of allegiance. "

Capuzi: "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: "In case you don't know it Representative Capuzi is the Co-Dean of the House."

Capuzi: "You'd better change that. You're the Co-Dean."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Reading of the Journal."

Clerk O'Brien: "Journal for the 86th Legislative Day, the House



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

11-1-79

met pursuant to adjournment. Speaker in the Chair.
 Prayer by Father William Krueger, Chaplain. Representative
 Ropp lead the House in the pledge of allegiance. By
 direction of the Speaker Roll Call was taken to ascer-
 tain the attendance of Members as follows; 171 present.
 by unanimous consent..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we dispense with the
 reading of the Journal. That Journal # 86 of
 October 16th, 87 of October 17th, and 88th of October
 18th, 1979 be approved as read."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the
 Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye';
 opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carried.
 Reading of the Journal is excused and approved as if it
 had been read. Take the record, Mr. Clerk, on the
 Attendance Roll Call. Total Veto Motions? Representative
 Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, it appears we have the same problem
 that we had several other times when we were considering
 Total Veto Override Motions. And it would seem to me
 that you ought to hand out report cards and perhaps give
 the House a 'D' for attendance."

Speaker Redmond: "What was that?"

Skinner: "I think you should give us a 'D' for attendance."

Speaker Redmond: "Well... Okay. I'll give them a 'D'.

Now what do I do? Representative Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege. Today
 is the last day that we can consider items that the
 Governor has vetoed. In all fairness to all the Members
 that conscientiously have served here in the House that
 have been here everyday, I would ... might suggest to
 the Chair that we go through the Calendar once. And
 everybody has an opportunity to vote on their Bill that
 is listed and if they aren't here, then that falls by the



wayside, cause I think it's unfair to the rest of us to keep repeating over and over again because of the lack of attendance of some Members of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I have an alternate suggestion. And you call the names of those who aren't here first."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, just let's start at 310 which is where I said I would start. Senate Bill 310. Representative Lechowicz? Out of the record. 420. Yourell. Out of the record. 459, VonBoeckman, out of the record. 468, Keane, out of the record. 492, Yourell. Out of the record. 798, Egan.. or Yourell. Out of the record. 809, J. David Jones. Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. 883, out of the record, request of the Sponsor. 884, Representative Jones. Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. 909, Representative Totten. Out of the record. 910, Representative Totten. Out of the record. 1137, Representative Hoxsey, out of the record. 1223, Representative Marovitz. Out of the record. 1229, Representative Pullen? Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. 1314, Representative Cullerton. Out of the record. 1328, Representative Bower, out of the record, request of the Sponsor. 1334, Representative Kulas? Out of the record. 1406, Representative Kornowicz. Out of the record. Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I've got an improvement on Representative Friedrich's suggestion. I would like to handle all those Bills of the Members that are not here."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he... Does he have leave? Total Veto Motions, consideration Postponed. Senate Bill 5, Marovitz? Out of the record. 111. Representative Piel, you 're in the wrong seat. But I know you. "

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In reference to .. in respect to Representative Kulas on House.. er Senate Bill 1334,



I noticed that you didn't mention that it was at the request of the Sponsor and so I would like the record to show that he is on the floor and that it was because of the request of the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "That's why I did it and when we get more people we will go those and the Sponsor was here at the time. 111, Representative Leverenz? Out of the record. 250, Terzich? Out of the record. 296, Representative Younge? Out of the record. 307,.. Representative Younge is? Well. Out of the record. I didn't expect to find you over there. Who were you talking to, Representative Borchers? Waste of time. Waste of time. Item Veto Motions. Senate Bill 157. Younge, out of the record. Request of the Sponsor. 157, E.M. Barnes. Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. No, no. Just out of the record. 578, Representative Totten? Out of the record. Senate Bill 578. 578. Out of the record. 581. Representative Dawson. Out of the record. Representative Pullen?"

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, while we're talking about the poor attendance here this morning I would like to call to your attention that once again, this entire row is here. "

Speaker Redmond: "Will that entire row please stand? Okay. Will the armorer strike a medal? Mrs. Younge's entire row is here, too. And the entire row in the Clerk's well is here. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "We've got four rows entirely empty over here."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Boucek."

Boucek: "Mr. Speaker, let the record show at this particular time, that there are more Republicans in attendance on the floor than there are Democrats. And that we should now take all the Republican legislation and then adjourn and then come back at nine o'clock tonight and all the Democrats will be here."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "That makes everything even."

Speaker Redmond: "Reduction Veto Motions. Page 5, 318.

Out of the record by Representative Wikoff, at the request of the Sponsor. Skinner?"

Skinner: "I'm curious, Mr. Speaker. Is it true.. Is the rumor true that the Democratic Revenue study group or tax limitation study group still is down in the Governor's Office?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, that's possible. "

Skinner: "I know that's where Representative Pierce said he was going and I don't see him. Couldn't we send out a rescue party?"

Speaker Redmond: "I think he said that there was going to be chaired by Samantha."

Skinner: "Right, who.. who?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Governor's advisor on revenue matters. Senate Bills, Second Reading. Senate Bill 1438. Representative Wikoff. This is Second Reading. Are there any Amendments, Mr. Clerk, as you read the Bill? 1438."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1438, a Bill for an Act making supplemental appropriation to the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments? Committee Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendment from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Pierce.

Wait a minute. Wait a minute. Wait a minute..."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute. ..."

Pierce: "And Gentlemen of the House, I want to report on the meeting of the Democratic Task Force on tax and spending limitations in the Governor's Office immediately



upon adjournment last night. We are.. We were briefed by Samantha and when we asked her about the one cent sales tax reduction on food and medicine, her response was, 'Pooh-pooh.' That's all I have to report at this time. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could we hold 1438 on Second Reading for a while? We don't have the Bill and we'll have some questions about it, I think."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, we'll put it on Second Reading.

It's been read a second time. The Gentleman from Johnston, Representative C.L. McCormick. Sitting in Representative Wolf's seat. You have anything for the.. the plight of the endangered mosquito?"

(McCormick) Wolf: "No, Mr. Speaker, I don't. I don't see MR. Katz in the chamber, Mr. Speaker, and if I could I'd like to tell a little story if I could use Representative Katz for kind of an example."

Speaker Redmond: "Leave is granted..... by Representative Katz in absentia."

(McCormick) Wolf: "Well, Sir, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, you know things always happen in the summertime after we're out of Session and last year, there was a lawyers' convention down in Springfield. And Harold Katz he went home and he told his wife, he wanted to come down for that there lawyers' convention and she said, 'Well Harold, I think I'll come with cause I like to see what you guys do down there in Springfield.' And Harold said, 'Well, honey, now you wouldn't like to come down here. There's really nothing for you.' But Harold's wife persisted. So she come down to Springfield for the lawyers' convention and they went to the Black Angus restaurant. And Harold walks into the Black Angus with his wife and the coat check girl she said, 'Hi, Harold, how are you?' And his wife says, 'Who



is that woman?' He said, 'Well, that was former Senator Horsley's niece, honey.' So he got inside the restaurant and he calmed her down. Cigarette girl come around the table says, 'Harold, what would you like tonight?' And his wife said, 'Who is that woman?' He says, 'Well honey, now, that's Judge Cadigan's sister.' Well he finally calmed her down and pretty soon the waitress come around the table and says, 'What would you like tonight, Harold?' And his wife says, 'Who is that woman?' He says, 'Well, that's Doug Kane's niece.' And finally he couldn't calm her down much more. They left the restaurant. She was still a cussing and a hollering and a belling and they got in the back of the cab and the cab driver turned around and said, 'Harold, you've sure got a wild one with you tonight.' "

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birkinbine."

Birkinbine: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the Representative of the First District, could I have a copy of that transcript for use back home?"

Speaker Redmond: "See Representative Hill is back with us again. Representative Hill. Representative Hill."

Matijevich: "No, I'm going to stay the way I am, but I'll say if we're here at six o'clock, you'll hear Representative Hill. I promise that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think some of our newer Members maybe didn't quite understand the C.L. McCormick humor is a former Representative from the 59th District. And C.L. as some of you and most of you would know had some great legislation. Every year he used to have a ten thousand dollar annual appropriation for mosquito abatement district down in I believe, Johnson County. He had two other pet projects. One was to improve the roads in southern Illi-



nois and the other was to get more money for the Circuit Court Judges downstate. And, of course, C.L. would get quite excited and the more he would talk the faster he would talk, the higher pitched his voice would get. And if I could do one more, I think I did this a couple of years ago. But this will give you an example of C.L. McCormick getting all of his good things together, trying to get improved roads and more money for the Circuit Court Judges in southern Illinois. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, now I know you guys upstate there in Cook County in Chicago don't know what bad roads is. You don't know what bad roads is till you get down in the back roads of Johnson County. And when this Session is over this summer and then comes the month of July or August, I want you guys from upstate up in northern Illinois, that's you guys up there around Chicago, who don't know what bad roads is, I want you to come down to Johnson County and visit us. And you'll see how the poor folks down there really live. Now when you come down and you drive your cars down them bad roads, and they is really terrible and folks down in Johnson County is so poor, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, that many years ago when they bought flour there was two brands. There was Gold Medal flour and there was the Mother's Best flour. And Mother's Best come in a muslin sack and folks down there who was poor used to make their clothes out of it. As a matter of fact, the women used to make the bloomers out of Mother's Best flour sacks and that's why it was such a big seller. And when you go down the back roads of Johnson County and you see the women a bending over in the tomatos, they're picking the tomatoes. You can look across the seats of their bloomers and you see Mother's Best written across the seat of them bloomers. And I want you people from Cook



County to know when you come down and you go down to Johnson County on them back roads and you see the clothes hanging out on the line, and you see the bloomers out there across the clothesline with Mother's Best written across the bottom of the pants, you know it belongs to the wives of our Circuit Court Judges cause they can't afford to buy them."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rea. Representative Rea."

Rea: " Mr. Speaker, ordinarily I would ask for equal time, but I would like to, at this time, yield to the Tiger of the 59th District."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Harris. Tiger Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm not really wound up like my colleague and northern friend, Representative Jake Wolf. I would like to say this, what he says is entirely true. He's telling the truth about us. Because that's... that's exactly what we do in southern Illinois. There are three counties in my district. Listen to me now. Hear me. Listen to me. Three counties in that district and I can verify this fact by a fellow by the name of Winchester and a fellow by the name of Rea, there are three counties in that district that have the highest unemployment, not in Illinois, not in the Midwest, but the United States. It runs from 18 to 21% you can go in Alexander County. You can see people on the street. You know why they're on the street? Because they don't have anything to do, no work. They've even drawn their unemployment. One thing I want to say about my friend Jake Wolf, I'm proud that he understands our problems. The rest of you in northern Illinois come down and hunt geese with us. Fish with us. Visit the unemployed people with us. Bring your set of shock absorbers. Bring you some new tires cause



you'll need them. But come down and visit us and see what we need. If there's anything available, jobs, roads, state facilities, we'll take them. Thank you, Jake."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I only want to say I'm luck here I sit next to big Giorgi's phone so sometimes I get some messages that come in that otherwise if you don't. But Representative Pierce didn't get that message straight from Samantha. She just called on Representative Giorgi's line and what she really said was, 'Pooh-pooh, pah-pah.'"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, I was just going to say yes to Representative Harris, that Representative Bullock and I would be delighted to come to southern Illinois and visit him in his counties."

Speaker Redmond: "Another Gentleman from southern Illinois, Representative Friedrich, to plead his case."

Friedrich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, you've heard a lot of references to the famous McCormick mosquito speech, but I think I'm one of the few ones that really ever heard it in its original state. But I want to warn you about talking about C.L. because I understand he's going to be a candidate and I understand he's asking for tape-recordings of all the things that go on here and that's said about him. So, he would have a pretty good way to get even. But I really want to tell you the history of that mosquito speech. They did have a mosquito problem down there and of course there's a provision for creating a mosquito abatement district, but that takes quite a bit of time and they had mosquitos and they had them now. So, he took the only thing that was available to him, he asked for ten thousand dollars for mosquito abatement right then. And he got the Bill out of the House. And I happened to be in the Committee



in the Senate when he was pleading his case and it was so good that it finally got to Third Reading in the House and C.L. was hanging on the rail and it was right down the last days of the Session. Everybody was at everybody's throat. So I thought I would do something that was a little bit new and I went to the Lieutenant Governor and the Leadership on both sides and told them I was going to ask to suspend the rules so that a House Member could speak on a House Bill in the Senate. I don't think it had ever been done before. So, C.L. put on his performance over there and just a couple of quotes about it, he said that they were eating all the meat off the cows and horses down there. Said over in the House, said Lillian Piotrowski, that was a Lady that I'm sure most of the people from Chicago will know, said, 'C.L.,' said, 'If they'll eat off the meat off your cows and horses, do you think if I come down they'll take a little weight off of me?' And he said, 'Well, Lillian, so far we haven't been able to control where they bite.' He said, 'Now the Sun-Times said this is a no good Bill, but I want to tell you something. They don't sell enough copies of the Sun-Times in my District to cover a tramp on a park bench.' "

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Harris, I think you forgot to invite everybody from Cook County down to southern Illinois to avoid the one cent sales tax. That goes on today. House Bills, Second Reading. 1577. Second Reading, House Bills, 1577. "

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1577, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Reilly..."



Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Reilly on the floor?"

Anybody know anything about this Amendment? Let's read it and see."

Clerk O'Brien: "It changes ..."

Speaker Redmond: "What is it?"

Clerk O'Brien: "July 1, 1980 to July 1, 1979."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't think we should proceed on this without Mr. Reilly."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Take it out of the record. Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 510, DiPrima. 529, Piel. 530, Harris. 531, Kane. 535, E.G. Steele. And Senate Joint Resolution 74, Oblinger-DiPrima."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative DiPrima. You're on."

DiPrima: "Yes, Sir. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, was that House Resolution 510?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah."

Clerk O'Brien: "510."

DiPrima: "I want to say a few words in regards to this Resolution, Mr. Speaker, if I may?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

DiPrima: "Alright."

Speaker Redmond: "Unusual."

DiPrima: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have Representative Penny Pullen. I don't know. I think she's a Member of the C.I.A. But in any event, she picks up these things wherever she gathers them up from I don't know, but I really want to compliment her. She handed me a pamphlet just a couple of days ago that almost made me puke. Now this pamphlet here says, 'to celebrate the 62nd anniversary of the U.S.S.R., SALT II, pathway to peace. Professor Howard L. Parsons.' And this guy's a member of so many peace conferences, American-Soviet friendship, entertainment, Soviet performers and guests."



Sunday, November the 11th, at two p.m. at Thorn Hall at Northwestern University, now that University has always been close to my heart. But I'm getting leakage at the heart after reading this thing. They're going to celebrate the 62nd anniversary of the U.S.S.R. on Sunday, November the 11th. That's Veteran's Day in our country a national holiday. And here these people have the audacity to want to celebrate the 62nd anniversary of the U.S.S.R. So I want.... I told Penny Pullen, I said, 'Penny, I'm going to have a Resolution drawn up.' And I went down to the Legislative Reference Bureau and I said, 'I want you to really hit them hard.' I said. But anyway, the Resolution was introduced and I'd like to have the Clerk read it if he may. It's like a slap in the wrist the way they drew it up."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 510, Whereas Veteran's Day is both a somber reminder of the narrows of the war and the joy of celebration at the end of hostilities of World War I and World War II. And whereas, it has come to the attention of this Body for some people November 11 is taken upon a new and shocking significance and whereas, on Veteran's Day, Sunday, November 11, 1979, a celebration is to be held not in memory of those who risked their lives for their country, but rather to commemorate the 62nd anniversary of the U.S.S.R. And whereas, under the auspices of the Chicago Council for American-Soviet Friendship, an illtime gathering will occur at North Western University of a group of people who attended without comprehending the length between their right to free assembly with the ending of hostilities in 1918 and 1945. Therefore, be it Resolved by the House of the Eighty-First General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that we express our displeasure with the extremely poor timing of the Chicago Council for American-Soviet Friendship and



scheduling a celebration of the 62nd anniversary of the U.S.S.R. on Veteran's Day."

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

DiPrima: "I want the names of those guys that said no. I wish they'd give me their names."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, I'll give you their names.. It was Borchers... Borchers, Ray Hudson.. Susan Catania, Conti, Bill Walsh. You all voted 'no' on DiPrima's Resolution. Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Not in voting 'no' on the Resolution, but I thought that all of those historic occasions that were mentioned in the Resolution were occasions that we fought to resolve that each person living in this country had an equal right to express his or her views in the manner in which they so desire."

Speaker Redmond: "I thought you moved the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Oh, okay. Representative Giorgi on the adop... on the Agreed Resolutions."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Piel-Getty-Grossi's Resolution of 529 honors Herman J. Passontini,.."

Speaker Redmond: "A little bit lower, nobody can hear you.."

Giorgi: "530 by Harris calls five counties the goose capital of the world. 531 celebrates a 26th pastoral anniversary. 535 recognizes achievements of a citizen. And Senate Joint Resolution 74 by Oblinger and DiPrima asks the Governor to proclaim Novemer 18th to the 24th family week in Illinois and I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The Gentleman has moved the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it."



The motion carried. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Death Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 533, Ewing. With respect to the memory of Livingston County Board Member, Wayne Patterson. House Resolution 534, Getty-Piel-Grossi, with respect to the memory of Phoenix, Illinois, Mayor, William Hawkins."

Speaker Redmond: "Giorgi. Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the two Death Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Death Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carries. The Death Resolutions are adopted. How about the adjournment Resolution? You got that? Page eight. Under Motions. Senate Bill 1125. Representative McCourt? Representative McCourt? Senate Bill 1125, there's a motion on it."

McCourt: "Yes. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this particular Bill has to do with pensions and in the Spring Session it went to a Conference Committee report which passed out of the House. And it got bogged down at a late hour in the Senate. And this motion is just to consider the Second Conference Committee report which has already been prepared, but we have to have this motion until we... so we can consider it. And I move that we adopt the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion on the Gentleman's motion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that provisions of Rule 68-E be suspended in order that Senate Bill 1125 be considered on the Order of Speaker's Table, Conference Committee Reports. Those in favor of the motion indicate by voting 'aye'; opposed 'no'. 89 votes. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 99 .. 100 'aye' and



no 'nay'. The motion prevails. We'll have to get a Supplemental Calendar on that one, Representative McCourt. On page 4, under item veto appears Senate Bill 157, Representative E.M. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, on the item vetos on page 15 lines 2 to 7, there appears a six million, 383 thousand, 600 dollar item. This was... This veto was related to a vetoed motion that both this House and the Senate have already taken action to override. Two weeks ago the House overrode the veto on House Bill 326, which implemented recommendation both of the Governor's Task Force and the Auditor General which removed the funding of General Assembly from a special general assistance... from a special fund and returned it to the general fund. The reason was with the excess buildup in the special purposes fund for general assistance that was not needed because of the decrease in caseload. The Public Aid Department agreed with that. The House overrode that veto on 326. In turn the Senate overrode the veto on this line item, these amounts of money, by a vote of 40 to 9. To keep consistency with the veto overrode of 326 it would require now that the House would so move to override this item veto on lines 2 to 7 on page 15. And I would so move, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Gentleman from Cook is correct because of the vetos that have been overridden we must act on this line item veto and support that as related to 326 and the line item veto on Senate Bill 578 which will follow this. I believe we're all in accord and we should support this line item veto restoration."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is, 'Shall item... the item on page 15 lines 2 through 7



on Senate Bill 157 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' Those in favor indicate by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, just to reiterate and I hope everyone understands what is occurring here. We.. We overrode House Bill 327 (sic) hoping that... 326 both in this House and in the Senate. In turn the Senate overrode this line item so that it will make the override of House Bill 326 consistent. This was a special fund that was set-up in the Department of Public Aid. The Department of Public Aid supports this override. Everyone does and it is necessary. This... The override... The restoration here would remove... In 326 we removed the funding of the General Assem... Assistance from a special fund and returned it to the general revenue fund. This is a clean-up motion to in fact move those dollars from that special fund into the general revenue fund. That's all it is. We've already accomplished the fact and we need to make this restoration to clear.. clear-up the whole, whole position relative to 326 and that special fund."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters. 107. Total Veto is 107. If it's a reduction to put it back again, it's 89."

Barnes: "The problem here, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that everyone understands, if this item is not restored, this in fact will.. will in all practical purposes deem that that department will come back for a supplemental. You have to have this restoration. Otherwise the department is put at a real... a real disadvantage... a real problem within the department relative to general assistance."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

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



my apologies first of all for rising late on this issue. But Representative Barnes is exactly correct in what he ends up saying. Had we not overridden the veto on 326, I would have then asked the Assembly to sustain the Governor's action on this particular item. But in view of the fact that both the House and the Senate overrode 326, there is no way that we can end up spending this 600... 6 million.. 6.4 million in this special trust fund unless we end up overriding this particular line item here. So I would urge the Members on both sides of the aisle to allow that money to be spent for the purposes that it was intended to be spent with the first time. So if you would end up giving it enough green lights to have it passed, we'd appreciate it."

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I know there is a little bit of confusion on the floor. And .. And it is a confusing matter. We would have objected to an override on this particular item except for the fact that the House already declared its intention as did the Senate in overriding House Bill 326. Now that we've vote.. overridden House Bill 326, the only way we could get a handle on this cash is by overriding the line item veto on this particular line item. Representative Barnes is 100% correct in what he is saying. So we would appreciate your 'yes' vote on this particular item."

Speaker Redmond: "Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 116 'aye' and 38 'no'. The motion, having received the 3/5ths Constitutional Majority, prevails and the item on page 15, lines 2 through 7 are declared passed, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, at this time, could .. would



it be possible to go to Representative Totten's 578
cause that's the other part of this..."



Speaker Redmond: "Five-seven-eight... Item veto motion on page 5, Representative Totten is... Representative Totten is here. He was not here earlier, but he is here now and he is duly penitent."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The line item restoration on Senate Bill 578 is part of what we just restored on Senate Bill 157 and the override of the veto on 326, and we must do it. This is to restore the one dollar to the special purpose trust fund so that the Legislature can appropriate the funds for the Department of Aid through this fund. These funds have not been appropriated in the past, and the Governor vetoed it out. But because we have overridden 326 and have now restored the money, we have put this motion before the House in order to complete the cycle, and I would ask that the Members support the motion to restore the money in Senate Bill 378 for this purpose."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes, do you desire to discuss this?"

Barnes: "No, just to reiterate and agree with Representative Totten, he is absolutely correct. This is tied in with the action that we just took. I would urge all of the Members to support Representative Totten on this override."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Would the Sponsor of the motion yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Leinenweber: "Is the fiscal implication of this motion \$1?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "What was the question?"

Leinenweber: "Is the fiscal implication of this vote \$1?"

Totten: "That is correct. All it does is keep the trust fund so that we can appropriate through it." One dollar to keep it alive."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is 'Shall the item on page 10,



lines 9 through 12 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? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 124 'aye' and 114 'no'. This motion having received 3/5ths Constitutional Majority prevails, and the item on page 10 lines 9 through 12 declared passed notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. Representative Flinn."



Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to.. for you to note the Board that Representative Pullen is voting to spend money."

Speaker Redmond: "Is::somebody voting Representative Pullen's switch? It's the language of the flowers. How about 578, Representative Barnes? Do you want to go on that one? 578? Or was that identical with... That's the same. You and Totten both had the same motion, didn't you? That cost a little more printing. Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, may I withdraw it?"

Speaker Redmond: "Okay."



Speaker Redmond: "What about Representative Younge on 157? That's on page four. Representative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the item on page 16, lines 28 to 31 of Senate Bill 157 do pass, the items vetoed by the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. This is a line item for the sum of 100 thousand dollars which would be made available to the Institute of Natural Resources as a fund that would be available to the various cities and municipalities and suburban and agricultural groups all over Illinois to apply to the Institute of Natural Resources for small grants for technical assistance and applications to the Department of Energy so that these cities or agricultural groups could become energy self-sufficient. And I ask that you vote 'yes' on this matter."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question... Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, it's a shame this is not being voted on tomorrow when I think that we .. a rather major announcement made by the Secretary of the Department of Energy with regard to alternative energy at the Alcohol Fuels Day at the fairgrounds. Regardless of that, there are ... There's a real possibility I think for rural School Districts to get together and produce their own alcohol. Now, there were headlines in the paper about a month and a half ago about rural school districts, not .. well, even some not so rural school districts not being able to get the amount of gasoline that they need to get in order to run the buses. In fact, my school district was told it was only going to get 2/3rds of what it needs. Well if you can't get gasoline, it certainly is possible to stretch the supply of oil by adding alcohol. In fact, it's possible to run internal combustion engines on straight alcohol with the new invention that has been.. for which a patent has been applied for in.. by two guys in Elgin. There is a paperwork problem though. Educators don't know really how.. how to go about this. And it seems to me that this is something that can't hurt, although I do... I'm a little hesitant about the agencies going too. The grants proposal plan they put



out so far will probably take longer for people to figure out than the money that they're supplying is worth to go get. But it's a step in the right direction. I think we ought to override the veto."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any further discussion? Representative VanDuyne."

VanDuyne: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could I ask the Sponsor a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Surely."

VanDuyne: "Well, my question lies a little bit in the past. It seems this last year when .. if this is the Omnibus Commission Bill, and I think it is, it seems that there were... it was so-called last June, the 'Christmas tree', or whatever type of name they wanted to attach to it. But anyway, some of the things that I wanted for my district were on this Bill and it seems that some of our leaders over in the Senate saw fit to purge those things from the Conference Committee report and you know, I don't really see where it's any different today just because Representative Barnes and Representative (sic) Carroll seem to think that these things are important to them. There were a few things that I thought were important to me last year too. And so I, for one, am going to sustain the Governor on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge to close."

Younge: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will simply say that this fund would be available for cities, suburban and agricultural groups all over the state of Illinois to apply for assistance for technical assistance and for the application process. So, therefore, I ask you to please support me in this and override the Governor's veto. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall the item on page 16, lines 28 to 31 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Younge."

Younge: "Just let me explain my vote please while we're voting green on this. The United States is running out of oil and we have to convert to some alternative energy resource and this Bill, in



this Amendment is about the establishing of a fund in the Institute of Natural Resources so that various cities and agricultural groups and suburban groups all over Illinois can apply to the Department of Energy for projects for alternative energy resource development. Now, when we say, 'alternative energy resource development', what are we referring to? We are referring to solar, geo-thermal, and wind power. If we're running out of oil then we have to quickly, quickly convert to something else. The emphasis up to now has been on large scale projects. The emphasis up to now has been on high technology, large scale development, nuclear energy and etc. The need... The need is for there to be a fund for the various cities to apply to the Institute of Natural Resources so that the intent of the Federal Government can be materialized and cities will become self-sufficient. All over Illinois now there are these municipal buildings. There are these public facilities that are very energy costly. They are very wasteful of the energy resources and what we have to do is to provide the means for various municipalities to apply to the Federal Government for the funds so that we can stop the rising costs of fuel bills. The most urgent problem that we, as a nation have, is this whole question of how we're going to get out of the command of foreign policy... powers as it results... as a result of the embargos and boycotts on oil that is being imported. It is said that some 50% of our oil comes from abroad. That means that we, as a nation, quickly, quickly must convert and develop the solar power, the power from the sun, wind power, geo-thermal, fusion and fission and every other kind of alternative energy resource that we can. And that is what this Bill is about, the development of alternative energy resources. And I'll ask you to support this override because it will mean that there will be a new emphasis in the Institute of Natural Resources so that the... rather than just universities and research laboratories having all of the facility to apply for these grants, our municipalities and agricultural groups will have the ability to develop alternative sources of energy. And,



for these reasons, I'll ask you for a green vote so that this:
veto can be overridden. And Representative Borchers is trying to
be loca...Mr. Speaker? "

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge?"

Younge: "Representative Borchers is trying to get your attention, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not for sure whether Representative
Younge would really want my help on this or not. But during
the war, I can tell you that all of the French cars were running
on pure alcohol. Now if this will help develop our knowledge and
I suspect all we'd have to do is write to France and we'd know it
right now, but we could run all our cars on pure alcohol. And
there's no doubt about that in my mind because I saw it. However,
I would like to point out there is a danger there. I believe
the rich French run their cars on champagne and I don't think we
have that kind of material in quantity for the champagne.
I'm just kidding on that, Representative Younge."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the
record. On this question there's 112 'aye', and 45 'no'. The
motion, having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority,
prevails and the item on page 16, lines 28 to 31 passes, notwith-
standing the veto of the Governor."



Speaker Redmond: "Want to try 809 Representative J. David Jones on Total Veto Motions? Page 3. 809. Representative Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, since this Bill has been in process on the override motion the Senator Sponsor, Senator Davidson, and I have been in conference with Representatives of the Aviation industry and they have supplied us with information that indicates that they are working to comply with the concept of this legislation. In view of that, we would like to withdraw the motion, but with the understanding that if this.. if they do not continue to work out this problem that we would be back with them..."

Speaker Redmond: "Then you're withdrawing the motion with respect to 809, is that correct? Okay. 883. Representative J. David Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like leave to have 883 and 884 considered together. They're both..."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to have 883 and 884 considered together? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Will you read 884? Go ahead. Representative Jones."

Jones: "I ask for your support to override Governor Thompson's veto of this important piece of legislation and a companion appropriation Bill. In passing this Bill last June by an overwhelming majority of 131 to 19 in this House, the Illinois House expressed its compassion and concern for women and adolescents faced with unplanned pregnancies. This passed on October the 17th, the State Senate again concurred with the spring legislative vote by overriding the Governor's veto 43 to 12. Governor Thompson vetoed these Bills on Constitutional grounds which ties the hands of the



Department of Public Health who would have made the grant allocations to various private, non-for-profit agencies providing comprehensive services for these women. The Supreme Court ruled in June, 1977 that states do not have to fund abortions. Congress prohibited funding programs performing abortions under their adolescent pregnancy program. Congress also has most importantly prohibited funding of programs using abortions as a family planning method. Therefore, 883 is Constitutional. 883 and 4 do not compete with the Department of Public Health and maternal programs because this legislation is for agencies providing a variety of comprehensive on-site services, educational, vocational, nutritional, so forth as listed in Senate Bill 883 or linkage to these services in the community. The Act confronts the problem of unplanned pregnancies with positive solutions and enables the State of Illinois to become a forerunner of model programs designed to aid these critical situations in a humane manner. So many alternative centers rely heavily on volunteers and their community for support. An override of SB 883 and 4 will provide a much needed commitment from the state and allow these agencies to hire paid professionals along with the volunteers and expand the realm of service to these needy individuals. Your consideration of this override will be greatly appreciated by all interested parties."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber?"

Leinenweber: "Yeah, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Gentleman's motion here on Senate Bills 883 and 884. I've looked at the Governor's message and frankly, I don't understand what he's talking about. Cause he claims that the Bill is Constitutionally suspect, but he doesn't enlighten us in what possible way it might be Constitutionally suspect. I therefore, feel that he probably didn't know and just wanted to use that



as the particular reason for vetoing the Bill. The Bill was put in last Session to meet a very real problem and that is, problem pregnancies. It was an effort on the part of this General Assembly to meet a problem which we are often criticized particularly those of us who do happen to oppose abortion, often criticized for not doing anything for people who are pregnant. Now it would certainly be inconsistent for us to come up with money to treat problem pregnancies if we're going to use that money to cause abortions. So the Bill was written that this money was not to be used to counsel for abortions. That makes a great deal of sense for those of us who feel that abortions are not proper. In any event, the Bill is very clearly not Constitutionally suspect. Cause I think if the Governor had really thought that it was he would have told us in what way it is unconstitutional. He didn't do so. It's a good Bill. It's a good program. And I urge the support of the Gentleman's motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative J. David Jones to close. Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This legislation will as it was pointed out by the Sponsor and also by Representative Leinenweber will provide a certain funding and information for women adolescents who are faced with these unplanned pregnancies. The... There was an Amendment adopted in here which prevents the use of these funds for contraceptive purposes and to my knowledge the pro-life organizations in Illinois and pro-life in general favors this legislation and I also feel that this has been... This particular proposal has been developed in other states and it's been ruled Constitutional so I can't see where the Governor's position will hold up. And those of you that are not even favorable to my position on the



issue of abortion should also support this measure for the override. So I will join my colleague, Representative Jones, in supporting his motion."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill..'
Representative Currie."

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

I reluctantly rise to oppose the override of the Governor's veto on House... on Senate Bills 883 and 884. I think the intention of the Sponsors to do something to help when teenagers find themselves facing unwanted pregnancies is indeed a very useful one. My concern with the Bill is not what Representative Kelly stated, that it does not permit money to go for contraception, In fact, there's a prohibition in the Bill against the money being used by any agency which might .. any agency or organization that refers or counsels listing abortion as a viable alternative. The fact is the Catholic charities, the Salvation Army, many of the groups that are involved, working with teenagers who find themselves with unwanted pregnancies, will not be eligible to receive these dollars. There are paranatal programs already operating in the State of Illinois. A real commitment to dealing with the problems of teenage pregnancies I think would funnel funds through the existing programs rather than creating this one which so limits the use of the money that it is not at all clear to me that we're doing anything truly important to help resolve the problem. So, although the concerns that lead to the introduction of the Bill is an important one, a serious one, in fact, a critical one, I don't think that the way the Bill is drafted in fact, it will meet the real need."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 884

pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted



who wish? Representative Deuster, to explain his vote."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, one of the purposes of this Bill is to provide prenatal care and any of you who are familiar with the infant mortality rates in Illinois know that it's a scandal. If there's one thing that pregnant women need particularly unmarried young pregnant women, it is prenatal care. Anything we can do to provide care and for information about diet and the other things that are needed by those who are pregnant we ought to do. And it is true that I offered the Amendment that has upset Representative Currie to provide that although there can be a lot of counseling, one thing the Bill won't do is, contraceptives will not be passed out free to unmarried teenage girls. I think that's a reasonable restriction in the law. I think the main thrust of this is to provide prenatal care and good counseling and that's what's needed. I urge more green lights. Thank you."

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

Jones: "In explaining my vote in response to some of the remarks made on the other side of the aisle, I will refer you to the testimony presented by Senator Rock when this Bill was in the Senate. We have in the fact that a number of programs, a number of grant recipients, like Planned Parenthood and Family Planning, and a number of others who do in fact, counsel and refer for abortions. What we are suggesting is that there's another whole segment of our society who are entitled to this kind of money, these kind of grants who do not so refer in the Constitutional question that the Governor brings up frankly is fallacious. "

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 'aye'... Representative Greiman. Well, the motion, having re-



ceived the Constitu.. 3/5ths Constitu... Wait a minute now. Representative Greßman requests a poll of the absentees. Verification? Representative Greiman requests a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Poll the absentees. Representative Jones requests a poll of the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees: Abramson. Bowman. Capuzi. .."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Capuzi, 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the poll of the absentees. Davis. Ewell. Virginia Frederick. Dwight Friedrich. Gaines. Garmisa. Goodwin. Griesheimer. Hallstrom. Kempiners. Kornowicz..."

Speaker Redmond: "Kornowicz, 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Kozubowski. Margulas..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers, 'aye'. Representative Watson, 'aye'. Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, will you please change me from 'aye' to 'no'?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Barnes, 'present'."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the poll of the absentees. Matijeich. McAuliffe. McBroom. McPike. Mugalian. Oblinger. Polk. Preston. Schneider. Schoeberlein. Schuneman. Simms..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms, 'aye'. McPike, 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the poll of the absentees. Terzich. Vinson. And, Wikoff."

Speaker Redmond: "What is the count now? Representative Vinson, 'aye'. Representative White, 'no'. Representative Henry, 'no'. Representative Grossi, 'no'. That's what I thought. Representative Grossi desires to be recorded as 'aye'. Representative Pouncey, 'no'. Schneider, 'no'. Brummer... Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a good deal of



confusion about this Bill. I.. There were a number of us that had our lights on to explain our vote in support of this Bill and then there appeared to be plenty of votes up there to pass it. This is a very .. And I wonder if I could explain my vote?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed. Representative Preston and VanDuyne, please sit down."

Brummer: "Yes, this is a very, very crucial Bill I think and it's not a..an anti-abortion Bill. It's an alternative to abortion. It's to assist those who decided they do not want an abortion to offer them alternatives and support with regard to that and to counsel them so that they can make a decision with regard to the alternatives or with regard to the decision of whether they want to have an abortion or not. I think everybody on this House Floor regardless of their philosophical beliefs about abortion, ought to be supporting this and I would urge more green lights."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMasters desires to be verified now. Does he have permission? Hearing no objection.. Representative Griesheimer. Griesheimer. Griesheimer."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is Representative Griesheimer recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is not recorded as voting."

Griesheimer: "Please vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "'Aye', Griesheimer. Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Just one thought that I might.... I didn't speak during debate, I would also explain my vote as did Representative Brummer. If I might?"

Speaker Redmond: "Go ahead. Explain your vote."

Greiman: "Alright. Well, this Bill went out in its original form barely out of Executive Committee and it got out with my vote. I gave this Bill my vote in Executive Committee before these various Amendments were put on.



It came... It was originally introduced as a sensitive response to difficult crisis for young women. And that's why I gave it my vote in Executive. But when it got to the floor, it was appropriated, taken over by a whole different kind of approach. It is an alternative. It's very narrow Bill and a subject which should be just as broad as anything so that we can intelligently deal with young women who are in crisis. And for that reason I vote... I've asked for a poll of the ab...a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Brien desires to be recorded as 'aye'. Representative Preston, 'aye'. Representative Bowman, 'no'. Representative Patrick, 'no'. Anyone else? Representative Bradley? Representative Bradley, can he be verified? Representative Wikoff, 'aye'. Representative Hudson. Hudson."

Hudson: "Mr. Speaker? Would you change my vote from 'no' to 'aye' on this?"

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from 'no' to 'aye'. Any other changes? Representative Huskey, 'aye'. Representative Kent, 'aye'. Anyone else? What is the total now? 122 'aye', 19 'no'. The Gentleman persist in his request for a verification? It says, 'persist' in the rules. That's why I used it."

Greiman: "In that I am duly intimidated, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "The motion for verification has been withdrawn. On this question there's 122 'aye' and 19 'no'. The motion, having received the Constitutional 3/5ths Majority, prevails and Senate Bill 884 is declared passed and 883. 883 and 884 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. Senate Bills.. No. House Bills, Third Reading. House Bill 2818, Representative Ryan on the floor? Ryan, 2818?"

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2818, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Motor Vehicle Retail Installment Sales



Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2818..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan..."

Ryan: "House Bill 2818 is the... The Chief Sponsor is the Speaker and I am a Co-Sponsor. It amends the Motor Vehicle Retail Installment Sales Act and it raises the interest rate which can be charged for auto loans to 10% add on from 8% add on. Last night the Bill was amended to put a ceiling on it for two years until December the 31st, 1981 and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Kelly. Kelly."

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to ask the Sponsor a question and I'm not sure whether or not he has this information, but these automobile dealers, they do make a profit when these retail sales are set up, when they purchase these automobiles through the financial institution or the other credit market. And I was wondering when they do make an arrangement, let's say through a bank, what percentage is actually given back to the automobile dealership when these arrangements are made and the loan is made? How much of a profit is there on this, George?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan?"

Ryan: "Well, I'm not sure that I can answer, Representative, other than I guess it varies and it's... there's no set pattern for it."

Kelly: "Well, okay. So..."

Ryan: "Somewhere between one half and..."

Kelly: "That's fine. I should have... I was on the Committee when it came up and I did have several questions but I didn't get any direct answer on just how much profit is



made and I do think there's a profit that a lot of people aren't aware of that's made in this area, but I'm still going to support the measure."

Ryan: "Well, I understand, Representative, that it's somewhere between a half and one percent and it really isn't... it isn't profit. It's to take care of the cost of the paperwork."

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

J. Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to explain my vote. I just don't want to let this .. let this Bill pass without at least a comment that we're talking about raising the.. the interest that can be charged on the... on a loan for a motor vehicle from \$8.00 per hundred to \$10.00 per hundred. Now that's not just a raise from 8 to 10%, Ladies and Gentlemen. When you talk about the way interest rates are calculated on car loans, that's what we call the add on interest rate. And you can roughly double the interest rate that's shown on the.. in the Bill here and shown on the car loan. If it's 8%, it's not quite 16%. If you run it up to 10%, it's not quite 20%. So what you're doing in these times of inflation when car prices have jumped and skyrocketed, when we can't take the sales tax off food and medicine, and when we can take the ceiling off the usury rate, you're telling people that at \$2.00 a gas... \$2.00 a gallon for gas that's coming and with groceries that they can't afford and a house they can't buy, that now they won't even be able to afford to buy a new car. Beware of what you're doing here. You're telling... You're telling those who finance new cars that they can add roughly 20%, charge 20% interest to the cost of that car for nothing more than the paperwork that's involved in processing and advancing the funds to buy the car. I maintain that 8% add on rate



is plenty enough interest for .. for those who finance cars. They can charge up to 16% that way. This is a bad Bill. You should pull the votes off to hold this down. Let's do one thing for the consumer while we're here this Session. We haven't done anything for the people back home. Lets at least do one thing for them and beat this bad Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Clerk will take the record..."

Ryan: "In response to that, Representative, let's point out the figures correctly. Eight percent add on works out to be about 14½%. And ten percent add on works out to almost 18%, not 20. This kind of thing you do with sales tax relief because we voted sales tax relief out of here yesterday and I know that you didn't vote for it. So if you didn't want to provide that, that's not my fault."

Speaker Redmond: "Cullerton, 'aye'..."

Ryan: "This rate's been in effect in 1967 and the banks basically have to loan out their money and pay the interest that.. at the same fee. So it's not as lucrative as it might sound to you."

Speaker Redmond: "Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 118 'aye'... Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, I request a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there's 118 'aye' and 14 'no'. Representative Dunn has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Ryan requests a poll of the absentees. Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk. Representative Gene Hoffman. Gene Hoffman, 'aye!'"

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

Bradley. Domico. Ewell. Henry. Huff. Katz. Kornowicz.
Kosinski. Lechowicz. McAuliffe. McBroom. Oblinger.
O'Brien. Patrick. Polk. Pouncey..."



Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman, for what purpose... record Greiman, 'no'. Also Matijevich is supposed to be 'no'. And Hanahan 'no'. And White, 'no'. Williams, 'no'. To 'present'? 'Present' to 'no' for Williams. Barnes, 'no'. Alexander, 'no'. Mugalian .. I wonder if we ought to dump this Roll Call. I think many Members weren't aware. Could we dump this Roll Call and we're going to have another Roll Call? Alright, the question is... On Third Reading, all in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed 'no'. Hanahan, could you vote me 'no'? McClain and Sharp 'no' also White. McClain and Sharp are 'no'. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, the national economy is going to hell in a handbasket under the Democratic administration and I think one of the reasons that it is has nothing to do with the Democratic administration and that is, the expansion of consumer credit well beyond the means of people to repay it. If we're ever going to have another crash, it's going to be because of consumer credit, not because of people raising interest on home mortgages. And I really fear for the people that are going to go out and be given a six or an eight thousand dollar loan to buy a car which they cannot afford to pay off and probably will never pay off. They'll probably never own a car. Before they pay off the loan, the car will have to be traded in because it will have fallen apart. I just.. There really is... There's a very serious problem and I think we're adding to it. There's a reason interest rates have been raised by the national administration. The reason is that they don't want people to buy cars. Now here we are saying that we don't agree, that we think inflation should continue. Now the Consumer Price Index in the Chicago metropolitan



area I predict will lead farther than any other metropolitan area in the entire country when the December.. when the figures for November are in. It will occur because today we have added a 20% sales tax increase on every car purchased in Cook County. Now on top of that what we're going to do is increase the interest rate by-what is it?- about 4 percentage points divided by 14 percentage points? Divide that out somebody that's... Woody, why don't you divide that out? You're good at math in your head. That's a rather phenomenal increase in interest rates. And the people, you know, I don't.. I don't take out a loan to buy a car. I pay cash. That's... But there are all sorts of people that can't afford to pay cash and they get sucked into this consumer loan racket. And they're just never going to be able to pay it back and I just don't... I'm in favor of the increase in the usury rate for the home mortgages, but I just don't think that something like this ought to be done."

Speaker Matájevich: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Tim Simms, to explain his vote. One minute."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this legislation is important. One out of every six people in the United States today is employed in the automobile industry in one way or another. If people are not going to purchase automobiles, you eventually are going to have a domino situation where you're going to have massive unemployment. This just makes available to the people that would like to purchase automobiles that right. At the present time, most financial institutions are not making car loans. Automobile sales are down. I think we should give the people the opportunity at least to buy a car if they want to. And I would urge more green votes to get this Bill passed."

Speaker Matijevech: "The Gentlemen from Lake, Representative



Deuster to explain his vote. One minute."

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the passage of this Bill is not going to force anybody to buy a car. Those who have a car and who realize the high interest rates and the problems of borrowing money at this time in our economy, will probably do as all of us are thinking about doing and that is, keeping that car a little longer and realizing that it's unwise to buy a car if you don't have to. But there's some people that have to. Some people must and this Bill will simply make it possible for that money, that money to be available so that they can even though for most of us we might want to keep our car a little longer. For those who must buy this will make it possible for the money to be there and I urge all of us to pass this Bill which is really a freedom Bill. We have truth in lending. Everybody knows about interest and the costs associated with buying a car. This will simply make it free for them so that they will have the choice and so that we have not by closing our eyes to their needs, deprive them of making that choice of whether or whether or not to buy a car."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Balanoff, to explain her vote."

Balanoff: "I don't see how anyone who represents a District in Cook County could vote 'aye' on this Bill. You know, today is November 1st and the car dealers in Cook County were crying when the sales tax was increased. They said this would drive car sales out of Cook County because 6% on a \$7,000 car will make people... will help people to drive out of Cook County to buy cars. This would permit an even higher charge and will drive the business from Cook County. So I don't see how anyone could vote 'aye' on this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative



Huskey, to explain his vote."

Huskey: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there's ... you're talking... You're the fancy soothsayers talking about the Consumer Act, helping the consumer. I'll tell you one thing, if you don't vote for this Bill you're going to hurt the consumer. The American public is in love with the automobile. He's going to have it regardless of what interest he pays. The banks cannot make any money, loaning money at the present rate. So they'll take the money and I am speaking with experience, I'm a Director in two banks. They're going to take that money and put it in places that they can make money. If they can't make money on automobiles, they're going to withdraw that money from automobile loans and put it in various places. And it's going to drive the man that's going to buy the automobile and he's going to buy it. Believe me, he's going to buy it cause he's in love with the automobile. He's not going to do without it. So that forces into the local loan companies at 18% add on interest. So if you want to defeat this Bill you're defeating a consumer Bill. You're chasing your consumer to the small loan companies with an 18% interest. So your 'no' vote is not helping our consumer at all. It's only hurting him because the bankers don't care. They'll take their money and put it where they can get the most for it."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Huff, to explain his vote."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm going to vote for this measure even though I know it won't do much toward increasing the consumer market. But like a previous speaker mentioned, and I imagine it is true, that a couple of hundred thousand maybe a million people who have to have some mode of transportation this year. For that reason, I'm going to



vote for it. However, I really believe that the effect of this measure if it does pass, is to increase the consumer deposit accounts in the bank and I don't think that's altogether a bad thing. So I'm going to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentlemen from Henderson, Representative Neff, to explain his vote."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In explaining my 'yes' vote, we want to keep in mind that the automobile, the economy is based on it, whether we like it or don't like it and when we stop car sales which we have been doing as the car sales have been off now, and what the problem is when a car dealer goes to borrow money, or finance his paper which he must do at the bank, the banks are paying more money than what they can get on the 8% usury rate and so they're either refusing to take that note, or else they're adding on one to two points on them. And that means that he has to pay more out of his profit and it cuts his profit down and what we're doing here, we're just hurting the automobile industry just a little more. And I think we've done enough in the State of Illinois to hurt the business economy and with economy based on the automobile like it is today, I just don't see how we can afford not to vote to allow them to have this interest rate raised to what is... what today is normal."

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

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

Oh, the Lady from Cook- I'm sorry, I didn't see you- Penny Pullen, to explain her vote."

Pullen: "Thank you. A previous speaker said that if we pass this Bill we're saying that we like inflation and we want to keep fueling it along. Well I would say that we're saying something a little bit different. We're saying that the people are not the cause of infla-



tion, the United States Congress is the cause of inflation. The Federal Reserve is saying that the people are the cause of inflation. That is why they are creating the policies they are and they're trying to cover up what the Congress is doing to us. We are saying that we shouldn't have the right to continue our style of living and let Congress shape up. Let the real culprits in the case have to pay the price, not the people of the State of Illinois. Please vote 'aye' on this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 106 'aye's, 37 'nay's, and the Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Ryan. Henry says change: his vote from 'no' to 'aye'."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This was as I pointed out earlier, Speaker Redmond's Bill and I was only handling it for him. I unders... I know now that he left the podium. You dumped the Roll Call. And now he's not to be found. And I was going to put this on Postponed Consideration, but as far as I'm concerned it can go."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. Well, we're going to see some people want attention before we do that. The Gentleman from Flinn... St. Clair, Representative Flinn, wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn. Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time I would like to request a verification of this Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Birchler, 'aye'. Birchler, 'aye'. Peters, 'aye'. Representative Peters, 'aye'. Are there any other changes? Richmond, 'aye'. Harris, 'aye'. McAuliffe, 'aye'. Catania, 'no'. Susan Catania, 'no'. Are there any other before we... Could the Clerk give me a count? 113 'aye's. Mugalian, 'aye'. 114 'aye's and . and



Representative Dunn wishes to remove his request for a verification. 114 'aye's and how many 'nay's? 33 'no's and House Bill 2818, having received the Constitutional 3/5th Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Ryan, do you want to go to the 2811 or not? Out of the record."



Speaker Matijevich: "The ... Representative McClain moves that the Regular Session be in recess at the call of the Chair. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no', and the Regular Session is now in recess to go into the Special Session. The Special Session is now convened. Reading of the Journal. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell."

Clerk O'Brien: "Journal for the First Legislative Day, Wednesday, October 17th, of the Special Session of the Eighty-First General Assembly of the State of Illinois..."

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

Yourell: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we dispense with the reading of the Journal, and that Journal #1 of October 17th and Journal #2 of October 18th, 1979 be approved as read."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved the dispensing of the reading of the Journal. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay', and the motion carries. The Journal is dispended ... The Dispensing of the reading of the Journal carries. Representative Yourell moves that the Roll Call of the Regular Session shall be the Roll Call of the Third Special Session. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay', and the Roll Call of attendance is the Roll Call of the Regular Session (sic). Representative Madigan now moves that the Third Special Session be in recess until the call of the Chair. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no', and the Third Special Session is in recess until the call of the Chair and we are now in Regular Session and hold still until we find out our Order of business. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty, on Senate Bill 147. This is Senate Bill 147. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move to over-



ride the Governor's veto on Senate Bill 147. Presently in Illinois, there are no statutory provisions concerning the establishment of tenure at community colleges. Due to the absence of such statutory provisions, each community college Board is able to establish its own tenure policy. As a result of that we have kind of a quasi... crazy quilt pattern of such tenure provisions. This would establish a uniform provision throughout the state. Faculty Members who have been employed in the district for three consecutive school years would be granted tenure with the provision that the local school Board would have an option to extend the probationary period for one additional school year. Each local Board is responsible for developing a procedure to evaluate its probationary teachers. The Bill provides for dismissal of tenured faculty Members for cause where the local Board must first approve by a Majority vote of all its Members a motion to dismiss such tenure faculty Member. The local Board then gives certain written notice and the Member can ask for a hearing. It provides for a sensible scheme of reduction in the number of faculty Members and I believe this is a Bill that would provide a uniformity and fairness throughout the State of Illinois for our community college teachers and I would ask for your support in overriding what I think is a very unfortunate veto by the Governor."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Getty has moved to override the Governor's veto with respect to Senate Bill 147. On that motion, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,

this Bill is not as bad as the Bill that passed the House and was sponsored by the Illinois Education Association because that Bill excluded Chicago from its



provisions. This Bill at least applies to all of the junior colleges in the state. It is, however, not good because what it does is take away local control from Junior College Boards. When the Junior College Act was passed in 1965 it provided for local initiative to create the junior colleges within that district and it provided also for local control, that is, the election in all cases except for Chicago and except for the East St. Louis District, which is controlled by the State. But appointment in Chicago of Junior College Board Members by the Mayor who are responsive to her or him and he, of course, or she is responsive to the people. In the case of other districts, a great preponderance of them in the State, those Members are responsive to the people that elect them and they, in turn, must provide a good service for those people. And I submit to you that generally, by and large, they do provide that service and they do it by negotiating contracts with teachers. That's one of the most important functions of an elected Board, and that is the hiring and firing and negotiating contracts with teachers. In almost of the junior college districts within the State, this is done. They have collective bargaining and within the collective bargaining agreement they provide for tenure. Now I suggest to you to mandate tenure for junior college districts removes junior colleges, in effect, from the college system of the State where there is not a tenure provision except by collective bargaining to the system used in the elementary and secondary schools where we, in our wisdom, mandate tenure. I suggest that it's wrong, that if it's correct to mandate tenure for junior colleges, then we must do it for the university system as well. It's wrong, however, for us to do that. We should remain with tenure as a part of collective



bargaining agreement where, in almost all cases, as I mentioned, it is done. So I urge you to defeat this Bill and maintain local control within junior college districts."

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

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if the last Gentleman spoke the hundred percent of the truth, possibly I would not, nor would any of the unions or Education Associations want this Bill. But what he said is half true. There is no collective bargaining law in the junior college or the community college system of this State. If there were such a law possibly we would not need this override motion. The fact remains that there is a crazy quilt pattern. In the 33rd Legislative District, like in many of your Legislative Districts, you may have 2,3, or 4 community colleges within your Legislative District each one setting up its own policy on whether or not to retain a qualified, experienced, advocate teacher in its system that has been on Board for more than 3 years. That's all this Bill does. It's not such a horrendous Bill. All we're saying is that there should be a uniformity. And I concur with the Representative from LaGrange that if we had a collective bargaining law, a decent collective bargaining law, in both the Boards and the educators, the teachers, the professors, had the ability to negotiate, truly negotiate, without.. without any fear of reprisal under a labor relations Board auspices, I'm sure we probably wouldn't need this law because they're would be granted under collective bargaining. But the fact is we don't have law and that there is crazy quilt patterns set around the State and we need this override in order to set straight the fact that in our community colleges, if a professor is teaching there for 3 years, and has been accepted as part of that



community, and has had the dedication shown, certainly shown, to that community, that he shouldn't willy-nilly be discharged because somebody disagrees with his or her views. I support this override and I think it's meritorious and should be overwhelmingly endorsed by this House."

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

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, during my second term in this House I devoted almost my full time to an examination of the tenure system. I visited with almost every school in my district and I was trying not to abolish tenure, but to reform it. I spoke with teachers; I spoke with parents; I spoke with school Board Members; I spoke with everyone who had some experience with the way tenure works in our elementary schools and our secondary schools. And the general conclusion that I heard from teachers as well as school Board Members and mothers and fathers who were interested, not with job security, but with educational performance, was that although tenure may sound good, the idea of telling someone why they are being dismissed and having a trial, that may sound good, but the net result is you lock in mediocrity and you lock in poor teachers. You make it extremely difficult to remove those who are not doing a good job of educating. An example is that as a result of the tenure law most school administrators realize that it's almost impossible to dismiss a poor teacher. It can be done, but you have to concoct evidence almost of the same kind that you would use to convict a rapist or a criminal. You have to build a case. You have to spend your time gathering evidence when you should be instead guiding education. And so the result has been.... I found in our schools in Lake County that they



evaluate the performance of probationary teachers cause they can fire them if they're no good. But with tenure teachers, they don't even bother to evaluate them in many cases. And you will find if you read this Bill, this Bill reflects what's really wrong with the tenure system because on page two, it requires that probationary teachers be evaluated, that their performance be evaluated, but once they're tenured, no, this Bill doesn't even require that you consider or evaluate the performance cause this Bill concedes in its very language that once they're locked in, they're virtually impossible to get rid of a mediocre teacher who is being paid with tax dollars to educate the children and should be removed. I think that we should allow the due process and fair hearing procedures for teachers to be something that are established through collective bargaining or as they are in the State of Wisconsin, through the simple matter of due process recognized by the courts. This is.. was an unwise Bill that will not tend to improve or upgrade the quality of teaching. It will tend to lock in people to jobs and I think that's unwise and we should oppose this motion to override. Thank you."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members. It's no wonder that we need legislation like this when you listen to Don Deuster equating it with the criminal procedure. It's that kind of attitude, of course, that discourages school districts probably from evaluating teachers. Let me just say this, I won't talk too long. I've said this before.. is that school Boards and in this case, college Boards of trustees, have the.. if they have the proper procedure for evaluating teachers, there is an ongoing system for that. A teacher that



has failed to comply with the Board and their direction on what constitutes proper and adequate and functional teaching, that teacher should be dismissed long before it gets to the position of dealing with tenure. What you also should know, of course, is that it's not such an obscene idea because of the 39 college districts, 29 of those already have tenure provisions and they also have probationary periods which range from 2 to 6 years. That means that during that 2 to 6 year period if a school district is doing its job and if it knows what they want from a classroom teacher in terms of excellence in education, they should have achieved it long before that person reaches tenure. Tenure does help deal with eliminating arbitrary actions by trustees and Boards and that guarantees a teacher the kind of job that he wants or she wants to be able to teach properly and with an opportunity to carry out his or her assignment. I don't think this is such a dramatic piece of legislation. It's just a logical piece of legislation. Please don't equate it with Mr. Deuster's notions about criminal proceedings. I would ask an 'aye' vote on the override."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Wikoff. Your light is on. The Gentleman from Henry, Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As you could guess from the remarks of the Gentleman from ... I've forgotten where he's from now.. from LaGrange, by his remarks the Bill is a good one. He does not really oppose it. As a matter of fact, the Bill passed out of the Senate 44 to 12 with such bleeding liberals as Senator Bloom, Busby, Martin, Ozinga, and Summer. Now I think that any Bill that flies out of the Senate with that kind of support is indicative of the content that is actually



is in the Bill. If you look at the Governor's veto he did his usual expertise job in explaining a 'yes' vote and then voted 'no'. In his veto he explains quite vividly that he believes in tenure, that it should be a due process, that that is the way to deal with educational problems. If you analyze the Bill we have 5 years before a teacher entering the junior college system would actually achieve tenure. We have 4 years to evaluate them. That is above and beyond what we are doing for the elementary and secondary education teachers. They receive tenure on the 4th year and I think that we compromise this in the real sense of trying to solve a problem that has been created by junior college districts that did nothing. We now have 9 junior college districts in the State of Illinois that have no mention whatsoever of tenure. I submit to you that even the university systems, the glorious University of Illinois included, all have some sort of tenure procedure. Right now, what has happened in your (quote)-local control situations- is that they sit and do nothing and that every person on the faculty whatsoever can be dismissed for any arbitrary and capricious reasons. We have nothing whatsoever to do with a person's ability to teach. I think that is a totally ridiculous situation. As a matter of fact, the Gentleman from Lake alluded to the fact that in the Bill we suggest or we mandate administrators to evaluate teachers. Now who among us, would have the audacity to say that the number one role of an administrator in the public schools of the State of Illinois should be to evaluate teachers to see that the educational process is working in the classroom for every child, every young man, every young woman, in the State of Illinois? I think that is indeed a grand part of the legislation. It is badly needed. It is something that



has been overlooked by the General Assembly for quite some time. It's time to be addressed. All people on both philosophies agree, let's get on with it and vote to override. Thank you."

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

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we're getting terribly complicated in this situation. Now listen for just a moment. We have people who vote for us who are in community colleges. They have a concern about tenure. It's relatively simple. We're just going to vote for this thing, move it out, and set aside the people who are with us. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Rock Island has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed by saying 'nay'. The main question is put. The ... The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I would yield to Representative Stuffle to close."

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

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Members, this Bill is much like another Bill that passed out of here, but I would want everyone to know this, this Bill is not a Chicago Bill only. This Bill is not a Bill promoted by or sponsored by or supported by only the Illinois Federation of Teachers. But in fact, this Bill is also supported strongly by the Illinois Education Association. So make no mistake. Both groups are in the same corner. They're not fighting on the issue. They're working for its passage and I think for good reasons. The argu-



ment's been made here that the universities don't have this. They do have it. They don't have to have it in the law because it's evolved over a period of as much as a hundred years in some of our colleges and universities. It's a new day. People want to be recognized and treated as first class citizens. I don't think the Bill goes too far in that direction. I think the Bill is fair. It does not abrogate any collective bargaining or agreement where there might be a lesser period of time for tenure. It does not abrogate a Board rule in that situation. It is, rather, as Representative McGrew said, a compromise allowing as much as four years for one to become tenured. In fact, it's my understanding that not only are there nine districts that don't have any tenure policy, now, in fact, there are ten. Another one has dropped completely out of the picture. The Governor suggests in his veto that local control should be the order of the day. But in fact, with those ten situations the only situation is arbitrary and capricious dismissal, not by seniority, not with tenure, not with notice, not with hearings. We ought to pass this Bill. Representative McGrew was also very, very accurate when he said that there are no options. The Governor says there are. But what are they? What's the option to the situation in this Bill? Either you have tenure or you don't have tenure. This Bill should pass for all the reasons that have been cited. If you believe that teachers, as other people, should be in our first class citizens, then this should be put on the law books in this State. If you go through the Bill it's fair. It's equal. The teachers have given up much. They've agreed to pay their share of hearings if you look at the Bill. They've agreed to extensive provisions. I think, have leaned over to reach toward the Board view-



point. It is fair in its provisions with regard to dismissal on seniority. It is fair with regard to dismissal where there is a re-employment right at stake. It doesn't really take away anything from the Board except to the extent that a Board may wish to prevent any sort of tenure. It's fair, I repeat. It's supported by all of the teacher organizations. It ought to pass this House and I would urge, along with Representative Getty, having sponsored a very similar Bill, that we give it enough votes to become law in this State and put the issue behind us, realizing that there is a new day, that teachers are people, first class citizens and this ought to be a right that extends to them as it does to others."

Speaker Matijevich: "On the motion of Representative Getty, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 147 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Huff, to explain his vote."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this measure which attempts to set standards with regards to tenure. I find in my district that some chancellors in the absence of such standards tend to become autocratic by temperament and absolutely byzantine by decree of the genuflecting teachers. Now when genuflecting becomes suspect for whatever the reason they will make the teachers walk the plank blindfold over a tank of piranhas. I submit if we pass this Bill the very least it will do is take away the blindfold."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich, to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, sometimes I think we engage in passing laws to solve a problem that



doesn't exist. Kaskaskia College is one of the colleges in the.. in this group that does not have a tenure law and usually if there's anything.. complaints to be made, they come to me, one way or another. And I've not had one complaint of a teacher being fired capriciously. So I think sometimes we engage in passing laws thinking that something could possibly happen sometime. I think we ought to... We've got too many laws now and I think this might be another one."

Speaker Matijevidh: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Wikoff, to explain his vote."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one of the speakers in debate mentioned the fact that if we passed this law we would then see the teachers as first class citizens. I don't know what endowed this General Assembly with the ability to make sure that people were first class citizens. I'm not sure that we do. I think one thing it boils down to as much as anything, is this, is just another erosion of any local control in placing a mandate upon local governments by the State of Illinois and that's the reason I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Matijevidh: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kelly, to explain his vote."

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I certainly think that the community teachers of community colleges in Illinois deserve fairness in what we give to our segments in our society. Time after time we've not only been giving less to our teachers in these community colleges, but we've also provided less benefits to these.. to these learning institutions. I'm very proud to vote 'yes' on this override motion."

Speaker Matijevidh: "The Gentleman from the 11th District, Senator Berman, to explain his vote. I'm sorry. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted? The



Gentleman from Wayne, Representative Robbins, to explain his vote."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm voting 'no' on this Bill. One of the things that we are proud of in the State of Illinois is the academic freedom that we have and that we afford. Now then we are treating these teachers like little children, not like teachers, not people that are willing to say that they have done a good job and are willing to stand on that job and they are going to do a good enough job that it doesn't make any difference whether you hire them back or not. This is the kind of people that you want to teach your children, someone that is dedicated, someone that wants to stay there and try to work and if this is a reason why that you don't have to worry, on most of the colleges are on tenure. They get good teachers. They treat them right. They pay them a good salary. And here we're trying to encourage mediocrity in our colleges. Let's try to encourage excellence by letting the teachers show the students and the people that they are qualified annually. And if you want your children taught by the mediocrity.. in mediocrity why go ahead and vote this tenure Bill. We have had in this Legislature..."

Speaker Matijeich: "Would you conclude your remarks? Your minute's up."

Robbins: "We have had, in this Legislature, to put tests on children because teachers tenure in your grade school has encouraged such mediocrity that the students are no longer learning."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Keane, to explain his vote. Jim Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. I served under a number of tenure programs in Illinois and I have found I have seen many, many violations of



tenure. Tenure has been used to intimidate teachers, professors. Tenure has been used by administration to keep costs down. It has been... It has been used to whip up and keep teachers in line on many administrative decisions. The higher education community in this case has had plenty of opportunity to solve the problem. The problem has existed for a long period of time. I think that the teachers in higher education are entitled to having at least their rights known. They're entitled to have a three year tenure... tenure after 3 years and it gives plenty of time for the administration to evaluate the teachers. I would urge you to vote 'yes' on this."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 128 'aye', 40 'nay', 2 voting 'present'. And this motion, having received a Constitu... Alright. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, I appreciate that it looks like there are a lot of votes up there, but I respectfully request a verification."

Speaker Matijevich: "The.. I think there's enough, but you have that right. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "As an alternative, in order that we be honest and those who are here be rewarded by having their votes cast and those who are not here have the record reflect what the record should be, I would suggest that we could take another Roll Call and push buttons and..."

Speaker Matijevich: "No, I don't... We're going to have your verification if you persist. I think there's enough there, but ... The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty, asks that the absentees be polled."



Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees; Catania. Dyer. Kozubowski. McBroom. Oblinger. Polk. Schoeberlein."

Speaker Matijevich: "Poll of the absentees is concluded. The Gentleman has asked for a verification of the affirmative Roll Call. The Clerk will call out the affirmative vote and when he calls out your name, be in your seat and raise your hand."

Clerk Leone: "Abramson. Ackerman. Alexander. Anderson. Balanoff. E.M. Barnes. Jane Barnes. Beatty. Bell. Bianco. Birchler. Borchers. Boucek. Bowman. Bradley. Braun. Breslin. Bullock. Burnidge. Capparelli. Capuzi. Chapman. Christensen..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave for Monroe Flinn to be verified. Leave."

Clerk Leone: "Collins. Conti. Cullerton. Currie. Daniels. Darrow. Davis. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Ralph Dunn. Epton. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Grossi. Hallock. Hanahan. Hannig. Harris. Henry. Huff. Huskey. Jaffe. Johnson. Emil Jones. Kane. Katz. Keane. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kucharski. Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz. Macdonald. Madigan. Mahar. Margulas. Marovitz.

Matijevich: "Mautino. McAuliffe. McClain. McGrew. McPike. Meyer. Molloy. Mugalian. Mulcahey. Murphy. O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Peters. Piel. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Rea. Richmond. Ronan. Ropp. Ryan. Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schneider. Schraeder. Sharp. Slape. Stanley. Stearney. Steczko. E.G. Steele. C.M. Stiehl. Stuffle. Taylor. Telcser. Terzich. Van Duyn. Vinson. Vitek. Von Boeckman. White. Willer. Williams. Winchester. J.J. Wolf.

Sam Wolf. Young. Yourell. And Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "Questions of the Affirmative Roll by Representative Deuster. The Gentleman from Perry, Repre-



representative Dunn. Leave to be verified. Leave. Proceed Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, I'll start with one that I'm sure is not here. Representative Marovitz."

Speaker Matijevich: "I don't see him here. Remove him."

Deuster: "Did you remove him?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He's removed."

Deuster: "Fine. Abramson."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Abramson? He's smiling away."

Deuster: "Oh, I'm sorry.."

Speaker Matijevich: "He's as close to you as Virginia Frederick."

Deuster: "Representaitve Bianco."

Speaker Matijevich: "Bianco is way in back."

Deuster: "Alright. Bradley."

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

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

Speaker Matijevich: "I don't see him peeking his head in yet. Remove him."

Deuster: "Burnidge."

Speaker Matijevich: "Burnidge is way in the back."

Deuster: "Back in the shadows. Chapman."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Chapman is in her seat."

Deuster: "Johnson."

Speaker Matijevich: "Tim Johnson. I do not see him in his seat. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him."

Deuster: "Daniels."

Speaker Matijevich: "Lee Daniels. He's right next to you. He's closer than Virginia Frederick."

Deuster: "Dawson."

Speaker Matijevich: "Dawson is in his seat."

Deuster: "Doyle."



Speaker Matijevich: "Ed Doyle is in his seat."

Deuster: "John Dunn."

Speaker Matijevich: "John Dunn. I don't see John Dunn here.

Remove John Dunn and place Catania as 'aye'. Catania
'aye'."

Deuster: "Ray Ewell."

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

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him. Continue."

Deuster: "Bruce Farley."

Speaker Matijevich: "Farley. Bruce Farley back there? I don'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 Call. Continue."

Deuster: "Zeke Giorgi."

Speaker Matijevich: "Giorgi? How is the Gentleman recorded?
I'll give him time to get out of his office. How
is Giorgi recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Re... There he is. Just in time. Keep
him right there."

Deuster: "Douglas Huff."

Speaker Matijevich: "Douglas Huff is waving."

Deuster: "What is he doing?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He's waving his arms and speaking on
the telephone."

Deuster: "Oh, waving. I thought he was walking. Did we take
care of Representative Johnson?"

Speaker Matijevich: "We removed him. Do you want to put him
back?"

Deuster: "That's good enough."

Speaker Matijevich: "You want to put him back on?"

Deuster: "Representative Keane?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Keane is in his seat. Did



you say Kane?"

Deuster: "Douglas Kane of Springfield."

Speaker Matijeich: "Doug Kane, how is he recorded? He just walked in."

Deuster: "Okay. Harold Katz."

Speaker Matijeich: "Harold Katz is in his seat."

Deuster: "Roman Kosinski."

Speaker Matijeich: "Roman Kosinski spoke on the Bill. He should be here somewhere. Roman Kosinski. There he is."

Deuster: "Kulas."

Speaker Matijeich: "Kulas is in his seat."

Deuster: "Mahar, I see him and Conti, he was here. Representative... Oh yeah, Conti is behind me. Margulas."

Speaker Matijeich: "Margulas, there he is in the middle."

Deuster: "There he is. McGrew."

Speaker Matijeich: "McGrew is in his seat."

Deuster: "McPike."

Speaker Matijeich: "McPike is in his seat."

Deuster: "Mulcahey."

Speaker Matijeich: "Mulcahey. Mulcahey. I don't see Mulcahey. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijeich: "Remove him."

Deuster: "O'Brien."

Speaker Matijeich: "Dan O'Brien. Is he back there? Yeah, he's back in his seat."

Deuster: "Patrick."

Speaker Matijeich: "Langdon Patrick. He's up. He's got both arms."

Deuster: "Pouncey."

Speaker Matijeich: "Pouncey is in his seat also."

Deuster: "Ropp."

Speaker Matijeich: "Put Mulcahey back on the Roll Call."

Return John Dunn."



Deuster: "We were on Ropp. Ropp."

Speaker Matijevich: "Ropp."

Deuster: "Oh, I see him. He's back there."

Speaker Matijevich: "He's back there."

Deuster: "Ryan."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. The Lady from Cook, Representative Braun. Leave to be verified? Leave to be verified. Continue."

Deuster: "Ryan."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryan. The Minority Leader, I'm sure he'll be out here, but how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him."

Deuster: "Sharp."

Speaker Matijevich: "John Sharp is in his seat."

Deuster: "Stearney."

Speaker Matijevich: "Stearney? He's not in his seat. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him."

Deuster: "Steczo. Oh, is that his hand? Yeah, okay. Evert Steelè's here. Cissy Stiehl."

Speaker Matijevich: "Cissy Stiehl?"

Deuster: "Oh, I see her in her seat. Jimmy Taylor."

Speaker Matijevich: "Jim Taylor. Jim Taylor. I don't see him yet. I'm not sure if he's going to come out of his office. Jim Taylor. How is Jim Taylor recorded? There he is."

Deuster: "Okay. Van Duyn, Leroy."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leroy Van Duyn is in his seat on the telephone."

Deuster: "Jesse White. Oh, I see him."

Speaker Matijevich: "Jesse White's in his seat."

Deuster: "Wyvetter Youngé."

Speaker Matijevich: "Wyvetter Youngé's in her seat."



Deuster: "No further questions."

Speaker Matijevich: "No further questions. Give me a count. 121 'aye', 40 'no', and this motion, having received a Constitutional three-fifths Majority, prevails and Senate Bill 147 is declared passed notwithstanding the veto of the Governor." 310, are you ready? The Assistant Majority Leader, from Cook, Representative Lechowicz on Senate Bill 310."

Lechowicz: "Thank... Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 310 is part of a three Bill package designed to effect reforms of nursing home care in Illinois. The major Bill, Senate Bill 316, was signed by the Governor mandating new standards for the protection of patient rights and for the improvement of services. These new requirements are scheduled for implementation beginning March 1st of 1980. It maybe difficult for some facilities to comply with the new standards, particular capital improvements are required to modify existing buildings or current construction of new facilities. Senate Bill 310 was approved by the General Assembly this past spring as a means of assisting nursing homes with the financing of any capital improvements necessitated by the new standards. I believe that the Governor's message gives too much emphasis to the construction of new facilities and new nursing home beds. And really loses the sight of capital financing that may be needed by the nursing home industry to up-grade or modify existing physical plant facilities. The intent of the legislation is not to add to the number of nursing home beds in this state. I concur with the Governor's findings that there may already be a sufficient number, possibly a surplus of these beds in certain parts of the state. I am concerned however with the very real possibility that the essential reforms will not implemented without the incentives or the



assistance that is contained in Senate Bill 310. I think that it is important to note that this legislation is permissive in the sense that Illinois Health Facility Authority will be reviewing any proposed projects on a case by case basis. Unless the project is sound, and the authority can make a bond issue attractive enough to the market place, no business will be able to realize the advantages offered under this legislation. Only essential and sound projects will be able to receive assistance under this legislation. So there should be no concern that this will become any financial boom to the nursing home industry. The State of Illinois assumes no liability for the projects assisted through the Illinois Health Facilities Authority. The authority screens the projects for their viability and marketability. And offers the tax exempt status which generally leads to a more favorable interest rate for the proposed capital improvement. So there is no direct cost to the state under Senate Bill 310. It simply offers an opportunity for facilities to obtain needed financing that will hopefully lead to the necessary improvements in nursing home patient care. I think that it is also important to note that financing for capital improvements whether they are for proprietary facility or not, has become more difficult to obtain in the current market climate. Interest rates, as you all know, are skyrocketing and this may.. may make compliance with the new physical plants standards required under the Nursing Home Care Reform Act virtually impossible. I think that the state has an obligation to offer an alternative financing for these facilities if we expect a recently enacted reforms to be effectively implemented. And it is for this reason I ask that you support notwithstanding the Governor's veto, an aye vote on Senate Bill 310."



Speaker Matjijevich: "Representative Lechowicz has moved to override the Governor's veto with respect to Senate Bill 310. On that motion, the Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank... Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Lechowicz is I believe correct on this Bill. I think the veto was mistaken. What we have is a situation where the State Legislature and the regulatory agencies are continually raising the cost and the capital costs to poor profit nursing homes. Everytime we pass a new fire safety requirement or life safety requirement, we raise their cost. At the same time, we're subsidising through this exact procedure many nursing homes in the state, the not-for-profit, the public nursing homes are already eligible to sell their bonds this way. What this does is to make the for-profits eligible to do this. It permits them if you will to continue to compete, get in this terrible regulatory environment, with the already subsidised homes. I think that there's no problem with this. I think the bonds can be saleable if properly administered by the authority. And I would urge an override of the veto."

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

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, while I originally voted for this Bill, I rise to suggest that we sustain the Governor's veto of Senate Bill 310. I cannot disagree with what other speakers have said on this Bill because it will not cost the state any money. These bonds are paid for by those who utilize them, meaning the particular institutions. The danger that we run into however, is that competition for the services of the Illinois Health Facilities Authority and the competition of bonding



authority. Might I suggest that those of you who are interested in not-for-profit organizations, who currently have the ability to utilize this authority, that we are expanding the role of the authority by allowing for-profit institutions to utilize the expertise of the authority and the bonding ability of the authority. Those who are aware of the bond market currently know that it is very difficult to sell government bonds. Which means if we override the Governor's veto of Senate Bill 310 we are potentially glutting the bond market with one more category of facility that would be able to use this type of bonding authority. I don't necessarily disagree with the concept, but I think at this time we could be creating a very severe problem for the not-for-profit institutions for which this authority was created. And I would like to indicate that the Governor stated in his Veto Message his agreement that there really is nothing wrong with the concept, however, we ought to wait to see what the situation is in the future. And I would agree with that assessment that he included in his Veto Message and I would urge that we sustain Governor Thompson's veto on Senate Bill 310."

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

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of Representative Lechowicz's request to override this motion. And I basically would share in the remarks of Representative Vinson and even share in the remarks of Representative Kempiners except the conclusion that he reached. The Health Facilities Authority in Illinois in my estimation does, in fact, give an unnecessary and unfortunate competitive advantage to those non-profit institutions. I think that the nursing homes have shown their good faith in supporting the legislation that the Governor signed sponsored by Senator Dailey and



in the House by Representative Lechowicz. I think this is a logical extension of that legislation and conceptually everyone's in agreement and I see no difficulty at all with the Health Facilities Authority managing the portfolio for nursing homes for profit, particularly those that are trying to comply with regulations that the State of Illinois has imposed upon that industry. So I don't think we should allow the unfair competitive advantage to continue, that the non-profits have and I would respectfully urge an 'aye' vote in support of Representative Lechowicz's motion."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Epton. Oh, I'm sorry. Your light's on. No, it was on by mistake. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I'm sorry. I was off the floor. Could you tell me how much authorization this will allow? How much bonding.... How many bonds can they sell? How much money?"

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Cal, this doesn't affect the bond authorization whatsoever. All it does, it presently the Illinois Health Facilities Authority since 1972 when it was created by the General Assembly was strictly for not-for-profit. With the passage of Senate Bill 316 and it was contained in Senate Bill 310 is for profit as well. The only thing that they will be able to do is go to the Illinois Health Facilities Planning Board and receive the approval as far as the... on any item that's new construction, or when they are mandated by the state law for upgrading their present facility. That's why it has nothing to do with any additional bonding whatsoever, Cal."

Skinner: "Well, I, perhaps a better answer would be that there's no limit as long as the market will buy the bonds."



Lechowicz: "Correct. Correct."

Skinner: "That's..."

Lechowicz: "And there's no limit presently as far as for the not-for-profit homes as well and that's why in my personal opinion it does not affect nor does it affect the bond portfolio of the state, nor is the state in any way held liable. It's an additional safeguard and a protection for the nursing home industry. It's the nursing home industry as far as when you've got that protection now for the not-for-profit and you're saying when we mandate as far as the requirements of the nursing home, it's not strictly for not-for-profit. It's for both. And what we're doing is saying that if we are telling you to do something, the same availability should also be from the Illinois Health Facilities Authority..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Wait..Wait. I'd like to.. I'd like to interrupt. We have a former Governor here. Yesterday we mentioned the Shapiro Mental Health Facility. Governor Shapiro : Sam Shapiro."

Shapiro: "I'm only going to say a few words and that is this is like getting back home. I was just telling Mr. Rosenmen who's with me that that seat up there where the young Lady is sitting at along the wall, I had that seat for 14 years. So...Well, anyway it's .. it's really a pleasure. I haven't been back here for a good number of years. Pleasure to be here. And I.. I know how hard you're working and all the fine things that you're doing. Good luck. Good health."

Speaker Matijevich: "Thank you, Governor. I understand he's one of the Co-Chairmen of the Singer.. Single-Member District. Just the opposite. Just the opposite. He knows what's good for us. By the way he was also Chairman of the Salary Commission. So he... Give him a hand. Are you through, Cal? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I think the issue is pretty clearly



drawn here. It's whether we want to expand authority, expand subsidies for for-profit nursing homes. I personally come down on the negative side of that issue. And I do so because virtually all of the complaints that have come about nursing home care have been in the for-profit sector. In fact, I can't remember any non-profit nursing home which has had complaints levied against them. Certainly there's no county nursing home that has had the type of black eye that Four Seasons which is now I guess .. or was at one point All Seasons in Zion. I guess I think that subsidies ought to be directive. We're going to subsidize private enterprise, we ought to write them a check. We shouldn't give them an indirect check through the federal tax structure."

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

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I join Representative Kempiners in hoping that this Body will sustain the Governor's veto of Senate Bill 310. This Legislature has reason to be very proud of the nursing home legislation which we approved in this Session. Senate Bill 310 not only is an unnecessary part of this package, but I believe, is an undesirable part of the package. The Illinois Health Facilities Authority Act was designed to issue tax exempt bonds for not-for-profit health facilities, nursing homes among that group. But almost all of the projects that have been authorized by the Illinois Health Facilities Authority have been hospital projects. Very few of the projects have been on behalf of not-for-profit nursing homes. This kind of financing is very difficult to get so we do not need to be concerned about the competitive aspects of this. Not-for-profit nursing homes have not made much use of the Act and I think we can be reasonably sure that for-profit nursing homes will make



little or no use of the Act. Part of this is because at the present time, we have a statewide excess of 33,000 long term care beds. This legislation is completely unnecessary. I hope that you will stay with the Governor on this particular measure."

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

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I find it rather ironical that Members of this House who have long supported providing proper facilities for long term care now find differences of opinion as to whether we should be doing that for not-for-profit or for for-profit facilities. It seems to me that if you want to do something about improving the care and providing the facilities, the for-profit or not-for-profit shouldn't make a difference. For those who raise the question as to whether the bonds can be sold no one can answer that. The market determines that. It seems to me that this Bill, Senate Bill 310, in its form is one that this House should support and I rise in support of overriding the veto of Senate Bill 310."

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

Willer: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Governor's veto also for many of the reasons stated by Cal Skinner and Representative Chapman. I happen to be somewhat of an expert on nursing homes, due to the fact that I have three aunts I've had to place in them. My Mother is now in one. Why in the world we should be subsidising private enterprise whether it's a nursing home or any other kind, I don't know. But the nursing homes that have caused us the problems as been stated are the for-profit ones. The ones that do not cause us problems generally are the not-for-profit ones. Why should we subsidise for instance, Americana Nursing Homes?"



I don't think they're in financial trouble. I think there's a perfectly dreadful idea and I don't care if the subsidy is in the form of bonds or outright money. There's no more reason why we should subsidize a for-profit enterprise whether it's a nursing home or any other business. We pass laws regulating businesses from time to time. It may cost some money. We don't therefore say, well, let's subsidize them because we've mandated thus and so. Let's get the nursing homes to clean up their act first before we start thinking of helping them out and also we have a surplus of beds so we don't need any more nursing homes. I urge you.. I urge you to support the Governor's veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Reilly."

Reilly: " Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The reason we should sustain the Governor's veto on Senate Bill 310 is simply that this is one more promise that government is going to make that we won't fulfill. We're going to tell these people in this industry that we're going to help them when in fact we're not. Representative Kempiners and others have already outlined the fact that we won't be able to sell the bonds and so it's an empty promise. Furthermore the realities are the the Health Facilities Finance Authority is in business to help... it conceives its goal as being helping not-for-profit health institutions. And it's just not going to get involved in this whether we override this or not. And so we would have another example. We'd be hearing five years from now, ten years from now, from nursing home operators, you promised us the money, where is it? Well, it isn't going to be there. And we ought to tell them up front it's isn't going to be there. We ought not get involved with making promises that we aren't going to keep, that the



real world won't let us keep. I would ask you to sustain the Governor's veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Williamson, Representative Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move the previous question."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Harris has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. And the main question is put. The Assistant Majority Leader, Representative Lechowicz, to close."

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe that the issue is quite clear. I know that there's a number of nursing homes presently in the state, there may be some excess beds as well, but I'd like to ask the Membership of this House is F.H.A. Financing available to existing homes? No. Is there any type of conventional mortgage money available to these homes? The answer is no. Now you're asking them to up-grade their facilities.. of their existing facilities and you're not even giving them an opportunity to go into the bond market on a fair basis. That's why in 1972 we created the Illinois Health Facilities Planning Board, for the not-for--profit homes. But the for-profit homes as well are faced with the same situation as far as regulation, and maintaining and trying to up-grade their facilities to our standards. And you're not giving them any type of financing available whatsoever. This is a tragic mistake. It should be created. That's why this type of legislation was put in as a package. 316 was put in the package and 310 provides that availability... availability to comply with the provisions of Senate Bill 316. I'd still like to hear one of the opponents tell me what type of financing is available for the for-profit homes.



I strongly urge that you reconsider your actions and vote to override on Senate Bill 310."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Lechowicz has moved to override the Governor's veto with respect to Senate Bill 310. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 310 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich, Friedrich, to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I just want to tell you that nursing homes these days, privately operated nursing homes, particularly those that are taking care of a high percentage of Public Aid cases are skating on pretty thin ice financially. And they need this help. I think if you'll check with them you'll find that's true."

Speaker Matijevich: "Problem is now we closed the Board... Let's dump it and try it once more. Let's try it once more and everybody get to their switches. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 310 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'nay'. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Campbell, to explain his vote. Let's get on the Roll Call so we don't have to go through this again."

Campbell: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explanation of my 'aye' vote, I would like to say to you that at the present time the nursing homes from the standpoint of Public Aid patients get about 60% of cost, 60% of cost. Now, they can't operate on that basis and what has been happening is that the nursing homes have been raising the rates of the private paid patients which is indirect tax to take care of the Public Aid patients. And I want to tell



you that they .. if we have to keep these Public Aid patients in the hospitals and the nursing homes refuse to take the Public Aid patients then it's going to cost the state a heck of a lot more money than what it is now costing and this is one way to help those nursing homes that are trying to provide the type of care and lessen the cost for the State of Illinois and I would urge you to get up there with 107 votes."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 98 'aye's, 54 'nay's, 4 voting 'present'. And the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, kindly poll the absentees?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. As soon as it comes out of the machine, Clerk will poll the absentees. "

Clerk O'Brien: "Jane Barnes. Beatty. Bowman. Ralph Dunn. Dyer. Ewell. Gaines. Hoffman. Kozobowski. Marovitz. McBroom. Neff. Oblinger. Pierce. Polk. Reed. Robbins. Sandquist. Schoeberlein. E.G. Steele. Mr. Speaker."

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

Conti: "Vote to 'aye' please."

Speaker Matijevich: "Change Conti to 'aye'. Speaker, 'aye'. One moment. Jane Barnes, 'aye'. Robbins, 'aye'. Dan Pierce, 'aye'. Carol Braun from 'no' to 'aye'. Braun, 'no' to 'aye'. Griesheimer, 'aye'. Bianco from 'no' to 'aye'. Huskey from 'present' to 'aye'. Bell, from 'no' to 'aye'. One moment. Clerk's got to catch up. That's Bell from 'no' to 'aye'. Bell. Enough. Donovan, 'aye'. Donovan, 'aye'. 109 'aye's, 48 'no's. And the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, asks for a verification. I understand. Absentees have already been polled. Representative Lechowicz, there's



been a request for a verification. Do you want to...

They've been polled. Skinner's asked for a verification."

Lechowicz: "Poll the absentees, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "We've already polled them so I guess..."

Lechowicz: "That was before the verification."

Speaker Matijevich: "So I guess we'll just have to go ahead with the verification. The Clerk will proceed with the Affirmative vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ackerman..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Representative Watson?"

The Gentleman from Bond, Representative Watson. Leave to be verified, is that it? No?"

Watson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a..."

There's a possibility I might be in conflict and I still want to remain, 'yes'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. Representative Griesheimer?"

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to be verified?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to verify Griesheimer and Capparelli. And Leon. And Huskey. Leave. Proceed with the Affirmative vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ackerman..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to verify Dave Jones? Leave."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. The Gentleman from Champaign,

Representative Wikoff, is that leave to be verified?

Leave to be verified, Wikoff. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Jane Barnes. Bell. Bianco. Birchler.

Birkinbine. Bower. Bradley. Braun. Breslin. Brummer. Bullock. ..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Ralph Dunn, 'aye'. Dunn, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing with the Affirmative Roll Call; Campbell. Capparelli. Capuzi. ..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Winchester, 'aye'. Winchester, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing with the Affirmative Roll Call;



Christensen. Conti. Cullerton. Daniels. Darrow.

Davis. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Leave to verify McClain?
Leave."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing with the..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Affirmative Roll Call; Ralph Dunn. Farley.
Flinn. Virginia Frederick. Friedrich. Garmisa.
Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Griesheimer. Hallock.
Hallstrom. Hanahan. Hannig. Harris. Henry. Huff.
Huskey. Johnson. Dave Jones. Emil Jones. Keane.
Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kucharski. Kulas.
Laurino. Lechowicz. Leon. Leverenz. Macdonald. Madigan.
Margulas. Matijevich. Mautino. McAuliffe. McClain.
McCourt. McGrew. Meyer. Molloy. Murphy. O'Brien.
Patrick. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Pullen.
Rea. Richmond. Robbins. Ronan. Ropp. Ryan..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. The Lady from LaSalle,
Representative Hoxsey, wishes to change her vote from
'no' to 'aye'. And..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. And Representative Dunn
from Macon wishes to change from 'no' to 'aye'. Could
we have a count? Skinner is wavering. 113 'aye's.
Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing with the Affirmative Roll Call;
Schisler. Schraeder. Simms. Slape. Stanley..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. The Gentleman from Cook,
the Majority Leader, Representative Madigan, for what pur-
pose do you arise?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, would you verify me?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to verify Madigan? Leave."

Madigan: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Continue with the Affirmative vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Stearney. C.M. Stiehl. Stuffle. Sumner.



Taylor. Terzich. Totten. VanDuyne. Vinson. Vitek.
 Von Boeckman. Watson. White. Wikoff. Williams.
 Winchester. Sam Wolf. Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Hardin, Representative
 Winchester."

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

My legal advisor sitting beside me has advised me that
 this may be a possible conflict for me, so please
 change my 'aye' vote back to 'present'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Winchester back to 'present'. The

... Questions of the Affirmative vote by Representative
 Skinner."

Skinner: "Yeah, would anybody else like to announce a conflict
 of interest? "

Speaker Matijevich: "Unfortunately, I have none. Proceed,

Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Bower?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Who was that?"

Skinner: "Bower?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Bower? Is in his seat."

Skinner: "Capparelli."

Speaker Matijevich: "Capparelli had leave to be verified."

Skinner: "Darrow."

Speaker Matijevich: "Darrow.. Here he is in the front.

Virginia Macdonald would like to have leave to be
 verified. Leave. Proceed."

Skinner: "Dawson."

Speaker Matijevich: "Dawson, is in the aisle."

Skinner: "Domico."

Speaker Matijevich: "Domico is in his seat."

Skinner: "He has returned. Flinn."

Speaker Matijevich: "Flinn is in his seat."

Skinner: "Giorgi."

Speaker Matijevich: "Right here."

Skinner: "I can't see him. I'm sorry."



Speaker Matijevich: "..... saw him."

Skinner: "Oh, I thought he was out looking for the U.A.W.

Griesh.. Oh, Griesheimer was verified."

Speaker Matijevich: "Yes."

Skinner: "Huff."

Speaker Matijevich: "Huff. Doug Huff? Douglas Huff, is he..

I don't see him back there. How is Douglas Huff recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

Skinner, "Johnson."

Speaker Matijevich: "Tim Johnson? How's Tim Johnson recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recored as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him."

Skinner: "Laurino?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Bill Laurino, how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

Skinner: "Stanley."

Speaker Matijevich: "Who was that?"

Skinner: "Stauley."

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

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Is that.. He's way in the back. That's him way..."

Skinner: "Stearney."

Speaker Matijevich: "Stearney? How is Stearney recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him and replace Tim Johnson back on the Roll Call."

Skinner: "Taylor."

Speaker Matijevich: "Taylor? Jim Taylor? Give him a chance to come out of his office.. How is Jim Taylor recorded? How is Jim Taylor recorded?"



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

Speaker Matijevich: "There's... He's in the back."

Skinner: "Excuse me?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He's back in the room."

Skinner: "Where is he?" Oh, there he is. So tiny.."

Speaker Matijevich: "Continue with the..."

Skinner: "Kozubowski."

Speaker Matijevich: "Kozubowski, I don't think was on the..

He's not on the Roll Call."

Skinner: "That's fortunate. ."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Skinner: "I thought I saw VanDuyne, but I don't anymore. Maybe he's left."

Speaker Matijevich: "Stanley's back on the Roll Call. VanDuyne?"

Skinner: "He's behind me. Excuse me. "

Speaker Matijevich: "There he is in the front."

Skinner: "Williams."

Speaker Matijevich: "In his seat."

Skinner: "The Speaker. Oh, he's not voting either. How many we got?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Continue.."

Skinner: "Oh, is the Speaker voting?"

Speaker Matijevich: "The Speaker of the House?"

Skinner: "Yes. Is he recorded?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He was on the floor a moment ago."

Skinner: "Is he recorded is the question."

Speaker Matijevich: "Yes, he is."

Skinner: "Which way?"

Speaker Matijevich: "'Aye'."

Skinner: "I would ask that he be verified."

Speaker Matijevich: "Well, remove him for the time being."

Skinner: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich : "He's here."

Skinner: "What are we up to now? Or down to now?"



Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Skinner: "What's the count?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Are you through?"

Skinner: "Just tell me what the count is."

Speaker Matijevich: "Well... What's the count, Clerk? 108."

Skinner: "McAuliffe?"

Speaker Matijevich: "McAuliffe? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him."

Skinner: "And any Republican that wants to support the
Governor, as typical as that may be. How about John
Hallock?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Hallock?"

Skinner: "Is Hallock recorded up there?"

Speaker Matijevich: "John Hallock? How .. Change Hallock
to 'no'. Hallock.."

Skinner: "Is it possible we're going to up-hold the Governor
on something?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Hallock from 'aye' to 'no'. Continue.

Do you have anymore?"

Skinner: "Nope."

Speaker Matijevich: "What's the count now, Mr. Clerk? The
count right now is ... The Gentleman from Cook, Represent-
ative Epton, from 'no' to 'aye'.. And Sandquist 'aye!'"

Skinner: "109. 108."

Speaker Matijevich: "Watson? Watson from 'aye' to 'present'.
Tim Simms, from 'aye' to 'no'. Tim Simms from 'aye'
to 'no'. And put the Speaker back on the Roll Call.
Shouldn't have been off. Neff, 'aye'. Clarence Neff,
'aye'. Put Laurino back on. 'Aye'. Verification's
concluded. Could we have the count? There are 109
'aye's, 47 'no's. And this motion, having received
the Constitutional 3/5ths Majority, prevails and Senate
Bill 310 is declared passed, notwithstanding the
veto of the Governor. On page five we have only one item



veto motion left, Senate Bill 581. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dawson, on Senate Bill 581."

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to restore line item 11 through 15 on page 5. which is.. comes to the sum of 285,000 or so much as may be necessary. It's appropriated from the Agricultural Premium Fund for the Department of Business and Economic Development for advertisement and promotion of port districts throughout the State of Illinois. We have 13 different port districts throughout the state. And we believe that this department is in grave need of this fund for the promotion of it for the creation of new jobs and businesses throughout the State of Illinois."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman has moved to over... with respect to Senate Bill 581 to override the Governor's veto of the item at page .. page 5..."

Dawson: "Page 5, line. 11 through 15."

Speaker Matijeich: "Lines 11 through 15. If there's not discussion... The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this motion to override the Governor's veto on this line item. This.. This is money that is greatly needed for the promotion of not only the port of Chicago, but all the port districts throughout the State of Illinois. As initially coming out of the Conference Committee, there was report... it was initially \$500,000. The Conference Committee cut it to \$285,000 and as I understand it, that is what is been restored. This money is really needed. Our ports in Illinois and especially Chicago have suffered and have suffered by competition with other ports. If any of you have been out in the Indiana area, you'll see that the port of Indiana is a modern, booming port that's taking business away from Chicago."



The same is true of the port of Milwaukee. And it isn't . . . It just isn't right. The port of Chicago is the natural hub for activities for exports throughout the middle west. I think that it's important that we get behind the ports in Chi... not only in Chicago, but in the State of Illinois, to insure that Illinois maintains its eminent position as the number one export state in the nation. This is a small investment indeed I think in the economy of the State of Illinois and I would urge everyone to join in support of this motion to override."

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

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as the House Sponsor of Senate Bill 581, I join with Representative Collins and Dawson urge that this item be restored to the budget. I think it's very important that we do expand the ports in the State of Illinois. The promotion program is tied to a recommendation made by the Commission on Economic Development to continue expansion of Illinois ports. It's extremely essential to the economy of the State of Illinois that we remain a viable exporting state. And I do believe that the expenditure of additional \$285,000 in general revenue funds would benefit the economy of the State of Illinois and I would urge along with the other two previous speakers that this money do be restored."

Speaker Matijevich: "If there's no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the item on page 5, lines 11 through 15, of Senate Bill 581 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'nay'. The.. All in favor signify by voting 'aye'. Needs 3/5th Constitutional vote.. Majority. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber, to explain his vote."



Leinenweber: "Not really to explain the vote, I was listening very attentively to my leader that sits next to me, Representative Collins, explaining why he's not supporting the Governor on this and I didn't understand what he said though. Was he talking about pork districts?"

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Adams, Representative Kent, to explain her 'aye' vote."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Economic Development Commission has made this recommendation as needed in the State of Illinois. It passed the Senate unanimously on the override and I urge you to say 'yes', we need to build the economy of Illinois through our port districts."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp, to explain his 'aye' vote."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, one of the few ways we have in this country to increase our balance of payment is by international trade. And the port of Chicago is one of the biggest ports of international trade that we have inland-wise. And I certainly urge support of this Amendment.. (sic) and if you certainly can't tell your story by advertising, I don't know how we're going to expand and promote the sale of not only agricultural products, but industrial goods throughout the world."

Speaker Matijevich: "Jones, 'aye'. Dave Jones, 'aye'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 117.. 18 'aye's, 27 'nay's, 2 voting 'present'. And this motion, having received the 3/5ths Constitutional Majority, prevails, and the item on page 5, lines 11 through 15 on Senate Bill 581 is declared passed, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. The Gentleman from Madison, Representative



Wolf. Representative Sam Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, would you record me as 'aye' on that last question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Record Sam Wolf as 'aye'. Bower, 'no'.
House Bills, Third Reading. House Bills, Third Reading.
House Bill 2811. Clerk will read the Bill."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2811. A Bill for an Act in relation to certain interest rate limits. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Minority Leader from Kankakee, Representative Ryan, on House Bill 2811."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2811 is the usury Bill on mortgage rates. Last night we amended this Bill, and we did three things to it. We lift...we lifted the general interest rate to 12% and...but that doesn't affect mortgage rates. We amended the Bill to remove the usury ceiling for a two-year period, which makes it become effective in 1981 for two years, and we also had an Amendment which permits government units to charge 9% per year instead of 8% per year, and it has nothing to do with the mortgage rates or anything to do with banking. I think everybody understands the issue here. This is of an emergency nature in spite of what the Senate has done, and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Ryan, has moved for the passage of House Bill 2811. On that, the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm not going to belabor the House with a long dissertation on my feelings on the usury limitation law. I'm sorry to see that so many people don't want to hear the truths and I think that they know so much that what they think they're doing is going to somehow create the panacea for all the ills of our society on the unemployment created in the home building industry and the resale market of housing. I hate to tell you Gentlemen and Ladies that are going to vote 'aye', you're wrong. It's not going to cure anything. Homes aren't going to sell. Home building is going to be stagnated. Unemployment is going to



rise in the home building industry no matter what you do here in Illinois and no matter how you try and amend the usury Bill, or abolish it, or repeal it, or put a moratorium on it. The fact that remains is that we're in an economic crisis nationally, and what we do here locally isn't going to mean a hill of beans when it comes to doing anything about the unemployment we're going to experience in the home building market. To those carpenters, and I represent a few of them, that are going to be unemployed, my apologies to you, because I think this General Assembly and this House is about to perpetrate a hoax, and the hoax is going to be that somehow by making the prices of the money that is lent for home building and for mortgage money, that by ris...raising those prices and making it even more unavailable, more really unattainable in the aspect of being able to repay that mortgage, that somehow this hoax should be exploited and...and exposed. Senator McGloon, one time years ago when he served in the Senate as Minority Leader, represented only 19 Democrats, and people used to criticize Senator McGloon of taking up time, and trying to bring about a sense of responsibility in the Senate, and...and bringing about a point of issues sometimes to the Majority party of the Senate. People used to say, 'Don't you feel frustrated? Don't you feel really that... that nobody's listening and nobody cares? That why do you go through it? Why do you speak? Why do you talk about issues that have no real chance of passing or no real chance of stopping its passage by the Majority?' And Art McGloon taught me a lesson in his reply to that statement. He said because back home...back home the people are listening to him. It may not be here where you Members are about to commit a higher interest rate to be charged to citizens that you may be...not be listening, but let me tell you, back home the citizens



are going to watch this kind of action, and they know you're putting a hoax on them. They know...know how you're going to justify putting an increase on interest rate is somehow a good vote for the citizens and consumers of this state. Now, you could justify that you're doing this for the realtors. You could justify and say you're doing it for the home builders, and you could say you're doing it for the banking and...and the savings and loans industry, but they don't have many votes. The people have the votes, and they're the ones that are going to be watching your vote, you know, and just...just put it in perspective. There is no way any Member who votes green on this Bill is going to be able to stand up and truthfully say that he or she did something about inflation in Illinois in the year 1979. If you all want to talk about inflation, remember a major factor in the index of why the consumer index is rising is housing and housing costs, and your action by allowing interest rates to rise through removing the interest...the...the ceiling on that interest charged for a two-year...26 month period is certainly going to be a factor in the increase in inflation in this United States and certainly in Illinois. You can't have it both ways. You can't beat your breast and say OPEC is doing something so bad by charging whatever price they want for their oil, and then you say that you're in support of the banking and the shylocks of this state and say that somehow we should have higher interest rates charged for our citizens on its home mortgages. You can't do it that way. I'm sorry that there isn't an easy answer. I thought a reasonable moratorium would...would have been advisable till we get to more stable economic conditions. I even sat down and suggested that I was willing to go 12 and 14 months for a reasonable moratorium, but to have this House vote on a 26-month moratorium and have no usury limitation in this state,



is, to me, is really ill-advised at best, because I'll predict this to you. You're going to be back here next year. There's still not going to be any housing built. There's still not going to be any mortgages. House... homes are not going to be resold. Not because we have a usury limitation, but solely because people can't afford it. Now, anyway you add it up you're going to, by voting 'aye', you're going to help inflation continue in the United States. You're doing it here in Illinois. We're a piece of the nation. You allow this to happen. It rests on your shoulders. At election time when your opponents talk about you not giving tax relief to the citizens, putting out an RTA tax, and raising other taxes was more important by not giving the consumer any relief, but it was real important to add to the interest rates allowed to be charged to consumers of this state, I think is really ill-advised. I urge a negative vote, and I hope the Senate in its wisdom will send this Bill to a good death knell, so that we could reach a good compromise on how long we should have a moratorium on the usury limit law of this state. I urge a 'no' vote."

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

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Of course, this Bill is not a panacea. To do everything we need to do we also have to reform workman's compensation laws, unemployment insurance laws, and repeal the Scaffolding Act, and if the Gentleman will join with us in that, we'll really make a great deal of progress for the home building industry in the State of Illinois. It has been suggested to me that raising interest rates might actually help bring down some of the inflated values of real estate, because sellers will need to be more realistic about what they are asking for their homes. I think that's an interesting and very logical suggestion. I think that



this could actually help to bring down some of the inflation in the real estate industry. There is no question, in any case, that this Bill is absolutely needed at this time, or our entire economy will come to a halt. Please vote 'aye' on this very good Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Chairman of the Committee, Representative Leon."

Leon: "Ladies and Gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'd just like to recall a little story of usury rates in the fi...in the last five years in Illinois. In 1976 we had a problem with the usury rate. We did have a temporary ceiling of 9½%, which we were renewing year by year. In Committee, in 1976, we presented 4 Bills relating to the Usury Act. One was the variable rate, the other was the Pennsylvania plan, the third rate was no ceiling permanently, and the other was 9½% indefinitely. Those 4 Bills came to the floor of this House, and in spite of the same opposition that I had heard for the last 5 years, those 4 Bills passed out of the House, and one of those Bills was no ceiling on home mortgages permanently. Now, in the wisdom and discussion with labor and the Senate, we decided that of the 4 Bills one that we thought would cure the usury rate in Illinois on home mortgages was the Pennsylvania plan, the present plan that is now in effect. The Senate adopted that. The Governor signed the Bill. We felt that we were through with usury. This last month a very severe crisis has developed in the mortgage field. There is no money available at any rate. Many persons in Illinois have sold their home or offered them for sale and bought another home and found that they were stuck with two mortgages. One is bad enough, but when they had two they were really going to lose one of them. Again, the present Bill before us will permit persons who are willing to pay whatever interest that the market will command can



buy a home and receive mortgage money. Without this Bill there will be no mortgage money. There will be no home buildings. There will be no sales of homes. I urge a 'yes' vote on this very important Bill."

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

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Terzich has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed, 'nay'. And the 'ayes' have it. The Minority Leader, Representative George Ryan from Kankakee, to close."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the ...of the House. I'm certainly glad that the Gentleman from McHenry County didn't have a long comment to make on this Bill. I am surprised though when he says it really doesn't matter what we do here...that it will have no bearing one way or another. Well, he's wrong. If we don't take some action today, without this Bill you're going to have about a 25 or 30% unemployment rate in the housing industry. Money's going to leave the State of Illinois to other states that have lower interest rates or have no ceiling at all, and there's going to be fewer housing starts. This is an emergency measure, and I think it's urgent that we pass it here today, and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryan has moved for the passage of House Bill 2811. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2811 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber, to explain his vote."

Leinenweber: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope it isn't necessary to explain the vote, but there are a couple of things that I think the Gentleman from McHenry, who



spoke against the Bill, didn't point out. And that is, that in the residential market right now, in fact, the real estate market right now, we have actual deflation. You can buy a home today for probably 10 or 20% less than you could buy it two months ago when interest rates were bonging around the 10% level, so I see there's plenty of votes now."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kelly, to explain his vote."

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I did some calculation on a \$50,000 mortgage at 11% for a 30-year period, and I came up with a figure of \$476 a month as a premium payment and a total over the 30-year period of \$171,000. Ladies and Gentlemen, it's...I don't know, and this doesn't include real estate taxes or insurance. You add that on, you're coming out anywhere from 600 to 700 dollars a month. Certainly, we're in an emergency situation, and I'm going to support this measure like many of my colleagues, but I feel that we are forcing our...the people of Illinois, and not only in Illinois but across the country, from going from 25- and 30-year mortgages into 50-year mortgages."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes, to explain his vote."

Barnes: "Thank you. Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in line with what Representative Kelly has indicated, I'm voting 'present' on this. I realize that there is an immediate problem, but I was just reading an article in today's Chicago Sun Times and Stan 'Enland', the head of the largest savings and loan in the state indicated what would happen to a \$50,000 mortgage home on a 25- to 40-year basis. On a 25-year mortgage that home would...would cost that buyer \$526 a month including principal and interest. On a 25-year



mortgage. What will...could very well happen here is that would be extended to 40 years, and on a 40-year mortgage that home buyer would save a total of \$22 a month, because on a 40-year mortgage it would cost them \$504 a month versus \$525 a month on 12%. That's what we're giving to our buyers, and what we are saying, I think, to those buyers who are in the salary range of about \$25,000 a year using the rule of thumb that $\frac{1}{2}$ of their monthly earning should go toward that home that they are buying; we are saying to those that make \$25,000 or less that you are simply out of the market. I vote 'present'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino, to explain his vote. One minute."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think I have as many constituents as every other Member in this House. Approximately 185,000 of them, and this was their week. I don't think I received a letter from any of my 185,000 constituents that said, 'Please, please increase the cost for me to buy a new vehicle. Increase the cost for me to purchase a home. Increase the cost for me in most aspects of government.' This was not...I didn't receive any letters of yearning to have this type of legislation passed, and I really don't know what we're doing except allowing those same people that we haven't given any breaks to to pay 4 for 1 money, and that's what you're saying. Two and a half times the family income is basically what real estate is based on, so for someone to borrow \$100,000 the family income had better be around 45. If it's not, we're..."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Johnson...Champaign, Representative Johnson. One minute, and I've got the timer, which I usually don't do, but it's get away day. One minute. Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "I don't know what the letters to Representative



Mautino said, but I know the communications to myself and a number of other Legislators said this, 'If we don't make this change now, jobs in the construction industry are going to vanish. If we don't make this change now, we're not going to be able to buy homes. If we don't make this change now, people in all sectors of the economy from financial institutions to consumers are going to be affected adversely, and if we don't make this change, we don't have to worry about what we have to pay for money because there isn't going to be the money to be able to allow anybody to purchase homes anywhere, and our economy is going to collapse or at least a large degree of collapse by our inaction. I see we have 140 votes, and I just hope they stay up there."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bullock, one minute to explain his vote."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I recognize this is not going to change any votes, but I think it ought to be said. I think it ought to be said that this Body doesn't care about the consumer that's going to take the shaft on this vote. We know that for two years the juice loans in this state that are made to various people, say at 25 cent a month, their homes will be taken and confiscated, because we haven't stood up for the consumers. There was a time when the Democratic party stood for something in this state and in this nation, and in 1976 we put together a Democratic national platform that said that interest rates were too high, and the policies that we're pursuing in this Legislature and in Congress were abhorrent, but we still stand here today, some of us proud to be good Democrat and voting against the very platform that we helped to formulate. I can't support this, and I think the public deserves better."

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



record. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, for what purpose do you rise?"

Skinner: "To explain my vote. There was a time when the Democratic party stood for sales tax relief, and when the Gentleman who just preceded me was sitting in his seat was recognized when the vote was 82-82 and said nothing."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 139 'ayes', 16 'nays', 14 voting 'present', and House Bill 2811 having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On Total Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 420. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Governor has seen fit to veto .. place a total veto on Senate Bill 420. This veto was discussed of course in the Senate and the Senate I believe voted without a dissenting vote for the override of the veto..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. The Minority Leader, the Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Ryan, for what purpose do you arise?"

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I had several Members that wanted to explain their vote on the last issue that feel that their rights have been misused and abused here by the Chair.."

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

Ryan: "And I would hope in the future that you wouldn't let that happen."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. I won't do that. I was.. I thought the sense of the Majority was to keep rolling and that's why I didn't. Sorry. The... The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Borchers. Go ahead, Webber."

Borchers: " This is happening entirely too much. Now I'm not going to take the time to explain my vote like I wanted to do. But let me tell you something; we either obey the rules of this House or we've got to make whoever's



stuck with them like I have been stuck has got to make them... make the acting Speaker do it. Now you.. From now on please recognize me when I want to be recognized. Cause, by God, I'll see to it that you do it."

Speaker Matijevec: "Alright. I'm sorry, Representative Borchers. It's really cause you're so far to the left I can't see you. And I'd like to correct you. That's the first time it's been done today since I've been here. Alright. Let's proceed. Representative Yourell continue. Representative Yourell. Let's continue. I've already apologized to everybody. Let's continue. Representative Yourell, let's continue with the business of the House."

Yourell: "Thank... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Senate has overridden the total veto placed on Senate Bill 420. The reason that the Governor gave for placing the total veto on this Senate Bill was that he had already signed another House Bill, 2380. His reasons were that there were enough ... the issues in Senate Bill 420 were apparently adequately addressed in the House Bill. And I disagree with that premise in that there are two basic difficulties that the Governor obviously didn't recognize. House Bill 2380 does not contain an explicit delegation of rule making authority to the agency. Although the very broad language which reads, 'to possess all powers reasonable and necessary for the exercise and administration of the parties duties, powers, duties and responsibilities of the department may imply the authority exists.' House Bill 2380 also retains an outdated Section on the applicability of the Administrative Procedure Act which Senate Bill 420 would delete. This provision has caused confusion and allowed the agency to evade the requirements of the Act with respect to the adoption of publication of federal ordered rules."



So I believe although he has signed House Bill 2380 that Senate Bill 420 addresses the issue in two different ways that I think are necessary if that agency, the Vocational Rehabilitation of Disabled Persons, would be able to operate in a manner called for under the Administrative Procedure Act. I ask for an affirmative vote on the motion to override the Governor's veto on Senate Bill 420."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved to override the Governor's veto with respect to Senate Bill 420. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 420 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'nay'. This issue takes three-fifths Constitutional Majority. All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'nay'. Three-fifths vote. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 79 'aye's, 57 'nay's, 1 voting 'present'. And this motion, having failed to receive the Constitutional three-fifths Majority, is hereby declared lost."



Speaker Matijevich: "Senate Bill 459, Representative Von Boeckman. The Gentleman from Tazewell, Representative Von Boeckman on Senate Bill 459."

Von Boeckman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Contrary to the Governor's Veto Message, the purpose of this legislation was to eliminate undue red tape whereby the Illinois Interstate Carriers have to carry a card cab with an identification stamp in addition to placing a decal on the side of their trucks. This legislation has a clause which states if there is a loss of revenue, the loss will be made up by the Interstate Carriers and the...both the industry and the teamsters have pledged their support in this regard. And I would like to bring your attention that this is the first time that this has happened when the Teamsters and the industry have supported an issue. The Motor Vehicles Law Commission held extensive hearings throughout the State of Illinois at a great expense to the taxpayers...and we had an agreed Bill here between everyone concerned. However, at the last minute, the Illinois Commerce Commission asked the Governor to Veto the Bill and then I...we had a meeting with them yesterday and they reconsidered...the issue and they're not whole-heartedly against it. There are a few changes they said they might have to make down the line and we said it would be better to make the changes after the Bill...it becomes law rather than go back and hold extensive hearings again. I have contacted the Leadership on both sides, they agree and I feel in my own mind we should override the Governor in this issue. The Senate vote to override was 42 to 1. I ask your favorable vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Von Boeckman has moved to override the Governor's Veto with respect to Senate Bill 459. On that...now listen closely, the



Gentleman from Macon, Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, I merely wanted to find out if my light was working."

Speaker Matijevich: "It's working all right. The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's not too often that I differ with my colleague across the aisle, particularly on his expertise in the...in the field of motor vehicles. But there are a couple of things in there that bother me in particular. And rather than try to get too long because we've got a lot of things to go through...is that it is shifting the fees from the small owner, increasing their fees from 5 dollars up to...the small trucks I should say, the intrastate trucks, from 5 dollars up to 19. It's decreasing the long haul interstate haulers from 19 down to 1 dollar. It's going to be shifting the fees to the small businessman again which I think he is less able to fend with legislative red tape and mandates than some of the larger ones. The thing that really bothers me, and I would like to read about five, six lines of the last paragraph of the Bill...and I think, herein lies part of the whole problem. Up to now, the Legislature does not fund the Interstate Commerce Commission. They exist on their own fees. But let me read this last paragraph. 'The Legislative intent that the fees prescribed in this Amendatory Act of 1979 shall not diminish the revenues to the Illinois Commerce Commission. And should it be determined that the changes of fees in this Section cause such revenues to be reduced, the General Assembly will subsequently adjust the fees to rectify such diminution of revenue.' I think that's a very serious fault with that Bill and I would urge a 'no' vote."



Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Von Boeckman, to close.
Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "Well, Mr. Chairman...Mr. Speaker, he's entirely wrong. The intrastate carriers will not have the burden of the increase. It will be the interstate carriers. And that's...the ones that travel through the state and not are located in...in the state. This is an agreed piece of legislation. We worked long and hard on it and I think it's one of the... things that we, as a Legislative Body, have to address ourselves to rather than have bureaucracy do it for us. I think it's a good piece of legislation. The Commission urges everyone to vote favorably for it."

Speaker Matijevich: "On Representative Von Boeckman's motion. The question is, shall Senate Bill 459 pass notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'nay'. This motion takes a three-fifths 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 are 117 'ayes', 29 'nays', 3 voting 'present'. And this motion, having received the Constitutional three-fifths Majority, prevails and Senate Bill 459 is declared passed notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor. One moment. The Lady from Cook, Representative Balanoff, for what purpose do you rise?"

Balanoff: "Add me as 'aye' to that vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right. Record Balanoff as 'aye' on that last Roll Call. Also Braun. On the Calendar is Senate Bill 468. Domico 'aye' also and Kulas 'aye' on the last Bill. Representative Keane, are you ready? Kulas, is that 'aye' on the last Bill? Representative Kulas. Would you turn him on."



Kulas: "Mr. Chairman, I rise on a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed, Representative Kulas."



Kulas: "When we convened this morning at 10:30, Spea...there were about 40 or 50 Members present in the House. Speaker Redmond, at that time, stated that he would call the Bills of the Members who were present in the morning first. I've got a Bill, Senate Bill 1334, which was one of the last ones on the Calendar, and I'm afraid if we keep going in numerical sequence, again, I'll be left with only 40 or 50 people here. So I would appreciate if the Speaker would stick to his statement and call those people who were here early in the morning."

Speaker Matijeich: "Alright,...I think he has a point, except I don't know which ones by what I've got here...that he would be referring to, but...but he surely was here because I was on the floor at the same time, so right now we will proceed to Senate Bill 1334, Representative Kulas. He very rarely asks for anything, and he's going to get his way. Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1334, which passed both Houses and was vetoed by the Governor, is a very simple Bill. It allows any person appearing before a grand jury to have the right to be accompanied by counsel who may advise him of his rights, but shall not participate in the grand jury proceedings in any other way. Existing law provides that any person against whom an indictment is being sought has the right to be accompanied by counsel before the grand jury. This Bill would extend that right to every person appearing before the grand jury. Now the Governor's rationale for vetoing this Bill, he states that this Bill would turn grand jury proceedings into mini trials. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill strictly limits the counsel's role to that of advising his client of his rights. The counsel may not participate in any other way. So therefore, this argument that the Bill would require



mini-trials is an empty argument. The Governor states that the grand jury's secrecy would be breeched. He states that counsel would advise their clients to flee in order to avoid indictments, that counsel would advise their clients to commit perjury or to defeat the system. Well, the Governor's objections are founded on the presumption that defense attorneys would ignore or disobey the law or commit unethical acts. Therefore...he is stating that all the attorneys in the State of Illinois are these kind of people. So, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move that the House concur with the Senate and pass Senate Bill 1334 notwithstanding the Governor's veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Kulas has moved the...that the...we override Senate Bill 1334. If there is no discussion, the question is 'Shall Senate Bill 1334 pass notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?'. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'nay'. This motion takes 107 votes, 3/5 Constitutional Majority. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take... The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer to explain his vote."

Brummer: "Yes, this is a very important concept. I really do not understand the Governor's message. It says somehow it would interfere with the secrecy proceedings of the grand jury. That is absolutely nonsense. They would be bound by the same rules as any other person who appears before the grand jury. I do not understand why individuals who appear before a grand jury and want to be accompanied by their attorney cannot do so. This is a strike for freedom and protection of the rights of the individuals again, being run over rough shod in some manners. If the importance of accompaniment



of counsel should not be overlooked. The Governor states that it is not..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 117 'ayes', 41 'nays', 2 voting 'present'. This motion having received the Constitutional Maj...3/5ths Majority prevails, and Senate Bill 1334 is hereby declared passed notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. Back to James Keane on Senate Bill 468."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly.

Senate Bill 468 requires the Director of the Department of Revenue to give Illinois taxpayers a written notice at least ten days prior to sharing tax information from their income tax returns with the Federal Government or with another state. Taxpayers would indicate their desire to receive such notification by means of a check off on their annual income tax return and they would pay for whatever cost it was. The Governor vetoed the Bill on the basis that the Internal Revenue Service supposedly has indicated that the imposition of the notice requirement contained in the Bill is contrary to an agreement between the Department of Revenue and IRS and would require the ... the IRS would require the termination of the agreement. The notice agreement is imposed not on the Department, not on the IRS, but on the Illinois Department of Revenue. The ... It's my understanding and I have asked the Department of Revenue to correct this- I have not received any correction- that they are basing the Governor's veto is based on a letter, communication that Revenue receive from IRS regarding the need for IRS to notify. According to a Senate staff attorney who reviewed the agreement between the Department of Revenue and IRS, the ten day notice requirement that this Bill stipulates



is not contrary to the agreement's position and would not necessarily result in its termination. I would ask for your vote in favor... and override the Governor's veto on 468."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Keane has moved for the override of the Governor's veto on Senate Bill 468.

On that the Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson.

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

I think what we really have to look to is the substance of the issue here. What we're talking about is how we adequately enforce the revenue laws. Now, what the Gentleman's Bill would do is require that the Illinois Revenue Department notify the taxpayer when the Feds request a copy of his form. The Feds, in fact, request the copy of a tax.. an Illinois taxpayer's form 72 times last year. 72 times they wanted to get a copy of that form. In fact, last year we requested the Federal forms 11,000 times. We needed their help in order to enforce our revenue laws, in order to catch tax evaders 11,000 times. We need their forms because the volume of information that's required to be disclosed on those Federal forms is so extensive. It helps enforce Illinois tax laws. What the Feds would do would be to terminate the reciprocal agreement. They... It's not important to them, the information they get off the Illinois tax forms, which they only requested 72 times last year, in order to engage in that reciprocal agreement. So what we're really doing is encouraging tax evasion with this thing and discouraging and inhibiting the ability of the Illinois Department of Revenue to enforce Illinois income tax and sales tax laws. The ... This goes directly at the whole issue that we went through in the 'Mirage' cases. Because one of the quickest ways to find out whether somebody's trying to evade the Illinois sales tax or the liquor taxes



is for the Illinois Department of Revenue to go get the forms, the income tax forms, that the businesses have to file with the Feds. They can go get those. They can identify a potential evader and they can prosecute him. What we're doing is giving up that whole ability if we vote to override the Governor here. This is one of the Governor's very good vetos and I would urge a 'no' vote on this motion."

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

Skinner: "I agree."

Speaker Matijevich: "If there's no further discussion, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Keane, to close."

Keane: "Yes. I believe that it's very important for the 72 people who received... whose tax information was sent to the IRS to know that that tax information was sent to the IRS. The Gentleman's contention that only 72 people at the present time, there's only an exchange of 72 tax forms from the Department of Revenue to the IRS, means that if we are to turn down a thing just because there's a small number of people, we're in sad shape. In terms of the agreement, what the IRS will do if the State of Illinois is required to give people ten days notice of sending their forms over to IRS, is totally in doubt. The legal opinion that the Senate found was that although the agreement gives both IRS and the Department of Revenue the option of terminating or modifying the agreement, their review indicated there was nothing inherent in the ten day notice requirement that would give cause or reason for termination. And I would ask for your favorable vote on this matter. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "On motion of Representative Keane, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 468 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All in favor signify



by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'nay'. This issue takes 3/5ths Constitutional Majority, 107 votes. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 49 'aye's, 78 'nay's, none answering 'present'. This motion, having failed to receive the Constitutional 3/5ths Majority, is hereby declared lost. Senate Bill 492, Representative Yourell. The Gentleman from Cook, 'Bus' Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have reviewed the Governor's veto message relative to Senate Bill 492 and rather than take the time of the House with this subject matter, I think in part his message is quite accurate and quite correct. There is some vagueness in the language and I would rather now just to amend Senate Bill 107 in the next... in the Spring Session..."

Speaker Matijeovich: "Leave... Leave to withdraw the motion on Senate Bill 492? Leave. Senate Bill 498.. Representative Yourell, are you ready on that one? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell, on Senate Bill 798."

Yourell: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 798 is a very ... important piece of legislation as far as counties are concerned. There were two Bills introduced in this Session of the General Assembly, Senate Bills 106 and Senate Bill 798. Both of those Bills required the distribution of state inheritance tax revenues to counties. Senate Bill provided for 10% of those revenues to be retained by the county and Senate Bill 798 sets up a special inheritance tax collection distributive fund in the State Treasury, into which each county must remit four percent of all inheritance tax revenues collected. The fund is then distributed to the counties each month on the basis of the amount paid in by each county and both pieces



of legislation became effective on becoming law. The Governor vetoed both of these legislation..pieces of legislation and I can suggest to you that the inheritance tax revenue retained by counties has been a traditional tax that counties have counted on through the years. Each of the 102 counties in the State of Illinois will lose substantial amounts of revenue should this veto of the Governor not be overridden. If those of you who have encouraged relative to the amount of revenue that would be suffered by your counties, I would be delighted to tell you what the figure is in this year. I think this is very important legislation. I think it's traditional legislation. I think it provides a source of revenue for counties that they have traditional enjoyed and I ask now for you to participate and share with me by a 'yes' vote on the override of ... by the Governor of the veto on Senate Bill 798."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Yourell has moved the override of the Governor's veto with respect to Senate Bill 798. If there's no discussion, the... The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to oppose this Bill and I know it's not a popular position to take because the counties are sitting around licking their chops hoping they're going to get this. But I would tell you that the proposal here is not fair in the first place. Now take the Wrigley' estate as a good example which produced 7 million dollars worth of inheritance tax just exactly why Cook County should get that because 'the Wrigley's' happen to live in Cook County is more than I can understand. And if some rich man happens to live in his last days in my county, I don't know why Marion County should get all of that. And that's what we're talking about here. Now the loss of revenue that they had after they lost the fees has been made up



in revenue sharing which is distributed on a fair basis. Now then, they want all this and heaven too. They want revenue sharing, now they want this. And they won't be happy with that. So I want to tell you if you just keep chipping away at the state's resources, you'd better quit coming in with your appropriation Bills."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Knox, Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to join Representative Yourell in support of this Bill. We all know that county government is one of the closest governments to the people. We know that we have in the past mandated many, many things to county governments that they must do. We all know that over the years up until the 1970 Constitution the counties were allowed to retain 4% of the inheritance tax prior to sending it on to the State Government. I really have some doubts about whether all that inheritance tax should go to the state anyhow. I realize of course that it would be impossible to retain all of it in the county of origin. But nevertheless, if someone in Knox County has an estate, I certainly feel that the County of Knox, who collects that inheritance tax and forwards it to the State of Illinois, does deserve the minimal amount of 4% for collecting and remitting that to the State of Illinois. And I certainly urge a 'yes' vote in this attempt to override the Governor's veto..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Yourell to close."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't want to presume upon the time of the House. I know this is a very important issue and does... should have a direct vote and I now ask you to join me in overriding the Governor's veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "On Representative Yourell's motion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 798 pass notwithstanding



the veto of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'nay'. This issue takes three-fifths Constitutional Majority. 107 votes. Those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Have all vote? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 133 'aye's, 14 'nay's, 4 voting 'present'. This motion, having received a Constitutional three-fifths Majority, prevails, and Senate Bill 798 is hereby declared passed, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. Senate Bill 909. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten." Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to override the Governor's veto on Senate Bill 909. Senate Bill 909 is part of the ongoing battle in the states and in Illinois as well over the right of the Legislature to appropriate Federal funds. At least three times that I can remember this Legislature has passed overwhelmingly a piece of legislation to allow the Legislature to determine how Federal funds were going to be passed. Each time it's come back to us with an Executive Veto. And each time the executive has created a new 'bogie' as to why we should not be appropriating all Federal funds. And again, those 'bogies' are being presented to us as the Governor indicated in his message and I'm sure some of the hatchet men for the Governor will be speaking to them. But, let me point out the importance of what we are doing. Many times there are Federal funds that go through our present system and are used by various agencies of State Government for programs over which this Legislature has had no input. One, two, maybe three years later the Federal funds lapse and we're asked to fund these programs with state money only. And they then impact on our general revenue picture and impact eventually on



us having to increase taxes to fund them for something for which we had no input at all. These arguments have been presented time and time again in these chambers. And time and time again the Legislature has overwhelmingly ... ratified their right to have these funds appropriated. This Bill passed with only one or two dissenting votes in both the House and the Senate and the veto was overridden in the Senate with no dissenting votes. Before you again today is the right for the Legislature to determine the use of Federal funds. I think it's an important issue. It is one that has been a battleground throughout the states and the courts have upheld the right of the states to appropriate Federal funds. We are trying to do that in this State and there are no statutes existing for us to do it, only a Comptroller's ruling that prevents these funds. We need a statute. We need that authority. We need to exercise the independence between the Executive and the Legislative and this proposal, Senate Bill 909, does that. I ask for your support in my motion to override the Governor's veto."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Totten has moved to override the Governor's veto with respect to Senate Bill 909. On that motion, the Gentleman from Cook, the Assistant Minority, Representative Arthur Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, let me first thank my colleague from Cook County for his very gracious compliment. I'm sure he meant Representative Collins when he was talking about the Governor's hatchet man. For some reason the Gentleman is not in his seat, so I will pick up the ball for him. The Gentleman is known in the House for his concern about fiscal responsibility. And in his remarks he very adroitly tries to play upon all of our feeling about protecting the Legislative process and seen to it that we are the ones who appropriate



not only state funds, but federal funds because, after all, that is our Legislative prerogative. And that is the cord upon which the Gentleman makes his case. But let me tell you, my friends, and let me remind you in the recent weeks of this Veto Session, we have been preoccupied principally with tax relief, and letting our constituents know or feel that we're all fiscal conservative and that we're deeply concerned about spending the taxpayers money and returning to taxpayers some form of tax relief, no matter what.... regardless of what type or in what amount. And it is for this very reason, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that I rise to oppose the Gentleman's motion to override the Governor's veto relative to Senate Bill 909. This Bill deals with federal funds that are used to pay unemployment compensation, benefits. Employers are taxed at a certain rate. They pay that rate to the state. The state gives the money to the Federal Government. I assume the Feds give it back to us and it's redistributed to people who are laid off from their jobs in a form of unemployment compensation. It is my understanding that that is the only purpose for which the funds could be used. I rather doubt that if we wanted to appropriate it for something else, we could not do it anyway. In addition to that, the rate is recomputed two times during the year. And so we would never really know in advance how much there would be to appropriate. But more importantly, I think all of you should bear this in mind, if we were to appropriate what I believe is a billion some odd dollars, that in effect would be added to the state budget. So some conservative back home or someone who's .. who feels that this tax issue is an important political issue, will go up and down your District and say, 'Look at this Legislator. He or she has voted to increase the budget by one billion



some hundred thousand odd million dollars.' And you will look as though you're a big spender and the Gentleman's Conservative Union will publish a list and you'll wind up at the top of the list of those great big spenders and while the Gentleman stands today and puts a motion to override the Governor's veto, my guess is when that Roll Call vote comes, he won't be on the floor or he'll vote 'no', because he'll want his rating with the Conservative Union or the Conservative League to look good while all of you will be voting for another one billion plus dollars in state spending. When the fact of the matter is this money is not a part of the state budget. This money is not taxed specifically for state purposes and if we wanted to appropriate it for something other than benefits in the field of unemployment compensation, we couldn't do it. I say to you that this Bill is simply flim-flam. It's simply a way to play upon your emotions as a Legislator. But it's going to get you in a political trick bag and it's unnecessary."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, the Assistant Majority Leader, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to support Senate Bill 909 and 9010 (sic?). In fact, my comments will apply to both Bills. Notwithstanding the veto of the Governor, Senate Bill 909 and 910 are simple Bills which prohibit state agencies and the State Board of Education from spending federal funds without the specific authorization and appropriation from the General Assembly. While the Bills are extensive in their coverage, there are exemptions allowed. These exemptions include the Circuit Courts, units of Local Government, School Districts, local Boards of Education, state colleges and universities, community colleges and all



other state created revenue bonding authorities. In addition, any federal funds used to pay principal and interest on state general obligation bonds are exempt from this legislation. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this legislation is not new legislation, nor is it legislation that has been casually passed by this General Assembly. Senate Bill 909 passed the House this spring by a vote of 156 to 1. And the Senate by a vote of 54 to nothing. Senate Bill 910 also passed the House and Senate overwhelmingly. Let me tell you the history of this legislation. As I have indicated, this legislation has been considered by this House previously. In 1977 the General Assembly overwhelmingly passed House Bill 186. Also a federal funds appropriation piece of legislation. In that year the Governor vetoed the legislation claiming the Bill would work an undue hardship on executive agencies and besides, the General Assembly already appropriates 99% of federal funds. Again in 1978, the General Assembly passed the federal funds Bill, House Bill 2769. And but for a technical error in the Bill relating to the revenue bond authorities, we would not be here today because that legislation would have become law, for the General Assembly would have overridden that veto in 1978. This brings us up to 1979 and Senate Bill 909 and 910. Predictably and because he could find no other reason, the Governor for the third time has vetoed this legislation for the same reasons as in the past. The problem the Governor has this year is that the legislation we sent to him is clean. There are no technical flaws. There are no loopholes. There is no room left for red-herrings. And yet still, despite the overwhelming vote in the Senate to override the Governor's vetos on these Bills, the Chief Executive is searching for red-herrings that was pointed out by



Representative Telcser. An example of the Governor's recent red-herrings surrounds allegations coming from the first and second floors relating and stating that these Bills will result in a billion dollars added to our state budget. Yes, Ladies and Gentlemen, it's a billion dollars. How ludicrous. This billion dollar allegation flies in the face of the Governor's own veto message where he states that 99% of all federal funds are already appropriated. Ladies and Gentlemen, the one percent that is not appropriated does not total to one billion dollars. One percent of the federal funds appropriated in fiscal 1979 equals 8.6 million dollars, 8.6 million dollars, substantially less than the one billion the Governor has suggested. The Governor has also suggested that this legislation will affect pass-through money to our municipalities and local units of government. This is wrong. The Governor has not read the Bill. Page two of the Bill contains a paragraph which states that federal money to be passed through the local units of government is specifically exempted. Let us talk about the one percent that the Governor suggests need not be appropriated. I submit to you that this is precisely this one percent that should be appropriated. It is elusive federal programs which are part of this one percent initiated by State Government without the knowledge of this Body that has caused the problem. Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly, I suggest to you that the Governor is grasping for any arguments to defeat this bill, no matter how fallacious. In order to continue his control over the appropriations process, in order to regain our stature as an equal branch of government, we must exercise the authority given to us in Article 8, Section 2 of the Illinois State Constitution. The Article states that the General Assembly shall- and Ladies and Gentlemen, I



stress, to you the language is not permissive. It says that the General Assembly shall make appropriations for all public funds by the state. General revenue funds are public funds. Road funds are public funds. Agricultural premium funds are public funds. All other state funds are public funds and all federal funds are public funds. We have a Constitutional mandate. These Bills straighten our mandate. I urge you.. I urge you very strongly to override the Governor's veto on Senate Bill 909 and 910."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, the Minority Spokesman of Appropriations I Committee, J.J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've listened very intently to the debate that's going on on both sides and I have heard some figures that I consider erroneous, the billion or billion and a half dollar figure. And I support the concept of this Bill. We have overlooked one thing, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, I believe which is kind of important, that we forgot to set up as the State of Oregon has, a mechanism to set up some way for emergency money that might come from the Federal Government when the General Assembly is not in Session. That is, unless you want to be in Session all year long... Now the State of Oregon, I'm not familiar with their plan. I'm sorry I didn't realize it before because I would have tried to set up the mechanism with this so I could support this override. Let me point out one particular instance when this could happen. While we could have some additional quota lifts on refugees from foreign countries, they could pour into this state as well as others. There could be some emergency money from the Federal Government in way of a Public Aid grant. And there would be no way for the State of Illinois to disburse this money because we weren't in Session to appropriate the dollars. And I think that's



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Fl-1-79

one of the shortcomings. At this time I would urge to uphold the Governor's veto of this Senate Bill 909, but if we are to set up some mechanism for emergency funds, I would be happy to support this concept and vote for it again next year."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Murphy."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Murphy has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The main question is put. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten, to close."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As every year at the last moment, the Governor comes forth with a new 'bogie' as to why he doesn't want us to be .. having a say in where these funds go. Let me address myself to those questions. The Gentleman from Cook, the first hatched to speak, spoke on the funds in the UC thing not being able to be appropriated. Well, first of all, those funds do not go into the Treasury. Secondly, I have talked to the Senate Sponsor and he is aware of this as I am, and that if in fact this could be an unforeseen problem this Bill does not become effective until July 1, 1980. And he would be more than willing to correct what could be the new 'bogie'. Let me remind the Members of this House also that we do have a mechanism for taking care of emergencies in this state. Outside of the fact that we are almost constantly in Session, the advent of the numerous Special Sessions keeps us here almost full time. And that should there in fact be a real crisis, in the use of federal funds, we must appropriate, you can be... You can well imagine how quickly we would be



called down here to take care of it. There are no serious problems with this legislation. It is just exercising our Constitution mandate and our right to appropriate those funds in the manner we see proper and I move that we override the Governor's veto on Senate Bill 909."

Speaker Matijevich: "On the motion of Representative Totten's, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 909 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'nay'. This motion takes 107 votes, a three-fifths Constitutional Majority. The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson, to explain his vote."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What this Bill ought to be entitled is, 'The High Perdiem Act of 1979.' I'm appalled that Representative Totten could stand there and urge us to be in Session every day to try to appropriate every dollar conceivable. We're talking about a tiny amount of money. We're talking about probably spending more on perdiem in order to appropriate that money than we're actually going to control or regulate. This Bill ought to be decisively defeated."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman... Sharp; you want to vote me 'aye'? The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, to explain his vote. One minute."

Skinner: "I don't know about the rest of you, but I've never seen a one billion dollar perdiem check yet. You know it's always next year. Next year we'll do it. It's okay. But, there's this little mistake. Well it's just like sales tax relief. It doesn't matter who is in the Executive Branch, it doesn't matter who controls it. The Executive Branch never wants to do it. But the Executive Branch is never going to want to give up this discretionary control over federal funds. Now,



there are enough... Well, I can't quite put it that way. But we have yielded enough times to the Executive Branch during this last three... during these last three weeks. There are some of us I presume who would yield forever. Some of us, however, believe that the Executive Branch ought to be a separate branch of State Government, and not just an appendage of the Executive Branch. I'm really getting fairly serious about introducing an Amendment just to abolish the Legislative Branch. And from the looks of the Roll Call up there it appears that such an Amendment probably would pass."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to explain my vote, if I may. It's quite difficult to imagine that the Members of this Body would be willing to give up so much of their prerogatives in the spending of taxpayers' money whether it be federal or state to the Executive Branch of government. This measure as I indicated earlier has long had overwhelming support until we put it on the Governor's desk and no matter in what form it's put on the Governor's desk, the Executive Branch has always come back with a full veto of the measure because they would like to control those funds regardless of the impact that it may have on future state budgets. Well, I and many others and many in other states have felt that right... that prerogative rightly belongs to the Legislature. Now why can't we understand that? Why are there 46 people willing to go along with the Governor and turn over that right to various agencies non-elected officials and to the executive to appropriate and have the final say on those monies and then be dismayed months later or maybe years later when they come back to us and say, 'We started these programs a number of years



ago and used federal funds, you didn't have any say in it, but now you're going to have to because you're going to have to pick up the full tab.'? I can't understand that. And I can't understand why this doesn't receive in it's.. at least 107 votes necessary for the full override and quite frankly, all the votes of the Members of this General Assembly who jealously.. jealously regard their right to legislate and appropriate."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Brummer, one minute to explain his vote.

Brummer: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This was a good Bill when it passed this House this spring with 156 'yes' votes, when it passed the Senate with 54 'yes' votes. It's the same identical good Bill now and it ought to receive the same number of 'yes' votes. The General Assembly ought not to abdicate its responsibility and its right to appropriate all the dollars, whether they're federal dollars or whether they are not. It's.. We should not expect the support of the executive with regard to this Bill. Obviously the executive would like to spend money without any legislative oversight, but we certainly ought to put the same 156 'yes' votes up there and protect the legislative obligation and responsibility to be involved in the appropriation process."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. ...We know what you want. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Telcser, indicated a request for a verification. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten, has asked for a poll of the absentees. Carol Braun wishes to be verified. Leave. Same request for Brummer. Leave to be verified, Brummer. Poll of the absentees as soon as it gets out of the machine. By



the way, the Minority Leader has asked if it is definite that we are not in tomorrow. It is definite that we are not in tomorrow."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees: Bluthardt. Breslin. Dyer. Ebbesen. Gaines. Griesheimer. Katz. Kozubowski. Marovitz. McBroom. Oblinger. Polk. Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Steczo. E.G. Steele. Sumner. No further."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Clerk will proceed with the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "How much..."

Speaker Matijevich: "We start with 107, right?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Right."

Speaker Matijevich: "Right. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander. Anderson. Balanoff. E.M. Barnes. Beatty. Bianco. Birchler. Birkinbine. Borchers. Boucek. Bowman. Bradley. Braun. Brummer. Bullock. Capparelli. Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton. Currie. Darrow. Davis. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Ewell. Farley. Friedrich. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Grossi. Hallock. Hanahan. Hannig. Harris. Henry. Hudson. Huff. Jaffe. Johnson. Dave Jones. Emil Jones. Kane. Keane. Kelly. Kempiners. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leinenweber. Leon. Leverenz. Macdonald. Madigan. Matijevich. Matula. Mautino. McGrew. McMaster. Meyer. Mulcahey. Murphy..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Representative McMaster, for what purpose do you arise? McMaster wishes to be changed from 'aye' to 'no'. Proceed."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Change McClain from 'no' to 'aye'. McClain."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing on the Affirmative Votes; Pouncey. Preston. Pullen. Rea. Reed. Reilly. Richmond."



Ronan. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schraeder. Schuneman.
 Simms. Skinner. Slape. Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich.
 Totten. Tuerk. Van Duyne. Vitek. VonBoeckman.
 Walsh. White. Willer. Williams. Sam Wolf. Younge.
 Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative
 Telcser, questions of the Affirmative vote. What do
 we start out with, Mr. Clerk? 107."

Telcser: "106, Representative.."

Speaker Matijevich: "No, we put McClain... he switched too."

Telcser: "Okay. Alright, Representative Beatty."

Speaker Matijevich: "Beatty, how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker?"

Mr. Speaker, it's got 106 votes, now. Want to declare
 it lost and save some time or..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Well, if you're all through, we can do
 that. But if you..."

Telcser: "Alright. Okay. You won't do it. Representative
 Birchler?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. One moment. The Lady from
 LaSalle, Representative Breslin."

Breslin: "Please record me as voting."

Speaker Matijevich: "Record Breslin as 'aye'. The Gentleman
 from..."

Telcser: "Representative Birchler.."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. The Gentleman from Madison,
 Representative McPike, wishes to be recorded from 'no'
 to 'aye'."

McPike: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed, Representative Telcser. You
 want to quit now?"

Telcser: "Representative Birchler. You were too slow
 with the gavel, John."



Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Birchler, is he back there? Yes, he's in his seat."

Telcser: "Representative Capparelli."

Speaker Matijevich: "Capparelli is standing on the side here."

Telcser: "Representative Chapman."

Speaker Matijevich: "Chapman. I think, yeah, she's way in the back."

Telcser: "Representative Darrow."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Darrow is standing by his seat."

Telcser: "Representative Davis."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Grossi, for what purpose do you arise? 'No'. Proceed."

Telcser: "Representative Grossi voted 'no'?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Grossi voted 'no'."

Telcser: "Representative Davis."

Speaker Matijevich: "He's in the back waving his..."

Telcser: "Representative Ewell."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Grossi.. went to 'no'."

Telcser: "Grossi went from what? 'Aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "'Aye' to 'no', that's right. I'm sorry. 'Aye' to 'no'. And Davis is 'aye'."

Telcser: "Representative Ewell."

Speaker Matijevich: "Ewell."

Telcser: "Not Yourell. Ewell."

Speaker Matijevich: "How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove hdm."

Telcser: "Representative .."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Verify Prestan. Leave to be verified. Leave. Proceed."

Telcser: "Representative Farley."

Speaker Matijevich: "Farley? Can I.. No, I can't see him back



there. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Representative Garmisa."

Speaker Matijevich: "Garmisa? In his seat."

Telcser: "Representative Hanahan.."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. Dave Jones, that 'no'.

Leave to verify Macdonald. Leave. Proceed, Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Representative Hanahan."

Speaker Matijevich: "Hanahan, how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Representative Harris."

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

Telcser: "Representative Hallock."

Speaker Matijevich: "Hallock? Where is he at? I don't see

him. No, I don't see him. How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien; "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Representative Henry."

Speaker Matijevich: "Bill Henry? Right here."

Telcser: "Representative Huff."

Speaker Matijevich: "Doug Huff is in his seat."

Telcser: "Representative Jaffe."

Speaker Matijevich: "Jaffe? Aaron Jaffe, how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Representative Emil Jones."

Speaker Matijevich: "Emil Jones? Just saw him a minute ago. Emil Jones, in his seat."

Telcser: "Representative Kelly."

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

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



Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Representative Kempiners."

Speaker Matijevich: "Kempiners? Don't see him. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Representative Kosinski."

Speaker Matijevich: "Kosinski, how is he recorded? "

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Representative McGrew."

Speaker Matijevich: "McGrew? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Representative Laurino."

Speaker Matijevich: "In his seat."

Telcser: "Representative Neff."

Speaker Matijevich: "Neff? How is he recorded? "

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Representative Piel."

Speaker Matijevich: "Piel, Robert Piel. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Remove him."

Telcser: "Representative Ronan."

Speaker Matijevich: "Who?"

Telcser: "Ronan."

"

Speaker Matijevich: "Ronan. Put Piel back on the Roll Call.

And remove Ronan. Oh, Ronan's in the back. Return Ronan

and return Clarence Neff. Piel has been returned. Yeah.

And return Birchler. Birchler. Are you through, Art?"

Telcser: "No, I'm not through, J. Representative Leinenweber."

Speaker Matijevich: "How is he recorded? Oh, he's up

in front here."

Telcser: "Representative Schisler."



Totten : "Can't win them all, Mr. Speaker. But, I wonder if you would poll the 'no's and ask them to explain their votes."

Speaker Matijevich: "This motion, having failed to receive a Constitutional three-fifths Majority, is hereby declared lost. Senate Bill 910. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 910 is similar to 909 except it only deals in one area and I do not think there is the opposition to 910 as there was to 909. But this Bill amends the School Code concerning the appropriation of federal funds by providing that the Office of Education may not expend federal funds until appropriated by the General Assembly, similar in that nature. But let me tell you that this... That first of all IOE was involved in the drafting of this legislation. They did not testify against the Bill in either Committee and this Bill gets at another problem which has happened. We have written into the statutes the provision that the Appropriations Committee Leaderships must be notified of the expending of funds by IOE so that we know what's going on. IOE has obviated or avoided that provision in the past and so if was felt necessary that we ought to sit down with them and draft the legislation that's before us for veto override. This would put an end to the possibility of misuse in expenditure of federal money without the Legislature's knowledge. And I don't know whether IOE is opposed to it. They did not oppose it in Committee, but the Governor has vetoed it basically for the same reasons and I would move therefore that we override the Governor's veto on Senate Bill 910. "

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Totten has moved for override the Governor's veto with respect to House. Senate Bill 910. Is there any discussion? If not,



the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 910 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'nay'. This question takes three-fifths Constitutional Majority, 107 votes. Giorgi, vote me 'aye'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will... The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten, to explain his vote."

Totten: "Let me explain my little... a little further on this. I indicated and as Representative Lechowicz had indicated in his remarks regarding 909, that they are similar in nature. But there has not been the direct opposition of the Office of Education on this one and it's one that by us overriding the veto I think we would provide.. I know we would provide us with the necessary additional oversight on these funds. It is one that we do have some provisions for caution in the statutes now and it is one that IOE has not objected to. So I think in this case, there is sufficient justification for us in overriding the veto. Whereas, the controversy that 909 did incur is not prevalent in this one and I would again encourage the Members to look at this a little differently and hopefully have your support on this override motion."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 98 'aye's, 36 'nay's, 2 answering 'present'. And this motion, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority... The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten."

Totten: "Poll of the absentees."

Speaker Matijevich: "Poll the absentees. Clerk will poll the absentees. I think most of the absentees have already voted, Don."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. E.M. Barnes. Beatty."



Bluthardt. Bowman. Bradley..."

Speaker Matijevidich: "One moment. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten, for what purpose do you arise?"

Totten: "I withdraw my request for a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Matijevidich: "Alright. Withdrawn. This motion, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Senate Bill 1137, Representative Hoxsey. The Lady from LaSalle, Representative Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1137 removes the requirement that sales tax be collected on mandatory gratuity, these that are added to the customer's bill. The employee receiving the tips will be paying income tax on this money and in my estimation that's double taxation. The food establishments should charge sales tax on the food only and not on the service provided by the employee. The Bill was overridden in the Senate by a vote of 53 to 2 and I would ask you to support me on my motion to override the Governor's veto."

Speaker Matijevidich: "Representative Hoxsey has moved to override the Governor's veto with respect to Senate Bill 1137. On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Well, I hesitate to get up on any of these vetos.. veto items but I feel constrained to point out that I believe that what this Bill does is give a sales tax break to people who are generally very affluent, private clubs where they have this system, country clubs, special dinners and so forth. After having refused to give substantial relief .. sales tax relief to people who go shopping at the grocery store, I think we should be pretty uncomfortable if we were to override this veto, which would only help essentially fat cat types who go to dinners of this kind, country clubs, Bar Association dining rooms where I go to at times, where



these things are stated separately. I don't think we should override this veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hoxsey, to close."

Hoxsey: "Yes, well I would differ with the previous speaker.

What you're doing is being fair with the customer.

Not only that, but when conventions and weddings and so forth are held, this is what we want to keep going in the State of Illinois and I think in all fairness to the customer, this tax should not be charged on the service. It should only be charged on the food. I ask your support."

Speaker Matijevich: "On Representative Hoxsey's motion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1137 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor? All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'nay'. This motion takes 107, three-fifths, Constitutional Majority, votes. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Lady from Kent... The Lady from Adams, Mary Lou Kent, to explain her vote."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just.. I'm glad you're voting green on this because really think what you're doing. Sales tax was not intended to be paid on tips. Sales tax was intended to be paid on the food that you ate. And that's what it should be. The tip has nothing to do with sales tax. I just can't imagine. This isn't just fat cats. This is all your organizations, all of those people that have luncheon meetings. These aren't just the people that have the money to pay. There was no intention to have sales tax on the tips. Please vote green."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson, to explain his vote. One minute."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'm not positive I understand this Bill. But it looks to me like what it does is to.. is to give a break to the .. the waiters, the



small people that deliver this food to the table. I think what it does is it avoids them being double taxed so that they go ahead and pay the income tax, yes, but they're not compelled to pay a sales tax too on the tips they get. That's my understanding of it."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Macdonald 'aye'. Want to press.. Harry, you want to press Macdonald's button 'aye'? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Huskey, to explain his vote."

Huskey: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, some years back they put on a service tax for if you took your car in for labor, you'd have to pay tax on the labor; you'd have to pay tax on various plumber; you'd have to pay tax on the plumber. They removed all that tax. They certainly should remove this tax. This tax is very discriminating. If you're not going to tax for services in other fields, if you're not going to tax for services on what Representative Hanahan's carpenter would charge you to fix your roof or to fix your cabinet, why should you have to pay tax on the services that a restaurant would provide for you such as the waitresses or the .. the .. an actually what you're doing, you might be lessening the tips you that you'd give the waitresses if you would wind up with a big tax on your .. on your waitress bill. So, I would hope that you would search your conscience on this Bill. If you're going to tax.. not tax everybody else for services..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 113 'aye's, 32 'nay's, 3 voting 'present'. And this motion, having received the Constitutional three-fifths Majority, prevails and Senate Bill 1137 is hereby declared passed, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. Senate Bill



1223. Marovitz. Is anybody going to handle that?
Out of the record. 1229. The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1229 passed the Senate by a vote of 56 to nothing and the House by a vote of 137 to nothing. Unfortunately there was a misunderstanding in the Governor's Office about this Bill and the Senate has overridden his veto 53 to nothing. The Bill would permit strictly on a permissive basis podiatrists which are physicians licensed to practice specially on the foot to join the medical.. in a professional service corporation with M.D.'s. The Bill is a fine Bill and the Governor has now indicated that he would support this override motion. And I move to override his veto."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Pullen has moved to override the Governor's veto with respect to Senate Bill 1229. If there's no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1229 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'nay'. This 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 132 'aye's, no 'nay's, and this motion, having received the Constitutional three-fifths Majority, prevails and Senate Bill 1229 is hereby declared passed, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. Senate Bill 1314, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill transfers the division of services for Crippled Children which is now under the University of Illinois, to the Department of Rehabilitative Services, formerly the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. The Governor's veto basically



said that the new Division of Vocational Rehabilitation does not have enough .. had not had enough time to be able to absorb the Division of Service for Crippled Children, but I think that ignores the fact that this Bill was amended so that it would not be phased in until July 1st, of 1980. The main reasons for the tranferance would be to make the Division of Services for Crippled Children which is now a very well run organization, but is under funded, make it more visible in the department level and that's the main reason why the transfer is needed. I would ask for a favorable vote and be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Cullerton has moved that the House override the Governor's veto on Senate Bill 1314. On that motion, the Lady from Cook, Representative Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to ask for your support to sustain the Governor's veto. First of all, to answer the Gentleman, Representative Cullerton, we did appropriate the necessary funds yesterday which I certainly supported. We've discussed before that this Division of Services for Crippled Children is a program for children with birth defects and chronic disease. It belongs in a medical care administration which understands the needs of children who require highly specialized medical care. The University of Illinois administers this program from the Medical Center. This is where the actual leadership for special medical care of children comes from. No state agency has this background. The Division of Vocational Rehab. which is now part of the Department of Rehabilitation Services does not have as yet these kinds of services and I am not saying that in the future this may not be a wise move. I am saying that it is not a wise move now. There is absolutely



no need to transfer these children into an environment where they will not have the same understanding that they do in the Medical Center. I urge you to sustain the Governor's veto on this Bill."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think the previous speaker very eloquently made most of the reasons that were necessary that this should not be transferred to University of Illinois and their research department has had a very enviable track record over the past years. Unfortunately part of this started about because a serious problem with an individual and it was.. became a situation where some personalities became involved with it. As the previous speaker mentioned, if the Department of Rehabilitation Services in the future does become more able to handle this I would support the transfer. But at this time I think would be a mistake and urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Reilly. Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as the Minority Spokesman on the State Government Organization Committee, I rise to ask that you sustain the Governor's veto of this Bill. Along with Representative Doug Kane with whom I've had the good fortune to serve- he is the Chairman; I'm the Minority Spokesman on the Committee- we opposed the Bill as it came out of Committee and I think perhaps you need to understand not only the perspective on the services that Representative Hallstrom has given, but also understand a little of where we are in the state government reorganization process. We gave to the Department of Rehabilitation Services a great deal of additional pro-



grams which we transferred from D.C.F.S. in this last Session. It is going to take them a good long while to digest that part of the program which we've already given them. So the first reason in terms of reorganization policy why this Bill should not be passed or why the veto should be sustained is that the department already is overburdened with trying to digest what it's received. Second reason is, we may very well be coming in and be the next logical step, next possible step in reorganization, deals with an comprehensive reorganization of the various human resources agencies. It is just the wrong time. We ought not do this piece-meal. If we're going to come up with some kind of plan that says that all the rehabilitation programs ought to be in one agency, that may make sense. It makes no sense at all to take this one little program and specify it and take it into the Department of Rehabilitation Services at this time. As the Minority Spokesman on the State Government Reorganization Committee, I would hope that you would understand where we are in the reorganization process, would understand that we can't reorganize the state all at once, that it makes some sense to do that in a logical and comprehensive manner. We're trying to proceed in that way. The Committee will be working on that this spring and on into the years in the future and I would ask you to sustain the veto of the Governor."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton, to close."

Cullerton: "Ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Cullerton has moved to override the Governor's veto with respect to Senate Bill 1314. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1314 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'nay'. Three-fifths vote, 107 votes required. Takes



107 green votes, not red votes, John. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 42 'aye's, 87 'nay's, 5 voting 'present'. And this motion, having failed to receive the Constitutional three-fifths Majority, is hereby declared lost. The Senate Bill 1328. The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Bower."

Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to override the Governor's veto on Senate Bill 1328. This gives statutory authority to the Environmental Protection Agency to make grants for sewage treatment plants and sewers for towns based upon areas that have been declared by the Department of Public Health as health hazard areas. This originally passed the Senate 53 to nothing. It passed the House of Representatives 121 to 1. There was absolutely no testimony in either the Senate or the House Committees against the Bill. I respectfully urge to override the Governor's veto."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Bower has moved that we override the Governor's veto with respect to Senate Bill 1328. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1328 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. This takes 107 votes, a three-fifths Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. . . The Gentleman from Will, Representative Van Duyne, to explain his vote."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to speak in favor of this item if I might. You know, there's been many a grant let out especially to smaller communities and I have.. I happened to be involved in one in Joliet where it's a very, very small area and the East Joliet Sanitary District has not even penny one. They



don't even have any money to .. to levy because they are a newly formed organization. Now the planning in a case like this would amount to maybe two or three thousand dollars, but as without any money to be able to use from these grants for planning and engineering it really puts these new entities really in a terrible bind. And it does defer construction for at least another couple of years until they get themselves out of the quagmire. In this case the Joliet Township Organization came to their aid and gave them ten thousand dollars to help in their planning and their engineering and without that I shudder to think what would have happened. And this.. this very Legislature did give them the grant with which to do the digging in the installation of the sewer. But anyway I see there's enough votes and I appreciate it. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 112 'aye's, 22 'nay's, 3 answering 'present'. And this motion, having received the Constitutional three-fifths Majority, prevails and Senate Bill 1328 is hereby declared... having received the three-fifths Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. Let's revert back to Senate Bill 1223, which is now being handled by Representative Getty. Senate Bill 1223."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would join in moving for the override of the Governor's veto on Senate Bill 1223. I think that the veto was a mistake. The Governor in his veto message compares this to another Bill which specifically provides that the physician assistant of the.. under the direct supervision of a physician. As a matter of fact that is exactly what this legislation would provide. It sets forth that



physicians assistants may be used in jails or prisons under the jurisdiction of the County Hospital's Governing Commission Act, the same as the Act which we approved .. the Governor approved, relative to physicians assistants by the Department of Corrections. This specifically provides that the written guidelines and procedures would incorporate and not be in conflict with the Illinois Department of Registration and Education rules and regulations adopted pursuant to the Physicians Assistants Act which would require of course that there be direct supervision by a physician. I think that the .. the veto was just a misunderstanding. I would say in the record clearly that it is the legislative intent, was the legislative intent that physicians assistants under this provision be under the direct supervision of a physician. It was never intended otherwise and I think with that in the record it would clarify what the Governor's only objection to it would be and I would move that the override be sustained. "

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Getty has moved to override the Governor's veto with respect to Senate Bill 1223. If there's no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1223 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed by voting 'nay'. Requires 107, three-fifths Constitutional votes. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 122 'aye's, 4 'nay's, 1 answering 'present'. And this motion, having received a Constitutional three-fifths Majority, prevails and Senate Bill 1223 is hereby declared passed, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. Senate Bill 1406. Kornowicz, is he ready? He wasn't sure if he was proceeding with that. On Supplemental Calendar #1 on Item Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 891. The



Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The item veto here, I'm not sure whether it was a misunderstanding by the Governor or what, but the Governor's Office has now agreed that there's no reason why we cannot proceed with my motion to override the item veto. This deals with some equipment for the state trauma program. The Governor's Office has no objection to the veto being overridden at this time so I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call on my motion to override the item veto on page 38, lines 5 through 7 of Senate Bill 891."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Reilly has moved with respect to Senate Bill 891 to override the Governor's veto of the item at page 38. Is that correct, Jim? Lines 5 through 7? Five through seven. On that motion is there any discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall the items.. item on page 38, lines 5 through 7 of Senate Bill 891 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'nay'. This requires 107 votes, a three-fifths Constitutional Majority. It requires three-fifths vote. Have all voted? Let's shut the buttons. There's no opposition. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 112 'aye's, 25 'nay's, 3 answering 'present'. And this motion, having received a three-fifths Constitutional Majority, prevails and the item on page 38, lines 5 through 7 of Senate Bill 891 is declared passed, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor. On the motion... On the.. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative J.J. Wolf."

Wolf: "Just on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. "

Speaker Matijeich: "Proceed."

Wolf: "It just seems like we have a lot of defections on the floor. It just seems to me that anybody ought to



make their own record. And I don't care how anybody votes, 'yes' or 'no', but I think they ought to be here and vote. Now if they want to go home I think it ought to reflect that. If they care enough to stay here with the rest of us, I think the record ought to reflect that and I would strongly urge those not to push buttons for people who have left and gone home."

Speaker Matijevich: "Point well taken. On the.. On page five on the Order of Reduction Veto Motions- Consideration Postponed appears Senate Bill 318. The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Senate Bill 318 is the appropriation for the retirement system of the state universities... for the state universities retirement system and it includes the appropriations for the various state universities, Chicago State, Eastern Governor's State, Northern Sangamon State, the Board of Regents, Southern Illinois, Board of Trustees University of Illinois, Illinois community colleges. Total amount of this is a three million, eight hundred and thirty-four thousand, which represents an additional one-half percent of payment .. or payroll for employees covered by the universities retirement system. Helps bring the retirement system closer to the Unfunded Act. It's for this year only. It's a one time situation. I would urge that.. that we do concur with the action of the Senate, that the Governor's action notwithstanding to restore the items restored to the Senate which they did by I believe it was 47 to 5."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Wikoff has moved with respect to Senate Bill 318 to restore the reduced item of appropriation as appears on the Calendar on page 5 on Senate Bill 318 to the original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor. If there's no



discussion, the ...Oh, The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House, again I apologize to my colleague, Representative Wikoff, for rising in opposition to his motion on this particular measure. But this Bill as we indicated on debate yesterday is tied in with Senate Bill 250 and another Bill that is on the Calendar regarding the funding of the various pension funds. It is our feeling that the General Assembly since 1975 has made a very diligent effort to bring up the funding of the various pension funds from a 43.6% degree of funding in '75 to a 53.1% in our next year and by 1985 if the plan is followed it'll be at 61.8 % which is just two or three points below the '66 funding level which is considered to be safe. Further, in adding up the amounts that we have added to the budget for next year and talking about surplus, if in fact we are to talk about a sales tax relief or in fact, there is to be relief of other kinds next year, whether it comes to indexing or additional relief on sales tax or whatever, funding for county hospitals, we've got to keep in mind a total funding picture. To this point, we have already added or sent out of here some 20 million dollars worth of additional funding. I am not fully aware at this point of how much in dollars we have overridden, but it also is in the tens of millions of dollars. It does not take long, Ladies and Gentlemen, for that surplus whether it's 250 million or 300 million to be eaten up. We are nearing the 70 million dollar mark already. If we end up adding this.. this Bill and the one to follow of some 18 million... 18 million dollars, we are taking those funds out of the general revenue fund. And I am not certain that that is the proper thing to do. I again apologize to my dear friend



and colleague, Representative Wikoff, who I know rises on this with all the best of intentions. And I feel though however, as the Minority Spokesman on the Committee that I have the obligation to present to the House, to both sides of the aisle, for their consideration the information that we have regarding to what the state has done and the possible impact this and other legislation may have on the total funding picture and in... with that in mind, and again, in all due respect to my good friend, Representative Wikoff, I would ask that we defeat his motion on this reduction veto."

Speaker Matijeich: "The... Representative Wikoff to close. One moment. The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to support Representative Wikoff's motion. When out campaigning in particular area where I have a university in that area one of the questions that is always brought to a .. our attention and asked in any particular meeting we might have is why we're not funding the pension system properly for the university systems when we very well take care of ourselves very handsomely in funding our own pension system. It's been stated many times in the last month we have a surplus of funds in the State Treasury. We were not successful in giving tax relief as much as we'd like. So we still in my opinion have a substantial amount of money in the State Treasury that is available to start and this is a beginning as Representative Wikoff pointed out, a one shot deal, to try to cut that deficit in our retirement fund and bring it up to somewhere, some kind of a figure that is more sensible and reach the kind of a plateau where the retirement .. retirees or those who are looking forward to retirement are not concerned... remove that concern, that doubt from their mind that the money would make a



time when they.. when it is their time to retire that those funds would not be available. I think this would be a good vote to vote 'aye' and start making a very viable, healthy, retirement system in all the retirement systems in Illinois. We've got the money and let's vote 'aye' on this particular motion of Representative Wikoff's."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Wikoff to close."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, not to delay the House any longer, one comment that was made earlier was that this was in connection with Senate Bill 250. The only thing that's under consideration right now is Senate Bill 318. Senate Bill 250 can rise or fall on its own merits. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The question is, 'Shall the reduced item of appropriations with regard to Senate Bill 318 as appearing on the Calendar on page five be restored to the original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'nay'. This takes 89 votes, a Constitutional Majority, 89 votes. All in favor signify by saying.. voting 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. Have all voted? Have all voted? The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite, to explain her vote."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I disagree with the statement of the Minority Spokesman on the Appropriations II Committee in comparing this to other types of needs of the state that he mentioned that may also be making demands upon the Treasury. There is a distinct difference between this and those other kinds of demands that he talked about. These are obligations that are already made upon the State Treasury and it has been because of negligence in making the appropriate payments for these funds that we now have



such a vast, uncrued liability of our pension systems. It is not in the same category as many of the other functions that were mentioned where we will or will not take on that added responsibility for funding. We already have this responsibility. The question is whether we pay it today, allow it to sit there and gain some interest to help to fund these pension accounts, or whether in fact we delay it until some future date. I strongly urge that we support it now and have it off our backs so that it can accrue interest and help us to fund these programs."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle, to explain his vote. One minute."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. I think we should recall that this is the one system that not until 1977 was even brought in line with the pay-out method in the other state systems. It lagged well behind those systems even in the method of appropriation. Only in two years has it caught up, even in that sense. And secondly it's the same system that for many years we didn't even bother to meet the pay-out for the various surveys that come under the pension system that we're dealing with here. This is the step that ought to be taken now to prevent chaos in the future, to make the system more fiscally sound. We're not talking about that much money. We're talking about an affordable price tag. And the time to do it is now and to stop saying year after year, we'll work at it next year. The year to do it is 1979. The time to do it is now. And to put at least four more green votes up there to restore the money, 3.8 bil.. million dollars, that Representative Wikoff has worked hard and accurately portrayed the situation to here today."

Speaker Matijevich: "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 are 91 'aye's, 51 'nay's, one answering 'present'. And this motion, having received the Majority, prevails, and the items on ... on the pages and lines as enumerated in Senate Bill 318, page five of the Calendar, are restored to the original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor. We have one more total veto motion. Senate Bill 1406. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 1406 amends the Capital Development Bond Act. It increases the time which the advertisements must be published before the opening bids on bonds from ten to twenty days. It's a very simple Bill. I ask you for your support."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Kornowicz has moved to override the Governor's veto with respect to Senate Bill 1406. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1406 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'nay'. This motion requires 107 votes, a three-fifths Constitutional Majority. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? They're watching the buttons so... Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 69 'aye's, 60 'nay's, and this motion, having failed to receive the Constitutional three-fifths Majority, is hereby declared lost. Before we go to the Total Veto Motions, Consideration Postponed, is there any Member who has a veto motion that we have passed up? Is there any Member that has a veto motion that we have not called? I don't see any. On the Order of Total Veto Motions, Consideration Postponed is Senate Bill 5. Marovitz. Out of the record. Senate Bill 111, Leverenz. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative



Leverenz, on Senate Bill 111."

Leverenz: "Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. Senate Bill 111 is the Bill that would allow the Department of Transportation to put the red lights on the emergency patrol vehicles in Cook County and St. Clair County. Fifty-two.. fifty-one vehicles in Cook and twelve vehicles in St. Clair County respond to accidents as we talked about earlier this week, over 70 thousand requests for their service on our expressway systems. We have had a number of accidents and there is a great deal of feeling both with the employees and even with the Department of Transportation that this would be a thing to do to avoid the problems that they have had. And I would entertain any questions the floor may have, Tiger."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Leverenz has moved that the House override the motion with respec.. the Governor's veto with respect to Senate Bill 111. On that, the Gentleman from Williamson, Representative Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Leverenz: "The compassionate man from Cook County will yield."

Harris: "Representative Leverenz, why is this just needed in two counties with the other hundred counties still left? Why do we just need this in two counties?"

Leverenz: "Well, being a very compassionate man to the Department of DOT employees and the bad roads you do have down there, they don't run these emergency vehicles in your counties."

Harris: "I see several emergency vehicles in the twelve counties that I represent which is approxiately 1/8th of the State of Illinois county-wise. Presently law enforcement vehicles, fire fighting vehicles, ambulances and rescue squad vehicles are permitted to use red lights



rotating or flashing lights whether they're lighted or unlighted. This Bill seems to allow emergency patrol vehicles of the Department of Transportation to have red lights. Seems like to me this would be somewhat confusing to the general public and those that are going along the highways."

Leverenz: "On the contrary, being a very compassionate man I would understand that you would see the need for these red lights on these emergency vehicles so they could operate just like the ones you have in your county."

Harris: "I have been a Member of the Illinois Police Association for the past sixteen years and I've had several anti-letters regarding this fact and the police.. the police officers and the fire fighters throughout the State of Illinois seem like this is something that they really don't need and that they really don't want. And if it's such an emergency that the Department of Transportation needs red lights, why don't we put red lights on coroners' cars and on Legislators' cars and on other cars? "

Leverenz: "Well, you find that the coroners are allowed to have red lights and if you should chose to have a red light on your vehicle, I would think that I would support that most needed legislation for you."

Harris: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Harris: "It seems like this would be a waste of time and money. It seems to me the Department of Transportation who would want red lights on their cars would be most confusing to the people on the highways and the byways and with traffic accidents being what they are today, when you see a red light today it means an ambulance, it means a police car, it means a fire truck, it means something that's an emergency. It doesn't mean the Department of Transportation, it doesn't mean



something is coming along. You think there's going to be an emergency and you want to step aside. You want to get off the highway. This is a totally useless piece of legislation in my judgment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz to close."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In closing I think that we were very close in getting the needed support for this. I think if the prior speaker were correct, they would have to remove the name emergency patrol vehicle on the side of the trucks. There are a limited number and I don't think they would be confused with the other emergency service vehicles operating in the state. I would think that if the police associations and the fire.. firemen in their little red trucks would really think about the people that ride on these trucks, certainly they are not police officers. But if they were, they would want those red lights. The rules of the road say that red means stop. When these trucks are parked in the traveling lanes of the expressway, I would mean.. think that you would want the people that were coming onto the expressway to be alerted to the fact they're stopped. That's why they're needed and I would suggest and encourage your 'aye' vote for this."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 111 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 67 'aye's, 68 'no's. The motion fails to receive even a simple Majority, is hereby declared lost. 250. Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 250 and this is certainly an opportunity for all of us to redeem ourselves from yesterday's vote by overriding the Governor's veto on Senate Bill 250. We've been talking about appropriations



and monies due and are we going to pay for it. And I would simply like to re-emphasize that the Governor's veto message on Senate Bill 250 is totally wrong, whereby the Bill actually provides that the governmental agency should put in their fair share or the amount of money that is due for benefits that are purchased or earned by participants in our state supported retirement system. Our systems are.. are deficient in their funding. For example, the amount of money that was put into our retirement system this year still provides that the unfunded liability will increase even though the employees have made their contribution and the other reason being that the governmental agency has not put in an adequate amount to meet their obligation. The Bill provides that the contributions would be increased by one-half percent or approximately 18 million dollars. And when each system reaches its level of where its paying accrued cost plus interest, this would in essence freeze the unfunded liability. It will not reduce it. It will simply freeze it which is currently approaching the eight billion dollar mark. We did receive 102 votes yesterday. The Governor stated that the money was not appropriated. However, there was an appropriation Bill for 18 million dollars which the Senate did override. It is provided. The analysis is wrong and I would urge support of this most meaningful legislation in overriding the Governor's veto on Senate Bill 250 and bring some credibility to the pension systems in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 250 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker. That this Bill was supported by the Illinois Pension Laws Commission and also there



were a number of articles regarding the status of our unfunded liability, the Tribune, and so forth have endorsed this here most worthwhile legislation. At the same time, I believe that there will be a record Roll Call and I plan to submit it to the Bridgeport News so if you've got a negative vote on there it may be in the Bridgeport News."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 90.. 93 'aye's, and 48 'no'. The motion, having failed to receive the Constitutional three-fifths Majority, is hereby declared lost. 296. Representative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the House concur with the Senate in the passage of Senate Bill 296, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. This Bill would establish a branch office of the Illinois Housing Development Authority in Springfield, Illinois. The branch would just be in Springfield and no other city. At the present time, the only office of the Illinois Housing Development Authority is in Chicago, Illinois. This branch office would better serve the needs of downstate developers and by developers, we mean contractors, we mean community organizations that the Illinois Housing Development Authority has.. was set up to assist. When we read the statutes setting the IDA and that's what the Illinois Housing Development Authority was called, it was called ... it was set up in order to lower the rental rates and also to make mortgage monies available to communities. When the objection was raised yesterday that the last office that was located in Springfield of the Illinois Housing Development Authority was not used, I'd like to indicate the distinction between that office and the present branch is that the present branch office to be set up would be a downstate branch office. That means it would



not only be used by the people of Springfield, but it would be used by the people in Cairo in Marion, and Carbondale and other cities. Secondly at the time that office was set up, the Illinois Housing Development Authority did not have Section 8 authority from the Federal Government. Now developers downstate have to go directly to HDA for their federal programs. So that shows that there is an additional need for this. This office would .. it would provide an opportunity for HDA to work with the financial institutions downstate and when the Act was originally set up there was a tremendous need to help the private financial institutions. But now, of course, with the mortgage rate going up and the unstable.. instable financial situation there is a greater need for the State of Illinois to be helping the .. building communities. And for these reasons, I ask you to please make available the additional seven votes that are needed to pass this legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill didn't get any better since yesterday and it ought to be resoundingly defeated again. And all isn't lost because in the Spring Calendar is House Bill 703 which will do precisely what this Bill does. However, it would require needless duplicative office which would cost about 15 thousand to open and annually about a hundred and fifty thousand for staff and to run. It's not needed. IDA is not that type of agency. People don't walk in off the street with major housing developing programs which they seek to have underwritten by IDA or seek to have IDA arrange loans for them. The Bill should be defeated and I urge support of the Governor's veto on Senate Bill 296."

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



Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to support Representative Young in her efforts. The Illinois Department of Housing Authority for the little housing they build in Chicago they should be in Springfield. But also I wanted to refute some of the misconceptions that the last speaker is giving. People do in fact walk off the street and file housing applications and I would, given the geographical location of HDA at the present in Chicago, it makes it very difficult to get housing starts in southern Illinois. And with regard to funding, it.. the staff that constitutes the Illinois Housing Department .. the staff funds are made from the proceeds and assistance of those projects.. those projects that they fund, that there is no material fiscal impact with this Bill because of that fact. I think it's a good Bill and it deserves your adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything... Representative Jones."

J. D. Jones: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise again to support Representative Young in her efforts to locate an office of HDA in Springfield, not because of any parochial interest, but because of the service. There are 83 employees in the Chicago office servicing some 26 projects. We have four projects right now operating in the Springfield area. How many more downstate I do not know. But it seems to me that if a few of those employees that are now allocated in Chicago would be allocated to a small office in Springfield just for information if nothing else would be a big help to the people downstate who are interested in HDA projects. I urge your green vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Braun."

Braun: "Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this motion to override the veto of the Governor. Certainly HDA finances and



sponsors housing developments throughout the state and there should be an office here in Springfield. There are offices in Springfield for just about every other function imaginable. Adding... Bringing to Springfield an HDA branch office would facilitate instead of hinder its activities in this part of the state. I'm from Chicago and that office is readily available to me. But were I from somewhere other than Chicago, I would want to see a branch office located in Springfield. It seems to me a rather curious argument that we should fail to support this legislation now in favor of legislation on the Spring Calendar. And I urge a 'yes' vote on this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge to close."

Younge: "Thank you. This Bill would just establish one branch office in Springfield. There will be no request for any appropriation because the fees from the various projects, the projects downstate would be how the branch office would be financed. I think fair is fair. The Chicago community groups that finance that build housing have HDA right there in Chicago. What is fair would be for the downstate developing groups to have HDA in Springfield. In Chicago a "RES" Corps has been set up to do rehabilitation. What would be fair would be for HDA to be located in Springfield so the people and developers in Cairo and in Marion and in other places would only be able to come up .. have to come up two hundred miles. The worst housing in this whole state are in the counties of ... and Calhoun and Alexander and Pulaski and St. Clair. And I think that the people of southern Illinois have a right, not a privilege, but a right to have their development costs held down by their just having to making a trip to Springfield. It is unfair to have the \$60.00 plane bill added to the cost of housing."



And so what I'm asking you to do is to bring down the cost of housing in Illinois and make it accessible to the people of southern Illinois by putting a branch office in Springfield. I will not ask you for an appropriation. The staff will be paid for out of project fees. I think that when you think of the suffering, the high infant mortality, that goes along with bad housing, you can see that right now this is a very timely and reasonable request and I ask you to please support this override at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 296 pass, notwithstanding the veto of the Governor?' Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Henry to explain his vote."

Henry: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I'd like to just repeat one thing. I'd like to remind you that there will not be one penny paid out extra for this project. We all know the problem in East St. Louis and I have to commend Representative Younger for her fight to try to bring some help in an area where there's a great need of housing. I think we all should support Representative Younger."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rea."

Rea: "I think Representative Younger has already stated, we do need an office downstate. We do need an office that is accessible to the people. It's a long ways from Cairo to Chicago. It's a long ways from East St. Louis or Pope County and we do need to have an office that you can walk into that the people can get to and not have to travel quite some distance. This is one of the problems that we have often faced with many of our agencies and I.. and with no cost involved here, I feel that we should establish an office downstate and Springfield would be fine. I would urge you, for those that have voted red or those who have not voted yet,



I would certainly urge you to cast an 'aye' vote and help us pass this piece of legislation."

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

Younge: "I would just like to advise the House of some of the horrendous housing conditions that exist in the lower counties of this state. There is a tremendous problem and I would not be asking you further, but there is a real need. For example, 32% of all of the houses in Pulaski County, Illinois lack some or all of the plumbing. They're not even indoor toilets. There is not adequate housing. We pick up the bill somehow, Ladies and Gentlemen. It might be in terms of health, it might be in terms of green cards, it might be in terms of disgusted or bad mental conditions. But we pick up the bill. And I am saying that the General Assembly has created a state institution, the Illinois Housing Development Authority, that is not servicing downstate. We have a right to their services and what happens is you call up there and then six months later you get an answer. We have a right for immediate help and that help can be made available by bringing them down here to Springfield. I believe that they can be located in the state office building, rent free and they can be accessible to the people of the State of Illinois through their Legislators and through community groups. I have read very carefully the.. the statutes setting up the Illinois Housing Development Authority and... and some people have tried to give the impression that it's only developers. IHDA is to give technical assistance. IHDA is to make its money available through the loan to lender program. It doesn't do this downstate. And I plead with you to assist us in establishing this branch office and we will not ask for an appropriation."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take



the record. On this question there's 101 'yes' and 50 'no'. Representative Younge."

Younge: "Poll the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "The Lady has requested a poll of the absentees. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "If there are six more votes that go on there I would ask for a verification or a new Roll Call either one."

Speaker Redmond: "Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees; Beatty. Bluthardt. Capuzi. Davis. Deuster. Dyer. Epton. Friedrich. Greiman. Hanahan. Hoffman. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Marovitz.."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley? Representative Younge?"

Younge: "I withdraw my request."

Speaker Redmond: "The Lady has withdrawn her request. This.. Representative Mulcahey, 'aye'. What's the count, Mr. Clerk? Representative McAuliffe, 'aye'. Representative Stearney, 'aye'. What's the count, Mr. Clerk? On this question there's 104 'aye', 49 'no', The motion, having failed to receive the Constitutional three-fifths Majority, is hereby declared lost."



Speaker Redmond: "307. Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 307, as you recall, was debated at great length yesterday afternoon. It received a sufficient number of votes but due to absenteeism and a threat of a verification, I saved the time of the House by putting this on Postponed Consideration. But today is a different story. I'd like to briefly again presume upon the time of the House to explain what 307 would mean to the General Assembly. It's a very important piece of legislation that will give to the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules an important...an important tool for dealing with agency rules which violate or ignore the statutory authority of the agency. This Bill would initiate a system which has worked well in the State of Iowa and has been upheld as not violating the separation of powers between the branches of government. Based on the experience in Iowa, I believe this same system would also work well here. Let me briefly explain how the system would work. The Joint Committee's operation would change very little. We would continue to review each new proposed rule for compliance with statutory authority, and more importantly, legislative intent. We would continue to issue an objection to rules which violated or ignored the intent of the Legislature and agencies could still refuse to modify or withdraw their rules. However, under the procedure Senate Bill 307 would establish, agencies which refused to modify or withdraw their proposed rules in response to an objection by the Joint Committee would face a more serious threat of having their rules overturned by a court. In any court challenge of the agency's rules, the agency would be required to prove



that the rules were not unreasonable, arbitrary, capricious or otherwise beyond the authority delegated to the agency. The agency would be required to prove to the court that the Joint Committee's objections were wrong. We believe this is a fair and balanced approach. Agencies will be more responsive and will change rules that they do not believe they could defend in court. The Joint Committee's primary function will remain advisory. And perhaps the greatest balancing involved in this system is that it would only come into play when an affected individual challenged the agency's rule in court. The system is directly tied to the harm done to the public by improper agency rules. One of the arguments that you heard yesterday during the debate, that the Joint Committee would be the one that would initiate the action in court, this simply is not the case. If an individual, a member of the public, had an objection due to the agency's refusal to withdraw or modify a rule, then the agency would have to provide in court...excuse me...that the rule was not in the best interest of the public. I know that we discussed this in great detail. The Senate acted on the override motion with a 55 to 0 vote. I think that this Chamber can respond in the same intelligent manner. And I believe that that is the tool that the Joint Committee needs. I believe that it's what the General Assembly wants. I believe that the Members of this House and of the Senate believe sincerely that legislative intent when we pass a law is what we are really after and not some agency's reasonable interpretation of the legislative intent of that law, that statute or Amendment implementing their act. That's all this does. It does not make, as some would have you



believe, the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules an all powerful Committee of the General Assembly. One of the individuals stated yesterday in the debate that it would only take three or five Members to bring this action to the front. That's not true. Again, the public is being protected by the agency's failure to withdraw or modify a rule that did not comply with the legislative intent. We have...we have reviewed over five hundred rules, over five hundred rules, and we have found that many of the rules that have been imposed by the agencies in this state have been capricious, arbitrary and certainly not according to the legislative intent of the legislation passed. And I would ask that you vote to override the Governor's veto on Senate Bill 307."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I want to make it very clear that I in no way impugn the motives of the Sponsor of this legislation or any Member of the Committee on which he serves and which would be impowered by this legislation. But I think we have to point out reality. ~~At this late point in the~~ legislative Session, the only people even in the balconies are Lobbyists. And that's because this Bill, more than any other Bill, is a complete sell-out to the vested interests. What this Bill stands for is to take nine Members of the General Assembly and to focus in them the powers to say what the intent of the General Assembly is on any piece of legislation. They can look at any piece of legislation that we pass, that 236 Members have acted on. They can take that piece of legislation and they can say what the intent is. They can wreak havoc on any orderly



administration on the laws of this state and there is no standard prescribed in this legislation that they have to resort to. It leaves them to substitute their willful judgment for this Legislature and you can trust how that willful judgment through time will be eventually abused. I urge the defeat of this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this measure. The Constitution reposes the power of creating laws in this General Assembly. That is where the power should remain. The allegation is now made that we are creating an all-powerful Committee. But I ask you which is better, should we repose that power to create and promulgate rules and regulation which have the force of law in a bureaucrat, in an unnamed faceless bureaucracy or should we allow that power to be reposed in the hands of Members of this Legislature who are on this Joint Commission? I say to you, it is better that the power be with the Legislature, in the hands of some Members of this Legislature, than in faceless bureaucrats. You have allowed the bureaucracy to promulgate laws more so than the Legislature itself...in greater number. This is the only way to restrain the bureaucracy, is to allow a Joint Commission to have the power to force them to prove by preponderance of the evidence that there is justification for such a rule. This Commission is the only, and the way proper, way to handle the problem. If you don't do it, you're accomplishing nothing. They say the vested interest are for this. Absolutely, because those faceless bureaucrats have restrained them and put a great burden on their shoulders over the years. And there



is no way to attack them. And a man said to me yesterday, 'Well, if a bureaucrat promulgates a rule which is detrimental, the way to do it, the Legislature will correct it.' But you and I know that the Legislature will do nothing. Only if that bureaucrat required a businessman to wear his halloween costume three hundred and sixty-five days a year, something so ludicrous as that, then only in that situation would our Legislature act. But any other reason we would not defeat or enact a piece of legislation which would overcome that regulation. Better that we put the power in the Joint Commission right now rather than a faceless unnamed bureaucracy. I urge an 'aye' vote on this measure. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of the House, I want to remind you that the greatest danger to democracy is a bureaucracy. Now hardly anyone I think could deny that statement. Now yesterday and when this Bill was first brought out, I told you of a concrete example of what this administrative agency of ours did to protect me. The day that I tried and did succeed in getting the names of all the foster parents in my district, because I wanted to see how the children were being treated, the next day the...the Department of Children and Family Services found out about it and immediately issued a brand new order to tell me and to say to others they could not have the names of the licensees in any of your districts. Now I went to the administrative agency and they came to my help and they had a hearing on it. Now I feel that this protected me as an individual. It protected my rights as a Member of the Legislature to do something



about the children in my area that were under the care of foster parents. Now I found nothing wrong. The foster parents were doing fine. The homes were fine. It wasn't criticism of that. But they tried to stop me and this agency came to my...to my help. Now, another thing. Six times I put that House Bill ...the last one was 1508, in relation to the recovery of metals...maybe I should go to this agency. But the Environmental Protection Agency has made a rule, not a law but a rule, that all metals that are dropped off at a landfill have to be buried. Now for six times I've had that pass through the House, through the Senate and defeated by the Gover...vetoed by the Governor because somebody from the agency goes and tells what I consider just damn lies to the Governor about the ...about the danger of getting run over or injury by a bulldozer in the...in a landfill. The only time I could ever find anybody being run over by a bulldozer in a landfill was in 1947 in Missouri. The guy must have been drunk because you sure as hell could hear a bulldozer. Anyway..anyway, I want you to know that something like this should be protected. It's our means of controlling the bureaucracy. And I, for one, intend to vote for it."

Speaker Redmond: "Do I hear somebody out there? Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this Bill. I think that one of the things we are seeing take place in our country today is an ever-mounting control of our citizens by rules and regulations that have the force of law that are promulgated not by our elected Representatives or Legislatures at the federal or the state level but by the faceless, nameless



bureaucrats that have been cited here before today. If I had to take my chance of having a rule or a law that is passed by this Body, interpreted by anybody, and that chance lay between Members... elected Members of this Legislative Body, elected by the people and still accountable to the people that elected them, I'll take my chance with those Representatives and those Senators, whoever they may be, before I will take my chance with the bureaucrats, nameless and faceless, who would place their interpretation upon a given law. I think the time has come at the federal and the state level, I think the time has come, when we indeed do need some check on the interpretation placed on legislation passed with good intent but sometimes subverted by others who subvert the intent. And this may be our opportunity to strike a blow in that direction. And I would urge support, my colleagues, for this measure."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell to close."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen..."

Speaker Redmond: "Do I hear a voice? Do I hear Mulcahey?

Do I hear Mulcahey? Mr. Skinner, I can't see you

~~because a lot of people are standing in front of you,~~

contrary to the rules. Wait a minute, now. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, I was the one I think that coined the phrase, a small group, that the Sponsor of this Bill mentioned. And I pointed out that this is a eighteen Member Committee and contrary to what I said yesterday, a quorum is still nine. House Bill 1503 which exceeds this Bill in its insatiable appetite for power does, in fact, increase the quorum. But nine Members of this Committee, and I might point out they might all be Senators if the



House Members are otherwise occupied or don't appear at the meeting, and five those acting, which makes a majority of the quorum, five could object to the rule and throw into complete disarray state government. Contary to what the Sponsor says, I don't think we can constitutionally delegate legislative power such as this to a small group of less than the whole of the Legislature. Which is what we would be doing here in effect, giving this group of people the power to, at least temporarily, repeal the rules which are adopted by the Executive pursuant to legislative power granted to the Executive by this Legislature. Now I would also point out that there's absolutely nothing in this Bill which limits the power of this Committee to file an objection to a Bill. They can do it for whatever reason they might...five of them or whatever the majority of those present, happen to think they object to. There's no criteria at all for the exercise of this power. This is, I think, quite clearly unconstitutional. If it's not unconstitutional, it absurd. And I certainly would request that the Legislature sustain the Governor on this particular veto. And if there should happen to be 107 at the end, Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recognized for..."

Speaker Redmond: "I won't recognize you for that because Representative Vinson has asked for that privilege. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I don't see how this Committee could be any worse in its representation of special interest than the Illinois Senate was today when they ...when they caved into the gravel mining magnets of the state and refused to change a regulation set forth by the Illinois court system. Now to suggest that we should trust a Committe of our Legislature



less than we trust the Illinois courts seems to me somewhat absurd. There's nothing that we can do to the Illinois court system. There is something we can do to our colleagues. We can pressure our Leadership to remove them if they abuse their power. And let me tell you, one of the reasons, the only valid reason I've heard to vote against this, is that the Members may use this as a means of raising campaign funds or intimidating department directors. Now if that happens, I assure you, I shall be in forefront of attempting to change the law or if there are improprieties involved I shall certainly act accordingly...in...period. I'm willing to give them a chance. Because I know what abuses the Executive Branch has done. They virtually control this House floor. I mean, it's amazing there aren't holes underneath the seats of some Legislators where one can see the Governor's hands sticking up through the hand puppet to push the button. You say, there are some people coming from the fifth floor, too. I didn't know we had a Governor's office up there too. I wasn't elected to be a hand puppet of the second floor, whether that Governor be Republican or Democrat. I was elected to represent my constituency. And at the present time the balance of power is clearly in the Executive Branch's court. I mean, it really is amazing that we're sitting here today. Why haven't we all gone home? Why don't we just let the Governor veto the Bills and not even file motions? But until that happens, this is a possibility. This is an...it couldn't be worse than the present procedure, I don't think. And if I'm wrong, I'll stand up here a couple of years from now and admit it."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries. Representative Yourell to close."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want to make one point clear. What we're doing today, hopefully by overriding the Governor's veto on Senate Bill 307, we're not making law. What we're doing is checking and correcting unreasonable rules made under the law by the agency. And I think that's most important. Senate Bill 307 is a step in the right direction. It helps restore to us, as the elected Representatives of the people, control over the law, over the law which agency bureaucrats are making. Senate Bill 307 represents a balanced, reasonable approach which has worked well in other states. And I would urge an 'aye' vote to override the Governor's veto on Senate Bill 307."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 307 pass notwithstanding the Governor's....the veto of the Governor? All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, each of us today have received a copy of the speech by the Chairman of the Board of the Chrysler Corporation, his testimony before Congress. If you'll read this you'll see that one of the themes running through, one of the reasons why Chrysler Corporation is in trouble, financial trouble and the Congress is being asked to bail them out, is excessive regulation by the bureaucracy. If there's anything we should do on behalf of the individual citizens and



business enterprises in the State of Illinois, we should take every possible step to limit and curtail Executive Branch excesses and over regulations. That's what our people are crying for. They want tax relief, yes, but they want relief from the over-zealous reaching out on behalf of state government, and that's federal government too. We can't do anything about the federal government, but we can do something about state government. We can vote 'yes', we can override this veto and we can put into effect a plan that has worked well in Iowa and other states. And I urge more green votes and thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 112 'aye' and 26 'no'. Representative Vinson requests a verification. Representative Yourell requests a poll of the absentees. May have a point."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. E.M. Barnes. Bluthardt. Braun. Capuzi. Davis. Dyer. Ebbesen. Epton. Friedrich. Gaines. Hoffman. Jaffe. Kelly. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Leverenz. Marovitz. Mautino. McAuliffe. McBroom. McCourt. Molloy. Oblinger. Polk. Reed. Rigney."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rigney, 'aye'. Representative Stanley, 'aye'. Representative Sumner, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing with the poll of the absentees. Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Stezco. E.G. Steele. Totten. Walsh and Willer."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the score now? 115 'ayes'. How many 'noes'? 26 'noes'. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Would you poll of the affirmative Roll Call?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman requests a verification of the affirmative Roll Call. Representative Slape."

Slape: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to be verified please?"



Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to be verified? Slape. Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Leave to be verified, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does Representative Huskey have leave to be verified? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Proceed with the verification of the affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Ackerman. Alexander. Anderson. Beatty. Bell. Bianco. Birchler. Birkenbine. Borchers. Boucek. Bower. Bradley. Brummer. Bullock. Burnidge. Campbell. Capparelli. Christensen. Conti. Cullerton. Daniels. Darrow. Dawson. Deuster. DiPrima. Domico. Donovan. Doyle. John Dunn. Ralph Dunn. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Virginia Frederick. Friedland. Garmisa. Giorgi. Goodwin. Griesheimer. Grossi. Hallock. Hanahan. Hannig. Harris. Henry. Hudson. Huff. Huskey. Johnson. Dave Jones. Emil Jones. Kane. Keane. Kempiners. Kent. Kornowicz. Kucharski. Kulas. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leon. Macdonald. Madigan. Margalus. Matijevich. Matula. McClain. McGrew. McMaster. McPike. Meyer. Mulcahey. Murphy. Neff. O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Rea. Reilly. Richmond. Rigney. Ronan. Ropp. Schisler. Schraeder. Schuneman. Sharp. Simms. Skinner. Slape. Stanley. Stearney. Stuffle. Sumner. Swanstrom. Taylor. Terzich. Tuerk. Van Duyne. Vitek. Von Boeckman. Watson. White. Wikoff. Williams. Winchester. Sam Wolf. Woodyard. Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions of the affirmative? Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Representative Alexander."

Speaker Redmond: "Who is it? Representative Alexander. Is she on the floor? She's here."



Vinson: "Beatty."

Speaker Redmond: "Beatty. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Bullock."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Vinson: "Capparelli."

Speaker Redmond: "Capparelli. Here he is. He's out bending iron."

Vinson: "Daniels."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Daniels on the floor? Daniels. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Dawson."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Vinson: "Where? Mr. Speaker, it might go a little better if you would ask Members to be in their seats."

Speaker Redmond: "If what?"

Vinson: "If you would ask Members to be in their seats so we can see."

Speaker Redmond: "I can't understand what you said. Your pipe was in your mouth, but... I think what you said was that if Members will please keep their seats, is that right?"

Vinson: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Would all the Members please sit down in your right place."

Vinson: "Domico."

Speaker Redmond: "Domico. Marco Domico. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Doyle."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here. Here with my boyhood hero."

Vinson: "Ewell."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Farley."

Speaker Redmond: "Who was that?"

Vinson: "Farley."

Speaker Redmond: "Farley here? Is Farley here? I can't tell whether that's Farley's sleeve or Bullock's collar."

Vinson: "I'm sure it's not Farley's sleeve."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Flinn."

Speaker Redmond: "Who was that?"

Vinson: "Flinn."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Flinn here? Remove him."

Vinson: "Garmisa."

Speaker Redmond: "Garmisa here? Those lights are kind of bad up there. I don't think you need to do that to us. Who are you taking Hugh Hill? You don't want to show all those shadows with that... Who was the last one?"

Vinson: "Garmisa, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Is he here? Remove him."

Vinson: "Goodwin."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here. He's always here."

Vinson: "Griesheimer."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Griesheimer here? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Hanahan."

Speaker Redmond: "Hanahan here? How's he recorded? Daniels has returned, put him back on the Roll Call. Take Hanahan off. Representative Mautino, did you seek



recognition? Mautino 'aye'. Proceed. Representative Steczo 'aye'."

Vinson: "Harris."

Speaker Redmond: "He's over there with the...the only other Member of the 59th District."

Vinson: "Kempiners."

Speaker Redmond: "Kempiners. Representative Kempiners here? Kempiner's here? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Kornowicz."

Speaker Redmond: "Kornowicz here? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Kosinski."

Speaker Redmond: "How's he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is not recorded as voting."

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Laurino."

Speaker Redmond: "How's Laurino recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Leon."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here I'll bet. He's here."

Vinson: "Madigan."

Speaker Redmond: "He's in his office. Do you want us to produce him?"

Vinson: "By the end of the Roll Call would be nice."

Speaker Redmond: "But...you want him out here?"

Vinson: "Sometime in the course of the thing. You don't have to remove him right now, I'd just like to see him..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan, Representative Vinson wants you."

Vinson: "McGrew."



Speaker Redmond: "He's here. He's that tall, good-looking one."

Vinson: "Where?"

Speaker Redmond: "Here's Representative Madigan."

Vinson: "Clerk, where did you say Mr. McGrew was?"

Speaker Redmond: "That good, tall...tall, good-looking man there. The other one is Darrow and the little runt is McClain."

Vinson: "And McPike."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative McPike here? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Patrick."

Speaker Redmond: "I'll bet he's here. Representative Patrick. Patrick. There, he's back there."

Vinson: "Preston."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Preston. Preston. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Schisler."

Speaker Redmond: "Schisler. Representative Schisler back there? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Terzich."

Speaker Redmond: "I bet he's here."

Vinson: "Von Boeckman."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Vinson: "Williams."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."



Vinson: "Winchester."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Winchester. He was here a minute ago. Representative Winchester. Winchester. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Woodyard."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Woodyard. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "Sharp."

Speaker Redmond: "How's he recorded? Remove him."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Remove him."

Vinson: "That's all the questions of the Affirmative Roll Call except to urge you to change your vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "What was that? The fellow with that pipe. 99 'ayes', 26 'nays'. The motion having failed to receive the Constitutional three-fifths Majority is hereby declared passed...lost. Resolutions. Representative James Taylor on House Resolution 459. Representative Taylor."



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

House Resolution 459 merely amends House Resolution 445 which gives the Auditor General the right to report back on the Cook County Hospital on the audit that we are doing on July 2nd. What House Resolution 459 does is it extends that date to January 9th and I move for the adoption of House Resolution 459."

Speaker Redmond: "I understand that you have to suspend the rules first, Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, may I have leave to suspend the appropriate rules for the purpose of hearing House Resolution 459 immediately?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "I just wanted to point out in the confusion, Mr. Speaker, that the Board still said override veto and since we had a Bill number of that sort about an hour ago I wanted everyone to understand this is the Resolution. It is not an override.."

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, this is the Resolution."

Pullen: "Yes. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "First off is a motion to suspend the rules in order that we can have.. consider House Resolution 459 immediately. On that question, those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 112 'aye's and no 'nay'. And the motion carries. Now Representative Taylor on the adoption of House Resolution 459."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, just it just extends the reporting date to January 9th and I move for the adoption. We'll accept the same Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption... of House Resolution 4-four-5-five-9-nine. Those in favor indicate by voting 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. This requires a Constitutional Majority."



Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 124 'aye' and one 'no'. The motion carried. The Resolution is adopted. House Joint Resolution .. or Senate Joint Resolution 51... Representative Pierce, on the motion to suspend the rule. Is there any objection to suspending the rule with respect to Senate Joint Resolution 51 so in order that it may be cleared immediately? Hearing no objection.."

Pierce: "I've cleared this..."

Speaker Redmond: "Use the Attendance Roll Call."

Pierce: "This is a Senate Joint Resolution that passed

last June and came over here and in the shuffle it never got heard. All it does is call for the Energy Resources Commission to investigate the creation of an interstate coal group in high sulfur coal states to look into the greater use of high sulfur coal. Senate Buzbee introduced it in the Senate and it passed there. The reason for the urgency is the initial meeting to take place in Columbus, Ohio next Monday and Senator Buzbee's going to represent the Illinois Energy Resources Commission and all we do is by this Resolution is direct the Energy Resources Commission to consider the creation of a joint task force with other coal states to promote the use of high sulfur coal and I urge the suspension of the appropriate rule and the immediate consideration and adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 51."

Speaker Redmond: "You've got unanimous consent for the immediate consideration. Now go ahead on the adoption."

Pierce: "Oh, alright. Now I move the adoption of SJR 51. It's perfectly harmless."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pierce: "No Brazil trip. Only Columbus, Ohio."

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

Speaker Redmond: " Proceed."



Pullen: "Does this have anything to do with the possible establishment of a compact with the other Midwestern and Northeastern states regarding energy?"

Pierce: "No. This doesn't have anything to do with interstate compact or any northeast states. It's only the .. the states like Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Missouri, and Kentucky that have high sulfur coal that would form a task force, not a compact, but a task force to discuss strategies to increase the use of high sulfur coals..."

Pullen: "Fine, thank you."

Pierce: "It would not take the dignity of an interstate compact."

Pullen: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Does this have anything to do with the Year of the Child?"

Pierce: "It's kind of a big 'NIPC'."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 51. Those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "I just wondered whether 'medley' movers might be in this?"

Speaker Redmond: "She wants to know if 'medley' movers.."

Pierce: "No. This has to do with the Chicago skyway bonds, the state taking them over and repaying them. Samantha wanted that yesterday when she said 'pooh-pooh'."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll get Judgelward down here.

Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 122 'aye's, and no 'nay'. The motion carried. The Resolution is adopted. We have one more on Senate Bills, Second Reading. 1...1438. I believe it's on Third Reading now. We want to return that to Second Reading. That right, Representative Johnson?"

Johnson: "As long as we can return it back to Third."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I guess it's been held on Second.



That's right. Are there any Amendments from the floor, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "This Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, McClain."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1438 makes a correction and adds a four million dollars for Illinois State Scholarship Commission. The problem is that there are more people and students moving from two year colleges to four year colleges and the problem is the Illinois State Scholarship Commission said is that a lot of people will be applying for grants second semester and there's not enough money to pay for those grants. So, I've checked with Senator Weaver, the House Sponsor. I checked the Bureau of the Budget and Jim Edgar, Representative Ryan, Peters, Representative Madigan, and the Speaker and we've all concurred on this Amendment so it's an emergency for the Illinois State Scholarship Commission and I'd ask for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Lechowicz: "This four million dollars that's contained in this Amendment will not be used to pay off an agreement that was made between the Illinois State Scholarship Commission and a testing agency, a Bill that was similar before Rules Committee and was not recommended 'do exempt?'"

Johnson: "I can answer that because that was my Bill. No, it has nothing to do with that and I just agreed to let this on as an Amendment as a courtesy to Representative



Madigan and McClain."

Lechowicz: "I just wanted to be sure. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment 1. Those in favor ... Representative Peters."

Peters: "Just to make the record clear. We have at this point agreed not to oppose Representative McClain in the adoption of the Amendment. However, as you well know, Representative McClain, there are a number of questions that are still unanswered, but to facilitate and as a gesture of bi-partisan aid and assistance and help..."

Speaker Redmond: "We've had too much of that here. Anything further on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the... Representative Slape."

Slape: "Is this the payment for the vote last night on sales tax, the bi-partisan support?"

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carries. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Johnson. Third Reading. Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 536, Greiman. 536, Greiman. 538, Bower. 539, Macdonald. 540, Meyer. 541, Chapman."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Greiman's 536 honors the Congregation 'Calimouth'. 538 by Bower tells of the election of the President of the Illinois Federation of Business Womens Clubs. 539 By Macdonald lauds the nursing profession. 540 by Meyer celebrates a golden wedding anniversary. 541 by Chapman tells of the winner of a Trustees Association Trustee of the Year Award and I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the



Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carried and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Death Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 537, Sandquist, with respect to the memory of Paul W. Gordon Jr. House Resolution 542, Braun, with respect to the memory of Lou Ann Maldner."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi moves the adoption of the Death Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carried. The Death Resolutions are adopted. Who makes that motion? Representative Giorgi requests unanimous consent on the change of vote. Is there any objection? Hearing none, unanimous consent is granted. 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 Resolution, the adoption of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives; to wit; Senate Joint Resolution #75, adopted by the Senate November 1, 1979. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Senate Bills, Third Reading. 1377. Representative Reilly here? 1377, Third Reading. Out of the record. Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "I can't resist it. I have to tell the House. One other time you agreed to call the Bill. About nine o'clock on June 30th I sent Representative Barnes up to ask you when you were going to call the Bill. You said you'd call it right after the next measure and then you called the road program. So I appreciate your consideration. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "I called it now for former Representative



Edgar. He said that we didn't call his Bill and I just wanted to... quarter after five, we vote adjournment tonight."

Reilly: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything else, Mr. Clerk? Adjournment Resolution? Any announcements? Rep... Introduction and First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2831, Alexander-Taylor-Henry, a Bill for an Act to promote the public health, welfare and safety of the people of the State of Illinois by preventing unlawful denial of civil human rights. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Rules Committee. Representative Braun."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, oh alright. It just happened. I was going to ask the Clerk to remove those numbers because they cause some of us palpitations...."

Speaker Redmond: "Message from the Senate. Wait a minute. Steczo. Representative Steczo. "

Steczko: "Mr. Speaker, an announcement. The special committee to investigate workmen's compensation insurance cost will not be meeting tomorrow. The meeting has been rescheduled for November 13th in Chicago at the State of Illinois Building in room 1219."

Speaker Redmond: "Do you have the magic number for the Bears, Representative Steczo?"

Steczko : "Infinity, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Message from the Senate? Adjournment Resolution. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the House adopt Senate Joint Resolution #75. Basically what it is is that when the House stands adjourned today, we shall return Tuesday, November 6th at twelve o'clock for perfunctory Session and the House will actually reconvene Wednesday at four p.m."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? "



Lechowicz: "Four."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the adjournment Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carries. The Resolution is adopted. Representative Griesheimer has arranged.... Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You want to reconvene the Third Special Session..."

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, I think we'd better do that. We will adjourn this one first. The motion to adjourn, Representative Lechowicz, adjourn the Regular Session til Tuesday at noon. Perfunct Wednesday. Regular Session at four o'clock. All in favor of the motion indicate by saying 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'aye's have it. The motion carried. The Regular Session stands adjourned til Tuesday at twelve noon. Third Special Session come to order. Message from the Senate."

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 Resolution, adoption of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit: Senate Joint Resolution #2, adopted by the Senate November 1, 1979. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I now move that the House adopt Senate Joint Resolution #2 and the Third Special Session which is the adjournment Resolution, that when we adjourn today in the Third Special Session we reconvene Tuesday, November 6th, at twelve fifteen o'clock p.m. for a perfunctory Session and then the Third Special Session will then reconvene and Regular Session Wednesday at four fifteen p.m."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion



for the adoption of the Senate Joint Resolution. 2.
Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The
'aye's have it. The motion carried. The Resolution
is adopted. Third Special Session is adjourned until
Tuesday at twelve fifteen. "



LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
SPECIAL SESSION # 3

PAGE 3

NOVEMBER 01, 1979

HR-0002 3RD READING PAGE 181

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
NOVEMBER 01, 1979

PAGE 4

SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND-HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REV. KRUEGER-PRAYER	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
READINGS OF THE HOUSE JOURNALS	PAGE	2
REG. SESSION RECESSES	PAGE	45
3RD SPECIAL SESSION CONVENES	PAGE	45
READINGS OF THE JOURNAL	PAGE	45
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	45
3RD SPECIAL RECESSES	PAGE	45
REG. SESSION RESUMES	PAGE	45
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	179
REG. SESSION ADJOURNED	PAGE	181
3RD SPECIAL SESSION TO ORDER	PAGE	181
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	181
3RD SPECIAL SESSION ADJOURNED	PAGE	182