

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

Speaker Greiman: "The hour of 9:30 having arrived, the House will be in Session. The Chaplain for today will be the Reverend Richard Maye, Pastor of Pleasant Grove Baptist Church of Springfield. Reverend Maye is the guest of Representative Michael Curran. Would the guests in the gallery please rise and join us for the invocation? Reverend Maye."

Reverend Maye: "Let us pray. Most Holy and Wise Father, these men and women have come together in order to weigh and consider and reconsider the work that You have assigned to their hearts and minds to do. Lord, since You have put them in charge of aspects of governmental work, they are now seeking Your wisdom, Your knowledge and Your understanding. Grant unto each of them and allow them to have their actions consistent with their conscience and mind. Forgive them if they, at any time, act according to social standing, alliances and emotional feelings. But, rather, let them in all decisions exemplify objectivity and reasoned thought. And the words of Paul, 'When I was a child, I talked like a child; I thought like a child; I reasoned like a child. When I became a man, a woman, I put childish ways behind me.' Give them an ear that listens to and hear the bleeding, the cries, the pains of Your sheep. Place within the being of each of these persons loyalty and consistency and that even when they have made a mistake not to proud or big to acknowledge it. In the Name of Jesus we pray. Amen."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Ropp, will lead us in the Pledge to the Flag."

Ropp - et al: "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."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

Speaker Greiman: "Roll Call for Attendance. Mr. Piel, do you have any excused absences on the Republican side?"

Piel: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Would the record show that Representative Davis is excused today?"

Speaker Greiman: "Let the record show that Representative Davis is excused. Mr. Matijevich, are there excused absences on the Democratic side?"

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, let the record reflect the excused absence due to illness of Representative Braun and Huff and illness in the family excused for Representative Richard Mulcahey."

Speaker Greiman: "Let the record so reflect. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 112 Members having answered to the Call of the Quorum, a quorum is present. ... Senate... Senate Bills First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1699, by Representative Greiman, a Bill for an Act to create the Comprehensive Health Insurance Plan Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Committee on Rules. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of Bills of the following title, to wit; 3200 and 3300, together with Senate Amendments and the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House, passed by the Senate as amended November 19, 1986. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.'"

Speaker Greiman: "Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1680, offered by Representative Parcels and Stern; 1683, Brookins; 1687, McGann; 1688, Capparelli - et al; 1689, Matijevich - et al. And House Joint Resolution 239, Madigan."

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

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

Matijevich: "Speaker, these are all congratulatory in nature, and I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Lake moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Death Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1681, offered by Representative Johnson, with respect to the memory of Ralph C. Hay. House Resolution 1682, offered by Representative Nash, with respect to the memory of Charles G. Rantis. House Resolution 1685, offered by Representative Curran, with respect to the memory of Richard A. Simmons, Sr. House Resolution 1686, offered by Representative Washington, with respect to the memory of Willie 'Jack' Pittman. House Resolution 1690, offered by Speaker Madigan, Representative Daniels, McPike, Giorgi, Farley and Daley, with respect of the memory of Edward F. Brabec."

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

Matijevich: "Move the adoption."

Speaker Greiman: "... moves for the adoption of the Death Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1684, offered Representative McGann and Ryder."

Speaker Greiman: "Committee on Assignment. Representative Giglio in the Chair."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Kulas, are you seeking recognition? Look good, don't I? Alright, on page 15 on the Calendar appears Amendatory Veto Motions, House Bill 3340, Representative Greiman."

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

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

House Bill... this is a Motion to override the Governor's amendatory veto. There are several parts to this Bill, some parts of the Bill the Governor accepted, but one of the critical pieces of this legislation that makes it a significant piece was the Mortgage Assistance Act which was passed by this General Assembly in the waning days of our Spring Session. It is a plan or program that assists people who are faced with the prospect of losing their homes. It provides a loan program based on a criteria, a modest loan program. It requires the evaluation of their situation. It requires an informed Judgment as to whether they have an opportunity to make their mortgage current eventually. It requires an appraisal and a loan, finally, on a monthly basis, for up to three years, and it limits the state's involvement to a five million dollar period for four years. It has an automatic sunset. I've come to the conclusion that in life pain is inevitable, but it is suffering that is optional. This is an opportunity for us to address some of the pain and some of the suffering attendant to the loss of homes. We have gone out of our way, in this General Assembly, to respond to the needs of farmers. I have heard, and justifiably so, the importance of farm families, the importance of keeping them together. We have hundreds of millions of dollars, hundreds of millions of dollars that the state has guaranteed under the 'Lung' Program that we passed last year, and I supported those. We have provisions to pay the creditors of farm people, and I supported that. And now we come, not to... not a welfare dole, but a loan to keep people in their homes. I watched the President last night, and my mind went back to his first campaign in 1980 when he talked about the city on the hill and he talked about mom and pop and the kids living in their house in tranquility, except

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

the bank took the house back. That's the only problem. We're the foreclosure capital of the world, sadly, and unless we respond and unless we provide people who are facing the loss of their homes with some kind of relief, we will not be doing our duty. There are those who say... who look and say, 'Well, who's for this and who's against this?' And that's the way we do things sometimes here. We say, well, in this hand we got... on the one hand we've have household finance; they're against it. And the savings and loans; they're against it and the relators; they're... they seem to be against it, because I guess they don't want to be paid. They'd rather foreclose and take the home. On the other hand, the Illinois Bankers' Association is for the Bill. The Bar Ass... the Illinois State Bar is for the Bill. People who are part of consumer groups are for the Bill. So, I leave it to you. I leave it to you, then, where your vision of middle class people should be, where they should go, who they should follow to save their home. The Governor, in somewhat a Senate... well, it's sort of a ... actually, it's the... in reading his veto message, the ultimate in the definition of the word chutzpah, which means gall. It's sort of... he says, 'Well, there's no money to do this. There's no money appropriated.' And what is really true is he vetoed the money. So, first he vetoes the money, and then he says, 'There's no money available.' That's like a guy... that's like a guy who kills his parents and asks mercy of the court because he's an orphan. Okay. Ha-ha. So, this is a serious issue. I ask you to join with me to override the Governor's veto."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Representative McCracken, the Gentleman from DuPage."

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

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

House. I rise in opposition to the Motion to override the veto and, as the Gentleman has pointed out, the funds which were appropriated for this have already been vetoed. So, there is no money available, and that raises the specter of once again the General Assembly raising expectations by the passage of substantive Bills which are not funded either because the General Assembly can't find the money or the Governor vetoes those appropriations. And the General Assembly cannot override those appropriations. This Bill, as always with the Sponsor, well intentioned. However, let's look at some of the details about it. The point at which the borrower comes into contact with the state is when a foreclosure is threatened against his residence. The foreclosure is threatened for a lack of payment. Now there is already in the law a provision that a mortgage lender who... strike that - a mortgage borrower can cure any mortgage default by coming up with any delinquent payments and that defeats any mortgage foreclosure action. Now, under current law, that can be done only once every five years, but that has proven to be more of an aid to the borrower than this purported program of state involvement. Let's go through the program and assume for a moment that it even hadn't been vetoed its appropriations. It appropriated about 160,000 dollars to the Department of Financial Institutions for the purpose essentially of administering the program. What does that entail? The administration of the program entails a decision to make credit risks, a decision to allocate the money which has been set aside for the purpose of giving to endangered homeowners. Now, at that point, one must conclude, and it isn't a pleasant prospect, but nonetheless true, that all of these homeowners in trouble are bad credit risks at this point. Who at the Department of Financial Institutions is

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

going to make the decision who is the better or worse credit risk? Who is going to make the allocation of that money? Surely, as citizens of the State of Illinois, all of them deserve the money if any of them deserve the money. So, how are we going to have it allocated? I submit that the Department, if it has this authority, is not going to be able to administer it professionally because the cost of getting people with this type of expertise far exceeds the 160,000 dollars originally appropriated for this purpose. Instead, what you'll see happening is people waiting in line. Essentially, it will come down to a first come-first served basis until the money runs out. Now, what good is that going to do? The point is this. The state is not an effective party in the loaning of money. Even if you don't have a philosophical problem with the state's being involved in the loaning of money or the overseeing of residents' credit, the fact of the matter is the state is not properly equipped to evaluate the risks, to follow up on the risks and to ensure that the borrower is put back on his feet to an extent that he can ultimately honor the obligation. You know, sometimes we get the impression in here that banks like to own foreclosed property, that their goal in life is to foreclose so they can own residences throughout the state. The point of the matter is it's the last thing they want. They don't want the homes, and, believe me, when the state starts picking up the homes, they're not going to want it either. So, the point here is we should not be going ahead with this counseling program and we should not be going ahead with this state aid program. The state monies would be inappropriately used, ineffectively used. The standards for eligibility or evaluating risks in this Bill are very vague, and nowhere nearly as tightly drawn as one would have us believe.

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

There are no real guidelines prevented (sic - provided) to the Department of Financial Institutions. The direction... or the discretion given to the Department will be too great. In conclusion, let me say again that this is a good idea. It addresses what apparently is a real problem. There are foreclosures going on. But, is five million dollars going to make a difference? Is twenty million dollars going to make a difference? How much mortgage foreclosure money has been realized in the last few years in just the Chicago area alone? Five million dollars is a drop in the bucket. One hundred sixty-three thousand dollars for the payment of mortgage bankers or persons with the necessary experience to evaluate these risks couldn't buy more than two or three of those persons, and they are to supervise mortgage foreclosures in the entire State of Illinois. Nobody wants the foreclosures to occur. The banks don't want the foreclosures to occur. The borrowers don't want to be foreclosed. But for the state to pretend that it can get in the business and save people from foreclosure when the thousands of banks in Illinois who have just as great an interest in not foreclosing have no choice but to foreclose, this... this just is not acceptable. I would say the other parts of the Bills are acceptable. The author has demonstrated a reasonable approach to a rewrite of the Mortgage Foreclosure Law. I think that's the reason that the Governor has sought to amendatorily veto this. And I see on the Calendar that the next Motion is to accept that amendatory veto. For now, vote 'no', vote to defeat the Motion to override and then vote in favor of the Motion to accept."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I urge

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

your support for the override of this Motion. The situation faced by homeowners around this state is critical. Thousands of homeowners are facing loss of their homes, a place for their children to live. House Bill 3340 offers some relief to these homeowners. The measure doesn't satisfy the incredible need, but it does offer some hope for strapped homeowners who is about to be evicted. The Governor says the cost is too great. First of all, the Bill provides for a loan program so that the money will flow back to the state. Secondly, the restricting on the programs are narrow enough to exclude the really bad risk. Third, the cost in Fiscal Year '87 is five million dollars and twenty million dollars over four years for the length of the program. Finally, last year the General Assembly initiated an extensive farm debt relief program which has already offered farmers nearly seven million dollars for debt relief since last spring for 2881 farmers. Homeowners throughout this state, both in urban and rural areas need this program now, and I urge your 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just a couple of brief comments in regard to this Motion. I oppose this Motion. I oppose it for several reasons. In my particular area of the state, I have some personal knowledge about foreclosures. I work with them and I can tell you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that houses aren't being taken away from people that have any equity in them. Most always when there is a foreclosure, there is no equity left in that homeowner. Let's think what happens now if we continue to keep these people in homes in which they have no equity. Many times, we keep them with a rock around their neck. The inability to maintain that property is a

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

cause for concern among our communities and local governments, continued deterioration of neighborhoods. These people need to be helped but they don't need to be helped in a way that we keep them in a piece of property that they can't afford to maintain, they can't afford to live in and they can't ever afford to pay out. What they need is a fresh start, but not with the government subsidizing them in these properties. The Sponsor of this Bill has indicated that the Illinois Bankers' are in favor of it. Well, the community bankers are not in favor of it. But I guess that doesn't come as a surprise that these two groups don't see things eye to eye. Here we are in Illinois trying to get into a program of subsidizing those people who are living in homes that they cannot afford to pay for, many of which the reason is their own lack of financial management. One, two, three mortgages. They have spent their equity in their homes, and now they expect, Ladies and Gentlemen, the taxpayers to come in and prop them up, to keep them in those homes that they can't afford to live in or maintain. While we all represent constituents who may have this problem of possible losing their homes, we also represent taxpayers who are going to foot the Bill. This experiment has been tried in other states. In the State of Pennsylvania, the costs have gone from a very meager twenty million to 77 million and they're climbing. Ladies and Gentlemen, we don't want this program. We can't afford this program. I don't think it's a good program. We should vote to defeat this override Motion and then vote to accept the Governor's recommended changes in this Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

in support of House Bill 3340 in its original form. I think it's shameful when we say that we can't provide assistance to people who have been employed in an industry that's been the life blood of this state for many years. Many of these people today are out of work not because of anything that they have done, but probably because of things that we have done or haven't done and that is to put a curb on some of the imports that are coming into this country or at least to address the inequities in the trade laws that exist in this country. I think it's very necessary that we provide assistance to these people and give them an opportunity to hold on to the property that they own and get behind House Bill 3340."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I also rise in opposition to this Bill. Let me first state that not only do the community banks oppose this override Motion, but also the Illinois Bankers' Association does oppose this Motion. The Illinois Bankers' Association liked the underlying Bill, but they agree with the veto message of the Governor. This is a program which would be a very expensive program it's based on the Pennsylvania program. That program started as initially a three year program. It's now in its fifth year. It's a total expense at this point of 75 million dollars a year. It started out as a small program, but it's continued to grow. Even the administrative costs are now a million a year. It's a program that once initiated is never going to be terminated. I don't think we can afford at this point to initiate this program. In addition, for those people who do enter into the program, under the auspices of this Bill, the people who run into a problem may never end

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

up repaying the money to the state because of the fact that they don't have to repay that money unless they reach a total proportion of 35 percent of their household costs. Where there's an excess of that amount that it would come to the state. If they don't reach that portion, then it would not come back to the state. At this point I think we ought to vote 'no' on this Motion, come back on the next Motion and vote 'yes' to accept the Governor's veto. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shaw."

Shaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think it's... the previous speakers has talked about why... who oppose this Bill. Possibly the Savings and Loan Association, they oppose the Bill. The bankers oppose the Bill, some of them. But you should ask yourself why the bankers oppose this Bill and the Savings and Loan Association oppose this Bill. And the only reason that they oppose this Bill is because it's a money grab situation here. People who bought their homes some ten, twelve years ago bought them at seven point some interest rate. The bankers and savings and loan people have an opportunity to get those homes and resell those homes at possibly a 14 percent interest rate. So, that's going to make money for the bankers. And I think you should look at that and think about it in terms of voting on this Bill. I think that this is a good Bill. And as some of the previous speakers have said, through no fault of their own, the dislocated workers who bought... who own their homes today, they didn't just walk off of their job. We're not talking about those people. We're talking about the people whose jobs has been relocated somewhere else in the country and left the people here with a mortgage to pay. I think

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

that this is a start. We should start right here. This Bill... this Motion should be... you should override this Motion and make sure that the people of Illinois, the farmers, as well as the people in urban areas, keep their homes and set up this program. And in my own area, there is a large percentage of mortgage foreclosures, and I think that this is a good Bill, and it should be... this Motion should be overridden. Thank you."

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

Friedrich: "There is a... Mr. Speaker, there is a conception, I think, among some people on the other side of the aisle and probably in the public, that lending institutions, banks and savings and loan associations are big Goliath who delight in going around taking somebody's home away from them so that they can make a big profit. Nothing could be farther from the truth. I've been involved in both banks and savings and loan and financing homes, and I have yet to see one time, one time, where the lending institution on a foreclosure made any money. Nine times out of ten or even 59 times out of 60 they lose money because of the foreclosure costs, the attorney fees and all the things that go with it, the delay of having a vacancy, going into and picking up a house that has been run down because of the... people who lived in it. So, this is just not true. Farmers' Home Administration, a federal agency, went into the lending business and financed homes with very minimal down payments. The loss has been horrendous. And if you think this isn't a big ticket item, you just don't understand foreclosures and what you get into when you start taking back property. I certainly don't want to see anyone lose their home, but I have never seen a case yet, again, where every effort was not made to work with the

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

person to see if something couldn't be done. But this goes on and on. They finance; they refinance; they take second mortgages and there is never anything less and there's always a loss to the lender at the end. Now, if you want the state to be the loser, go ahead and vote for this. That's exactly what you're getting yourself into."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the Motion to override the amendatory veto. In this House, there are a great many Bills that we consider where we kind of compromise, where one side comes in and wants something and the other side wants something else. And that's part of our process. And that was part of the process in terms of this legislation. The basic underlying Bill was one that the financial community wanted. They wanted to take away certain rights from the consumer. They wanted to cut the length of the foreclosure period. And the consumers, those on the consumer side said, 'We're willing to compromise with you with certain things we want that are going to benefit the consumer.' And those were added to the Bill as it went to the Governor. What the Governor then did was to strip out all of those provisions that were put into that Bill to benefit the consumer. So, what we're left with is a Bill that's one sided, that reflects half of the compromise, but not the other half. And I think that's wrong. This Bill, without the provisions in it that went to the Governor that benefit the consumer, is worthless to the consumer, is one sided... sided, is unfair. We have serious problems throughout the state as far as people that are unemployed, people losing their houses because of the economy. So, this is a Bill which is, with the provisions in it that were put into it to benefit the consumer, is a good Bill.

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

Without it, it's one sided and unfair. We ought to override the Governor's amendatory veto to maintain the integrity of our legislative process that says when you cut a deal you live with that deal."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Kane, Representative Zwick. Representative Zwick, are you seeking recognition? The Lady from Kane."

Zwick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask Representative Greiman a question if I may about this Bill?"

Speaker Giglio: "Gentleman indicates he'll yield."

Zwick: "Thank you, Representative, when we voted on this back in May or June, whenever it was, I recall quite vividly the debate on this and the work that went on in the background to... for this entire proposal to come to fruition. And it was a whole group of people who had various interests that normally don't work together, that came together and reached a compromise and we came up with this package. Now, the provision which the Governor has left in the Bill was part of the agreement, to my recollection. That that would pass only if these other provisions dealing with the mortgage assistance were passed. I was hoping you could explain to us, so that we know what to do on this, what is in the original provision that the Governor leaves in the Bill and who does that benefit and who does it hurt and..."

Greiman: "Well, the original underlying Bill, so-called, revamps the process for filing mortgage foreclosures and straightens out some of the ambiguities in how one makes foreclosure sales, when the sale is and, theoretically, streamlines the process. Now, streamlining the process means, I suppose, that it's relatively easier for the holder of the security to foreclose. And that's the trade-off, as it were, that was there. But the Bills..."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

the foreclosure Bill has been developed by the Illinois Bar Association and the Chicago Bar Association and others and most of the folks who do foreclosure work, of course, and that's usually the banking bar, think it's great, and the state cannot live another day without it. But... And it has advantages. It does clean up some ambiguities. There's no question about that, and that's I'm for the Bill... for that part of the Bill as well. But, you know, the two are not totally interdependent on each other. But, obviously, you know, that's how we work out many... as Representative Levin has suggested, that's how we work out a lot of problems here. We put on things that are of interest to several people to get something passed."

Zwick: "Okay. If... If this Motion is overridden, of course, all three of the provisions of the Bill will become law, and that does not include any funding because the funding has been vetoed."

Greiman: "Funding is on another Bill. We could, obviously, pass the substantive legislation and fund it next year. You know, fund it for FY '87. We do that... we do that all the time."

Zwick: "Right. Certainly."

Greiman: "So, that's certainly possible or we could, if we believe we wanted to, we could put it in a supplementary, we could do it next spring. The funding doesn't necessarily have to go with the substantive law."

Zwick: "Okay. Thank you. It just... my only comment would be that it doesn't seem appropriate to me that in this Body, when we do come up with... with agreed Bills, such as this really was when it came to us originally, that perhaps either the entire Bill should pass or none of the Bill should pass. If the underlying portion of the Bill which the Governor left in tact is good, we could certainly do

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

that next year. And thank you very much for your explanation."

Greiman: "Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman, to close."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to just comment on a few of the comments that have been made, some which were inaccurate. I'm sure the Gentleman from the Lake, who represented to you that it was 75 million dollars a year, wouldn't want to make that misrepresentation. I'm sure Mr. Churchill would want to be more honest about it. I'm sure it was just an error that 75 million dollars over the five year period and not over the year. And I'm sure he would want to correct that. With respect to what the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken, suggested, we have... we have dozens of programs that DCCA handles, that other agencies handle that make a decision as to one applicant over another. They're qualitative decisions. You come in for economic development. We passed... we pass an economic development Bill in this House about every 45 minutes. I don't know if they're any good, but we pass one. And those are qualitative Judgements that we give state employees the right to make and it's kind of insulting to believe that state employees can't make ... can't use a criteria, can't develop a criteria to develop who should get this loan. I mean, we let them pick and choose all the time. Now, this criteria is, one of the important parts is that the person has an opportunity to come back. That the person who is... who is making the evaluation looks at the guy's situation and says, 'This person maybe can make it. The plant is closed, but they're dickering to open the plant and maybe he'll come back. He has an opportunity to.' Now, the Gentleman from Livingston talked about equity. I'll tell

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

you what the equity is. The equity is the belief in people. The equity is the belief that a man and a woman, or a woman can go and work and work their way out of a hole with a little help from the state. The equity is human value. I treasure that human value, and I hope you'll join with me and override this veto."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 3340. The... This Bill... this... Representative Leverenz, for what purpose do you rise?"

Leverenz: "Just an inquiry of the Chair. You just said to accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change. I don't think that's what we're doing."

Speaker Giglio: "No, no. You mis... you didn't hear me right, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Explain it to me."

Speaker Giglio: "The Motion is that House Bill 3340 do pass, the Governor's specific recommendations for change notwithstanding. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes', those opposed 'no'. This requires 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Motion there are 57 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. This Motion, having failed to receive the necessary votes of 71, is hereby declared lost. Representative Greiman? Out of the record. On the Order of Reduction and Item Vetoes, on page 14 of the Calendar, Representative Cullerton, House Bill 3090. Representative Greiman in the Chair."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Clerk. Mr. Cullerton, on Motion #6."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. When we passed the Education Reform Act in 1985, one of the elements was an expansion of the state's

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

truancy program. The program also was designed to help the problem of students dropping out of school. In order to fund that truant dropout optional education initiative, we increased state funding for the program from two and a half million dollars in 1985 to ten million dollars in 1986. Now, it was decided that seven and a half million dollars of that ten million would be awarded via the competitive proposal process for one half a year and 26 million dollars was requested from throughout the state for this program. Of course, only seven and a half million dollars was able to be awarded and the total for half a year in 1986 was ten million dollars. The State Board of Education requested an appropriation of 20 million dollars for Fiscal '87. We approved an appropriation for 20 million dollars, and the Senate reduced it to 13.5 million which we concurred in. The Governor, through his amendatory veto, reduced the appropriation to ten million dollars. So, in effect, it's about half the amount of money that we had the previous year to spend on the truant and dropout program. The Governor did sign a Bill that myself and Senator Berman was a Sponsor of dealing with the changing definitions and getting ready, in effect, to spend the new money under the education reform proposal. But, of course, by the Governor's action, we took three and a half million dollars out of the program. Even three and a half million is not enough, of course, to... as what would normally be requested throughout the state. But the problem of truants, the problem of dropouts is something which we have, I think everyone in the General Assembly realizes, if we could cut down on this dilemma and this problem throughout the state we, in the long run, end up saving money. There's a lot of pressure, of course, to take the problem of truants and put them back in the court system.

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

This is a result... this pressure is a result of the increased problem of truancy throughout the state. So, maybe that might be an alternative, if the programs that we attempt fail, but we haven't even really tried to fully implement these programs. So, as a result, I would ask that we spend this additional money for the truants and dropout program and I would appreciate your support and be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, has moved that the House restore the reduction veto of the Governor. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What happened to education reform? Where did it go? Where is it hiding? Last year, the number one item on our agenda was education reform. We labored all year. We had a Joint Committee on Education Excellence. We came up with a Bill that had 45 separate Articles in it targetting 45 separate programs and policies that will make a difference in education in this state. And dropout programs were one of those targetted, and we passed the money to do the job. We gave the money to the Board of Education to allocate to implement the recommendations that we had contained in that legislation. And now what we're doing, if we refuse to override, is turning our backs on that, is cutting the funds because we won't be able to keep those programs going at last year's levels. The Governor cut the programs back to about half of last year's level. So, only if we override his veto and restore the funds will these programs be able to move ahead at the same level they were last year. So, I call upon you, my colleagues, not to turn your backs on education reform, not to pretend that the education reform of last year was just make work, was

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

just a joke, a big joke on everybody. That was serious business. And if we mean business, we must restore these funds. I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If the Amendment is... or the amendatory veto is sustained, this program will be funded at the same level for FY '87 as it was funded in FY '86. Ten million dollars budgeted in '86; ten million dollars budgeted and provided in 1987. Has there been a case made for a reduction, not only three and a half million greater, but even twice as great as was originally proposed? I submit to you that the case has not been made for such a dramatic increase in one year's experience. And that given that fact, to fund it at the same level as last year, when many other programs and many other line items are being cut, when the Governor has instituted a three percent reduction across the board, is not an inappropriate act by this General Assembly. We do not turn our back on education reform. To fund this level at 10 million dollars is a responsible act, and I would ask that we defeat this Motion to override."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield please?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he'll yield for questions."

Ropp: "Representative Cullerton, in this particular attempt to deal with dropouts, does this program, in any way, address those students who are not in school and are classified as dropouts or truants?"

Cullerton: "Yes, the programs that would be offered by the State Board of Education. The State Board of Education awards grants to local school districts. The programs would be to allow dropouts, up to and including age 21, including truants, to enroll in alternative... in optional

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

educational programs."

Ropp: "What do those school districts do? Do they just say, 'We have this program. You all dropouts, here it is. Come and get it.'"

Cullerton: "Well, you may be aware of this. There's a whole network of alternative schools which are very successful, I know, in the Chicago area, and I assume that these are the types of programs that could be bid on by local school districts, optional alternative school networks which pick up the problem of the dropouts and the problem of truants."

Ropp: "If they're so successful, why is it that there are schools in Chicago that still have 60 and 70 percent dropout? Are those programs not operative in those school districts?"

Cullerton: "We don't have enough funds to operate enough of the alternative schools to pick up the total problem. That's why the State Board of Education asked for a 20 million dollar appropriation and we've cut that in half. That's why we're just trying to restore three and a half million."

Ropp: "Well, why is it that it doesn't seem... if three million extra dollars would, in fact, reduce that 70 percent dropout to some figure - from 70 down to 30, it would be a significant improvement. I guess the other question that I'll have is do you really think that without some kind of a lever, as we have attempted to do by putting truants and dropouts in the juvenile court system to actually force them back into our system, that there will never be any way that we're going to get them back in there without some kind of a lever?"

Cullerton: "I appreciate your concern there, and I think that the major problem with the truants going back into juvenile court is really a problem in Cook County where we don't have enough court rooms to handle the mess. Now, downstate

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

I am convinced and agree with you that, as a last ditch effort to try to bring a truant back into... into a school situation, it might be the cite of a robe of a Judge might be what it takes. But only after we have made every attempt at funding alter... components of the Education Reform Act so that we can at least try these programs to cut down on truancy and to do that, we would have to spend... you know, last year, as I said, 26 million dollars was asked for. Only seven million was appropriated by the State Board of Education. So, we're not even close to coming up with enough money for these programs. But I will tell you this - if you support me in this override, we'll start spending the money that's needed to cut down on truants and dropouts and, if it doesn't work, then we can go back and look at how we can get the juveniles back in the... in juvenile court."

Ropp: "Are you saying now that you're going to give me your word you're going to support that Bill next year, now, to put the students back in the juvenile court system, if not in Cook County, even though Judge Hamilton was a strong supporter of that? And I think he's in Cook County..."

Cullerton: "What I'm saying is let's spend the money and see if it starts to work. We're going to have an appropriation process next year. Presumably the State Board of Education is once again going to try to ask for the 20 million or more that they asked for this year. This only would raise it up to 13 and a half."

Ropp: "Okay. One final point. I think that it would be a far better proposal to put any and all of this money in the program that was already implemented in the reading program for K through 6 in order to encourage young people to like to read, want to read and then understand what they do read. I think that's the very basis and the very basic

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

concept of our whole educational philosophy which I think we should address. Now, in favor of your proposal here is the fact that any percentage of reduction in dropouts that we can incur, I think, will go a long way in attempting to reduce the cost of the social programs, the prisons that we have to maintain in order to take care of dropouts who get involved in some real serious problems. Even though this is three million extra dollars, I think if we don't really, sincerely attempt to address this situation constructively, the costs are going to just be astronomical and these few dollars that may go to this program, should they begin to reduce the dropout, and I think if they don't reduce the dropout then we're really going to have to do something else - but the costs for these programs are going to far exceed what the state can afford, unless we see a turnaround. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McGann."

McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. I rise in support of Representative Cullerton's Motion. I believe I can speak to you, the Members of this Assembly, from a personal view from my experience as former Chairman of the Board of Trustees at City College of Chicago. We received approximately 700,000 dollars in these funds to embark upon this program to help on the dropouts and the tremendous percentage of dropouts in the City of Chicago. We have several hundred involved in this program in two of our college sites, Truman and Olive Harvey. We believe that two million dollars more is needed this next fiscal year in order to expand this program, this much-needed program in the City of Chicago. We talk about we should be working on K-6 through 12 and so forth. We've got to worry about these individuals. We have changed their environment. They like a campus site. They are doing their

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

job. They're energetic, working to better themselves and we'll probably find a great percentage of these enrolling in the community colleges or other... some of the major universities as the years come about. I would ask you - and I know that things are tight in this state presently, but I would implore upon you today to rethink this and please vote for this measure. The money is needed. The money is well spent, and I'm sure even despite the crunch, we could find the two million or three million that is necessary to keep this program moving. Thank you so much."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Adams, Mr. Mays."

Mays: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me that we sometimes lose sight of the big picture when we're discussing specific appropriations Bills or restorations or line items and so on. The fact of the matter is that we are spending actual dollars, 238 million more for education this year than we did the previous year. Yes, that's a mix of increases in various categorical programs as well as increases in general state aid formula. There is nothing that limits these school districts from spending those general state aid formula dollars for whatever purposes they deem appropriate, but the fact of the matter is there is something that limits us in this appropriations process from going on overrides on individual line items and these categories. We spent 11 and a half million more for the preschoolers yesterday. We spent nine and a half million more for gifted education. We're asked to spend three and a half million more now for an alternative education program. They're all great. Nobody in this chamber is disputing their hope and their chances for being a good thing for the school kids that are charged with our responsibility. The fact of the matter is though we are limited in terms of dollars. Whether they go for

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

categoricals or state aid or what-not, that is passed. The fact is now we have to do what we can to hold the line on a budget that is extremely tight and going with continued overrides just doesn't make sense. If, indeed, these things pass, we're just going to be digging ourselves in a deeper hole for next year and we may have to decrease funding for some of these things if we don't want to vote for tax increases. So, I would suggest that now is the prudent time to hold the line and this is a prudent time to start. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, to close."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Just to clarify one thing. I'm sure Representative McCracken didn't mean to mislead, but let me just clarify. The ten million dollars last year was spent over a half a year and so that's why the State Board of Education asked for a full funding this year of 20 million. If we override the veto, we will only be spending 13 and a half, which is not the full 20 that's needed. I would point out that when we had this competitive process of these programs that were proposed to the State Board, 75 percent of them went outside of Cook County. So, actually most of this money, historically, is going outside of the Cook County area. The... I would emphasize what Representative Ropp said, that... and I agree with him and he's been working on this issue of truancy for a long time and he's aware of the problems - that you end up losing a lot more money by increased money for prisons, by increased paying for crime that is committed by people who are not in school, and it just makes sense for us to just make this, really, a small amount of money, but at least go in the right direction and restore the cuts that the Governor made. So, appreciate your support."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall this item be restored, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. 60 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 65 voting 'aye', 46 voting 'no', none voting 'present', and this Motion... Mr. McCracken, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

McCracken: "Verify the vote."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. McCracken, the Gentleman from DuPage, requests a verification. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, asks for a poll of those not voting. Mr. Levin, what... for what purpose were you seeking recognition? Mr. Levin. Mr. Levin wishes leave to be verified, Mr. McCracken. You have leave, Sir. Mr. Clerk, poll of those not voting."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of those not voting. Representative Mautino. No further."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Shaw seeks leave to be verified. Does he have leave, Mr. McCracken?"

McCracken: "Yes."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Clerk, proceed with the call of the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the affirmative. Berrios. Bowman."

Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me. Ms. Breslin seeks leave to be verified. You have leave, Ma'am. Proceed, Mr. Clerk. And Mr. Martinez. You have leave then."

Clerk Leone: "Proceeding. Breslin."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Brookins. Brunsvold. Capparelli. Christensen. Cullerton. Curran. Currie. Daley. DeJaegher. DeLeo. Didrickson. Dunn. Farley. Flinn. Flowers. Giglio.

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

Greiman. Hannig. Hartke. Hicks. Homer. Keane.
Kirkland. Krska. Kulas. Laurino. LeFlore. Leverenz.
Levin. Martinez. Matijevich. McGann. McNamara. McPike.
Morrow. Nash. O'Connell. Panayotovich. Pangle. Phelps.
Preston. Rea. Rice. Richmond. Ronan. Ropp. Saltsman.
Satterthwaite. Shaw. Steczo. Stern. Sutker. Terzich.
Turner. Van Duynes. Washington. White. Wolf. Anthony
Young. Wyvetter Younge. Zwick. And Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. McCracken, questions of the Affirmative
Roll Call."

McCracken: "Thank you. Representative Terzich."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Terzich. Mr. Terzich. Mr. Terzich in the
chamber? Mr. Terzich. How is Mr. Terzich recorded?"

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

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Terzich from the Roll Call."

McCracken: "Representative Dunn."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Dunn. Mr. Dunn's in the rear of the
chamber."

McCracken: "Representative Stern."

Speaker Greiman: "Ms... Mr. Terzich has returned to the chamber.
Restore Mr. Terzich to the Roll Call. Ms. Stern. Ms.
Stern is at the rear of the chamber."

McCracken: "Okay, thank you. Representative Krska."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Krska. Mr. Krska in the chamber? Mr.
Krska. How is Mr. Krska recorded?"

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

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Krska."

McCracken: "Representative Sutker."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Sutker is right here at the well."

McCracken: "Representative Mulcahey."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Mulcahey has been excused, Sir."

McCracken: "Okay, sorry. Representative Pangle."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Pangle. Mr. Pangle. Is Mr. Pangle in the

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

chamber? Mr. Pangle. How is Mr. Pangle recorded?"

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

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Pangle from the Roll Call."

McCracken: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Speaker Greiman: "Ms. Satterthwaite is on the Republican side at the rear of the chamber."

McCracken: "Nothing further."

Speaker Greiman: "On this question there are 63 voting 'aye', 46 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Motion, having received the Constitutional Majority, prevails, and the House does restore this item. Alright. On page... on page 14 of the Calendar under Item and Reduction Veto Motions appears Motion 9 of House Bill 3090. Mr. Berrios."

Berrios: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I move to restore the funds that were cut by the Governor's... in regards to the bilingual education program. I ask this for all the kids in the City of Chicago and throughout the state that need this help in order to finish school. I know that a lot of people complain about the program, but the program does help some of the kids that are involved in it. It helps them with the transition to an all English class. In an area where we have a 70 percent Hispanic dropout, we cannot shut the door on some of these kids. What we're telling them to do is just leave schools. I cannot understand why we are attempting to cut the funds from this program. It's something that is desperately needed, and it's not only just for the Hispanic student - it's for all students in the State of Illinois that have problems with an all English class and they... are able to be taught in their own native language for a period of time in order to transcend into the regular system. I ask, as I've never done before, for these kids, who I feel deserve a break. Thank you."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berrios, moves for restoration of this item. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to remind the Members of the Body that this Motion was considered yesterday and was defeated. I don't think anything has happened in the intervening 24 hours to... to make us change our mind. If the Motion is defeated and there is no restoration of the reduction veto, then this program will be funded at the same level as the FY '86 funding in spite of the fact that as to the budget generally there is a three percent reduction across the board in order to comply with available state revenues. So, for all those reasons I think that the vote yesterday was the correct one, and I ask for a similar vote today. Thank you."

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

Martinez: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as a Member of the Appropriations II Committee, I had occasion this summer to attend the meeting ... a hearing on the proposed cuts of programs beneficial to the large Hispanic community. In attendance were my colleagues Representative Klemm and Representative Deuchler. I believe that they can attest to what I am about to state. The number of parents, teachers and other witnesses that attended the hearing room could not be accommodated in the regular hearing room and it had to be moved down to the auditorium. The testimony that ensued was highly charged and emotional and to hear the parents of the recipients of this program decry the cuts and hear them state what these programs meant to them was something that I had never witnessed before. I must confess I was deeply moved and I was moved to the point that I arose to try to assure those present that I and my colleagues would come back to the House with their message

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

and that I and Representative Berrios would do everything within our power to try to restore the proposed cuts. It is with this in mind that I ask the Members of the House, on both sides of the aisles, to please, please search your consciousness and try to find it in you to try and help me and Representative Berrios to restore these sorely needed cuts. I urge you, give us the votes needed to accomplish this. And, I thank you very much."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Adams, Mr. Mays."

Mays: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentlemen yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "You mean the Sponsor..."

Mays: "Yes."

Speaker Greiman: "... or the Principle Sponsor. Mr. Berrios, yes, indicates he'll yield for a question."

Mays: "He is a Gentleman, I assume."

Speaker Greiman: "They're both Sponsors and they're both Gentleman. Alright, Mr. Berrios will yield for a question."

Mays: "How much are we seeking to spend in this Motion?"

Berrios: "Raising it from 13.9 to 16.9 and going from 4.6 to 9.7 for downstate bilingual programs."

Mays: "So, how much is this Motion, should we decide to vote for it, going to cost the taxpayers of the State of Illinois."

Berrios: "About seven million, almost eight million."

Mays: "So, this one vote here, should you vote green, is eight million dollars more for bilingual programs, right?"

Berrios: "Yes, but most of the money is going downstate."

Mays: "Well, we're always pleased to get whatever dollars downstate we can. But, the fact is and to the proposal, we... this is an eight million dollar ticket. The last one we considered was a three and a half million dollar ticket. We've already voted for over 20 million dollars in

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

education overrides. Again, the arguments have been made on both sides as to the value or lack of value of these given programs. I don't think there is much argument to be made in terms of the lack of value. The argument is that 238 million is all we had to allocate for education... elementary and secondary education in this state for this fiscal year. And that's what we gave it when we put the whole budget together and how education spent it through categoricals or state aid funding, that's... you know, that's the way it's come down. So, what we're doing with these and what we're doing... we've now spent about 24 million dollars more for categoricals, on top of a seven percent state aid increase that was approved by the General Assembly last spring, and the pot's running low. If we keep going with this, we're just going to have to address a financial crunch later down the road and I think that's the point that a lot of people are missing. For that reason, I would suggest respectfully, that we bite the bullet now rather than having to bite it a couple times more next year."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ronan."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I, too, rise and support this Motion offered by Representative Berrios and Martinez. This is really one of the issues that makes our responsibility in the General Assembly make some sense. We stand here, year after year, and talk about the needs for adequate education funding and we've got a situation, not only in the City of Chicago, but you can visit numerous downstate communities where bilingual education is the vehicle that's available to keep young people in school. It's the opportunity for young people to participate in a process that's very difficult. We've got a dropout situation that we've addressed to the previous

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

legislation, but this is just as important to keep people in school by a bilingual education program. Of course, we're in a tough budget year. We know that the problems that the state's facing. But if we turn our backs on the young people who need bilingual education in order to participate in the educational system, we've done a tremendous disservice for every citizen in the State of Illinois. If these kids aren't given a chance to stay in school and aren't given the tools necessary in order to make education a little easier, we're not doing our job. I want to compliment both Representative Berrios and Martinez for the efforts that they put forth yesterday and just to let you know, Representative McCracken, the only reason this lost yesterday is there were a few Members who were detained at other places. Those Members are here today and this Bill is going to pass out of here and go the Senate where it's going to get the same kind of fair consideration. I urge everyone to please cast an 'aye' vote on this very important measure."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn."

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

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from St. Clair moves the previous question be put. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The previous question is put. Mr. Berrios, to close."

Berrios: "One of the previous speakers said that this was an increase. One of the reasons it's an increase is because of the fact that during our educational reform Session that we had earlier this year, we've provided more services for downstate kids and we put, in actuality, a clause in the Bill that would allow children downstate and in Chicago who were not allowed the benefits of this program to come into

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

the program. When we start talking about money for education, what are we talking about? We're talking about kids' minds. We're talking about the future of our state and unless we, as a Body, come forth and say education is the number one priority in this state, this state will suffer in the long run. And I ask everyone to vote for this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall this item be restored, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Sixty votes are required. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kulas, one minute to explain your vote."

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It seems that we've got our priorities all screwed up in this General Assembly. Yesterday, there were about 90 people who voted to override the Governor and to restore millions of dollars for the gifted children of the State of Illinois. But for the poor children of the State of Illinois, for the poor Puerto Ricans, the poor Koreans, the poor Mexican, the poor Vietnamese child, it seems we don't have that money available. But for the gifted we do. I think that those of you who vote for the gifted should be voting for the poor and I vote 'yes'."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman, one minute to explain your vote."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I want all my downstate colleagues to understand that this Motion has downstate bilingual education in it and, furthermore, the Governor's veto is particularly interesting because it cuts the downstate bilingual line by half, by half. The Chicago reduction was far less on a percentage basis and on a total dollar basis. So that the particular veto that we are considering here fell

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

disproportionately hard on downstate school districts. So, I hope all of you take that into account as you cast your vote."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Ropp, one minute to explain your vote."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. You know, we talked about all the poor this and the poor that. When this country was first founded we had the poor Germans, the poor French, the poor Italians, they came over here and learned to speak English. I think this is a tragedy to continue to fund a bilingual education for every kind of race or nationality that we have in the world. It is an endless pit that cannot fully be funded. In regards to downstate, I don't know why the... this was vetoed thing that we need more money downstate. I really don't think that there is that many people who need this kind of program in downstate Illinois. If the problem is in Chicago and if it should be certainly more money should be spent in that area. This is not an attempt to improve English speaking in the United States. It is a diverse move and certainly we ought to stop it if we possibly can."

Speaker Greiman: "Okay. Okay. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. McCracken, one minute to explain your vote."

McCracken: "I'm going to verify and see if Representative Ronan is here."

Speaker Greiman: "Back of the room. Leave to be verified. Alright. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. This question there are 62 voting 'aye', 50 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. And the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken request of Verification of the Affirmative vote. Mr. Clerk, Mr. Berrios asks for a Poll of those not voting."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

Berrios: "There are no Members who are not voting."

Speaker Greiman: "Fine. Mr. Shaw asks for leave to be verified. You have leave. Mr. DeLeo and Mr. Levin asks for leave and Mr. Nash asks for leave. DeLeo, Levin and Nash. Mr. Clerk, proceed with the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative. Berrios. Bowman. Brookins. Brunsvold. Capparelli. Christensen. Cullerton. Curran. Currie. Daley. DeJaegher. DeLeo. Dunn. Farley. Flinn. Flowers. Giglio. Goforth. Greiman. Hartke. Hicks. Homer. Keane. Krska. Kulas. Laurino. LeFlore. Leverenz. Levin. Martinez. Matijevich. Mautino. McAuliffe. McGann. McNamara. McPike. Morrow. Nash. O'Connell. Panayotovich. Pangle. Phelps. Preston. Rea. Rice. Richmond. Ronan. Saltsman. Satterthwaite. Shaw. Steczo. Stern. Sutker. Terzich. Turner. Van Duyne. Washington. White. Wolf. Anthony Young. Wyvetter Younge. And Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. McCracken, questions of the Affirmative Roll Call."

McCracken: "Yes, thank you. Representative McAuliffe?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. McAuliffe? Is Mr. McAuliffe in the chamber? Mr. McAuliffe. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. McAuliffe."

McCracken: "Representative Pangle?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Pangle? Mr. Pangle in the chamber? Mr. Pangle? How is Mr. Pangle recorded?"

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

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Pangle."

McCracken: "Representative Hicks?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Hicks? Mr. Hicks in the chamber? Mr. Hicks? Mr. Hicks is in the gallery. We have leave to let Mr. Hicks be recorded as in the chamber? Alright. Mr.

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

Hicks is with us then."

McCracken: "Representative McGann?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. McGann is in his seat."

McCracken: "Representative Goforth?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Goforth? Mr. Goforth in the chamber? Mr. Goforth. How is Mr. Goforth recorded?"

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

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Goforth from the Roll Call. Does Mr. Cullerton have leave to be verified? You have leave Mr. Cullerton. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

McCracken: "Mr. McNamara?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. McNamara is at the Republican rear... rear of the Republican side."

McCracken: "Representative Giglio?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Giglio is at his seat and Mr. Bowman were you seeking... Ms. Breslin, did you wish to be verified? Oh, I'm sorry. Vote Ms. Breslin, 'aye'. Ms. Breslin goes from 'no' to 'aye'. Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "Representative DeJaegher?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. DeJaegher is in the aisle."

McCracken: "Representative Krska?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Krska? Mr. Krska in the chamber? Krska is here at the door."

McCracken: "Representative Brunsvold?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Brunsvold is at his desk."

McCracken: "Representative Flinn?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Flinn is at his desk."

McCracken: "Representative Richmond?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Richmond is at his desk."

McCracken: "That's all."

Speaker Greiman: "On this question there are 60 voting 'aye', 49 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Motion, having received the Constitutional Majority, prevails, and the

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

House does restore this Item. On the Order of Reduction and Item Veto Motions, on page 14 of the Calendar appears Motion 4 of House Bill 3191. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "I move the following Bills of House Bill... following Items of House Bill 3191. Do pass the veto, of the Governor, notwithstanding."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Rea."

Rea: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move for override of the reduction veto on House Bill 3191, lines 24-30. Two-hundred thousand dollars for the Coal Marketing Office. Two-hundred thousand is a very small amount, when we consider the valuable resource that we have here, in Illinois, in terms of coal. We have a thousand year of supply. This is a resource that we need to do much more of burning in a clean way. And marketing, both exporting out of the country, as well as in the United States. We are making some efforts forth there, but we need to be able to promote the marketing and this would be done within the Department of Energy and Natural Resources, which is a most likely place for this to occur. They've already been working with a Mississippi Valley Co-exporting Council, with the New Orleans Port, in terms of exports and have a working agreement there. We need this money desperately to promote the markets. We've done it in terms of Agricultural. We've done it in tourisms, business and industry. We need to do it for this valuable resource of coal. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Rea, moves for the passage of this Item, the veto, the Government, Governor, notwithstanding. And on that is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Item pass, the veto of the Governor, notwithstanding?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

'no'. Voting is now open. 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Saline, Mr. Phelps, one minute to explain your vote."

Phelps: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We have the... the sufficient number of votes. I just want to commend those who might put a lot of laid-off workers down in several counties back to work because of this new provision. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 75 voting 'aye', 36 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. And this Motion, having received the required three-fifths majority, prevails. And this Item is declared passed, the veto of the Governor, notwithstanding. Well, just go back up over a few that we passed over. And on page 14 appears House Bill 2989, Motion 15. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2989, I move the following Items of House Bill 2989, do pass the veto of the Governor, notwithstanding."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Saline, Mr. Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is another attempt to try to appeal to those who might have second thoughts about 25,000 dollars, which is a small amount of investment, at what might mean something big for southeastern Illinois. Southeastern Community College has been awarded some land by Peabody Coal Company, contingent on the fact, that they can get a study showing how to develop that property, possibly up to one-thousand acres. Which they have now gained two-hundred and fifty acres. If we can get this feasibility study passed then we can have a development there that might mean a whole lot for jobs. So much needed in that area. I appreciate your support."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Saline, moves that this Item pass the Veto of the Governor, notwithstanding. And on that is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. Mays."

Mays: "Just a couple of questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Were you going to address these questions to the Gentleman from Saline, or were they rhetorical?"

Mays: "I've got a parliamentary inquiry for you, Mr. Speaker. We on the order of business that requires second thoughts on all disorder is on Motions that we defeated yesterday or what?"

Speaker Greiman: "We are on the Order of Item... Reduction and Item Vetoes. Now, do you have questions of Mr. Phelps? Alright."

Mays: "... Order of business. Okay. Yes. Yes, I do."

Speaker Greiman: "He will yield for questions."

Mays: "I would like to know if the contingency, that we're talking about in this land transfer, was placed on the transfer by the people that were going to donate the land or by the community college that was going to receive it?"

Phelps: "It's merely the first two-hundred and fifty acres was just a gift and they said that they would award the rest of the acreage if they could develop the total acreage of one-thousand acres. And the 250 is not near as the value or to reach that goal if the other 750 acres are not realized."

Mays: "The company that wants to donate this land has made that donation contingent upon the community college receiving these dollars, or the community college has made, receiving that land, contingent upon receiving the dollars?"

Phelps: "The agreement is, if the community college can show some professional study that would... show the development that we would merit them awarding the property. But, it's not

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

agreed upon the 25,000. No, the Peabody Coal Company knows nothing about this money. They just want some development plan that they can base up on their gift."

Mays: "Has the community college committed to do anything of it's own resources towards this proposition?"

Phelps: "In the terms of dollars, I can't say. But, I do know that this staff is working with the southeastern planning commission. And I'm sure that there will be a lot of follow-up work and some of their own resources that will go in, that I would recommend, but I can't say tangibly, what that would be."

Mays: "Finely, have you talked with Mr. Ropp, yet?"

Phelps: "I did, but that didn't seem to work out."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall this Item pass the veto of the Governor, notwithstanding?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all vote who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 61 voting 'aye', 48 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. And the Motion fails. On that Order of Business appears Motion 2, on House Bill 2996. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "I move to restore the following reduced Items of Appropriations in House Bill 2996, the reduction of the Governor, notwithstanding."

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

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This particular reduction veto affects the basic health services line in the Department of Public Health Budget. These funds are earmarked for grants to 75 local health departments in Illinois. These departments represent our front line defense against the spread of communicable diseases in the state. And many areas, local

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

health departments are the only providers of in home help and social services that are so necessary to our state's growing aging population. The demands on these departments are far outstripped resources in the past decade. Recent studies have clearly demonstrated the serious erosion over the past seven years the state funding for local public health services. Since 1980, the decline has been on the order of 41 percent, services have had to be cut, and local tax bases further burdened as result. It is necessary that we restore these funds for the basic health services in order to make sure that the fiscal health of our local agencies is provided for. I move to restore these monies."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman, moves for the restoration of this Item. On their is there any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "This... this also was considered yesterday, and after lengthy debate, was defeated. I would ask that the Members of the General Assembly consider that fact. As a matter of fact, apparently; every vote we are acting on today was one which was defeated yesterday. And with some exceptions their all Democratic Motions. So, on that basis I think we should defeat this again."

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

Matijevich: "I would only like to say in response to Representative McCracken that we did receive 62 votes on this yes... yesterday. And on Verification some Members were detained but they were around the area. It looks like the numbers are a little better today. These... these services are so necessary, and the fact of the matter is we often hear that when you provide services locally, you get so much better for your dollar in services. So, I think, let's allow the local health departments to provide the services that are so necessary. I urge an 'aye' vote."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none the question is, 'Shall this Item be restored?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. 60 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the... take the... take the... Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 60 voting 'aye', 48 voting 'no'... Mr. McCracken, that is correct. That is the way to get the Chair's attention by pushing that small button on your..."

McCracken: "That's what I did."

Speaker Greiman: "Which you have now done."

McCracken: "No. No. I didn't say anything. I just... I just pushed the button."

Speaker Greiman: "60 voting 'aye', 48 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. Mr. McCracken, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

McCracken: "Well, this got fewer votes than yesterday so, I will verify."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. The Gentleman request... excuse me. Mr... Mr. Flinn, what purpose do you seek recognition? Mr. Flinn requests leave to be verified. You have leave. Mr. Krska asks leave to be verified. Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Krska votes 'aye'. Vote, Mr. Krska, 'aye'. Mr. Bowman asks for a Poll of those not voting. Ms. Breslin votes 'aye'. Ms. Breslin votes 'aye'. Proceed, Mr. Clerk, with a Poll of those not voting."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of those not voting. Capparelli. Virginia Frederick. And Parcels."

Speaker Greiman: "Okay. Now, Mr. Clerk, proceed with the... with the Verification of the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative. Berrios. Bowman. Breslin. Brookins. Brunsvold. Christensen. Cullerton.

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

Curran. Currie. Daley. DeJaegher. DeLeo. Dunn.
Farley. Flinn. Flowers. Giglio. Greiman. Hannig.
Hartke. Hicks. Homer. Keane. Krska. Kulas. Laurino.
LeFlore. Leverenz. Levin. Martinez. Matijevich.
Mautino. McGann. McNamara. McPike."

Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Vote Mr. Capparelli
'aye'. Ms. Parcels."

Parcels: "Me, 'no'."

Speaker Greiman: "Vote Ms. Parcels 'no'. Proceed, Sir. Mr.
DeLeo, asks leave to be verified. You have the leave, Sir.
Proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the Poll of the Affirmative. Nash.
O'Connell. Panayotovitch. Pangle. Phelps. Preston. Rea.
Rice. Richmond. Ronan. Saltsman. Satterthwaite. Shaw.
Slater. Steczo. Stern. Sutker. Terzich. Turner. Van
Duyne. Washington. White. Wolf. Anthony Young.
Hyvetter Younge. And Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. McCracken, questions of the Affirmative
Roll Call."

McCracken: "Yes, Sir, Representative Mautino?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Mautino is right here in the aisle,
Democratic aisle."

McCracken: "Representative Farley?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Farley? Representative Farley? Is Mr.
Farley in the chamber? How is Mr. Farley recorded?"

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

Speaker Greiman: "Remove the Gentleman."

McCracken: "Representative Laurino?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Laurino? Mr. Farley has returned to the
chamber. Restore Mr. Farley to the Roll Call. Mr.
Laurino? Mr. Laurino? Mr. Laurino? How is Mr. Laurino
recorded?"

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

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

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

McCracken: "Representative Pangle?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Pangle? Mr. Pangle in the chamber? Mr. Pangle? How is Mr. Pangle recorded?"

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

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Pangle from the Roll Call. Mr. Laurino has returned to the chamber, restore Mr. Laurino to the Roll Call."

McCracken: "Representative Panayotovich?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Panayotovich? Mr. Panayotovich? Is Mr. Panayotovich in the chamber? How is Mr. Panayotovich recorded?"

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

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Panayotovich from the Roll Call."

McCracken: "Representative Rea?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Rea? Mr. Rea is at the... is at Mr. Hicks's desk."

McCracken: "Representative Daley?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Daley is at Mr. Keane's desk."

McCracken: "Representative Morrow?"

Speaker Greiman: "Representative Morrow? Representative Morrow? I'm told he got leave. I don't... the Chair doesn't recall that, but... Mr. Morrow? Mr. Morrow? Mr. Morrow is here at the... at the door."

McCracken: "Where?"

Speaker Greiman: "The Chair is recognized. Mr. Morrow is at the door. Proceed, Sir."

McCracken: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Okay, Mr..."

McCracken: "Nothing further."

Speaker Greiman: "On this question there are 61 voting 'aye', 48 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. And this... and the Motion, having received the Constitutional Majority,

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

prevails, and the House does restore this Item. On the Order of Reduction and Item Vetoes, appears Item 29, House Bill 2998, Motion #1. Do you wish to proceed, Mr. Matijevich? Mr. Clerk, Motion #1."

Clerk Leone: "I move that the following Items of House Bill 2998, do pass the Veto of the Governor, notwithstanding."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to override the Item Veto on page 37 and 38, lines 32-35, and 1-3 on page 38, in the full amount of 4,500,000 dollars. This Item is in the amount of 4,500,000 dollars for the northeast Illinois region, for transportation services to the disabled, including Para-transit services. First, I want to make it very clear that the substantive Bill with regards to this Appropriation was signed into law by the Governor. I think we have a... a strong commitment to the disabled in Illinois. What has happened in the northeast Illinois area that the ridership for disabled is growing. Many of us are not aware that the CTA for example, transports 2,000 disabled persons per day and 10,000 disabled persons are certified to use the CTA per day. What is happening also is that private carriers, if we don't provide the funding, and the CTA does this as a... as a... at a reduced cost because they use private carriers. But, those private carriers are not going to continue the services if more funds are not available. So, I believe that this is a urgent necessity. I think many of us often find it very difficult to put ourselves in the place of the disabled. Many of us aren't aware how difficult it is for disabled to get from here to there. You know, when we're going to adjourn today we are going to pick everything up and we're going to quickly leave Springfield. We are going to quickly find our way homes

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

through normal modes of transportation. Think for a moment how difficult it is for the disabled. When they want to do just a normal day to day activities. Just the normal thing of going to a grocery store. The normal thing of going to see your loved ones. That is most difficult for the disabled. We have a commitment to the disabled. Now, this issue was not called yesterday. The reason I didn't call it yesterday because there was some negotiations being attempted. I had the feeling, I had the strong feeling that the administration would bow, would bow to the needs of the disabled. I didn't call it yesterday giving them that time. But, now we are at the last hour. We can't wait any longer. We can't wait for anybody to move and negotiate. We are at this urgent crisis, now, to make sure that the needs of disabled are provided. So, I would urge the Members of the House to show that we, in the House, do have that commitment to the disabled. That we are not going to turn our backs to those... those who are less fortunate than we. So, I would urge all of you to give a strong 'aye' for this Item Veto."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman... the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, moves that this Item shall pass the veto of the Government... Governor, notwithstanding. And on that, the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will... will the Gentleman yield for some questions?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will yield for questions."

Churchill: "Representative Matijevich, is this money for the RTA?"

Matijevich: "Yes. Yes, it is. Money is allocated to the RTA and then distributed to the CTA and the suburban trains and buses... buses."

Churchill: "So, this is not directly to the CTA?"

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

Matijevich: "No. No. Naturally, the... the bigger burden is on the CTA, but this... this is across the Board. And I thought I cleared that when I said the northeast Illinois."

Churchill: "Do you know, has this... has an amount been put into the budget for similar services with the CTA?"

Matijevich: "They receive some money. But these are monies state funds allocated to the RTA."

Churchill: "Does the CTA have in its own budget?"

Matijevich: "Yes. Yes, but no... but no state funds if they don't get this at all. And what they have is not nearly sufficient to provide the services for the disabled. See, when we passed the reform Legislation we didn't take into account services for the disabled. If we had done that at the time, I'm sure that we, in the state, would have provided funding for the disabled, but, that wasn't taken into account at all."

Churchill: "How much money does the CTA have in its current years budget for this service?"

Matijevich: "There current budget for 1987 is 10.1 million in special services, which would include services for the disabled."

Churchill: "And that's in the CTA's budget?"

Matijevich: "Part of that... by the... by the way included the 4,500,000 million dollars. As I understand."

Churchill: "Okay. So, that was a previous appropriation from the state of 4.5 million dollars..."

Matijevich: "That was last year."

Churchill: "And have they spent that money?"

Matijevich: "The reason there was some carryover was that the funds didn't come into... come to them until, I believe, about three months into the fiscal year... four months into the... into that fiscal year. So, some funds were not expended. I think it was 650,000 dollars, which would

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

be... which were... was a carryover."

Churchill: "Does the RTA have an amount in their budget for the similar services?"

Matijevich: "Yes."

Churchill: "And how much is that amount?"

Matijevich: "Twelve percentage from fairs and the rest from the RTA."

Churchill: "I'm sorry, John, I didn't catch the amount?"

Matijevich: "I don't know what that amount... 8.1 million I'm told and they say that is not near enough."

Churchill: "Okay. So, the RTA has 8.1 million in their budget, the CTA has a little over ten million in their budget for these similar services?"

Matijevich: "Well, no, the... with the ten million you're adding the monies that have been vetoed. So, let's start... that eight million also is part... part of the tab, I'm informed. So, we're... we're... it's a ten million total."

Churchill: "Okay. So, there is money in the RTA budget, there is money in the CTA budget, the total of that is only ten million dollars."

Matijevich: "It's all the same budget though, Bob, let's not make it... let's not bulge it to make it look like more. It's all... it's all a total of 10.1, I believe, million."

Churchill: "Yeah. That's what I was trying to get to though, but there was ten mill... ten million, but it's split between all the budgets. Some of that... some of that money has not been used from the previous year?"

Matijevich: "Yes."

Churchill: "And you're saying that that is only 100,000 dollars?"

Matijevich: "Yes. 600,000 and the only reason is that it came four... four months away, after the fiscal year it begun."

Churchill: "Does the RTA have a position...?"

Matijevich: "After it ended rather, I mean, after it ended."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

Churchill: "Does the RTA have a position on this override?"

Matijevich: "Their against it. Now, you want to tell me why their against it, Bob, let's be realistic. Sam Skinner is against it because of Governor Thompson. That doesn't mean we should be against the disabled. It is not a political issue. The RTA should be for this 100 percent because of the needs of the disabled not because of some commitment to any political person at all."

Churchill: "Representative Matijevich, can you... do you understand or can you tell me, do we know, how the CTA is going to use these funds?"

Matijevich: "I'm sure there going to use this... use it the same way they... they have in the past contracting with the private carriers to provide the services."

Churchill: "I'm just trying to understand exactly what the dollars are going to be used for. Is it the same items that they have done in the past..."

Matijevich: "... to contracts for private carriers and the indication is... my information is that the private carriers are threatening to... to not service if there are not additional funds available."

Churchill: "Thank you... thank..."

Matijevich: "And by the way, we have... we have lowered the cost by going this route, dramatically."

Churchill: "Thank you. To the... to the Motion, Mr. Speaker, I guess, I rise in opposition to the Motion. I don't rise in opposition to try and help obtain access to our busses and our commutable rail lines for the handicapped. That's something that I have worked on in the past. I do rise in opposition to this particular Motion at this time. The RTA is not in support of this. They fill that they have their budget. They have at least this ten million dollars, which is supposed to go for these services. I think as a policy

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

matter though, we ought to take a better look at this. When I first came down here to the Legislature that was the year that we rewrote the RTA. And what we did was we said, 'You can show us what you're going to do at your level in the RTA, and please don't keep coming back here every year to the legislature for more funding.' I think what we do here, if we are going to do this, is we're going to say, 'Okay it's fine. Come back from time to time and we're going to put in additional funding for this program and additional funding for that program.' I don't think we should support this at this time because I think it sends a bad message to the RTA that they can come back here from year to year and get additional funding for specific programs. I would suggest that we vote 'no'."

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

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion. And I think it's important for us to put this funding into perspective. We do know people who use this kind of transportation. You may recall, Representative Dolly Haustrum, a very distinguished Member of this House, is one of those people who has to be at a stop at 5:00 o'clock in the morning in order to be picked up so she can go to work in downtown Chicago in the very productive manner that those of you who have seen her in Springfield and worked with her in Chicago knows that she puts out in behalf of the State of Illinois. She needs this kind of funding. She needs this kind of transportation to enable her to at least have the outrageous transportation that requires her to be picked up at 5:00 a.m. Think what time she has to get up in the morning in order to be ready to be picked up at 5:00 a.m. If, at the same time, we cut this funding so

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

she is unable to be the very productive member of society that she is, we are the losers. Our constituents are the losers, the people of Illinois are the losers. So, I certainly think to restore this meager amount of money on behalf of disabled and handicapped transportation is something that we ought to do. And by right, ought to do on behalf of all the people of Illinois."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duyne. Mr. Van Duyne."

VanDuyne: "Yes. Thank... thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion. And I would like to bring to the attention of the body if they'll listen just for a second about the malady that's forming in the... on the front of our local government. Our town of Joliet just has recently, cancelled their participation in the HEP Program because of the cutback in federal funds that are forthcoming, not to mention, revenue sharing as far as transportation is concerned. I have a personal incident of a girl who lives next door to me, who is handicapped, and has been using those bus services where she goes to a sheltered work shop. Now, this gal is going to have to find a different form of transportation and she has no money with which to do so. I think if the HEP program itself is the only thing you use as a criteria, to vote for this restoration, that in itself is enough. And I would like to have everybody think of it in that light if no other."

Speaker Greiman: "Ms. Parcels, the Lady from Cook."

Parcels: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am also opposed to this. I lived through, as did many of you, although I wasn't in this House, but I had a lot of input into that RTA restructuring in 1983. The intent was that CTA, Metra, and Pace would be under the

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

RTA. And RTA would make sure they were properly funded, which they do. Now, CTA does and end run here, comes down here and asks for money, which we gave them last year that was supposed to be set up money. We're going to set it up. We won't come back for more. Here they are back at the trough again, outside of RTA. Why shouldn't Metra and Pace come down. Do the same thing, take an end run and try to get money for themselves. The Department of Transportation has taken a three percent cut across the Board and Public Transportation. Metra and Pace are living with it. RTA has done adequate funding. And this is nothing against Para-transit. I, as a township Supervisor, set up Para-transit. I am all for those people. There is plenty of money for those people. RTA says that CTA will have enough money to run them through June. They intend to come down here with a strategic plan in the spring. If we start giving this money out now that's going to throw there plan off. RTA has it well funded. There is plenty of money to last until June. There is no reason to keep piling money on top of money just because the cause is good. You must spend it wisely. This is not a wise expenditure. The money is there presently. And I would ask for your 'no' vote."

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

Young: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the Motion. And I would like to rebut just a couple of misstatements that were made by people on the other side of the aisle. And the biggest one being that the disabled people of the city of Chicago or that security for CTA and RTA bus drivers were considered in the 1983 Legislation, because they were not, the disabled people were not considered in 1983. Someone on the other side of the aisle indicated that a vote against

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

this Motion was not a vote against the disabled people of this state, and that is absolutely incorrect. We talk about spending money, wisely, this money if it's passed, will be spent to help disabled citizens of this state transport themselves around the city of Chicago. And I think anyone who votes against this Motion is casting a clear concise vote against the disabled people of this state. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, to close."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I didn't want to bring up that, you know, quote, 'political side of it', but everybody knows I like to tell it like it is. But, let me make this clarification. One, Representative Parcels, if you would listen, Representative Parcels, if you would listen, this does not go to the RTA... CTA. It goes to the RTA for allocation, to the RTA... CTA, to the suburban buses, to the Metropolitan, to Pace and Metra. So, it isn't a CTA issue. Please realize that. Also, what we must realize that the addition of state money, and we did this last year, this isn't something new this year, we did this last year, that when we did it last year the addition of new state money allowed the CTA for example, to increase its service by over 400 percent. In other words, what we are saying when we have provided state money we are allowing more disabled persons to utilize the services. So, if we... if we finally turn off the spigot, lesser numbers of disabled persons will use that service. And I can't say more strongly about the fact that we don't put ourselves in the place of disabled persons. Let me tell you, you know, when I came on as... on a plane... state plane, Tuesday, I talked to a person in the Attorney General's office about a

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

disabled person in that office. And she said, you know, I asked her why she wasn't at this function over the weekend. And she said, you know why I didn't attend because I'm down here and everybody else is up here. In other words, she is in a wheel chair and everybody else is up here. I tell you that if we turn our backs to the disabled for this money, we are being hypocritical. We are really discriminating and telling that person you are going to be even farther down. We are being... what would the political... politically naive say. They will say, 'Oh you gave the money last year because an election was coming'. Now, the election is over, you're going to say to the disabled the hell with you, election's over. I don't think we really want to do that. I think we want to continue this service so the disabled can travel around just as we do."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall this Item pass the Veto of the Governor, notwithstanding?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. 71 votes. The Chair suggestive record the fact that... that he provides services to the Chicago Transit Authority, but none the less, we'll vote his conscious. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Krska, 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 59 voting 'aye', 45 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present'. And the Motion fails. On this Order of Business appears Motion #2, to House Bill 2998. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "I move that the following Items of House Bill 2998, do pass the Veto of the Governor, notwithstanding."

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

Matijevich: "I think I'll take this out of the record. If we can't help the disabled we surely aren't going to confute

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

crime on our mass transit. I'll pull this one out of the record."

Speaker Greiman: "Out of the Record. Alright, now we're turning to the regular order that we were in. On page 14, Reduction and Item Veto Motions appears House Bill 3191, Motion #6. House Bill 3191, Motion #6. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "I move that the following Items of House Bill 3191, do pass the veto of the Governor, notwithstanding."

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

Brookins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly, I know that on yesterday, I asked that you help me by passing this Bill, Probation Challenge. I'm here to tell you that this is not a salty Bill. This do mandate, mandate, parole the probationer's to attend class, to get a GED, to receive some training. They're actually there five days a week for a minimum of five hours. If they do not attend, if it doesn't not reach some proficiencies in the program, they are then returned to probation or placed in jail. We're asking for a mere 250,000 dollars. Yes, the state is spending 66,000,000 dollars in probation here, in the state of Illinois. Yes, we're spending it. But, I'm saying to you we're not getting nothing for that 66,000,000 dollars. The probation department, the probation in the state of Illinois, and the county of Cook, is a shamble. We're wasting that money. I'm asking to do something useful with a mere 250,000 dollars. If it do not work then you're the ones that can turn it around. I'm here to tell you that this program is working. The oversight for the program is the city colleges of the Chi... of the city of Chicago. It works. I'm asking for a favorable vote on this matter. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brookins, has moved for restoration of this Item veto. And on that, is

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

there any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is another matter which we considered yesterday and there was lengthy debate about it. And it was observed at that time that the state had recently gotten into the probation business itself, to the tune of millions and millions of dollars. I responsibility historically reserved to the counties. This would put money into still yet, another bureaucracy, the city colleges. We, it was considered yesterday. It was defeated yesterday. I'd ask for the same vote today. Thank you."

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

Young: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this Bill and each time this Assembly, since I've been here, has used magic words to the other side of the aisle. They talk about what is a good law and order Bill. And when ever those words are used will pass Legislation that increases penalties for this or that or transfers juveniles automatically. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a good law and order Bill, because this program works. One of the biggest problems we face in this state is the recidivism rate among people exoffenders released from our prisons who are constantly going back. This program has proven itself in the city of Chicago. This program has a very high rate of keeping people in this program from returning to our prisons where we spend 20,000 dollars a year housing inmates. It's a mere 250,000 compared to what we spent the rest of the day for a good law and order program that works. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Brookins, to close."

Brookins: "I challenge anyone in this Assembly to say that this

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

Bill is not a good one. I challenge you to say that the probation system in this state is what you would like it to have. I challenge you to visit this program, which I had at the last session. Go there, look at it. It is working. It is working and it will work. It is a savings to the people of the State of Illinois. If we're talking about saving money, here's a place we can save money. Why pour the money down a rat hole. Let's get behind something that works. It works. Give me a 'yes' vote on this one."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall this Item pass the veto of the Governor, notwithstanding?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 61 voting 'aye', 46 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. And the Motion fails. On page 13 of the Calendar, under Reduction and Item Veto Motions appears House Bill 2987, Motion #2. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2987, I move that the following Items of House Bill 2987, do pass the veto of the Governor, notwithstanding."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from St. Clair, Ms. Younge."

Younge: "Mr. Speaker, take that out of the record, please."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright, out of the record. On the next order is House Bill 2988, Motion #4. Do you wish that out of the record or do you wish to proceed? Yes. Mr. Clerk, read the Motion."

Clerk Leone: "I move to restore the following reduced Items of Appropriations in House Bill 2988..."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from St. Clair, Ms. Younge."

Younge: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The Restoration would be for a million dollars from 2,400,000 from 1,400,000. This is for the Illinois Conservation COR. There were some

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

600 young people who worked in the parks all over Illinois. These employees come from all over the state in areas located near the state parks. There are 88 people working in fulltime... in the fulltime programs. That program will terminate in February as a result of the taking a way of these funds. I believe that this is one of the best programs that the State of Illinois has had an opportunity to participate in. Because it gives... we have a situation that only throughout the rest of their lives and throughout the rest of this century, only one half of our young people will have an opportunity for gainful, private employment. We need a substitute opportunity for them to learn experiences as to how to work, how to... what nature is, how to be of service to others, how to be prompt, and how to not only take care of themselves but to take care of other members of society. I can truthfully say to you that one of the most important experiences I had when I was growing up was when I finished my undergraduate degree I was asked by the American Friend Service Committee to go to Europe to one of there work camps. And for three months that summer, I worked in "Commegetic", Finland helping refugees... finish refugees, who had been driven back from the Russian border. We built houses for those people. That was a volunteer service. This service here for these young people, they only get 3.35 cents an hour. And they work 37 hours a week. But, the things that they learn as a result of that service, they learned how to be occupied in a meaningful way. They learn how to give service to their society. We have both in urban areas and in suburban areas and in rural areas, large numbers of young people who are growing up in aimlessness without any direction, without any opportunity to work. And I believe that it is incumbent upon us as adults to give our young people an

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

opportunity to do the thing that is most important to us and that is the work that we do. And it is for these reasons, and for the reasons that this override Motion got, originally, 63 votes. I'm asking you to come forward here and to... with the fact that the Members are now on the floor and give the 60 votes, necessary to continue this program."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from St. Clair, moves that the House restore the amount reduced by the Governor. And on that, the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Motion, this also was heard yesterday and was defeated. This... this proposal, which was Amendatorily Vetoed or reduced, proposes to restore 1,000,000 dollars to the Illinois Conservation Core Operations Budget. The Sponsors purpose in having that money, however; is to use it for a purpose different than that to which it is now appropriated. The original Department of Conservation requests a 14,000,000 dollars, was approved by the Governor. That program does not deal with Urban Youth Programs. That program has been run at state parks. Now, Conservation advises me, that the way the appropriation is drafted, they believe that they would not be able to grant the money out for the stated purpose because of the manner in which the appropriation is written. I understand there is authorization, which is been approved, to which the Sponsor wants to put this 1,000,000 dollars. But, as written the appropriation is to the Illinois Conservation COR for a particular purpose. And that purpose is not consistent with the authors intent. So, for that reason alone, the reduction veto should... or the Motion to restore should be defeated as it was yesterday."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? Ms. Younge, to close."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

Younge: "Thank you very much. If we refer to page 11 of the Veto Message, this sum was for 2,400,000 dollars for the Department of Conservation, for the administration operation of a youth and young adult employment program for Conservation. And resource management, related work on public land. Our public lands are in the public parks. And I would definitely take issue with the fact that there is any possibility for this... these funds to be used for anything but the Illinois Conservation COR. It says specifically, for the Illinois Conservation COR and for the Speaker to suggest that it would be used for anything else of certainly is just an attempt to confuse this body. These funds were added to the Illinois Conservation COR. And because it would have the effect of continuing these 88 people in a year round capacity, and because it would have the effect of not just having rangers in these parks as of February with nothing to do, I implore you to override and restore this amount so that these young people can continue to work in our parks."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall this Item be restored, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. 60 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 54... 55 voting 'aye', 49 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. And the Motion fails. House Bill 2989, out of the record. House Bill 2989, Motion 9, out of the record. House Bill 2989, Motion 13, out of the record. House Bill 2989, Motion 14. Mr. Clerk. Out of the record. Out of the record. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

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

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

would ask leave of the House that we suspend the rule, whereby; a Committee cannot meet while the House is in Session. For the purposes of the Rules Committee meeting, immediately, in the Speaker's Conference Room, for consideration of one Bill, Senate Bill 1699. This has been cleared with the other side of the aisle. I'd asks leave of the House?"

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman asks leave to waive the posting requirements and the Rule Spective Meeting, while the House is in Session. And leave is hereby... does the Gentleman have leave? Leave is granted. And the meeting will be immediately, at this time, Sir. But, Members of the Rules Committee should retire at this time to the Conference Committee... Conference Room. Members of the Rules Committee, please retire. On page three... on page three of the Calendar, on the Order of Item Veto Motions appears House Bill 3257, Motion #1. Mr. Clerk, read the Motion."

Clerk O'Brien: "I move that the following Items of House Bill 3257 do pass, the veto of the Governor, notwithstanding."

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

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What this Appropriation was for was again, part of the Child Protection Package. This money was to be used to permit the Supreme Court to train Judges, throughout the State of Illinois, to train Judges on how to detraumatize the Court Room setting for child witness victims. So that, children will in fact... children who have been the victims of child abuse and sexual abuse, will come to court and testify. Until now, children, all too frequently, are to frightened by the court room procedure, the court room setting, the demeanor, which is frightening even for adults. And because of that fright, children often are unable or their parents are unwilling to let the child go

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

to court and testify when that child has been the victim of child abuse. This program will enable the Judges throughout the state to be trained, on methods to make the court room setting less frightening. The Governor's veto message was in error. There was a staff error when they said in the veto message, 'That the substantive Legislation establishing this program had not passed.' In fact, it passed the General Assembly, the Governor signed it into law. It is now law. We reduced the amount of the appropriation from the original amount, based on negotiations. It was originally, we were asking 240,000 dollars. We are now asking 120,000 dollars to fund the state wide... the state wide training program. And I do urge, encourage and plead for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, moves that we pass this Item, the veto of the Governor, notwithstanding. And on that, the Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Countryman."

Countryman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield?"

Preston: "Yes. Yes, I would be glad to."

Countryman: "Representative Preston, I recall you had two appropriations for training. One was to go, and I think, to the State Appellate Service Commission, to train prosecutors. And the other was to go to the Supreme Court to train the Judges. Can you tell me the status of the Appropriation for the prosecutors and how much that was, and whether or not that was signed in the law?"

Preston: "That... that Bill has become part, I believe, of a Senate Bill 1808. I don't know what the status of that is. The amount of the money in that also, was cut in half, based on negotiations. And I don't... I can't answer the status. I don't know if the Senate is done with that, yet."

Countryman: "So, that Bill has not passed the Senate at this

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

point?"

Preston: "I don't know that it has or has not. I just simply don't have the answer to that question. It's Senate Bill 1808, I don't know if it has gotten out of the Senate."

Countryman: "Okay. But, was it subjected to the same sort of gubernatorial veto?"

Preston: "Yes. It the same veto message, incidentally, which again was incorrect, that the substantive Bill had not passed. And the substantive Bill had passed and the Governor signed that Bill. As the Governor did this substantive Bill. That Bill is now law in the State of Illinois, as is the substantive Bill for the Supreme... for the Appellate Prosecutor's Training Program."

Countryman: "So, you've reduce your appropriation request now to a total of 240,000 dollars?"

Preston: "That's right. That's half of what it originally was."

Countryman: "And... and can do the project at that kind of money?"

Preston: "Yes. I am told that the project can be done. The training program can be accomplished at... at that amount."

Countryman: "You still take the position that you have to have one for Judges and one for the prosecutors?"

Preston: "You do. You can't order jud... you can't order the Supreme Court to do anything outside of the Judiciary to the Prosecutorial branch is not part of the Judiciary Branch of Government. It's under, really, the Executive Branch and because of Constitutional separations you can't have that mixing."

Countryman: "Can we do it? Can we convince the Supreme Court, I guess we haven't been able to convince the Supreme Court to submit a number of Items to audit and other things like that. Are we going to be able to convince the Supreme Court that they ought to carry out this program?"

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

Preston: "Yes. I... I have spoken with the... a number of Judges who are very much in favor of this. The program is badly needed, not because Judges are insensitive, but because they... just as I didn't until I attended meetings, they don't have the knowledge of what can be done. And incidently, the program costs really nothing to rearrange a court room setting, just as children's dentist rearrange the waiting room for it to accommodate children and pediatricians rearrange waiting rooms to accommodate children. So can a court room, at no cost, be rearranged to accommodate a child witness victim. But, the savings is really getting a conviction against a child abuser where otherwise that person goes free and is free to abuse other children."

Countryman: "Thank you. No further questions."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Regan."

Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Will the Sponsor yield for questions?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will yield for questions."

Regan: "Representative Preston, do you know, how many cases of sexual child abuse are in the State of Illinois in 1985?"

Preston: "No, but I have a feeling you do, Representative."

Regan: "There was 4,748 cases of child abuse, sexual child abuse in the State of Illinois. Do you have any idea of how many convictions for sexual child abuse?"

Preston: "I know it's painfully few. And I think you probably have an accurate number, Representative."

Regan: "No, as a matter of fact, I was hoping you'd have that answer. But, I know it's painfully few..."

Preston: "It's extremely, extremely few, because it is so difficult to get a child to come to court and testify."

Regan: "In our area, excuse me to the Bill, In our area we had a fellow just released, found innocent of child abuse of a

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

six year old child, a ten year old child, a twelve year old child, 300 counts of sexual child abuse were placed against him and he was found innocent. We need this help in our judicial system. We need the child witnesses. And I think the amount of money here is going to be well spent. We got to put these people behind bars and the only way to do it is to make the child be able to testify and feel comfortable in doing so. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Mr. Mays, the Gentleman from Adams."

Mays: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will yield for questions."

Mays: "The two previous speakers were correct in that we did address this topic last year, did we not? And the appropriation was originally requested 240,000 per each, for the Judges and for the appellate service prosecutors to train... okay. And this is at 120,000? How much other things do we spend in the Supreme Court Budget? How many more dollars do we spend for training and seminars, for Judges, right now, in the 1987 budget?"

Preston: "Well, you seem very angry, Representative, and I don't know the answer to your question."

Mays: "If you will recall, we got... we had over 42,000 dollars spent for catering at the Judges conference in September of 1986. We had catering costs for an associate Judge seminar of 32,875 dollars. We had regional seminars pulling 21,000 and so on and so forth. When I got up and spoke against you, respectfully, last spring, in outrage about your proposal here, it was my premise, that number one if there is a need, it has not been documented. And also if there is a need that is documented, it should be taken care of within various line items of the existing Supreme Court budget. If we... now I don't know what they ate for those

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

nice meals that were catered, but the assertion that I would make is that there is training on going now or else we should just forget about the Judicial Conferences in the first place. If there is a need and we should mandate a response to it, by God let's do it and let's let the Judges pay for it out of their own salaries. So, it's with those things, all day we have considered various, important matters before us, and there has been a case of need built for some of them that we were unable to fund. This, however, I can't see any case for need to be built and I think the expenditures in this area are not in the best interest at this time."

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

McNamara: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. When we take a look at the dollars that were talking about here, which is approximately 120,000 dollars, we also take a look at yesterday we passed a supplemental to the... to the Lt. Governor's Budget of 100,000. That passed out of this House overriding a veto on him. Yet, when it comes to child abuse, for protecting children, we have to defend our budget as if this budget of the state is going to fall because we're going to defend the children that are so needy of that defense. To protect our society, we are not going to fund the amount of dollars that are necessary in order to train our people to do it right. We also here the argument that, okay, this is just something that hasn't been documented. Most of the Bills in this House have not been documented. They are things that are for the future. Things that are to correct the wrongs of today. We have to make our social conscious aware now and fund as we should, the right projects in order to take care of our society and our children and our future as they should. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Preston, to

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

close."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I should just quick, very briefly, tell you what the money is for. The money is not to train Judges in a way that they are already being trained for, you have to know what to tell the Judges. They're have to be people who are brought together, University Professors who have worked in this area, pediatricians who have worked in this area, child psychiatrist who have worked in this area, who can tell the Judges, first of all, put together a curriculum to tell the Judges how you can simply and without expense, do certain things to make a child feel more comfortable in a court room setting. That's what the money is for. Once it is done, we are going to get more convictions against wrongdoers and abusers of children. And I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall this Item pass the veto of the Governor, notwithstanding?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. 71 votes required. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... yes, Mr. Hicks? Vote, Mr. Hicks, 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 59 voting 'aye', 43 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. And the Motion fails. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, it just dawned on me that I haven't seen Representative Vinson around in the last three days and I was wondering if you knew where he was? I haven't seen him."

Speaker Greiman: "Well, we... there is a search group out for him. I understand he is in Chicago and he is thinking of running for Mayor, Mr. Cullerton. That's the latest we heard."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

Cullerton: "Someone... , someone told me that he resigned from the General Assembly, is that true?"

Speaker Greiman: "It's pending."

Cullerton: "Well, if he did, indeed resign, I certainly hope that I had nothing to do with it. I hope he didn't resign over anything I said. But, it has been much quieter, I know the last three days. And it has been kind of enjoyable. I think Representative McCracken, is doing an excellent job in his stead. And I think we all owe a debt of gratitude for Representative Vinson's retirement."

Speaker Greiman: "Representative Ropp, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Ropp: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a clarification and kind of an introduction to Representative Cullerton, there is a new Member in the chamber I'm sure you would like to know that, it's a replacement for Representative Vinson, Representative Bob Olson. He's been here for some time and maybe you'd like to stand up so Representative Cullerton, can see him."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Olson, you are recognized, Sir."

Olson: "I've been here three days now."

Speaker Greiman: "Are you turning in you resignation?"

Olson: "I'd have to say I'm enjoying it. It's a new experience. I'm a farm boy. We don't... we move a little faster than this group, we go out and get a 40 acre field and get it done and go over to the next 40. But... so, I'm... I'm in the process of learning the way. But, I will say, I'm enjoying it. I've met a lot of you. I think the best experience that I'm going to have down here is meeting people. I want to meet everyone of you and if I don't get around to say hi to you, come by and say hi to me. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Representative Breslin, in the Chair."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Turner, would you make another introduction of a new Member, for us please."

Turner: "Thank you, Madam Chairman. As you know, Representative Alexander, is now in the Senate. Representative Alexander, and we're certainly going to miss her presence here in this August Body. But now, that she is in the House of the Lords, we have been so blessed to have a new replacement here, to take her place. And I'd like, at this time, to introduce to you, Representative Charles Morrow, a very able, and outstanding, young..."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Morrow, would you introduce yourself and tell us a little bit about yourself."

Morrow: "Thank you, Madam, and my other Colleagues, here in the House. Representative Turner, naughty, naughty. I am glad that I am a Member of this Body, now. And I hope that in the next two years, that I'm here, that I will be able to become as knowledgeable as the young Lady that I replaced. A lot of people have come to me and said that I've replaced the Senator. I haven't replaced her, yet. I have a long way to go. But, be patient with me and I'm sure by the end of my first term, that I will be at least as knowledgeable as her. And I promise you that I won't talk in a high voice. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "On the Order of Reduction Veto Motions, on page seven on your Calendar, appears House Bill 2878. With the advice that the Governor is putting this in the Supplemental Budget, I will withdraw that Motion. And we will go to House Bill 2997, Representative Bowman. Motion #3. Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Motion #3, restores funds to the personal services and fringe benefit lines for the Illinois School for the Deaf in Jacksonville. This is necessary because the average salary of teachers at ISD is

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

nearly 20 percent less than the statewide average teacher's salary. The average teacher's salary in Illinois is 27,000. The average salary of teachers at ISD is 22,000. Unless these funds are restored the School for the Deaf will continue to decline in its ability to carry on its unique mission. The agency says that without these funds it cannot afford to bring these teacher's salaries into line with other teachers. The last increase for these people was 2 percent, two years ago. In this time of education reform it is a disgrace that the State of Illinois is neglecting this historic and important school for handicapped children. The people we are talking about are among the most highly trained special education teachers anywhere in the state. And I am proud to offer this Motion to restore the reduction of the Governor."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to restore this item to its original amount. And on that question, the Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's rare that I stand up and support a Motion by Representative Bowman. In fact, one of the greatest pleasures I have is doing battle with Representative Bowman on the various and asundry tasks that he undertakes. This particular item happens to be one of agreement with he and I. It is a deserving item, one that we worked together on in the spring, and I would ask those of us on this side of the aisle who normally do not respond favorably to Representative Bowman, to also respond to my request to vote favorably on this Motion. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing."

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

Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will."

Ewing: "Representative Bowman, does the Department of Central

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

Management Services, are they asking to have this restored, or is this something that you, as Chairman of the Appropriations?"

Bowman: "Oh, the Department of Central Management Services opposes the Motion. I am doing this as Chairman of the Appropriations Committee."

Ewing: "Alright. Is there currently collective bargaining negotiations in process with these teachers?"

Bowman: "Well, I have heard that from some quarters. However, my understanding is that these collective bargaining negotiations may, in fact, be a figment of somebody's imagination because CMS is not moving very rapidly to conclude them."

Ewing: "Would... would the restoration of these funds be an unfair pressure on the Central Management Services? You know, they represent all of us taxpayers when they negotiate with state employees."

Bowman: "Actually, I think it would be fair pressure."

Ewing: "Fair pressure. But you would agree that it would be a pressure involved in the negotiations."

Bowman: "Well, they couldn't very well use the excuse that they've been using all along that they don't have the money."

Ewing: "You realize that negotiations are scheduled this very day?"

Bowman: "No, I didn't. I suspect that is probably because they were just called ten minutes ago."

Ewing: "Well, maybe you will get some credit for that. But I understand that's not the case; that these negotiations were called even before ten minutes ago, maybe 15, but..."

Bowman: "Or 20."

Ewing: "Are the salaries that are being paid to the teachers involved, do you know how they compare with other salaries

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

for similar teachers in schools in Illinois?"

Bowman: "Yes, if you're... you're probably referring to the ISVI?"

Ewing: "Well, I'm referring to the AFSCME... AFSCME people..."

Bowman: "Yeah, the AFSCME teachers at other facilities have an average salary of about 21,000."

Ewing: "My figures show 20,432. The..."

Bowman: "My figures..."

Ewing: "... teachers' average salary right now at the school you're talking about is 21,362, is that correct?"

Bowman: "That is correct, yes."

Ewing: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we all realize that collective bargaining is a part of the process. I don't think at this point in time, though, we should be overriding this reduction veto and putting the state in an unfair position in their negotiations. The point here has been made and not refuted, that the AFSCME teachers make less than these teachers right now. If we put this added pressure on, all of us can be expected to be coming up with the funds to make the AFSCME teachers at least equal to these in the next Session. Let's let the system work. Let's don't tinker with it. You people over there on the Democratic side passed it. So, let it work and don't play with it. And I would ask for a 'no' vote on this reduction veto."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Hannig. Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. Often times during the debate we here references to this is good for my district or that district or the other district. But the fact is that here in this institution in Jacksonville, we have a state school that serves the entire State of Illinois. Now, I had two uncles that went to the

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

School for the Deaf, one of them now lives in Peoria and is doing meaningful work up there and I think is one of the reasons that we can see why the School for the Deaf needs to be funded at proper levels and why it's important that we have teachers there that are the top in the nation. Now, we had an education reform package last year that we passed and we funded. We saw a lot of debate on the overrides here today. But the bottom line on that package was that we want to provide the best education possible to our children and provide the best teachers possible to our children in the schools. Well what we want to do in Jacksonville for the School for the Deaf, for all the deaf children from the State of Illinois is to provide the very best teachers for them as well. And we all know that you can't hold and keep good teachers if you don't pay them what they're worth and what we see here in Jacksonville is that we're paying teachers much less than the average that's being paid for other teachers, much less than the national averages and in any way and measure less than they really should be paid. Now, we talk about negotiations, but on the one hand we see the State of Illinois saying we can't give more than a two percent raise because that's all the Legislature appropriates. But then when they do appropriate more money, we're told that well, we shouldn't be appropriating that money because they should negotiate for it. It's a Catch-22 situation. This override today will not break the state's budget, but it will provide some help for some teachers in a school that provides specialized teaching for deaf students from all over the State of Illinois. I think it's a good proposal, and I think that we should override this veto."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

Johnson: "Move the previous question."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The main question is put. Representative Bowman, to close."

Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just reiterate that these funds are badly needed. I would say, in response to the Representative from Livingston, that... that the funds are not earmarked for the pay raise. And if you think that the Illinois School for the Deaf could use more staff, then you should be voting for this. This particular appropriation is for personal services, and I think there is no doubt... there should be no doubt in anyone's mind that the Illinois School for the Deaf could certainly make very good use of these funds. I would urge that we restore these funds at this time. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall this item be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman, one minute to explain your vote."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I don't think it's any question, but what the teachers at the school have needs. It would seem to me like what's happening here is if we do this ... take this kind of an action as a House after the fact, that we will be coming involved in the collective bargaining process, and this would be just the beginning of every group that don't get... doesn't get what they want, they're going to be coming back to us for more money. For that reason, I vote 'no'."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? Sixty votes are required for the passage of this Motion. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 60 voting 'aye', 46 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. And this Motion, having received the Constitutional... The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing, asks for a verification... Change Representative Ewing from 'aye' to 'no'. So, there are 59 voting 'aye', 47 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. Representative Bowman requests a Poll of the Absentees. Representative Wyvetter Younge is voting 'aye'. Representative Younge, you're voting 'aye'. Representative DeLeo is voting 'aye'. Representative DeLeo changes his vote from 'aye' to 'no'. Poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the Absentees. Giglio. Keane. Kulas. Mautino. And Ronan. No further."

Speaker Breslin: "On this question there are 58 voting 'aye', 48 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. And the House does not override the Governor's reduction veto on this item. Turning to page 15 on your Calendar, Ladies and Gentlemen, appears Amendatory Veto Motions. House Bill 3340, Representative Cullerton, on Motion #2."

Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3340 was originally my Bill. It dealt with providing for the recovery of fraudulently obtained public funds. When it went over to the Senate they amended on the Illinois Mortgage Foreclosure Law and the Illinois Homeowners' Emergency Assistance Law and the Illinois Homeowners' Mortgage Counseling Law. The Governor, in his amendatory veto, removed those two new programs, the Illinois Homeowners' Emergency Assistance Law and the Illinois Homeowners'

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

Mortgage Counseling Law. Representative Greiman made a Motion earlier today to override the Governor's veto. That did not receive sufficient votes. So, at this time, I would move to accept the Governor's amendatory veto which leaves in tact the changes in the Illinois Mortgage Foreclosure Law, as well as the original Bill, House Bill 3340, dealing with the recovery of fraudulently obtain public funds. And even though it's obvious that some people felt that the Governor's amendatory veto was not correct, this House has not chosen to override it, so it's appropriate at this time to save that portion which is... which he has retained which involves the rewrite of the Mortgage Foreclosure Act. I'll be happy to answer any questions if I can as to what is left in the Bill. It's still a significant piece of legislation and appreciate your support."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to accept the Governor's amendatory veto of House Bill 3340. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's amendatory veto on House Bill 3340?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Seventy-one votes are required for the passage of this Bill. Have all voted who wish? This is the acceptance of the amendatory veto. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 109 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present', and the House does accept the Governor's amendatory veto on House Bill 3340. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Resolutions, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1690, offered by Speaker Madigan, Representative Daniels, McPike, Giorgi, Farley and

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

Daley."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Farley, on the Resolution."

Farley: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's with great sadness that I present this Resolution. And I would hope that we'd have just a little order."

Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a Death Resolution. give Representative Farley your attention."

Farley: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. As I said, it's with great sadness that I present this Resolution. This Resolution is a Death Resolution for Ed Brabec who has been a friend, who has been a leader in the labor movement all of his life, who has come through the ranks in the labor movement to finally accomplish and be the President of the Chicago Federation of the AFL-CIO. A lot of us knew him personally. He was a jovial, personable gentleman, always taking into consideration our feelings, our legislative thoughts and ideas and the people that he represented. I would move, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for the adoption of this Resolution and would hope that all Members would join as Sponsors of this Resolution."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Farley has moved for the adoption of the Death Resolution with all Members being added as Cosponsors. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "I echo Representative Farley's remarks regarding Mr. Brabec. We're not always on the same side of the issue, but he was a man of integrity whose word was always good and who was a credit to his organization and to his people. We shall all miss him, and I join with Representative Farley in asking that all of the Members be made Sponsors of the Resolution."

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the Resolution?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Resolution is adopted. Leave for all Members being added as Spons... Cosponsors. Further Resolutions, Mr. Clerk. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed a Bill of the following title, the veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding, the passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House, to wit; Senate Bill #1516, passed by the Senate November 19, 1986 by a Three-Fifths Vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.' A Message from the Senate, by Mr. Wright, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed items of Bills, the items veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding, the passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House, to wit; Senate Bills #1738 and 1752, passed by the Senate November 19 and 20, 1986 by a Three-Fifths Vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.' A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has restored items reduced by the Governor which is attached in the Bills... and the restoration of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House, to wit; Senate Bills #1749 and 1759, action taken by the Senate November 19, 1986. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.' A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has accepted the Governor's specific recommendations for change which are attached to the following Bills, the acceptance

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House, to wit; Senate Bills #522, 1706, 1951, 2177, 2255, action taken by the Senate November 19, 1986. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Breslin: "Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Committee on Rules has met and pursuant to Rule 29(c-3), the following Bills have been ruled exempt on November 20, 1986: Senate Bill 1699. Signed John Matijevich, Chairman."

Speaker Breslin: "Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Joint Resolution 185, offered by Representative Klemm. House Joint Resolution 244, offered by Representative Olson, Robert Olson - et al. House Joint Resolution 245, offered by Representative Klemm and Wait."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich, on the Agreed Resolutions."

Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, these are agreed, and I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Adjour... Adjournment Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Joint Resolution 186, resolved by the Senate of the 84th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring herein, that when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, November 20, 1986, they stand adjourned until Tuesday, December 2, 1986 at 12:00 noon."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Adjournment

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

Resolution is adopted. Representative... Representative McPike is recognized for the adjournment Motion. Representative McPike moves that this House stand adjourned until 12:00 noon on December 2. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and this House is adjourned until that time. 12:00 noon on Tuesday, December 2. The hour of 9:30 a.m. having arrived, the Third Special Session shall come to order. With leave of the Body, Roll Call for Attendance will be by the Attendance Roll Call from the Regular Session. Does the Chair have leave? Hearing no objection, the Chair has leave. Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Joint Resolution #1, resolved by the Senate of the 84th General Assembly of the State of Illinois at the Third Special Session thereof, the House of Representatives concurring herein, that when the two Houses adjourn on Thursday, November 20, 1986, they stand adjourned until Tuesday, December 2, 1986 at 12:30 p.m."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McPike moves the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Adjournment Resolution is adopted. Representative McPike now moves that the Third Special Session stand adjourned until 9:30... excuse me, until 12:30 a.m. on the date of Tuesday, December 2. All those... p.m., 12:30 p.m. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have, and the Third Special Session is adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on December 2. Have a good Thanksgiving Holiday, everyone. We will see you back here at noon on Tuesday, December 2. Representative Friedrich, for what reason do you rise?"

Friedrich: "Point of... Point of inquiry. When are we going to

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84th GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

144th Legislative Day

November 20, 1986

get around to considering the Bills on the Call for the Special Session? I haven't had any information they've been assigned to Committee or anything else."

Speaker Breslin: "They have been assigned to Committee according to procedure, Sir."

Friedrich: "Thank you."

01/21/87
13:53

STATE OF ILLINOIS
84TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 1

NOVEMBER 20, 1986

HB-2987 MOTION	PAGE	58
HB-2987 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	58
HB-2988 MOTION	PAGE	53
HB-2989 MOTION	PAGE	39
HB-2996 MOTION	PAGE	41
HB-2997 MOTION	PAGE	70
HB-2998 MOTION	PAGE	46
HB-2998 MOTION	PAGE	55
HB-2998 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	55
HB-3090 MOTION	PAGE	18
HB-3090 MOTION	PAGE	29
HB-3191 MOTION	PAGE	38
HB-3191 MOTION	PAGE	56
HB-3257 MOTION	PAGE	62
HB-3340 MOTION	PAGE	4
HB-3340 MOTION	PAGE	76
SB-1699 FIRST READING	PAGE	2
HR-1690 RESOLUTION OFFERED.	PAGE	77

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REPRESENTATIVE GREIMAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REVEREND RICHARD MAYE	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	2
MESSAGE FROM SENATE	PAGE	2
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	2
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	3
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	3
COMMITTEE ON ASSIGNMENT	PAGE	3
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	79
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	80
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	80
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	80
THIRD SPECIAL SESSION TO ORDER	PAGE	31
RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	81
THIRD SPECIAL SESSION ADJOURNED	PAGE	81