

Doorkeeper: "Persons not entitled to House floor, please retire to the gallery."

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

Reverend Krueger: "The name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Amen. O Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. We express our thankfulness to God for the return of Representative Peter Peters in good health and we ask your special prayers this day for the continued recovery of Governor Daniel Walker, Representative J. David Jones. Let us pray. Almighty God, who was the Giver of all health, the aid of them the we turn to Thee for succor. We entreat Thy strength and goodness in behalf of Thy servant Daniel and John David that their weakness as being banished and they be healed of their infirmities to Thine honor and glory through Jesus Christ Our Lord. Amen. Abraham Lincoln said 'our defense is in the spirit. Destroy this spirit and you have planted the seeds of despotism at your door'. Let us pray. Heavenly Father Great Provider of all that we have and all that we are grant that Thy Holy Spirit may ever dwell within us so that we may see the course to follow in every issue that comes before us. Guide us, we pray Thee, to staunch defenders of this great republic so that the purposes of freedom and the spirit of independence may never be dulled; that all our efforts be pleasing to Thee and in key with Thy Divine Plan for all the people of this state. Through Jesus Christ Our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Representative Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, would you let the record show that Representative Jones is excused because of illness?"

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, the record will so show. House Bills Second Reading. On House Bills Second Reading appears House Bill 3582, Representative Bradley."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3582. A Bill for an act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee



Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 3946."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3946. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Kane."

Kane: "Could I hold that on Second?"

Speaker Redmond: "Hold that on Second. 3966."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3966. Maragos. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to State finance. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1. Schuneman. Amends House Bill 3966 on page 1 by deleting lines 22 and 23 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Mr. Schuneman has two Amendments. I ask that we do not pass...a...vote to table Amendment #1 and ask that we adopt Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Well in all fairness, Representative Schuneman is not here yet this morning, if it's possible, Sam, you could hold this Bill until he does come?"

Maragos: "Well I've held it now for...that we did it last time again, and he didn't have it..."

Simms: "...well, it's still early in the morning..."

Speaker Redmond: "...what time is it, Representative Simms?"

Simms: "Almost 9:00, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "We have a clock that's on the transcript and I think we'll find out it's seven minutes after nine."

Simms: "Well, out of courtesy to Representative Schuneman, if you could hold it fifteen or twenty minutes, maybe?"



3.

Maragos: "Well I don't mind being courteous, he gets the Bill by his Amendment, then I think that we've been courteous enough."

Simms: "Well I don't really think that if we have a quorum call right now, I don't think there is 89 Members on the floor."

Speaker Redmond: "Why don't you make a quorum call? Out of deference to Representative Schuneman, we'll take it out, but at 9:30 we'll be back on again, so...send out the skirmishes. Take 3966 out of the record. 3980."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3980. A Bill for an Act to require the Illinois Commerce Commission to conduct a study relating to transportation of hazardous material over railways. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Permission hasn't been granted to take pictures. Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Agreed Resolutions. Wait a minute. 1850...1815."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1815. A Bill for an Act to regulate the transportation of hazardous material in the State of Illinois. Second Reading of the Bill. This Bill has been read a second time previously and Amendment #1 was adopted. Amendment #2. Neff. Amends House Bill 1815 by deleting everything after the enacting clause and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, this is an Amendment agreed upon by the Transportation Committee and I move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2. All infavor indicate by saying aye. Opposed, no. The ayes have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 904, Choate. House Resolution 905, Yourell. House Resolution 906, Richmond."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Craig."



Craig: "House Resolution 904, our friend and colleague, Jim VonBoeckman, and his charming wife are observing their 35th wedding anniversary. 905 is the tornado that caused extensive damage to the Village of LaMonte in LaMonte Township and resulted in the loss of life and they're asking that the President of the United States, Gerald Ford, and all the Senators urge and request that if all possible designate the area as a qualified disaster area to provide aid to the citizens of those areas. And 906 is by Richmond because of the help and quick action of two youngsters, Dwight and Dallas Dingham from Pinckneyville, when their father, Perry County Clerk, Wilton G. Dingham, was accidentally injured in a brush fire at the family home, that we recommend Dallas and Dwight Dingham for their heroic actions on May 3rd of '75 to express our sincere admiration for their courage and quick thinking and be it further resolved and I move for the adoption of the three Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor vote aye...say aye. Opposed, no. The ayes have it and the Resolutions are adopted. Are there further Resolutions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 903. Friedrich."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative...Committee on Assignments. Representative Madigan, are there any excused absences?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, would the record show that Representative Davis is excused?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "I'm told, also, Mr. Speaker, that Representative Mugalian will not be here today and that I request that he be excused because of illness."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Hearing none..."

Madigan: "I understand his name just appeared on the Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, will you remove Representative Mugalian? Committee Reports. "

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Maragos, Chairman of the Committee on Revenue to which the following Bills were referred. Action taken June 14, 1976, reported the same back with the following



recommendations. Do pass Senate Bill 1918, do pass as amended, House Bill 991 and House Bill 3656."

Speaker Redmond: "Senate Bills' Second Reading. Senate Bill 1684. Representative Bradley....a...Madigan, rather."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill..."

Speaker Redmond: "...out of the record. Representative Maragos, for what purpose do you rise?"

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of an announcement. The Pages have just concluded passing the House Revenue Committee Report which has to do with the Committee on Consolidation of State Special Funds. This is a report which is due under House Resolution 720, which was adopted by this House and this is the report of the Committee and I want everyone to please look at it because there might be some good suggestions regarding revenue procedures and consolidation funds. Thank you Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Senate Bills' Second Reading. 1623."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1623. A Bill for an Act making certain appropriations and reappropriations to the Board of Regents. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Consideration Postponed appears House Bill 3959, Representative Holewinski. Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave to return House Bill 3959 to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Hearing none, 3959 will be returned to the order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Representative Holewinski...will you read the Amendment please?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3. Holewinski. Amends House Bill 3959, as amended, in paragraph 3, sub-section A and so forth."

Holewinski: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment is should be non-controversial in nature. The Bill provides for an advisory board and some Member raised an objection that chiropractors were not included in this Amendment



simply puts chiropractors on the advisory board."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the Gentleman's motion on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor say aye. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "I wonder if the Gentleman could tell us why this is being done?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Well Representative Walsh, what the Bill provides for is an Interim Advisory Board made up of the medical practitioners covered by the Act. It is really an oversight that chiropractors were not included in the advisory board. They are included under the Medical Practice Act. Several Members raised that to me as being an objection and they felt that chiropractors should be included and I saw no objection, had no objection to doing that and really it is in consideration to their objection, I decided to offer the Amendment."

Walsh: "This is as distinguished from the Licensing Board, is that right?"

Holewinski: "That's correct. This is merely an advisory board."

Walsh: "Are there chiropractors on the Licensing Board?"

Holewinski: "As far as I know they have their own advisory board under the Department of Registration and Education."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the adoption of this Amendment. All in favor say aye. Opposed, no. All in favor vote aye, opposed vote no. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 52 aye and 21 no, the motion carries and Amendment #3 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Return to Consideration Postponed. Order of Senate Bills' Second Reading appears 1684."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1684. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense to the Illinois State Scholarship Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. Three Committee Amendments. Amendment #1. Amends Senate Bill 1684, as amended, on page 2, by inserting immediately after line 11, the following and so forth."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, would the Clerk tell me who sponsored that Amendment in the Committee?"

Clerk O'Brien: "It was offered by Representative Choate."

Madigan: "Would the Speaker recognize Representative Mudd?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, I discussed this Amendment with Representative Choate because we both had agreed interests in this Amendment placed on this Bill. What this Amendment does, it appropriates \$250,000 to the scholarship fund for the National Guard and the Naval Militia. As you recall, last year, the legislature passed a Bill which mandated that we fund the scholarships for these two organizations and this addresses itself to that appropriation so I would ask for a favorable vote on Representative Shea's ...a...Representative Choate's Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, this Amendment asks \$250,000 for the National Guard, a...money for the scholarship program and I move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor of this Amendment yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Dyer: "First thing I need to know is..."

Speaker Redmond: "...Representative Mudd?"

Dyer: "...I'll wait, thank you..."

Mudd: "...go ahead..."

Dyer: "Representative Mudd, excuse me."

Mudd: "That's alright."

Dyer: "The first thing I need to know is there any connection with need in this scholarship? Does the recipient have to demonstrate any need at all?"

Mudd: "Well I think that it is pretty hard for anyone to attempt to get a scholarship of any kind if he can't demonstrate need and I think need is for the State National Guard and the Naval Militia to



make sure that we get qualified people and I'm sure they are spending their time serving the State and the government, it's very difficult for them to pursue an education without our help also."

Dyer: "Well this next question I would like to ask is how many ships does Illinois have for the Naval Militia?"

Mudd: "Well I imagine we serve, or our people in Illinois serve on almost every battleship in the United States at some time or other. We send our people to training out in the Pacific, out in the Atlantic, and service some of the Coast Guard units during the summer just the same way all of our National Guard units serve in the service. They serve in all areas of the Pacific and Atlantic during the summers."

Dyer: "Well isn't it true, though, at this moment, that Illinois has no ships to give its Naval Militia training in seaworthiness, isn't that correct?"

Mudd: "I don't believe there is any State-owned ship."

Dyer: "Represen..."

Speaker Redmond: "...Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Just on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. That question should be addressed to the Naval and Ordinary Contingent Expenses of the National Guard."

Speaker Redmond: "I believe your point is well taken. Do you have any further inquiry?"

Dyer: "Yes, may I speak to the Amendment then?"

Speaker Redmond: "Certainly."

Dyer: "All right, I'd like to remind the Members of this General Assembly this Amendment proposes an appropriation of \$250,000 for scholarships specifically for people in the National Guard and the Naval Militia. There is no connection with the need of the person, in other words, a millionaire's son could volunteer for National Guard duty or volunteer for Naval Militia duty and without any ships to practice on, I'm not sure how efficient our Naval Militia might be. We consistently in the whole field of higher education



are trying to get scholarships based more on need. I think this is a wasteful use of our very scarce money for higher education. I would recommend that this Amendment be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was a little late in coming in and I apologize and I didn't catch all that, but somebody was asking if the State of Illinois had any ships and I didn't hear the answer, but I assume we have none, but at one time in a previous meeting of the General Assembly, part of the time that I was here, someone made the observation that the State of Illinois does have the third largest Air Force in the tollway authority."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Will the..."

Speaker Redmond: "...Representative Lechowicz, for what purpose do you rise?"

Lechowicz: "The first is the University of Illinois, Joe."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "I'd like to ask the sponsor of the Amendment one question."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Byers: "Representative Mudd, what will...will the women be eligible for these scholarships also?"

Mudd: "Any person who serves in the National Guard and our Naval Militia will be eligible. The other thing, I might say that a lot of people.. we addressed ourselves to some things there yesterday about help on disaster and help on our Civil Defense and I think that all forget when we do have serious problems, either the people we depend upon for backup services. They're very necessary for the State and I think they are necessary for the country, these are the people that we ask to defend our State and address...a...represent us on a national level, I think that \$250,000 is a small fee to pay for this service."

Byers: "Representative Mudd, what was the appropriation last year?"

Mudd: "I can't recall, I think what we did last year is that the Representative who sponsored the Bill, we passed that Bill, but I am not sure that there was that much funding last year. I think this



is the first year that comes in to effect so this is the first year that we have received funding. But I could be wrong."

Byers: "Well I think that my understanding is that the funding last year was \$100,000 now here this year it is going to \$250,000, everyone wonders why the State is going broke and if the legislature is spending the money, it's not the Governor, I think this is another case of misplaced priorities and I would urge a no vote on this Amendment. "

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm rising in support of this Amendment. There is a great need to maintain a strong National...a strong and effective National Guard not only for the State emergencies, but in case of the need for a national emergency. This is certainly an excellent way to encourage young men and young women to join the Guard to continue their education, not only to become more effective and efficient Guardsmen but to become more efficient and better citizens, I think it is a very good Amendment and one that should be supported by everyone."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I couldn't disagree more with some of my colleagues on the Higher Education Committee here, I know that, truly, have the interests of this State as to how...but let me say this. We have, indeed, in this State, had a National Guard and a State Militia, which is second to none in the country. For many long years we have provided incentive for the average citizen to join the Militia and the National Guard and the Naval Militia to serve our State in many many ways. And let me suggest this that we use to offer guardsmen, for instance, free license plates. We used to offer them scholarships. We used to offer them opportunity as an incentive to join the National Guard and the Naval Militia. We don't do that anymore. We don't do that because for some reason or other our military units in this State have fallen in disfavor. I can't really understand that



11.

because if we look at the long history of the National Guard in this State, you will find that not only does it deal with problems like the disasters that we saw over the weekend in this State and flood control along the Mississippi, but the National Guard in this State has participated in every major conflict that this country has been involved in with the exception of the last one, the Viet Nam War, and the reason for that was very obvious, because we were having problems here at home at the time. Domestic problems that required some sort of military response often times. Right now the National Guard is having a very difficult time recruiting young men. This is one of those things that we can do that cost very little money compared to other expenditures that we expend here to make sure that our National Guard and State Militia is indeed of the finest quality. Having spent some ten years in this Guard I can tell you in a combat unit that our National Guard has compared favorably with regular Army troops in every situation that it has been involved in. Each and every year the Army runs a training test for instance, and the Army National Guard in Illinois has done far superior to the regular Army troops that run the same kinds of tests. If we are to maintain this kind of unit, if we are to maintain these kinds of people and if we are going to contribute to their training we should provide incentive for them to get in and we should also see that we have the finest people in this State serving as citizen soldiers. This is a fine measure, it is something that we ought to do and I urge your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Neff."

Neff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I strongly endorse this Amendment, I think that without a question, this is very important to keep our National Guard up in strength. At the present day, we are two thousand short in the National Guard and in order...there is very few incentives to encourage enlistment. Education is the accepted best tool, it previously, it provides quality to recruit, it helps build a leadership resource, and in addition, it prepares, or it assures a broader contribution to



and our State. Therefore, I would hope that we would all vote yes on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in contrary to what the Lady from DuPage stated, it is usually the poorer young people who take advantage of these scholarships, but not the rich man's son. They don't always join the National Guard to get scholarships. There is a very vital purpose of the National Guard and therefore, I also support the endorsement of this particular measure."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. You know, this is something that I think all of us would like to vote for if we could, but we've spent a lot of time during this session, we've spent a lot of time last fall taking a good hard look at the fiscal picture of the State of Illinois and we know that we have a tight, tight revenue situation on our hands. Many of us have gone into our district and talked about priorities in State government. And as much as I'd like to support spending money for scholarships to entice to join the National Guard, I don't think that this is at the top of anybody's priority list. Now we've got to start cutting someplace. And I think this is one area that we can postpone funding for a few years until we are in a better financial condition and even though it is \$250,000, it's a step in the right direction and I don't think we ought to pass this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. A question of the sponsor? Does this Amendment and Bill only provide for money for public schools and not non-public schools?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Why are you excluding the private school in the State of Illinois in this Amendment? "

Mudd: "We felt that the scholarship should only be provided by the State because it was a State service. We have to recognize that



all of our municipal government and all of the employers of the State have recognized..."

Speaker Redmond: "...Representative Shea, for what purpose do you rise?"

Shea: "Well if the Gentleman would look back at the Bill..."

Meyer: "...excuse me, I'll look back the history of the Bill and the Senate amended out non-public schools and private institutions and I don't know why we don't send it back to the Senate so the kids that want to go to private schools in this State and the private junior colleges are deprived of it."

Shea: "You know, I don't think anybody argues with you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Mudd: "Only to clarify this last question. I think last year, if you will recall, that particular position was supported in the Bill, but did not carry. We ended up with the State colleges, but we were attempting at that time to seek funds to, or appropriate funds to see that the recipient went to any college of their choice, but this is the way the Bill was adopted and I'm sure that you will find plenty supporters in the future if this the route that the majority of the House chooses to go, but right now this is the law, this is the only type of compensation that we can give to these people. "

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker, would the sponsor of the Amendment yield for a question please?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Brinkmeier: "I think I know the answer, I thought I heard it earlier, but I wanted to be very sure. I understand there is no qualification insofar as need as concerned, no one has to exhibit that they actually need the money. Is that correct?"

Mudd: "That is correct, yes."

Brinkmeier: "Well then, very briefly, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to support this program and I'd like to support the additional monies, but I think there should definitely be some requirement in there to show evidence of need and without that, I'm afraid I would be unable



to support the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the last speaker kind of used my speech, I agree with him absolutely, that if there is not a requirement that needs to be shown for a scholarship, then a scholarship should not be given. And I really question how many people join the Naval Militia for the purpose of obtaining a scholarship to a State school. It seems to me that there are precious few, there are precious few that join the National Guard for the purpose of obtaining a scholarship to a State university. After all, the tuition to Illinois is something in the neighborhood of \$485 a year, that isn't very much money, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest that that isn't much of an incentive. I would think that if the scholarships were forbidden at the State schools and given to private schools then there would be some incentive and really the cost to the State wouldn't be a great deal more. I submit that for every student that goes to a State university, the State pays several hundred dollars over what the tuition is. There is no excuse, Mr. Speaker, whatever for giving this scholarship as an incentive to people in the Naval Militia anymore than there is giving it to people who are in other public service such as the police or fire departments locally, investigators for the Secretary of State's Office, or any of the other various categories that would be involved in keeping the peace. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that there is absolutely no excuse for this and I would hope that some day, someone would take an analysis of our voting records and look at irresponsible spending votes such as this one and judge us accordingly."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Riccolo."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Will you hold that for one minute? Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I just want to add just one point. Not only is this an incentive for people to join this particular service,



but it is an incentive that they remain in the service and that's been one of the problems of keeping them there and holding them there and these scholarships are only available while they are in the service."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you ready for the question? The question is on the adoption of Amendment #1. All those in favor vote aye, opposed vote no. We are voting on the adoption of the Amendment. The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 90 aye and 28 no, the motion carries and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2 failed in Committee, Amendment #3 amends Senate Bill 1684 on page 1, line 9, by deleting \$1,038,800 and inserting in lieu thereof, \$1,035,800."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the sponsor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Catania."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This was a Committee Amendment, it was adopted to provide that there will be a 2.5 percent salary increase for administrators, the request had been for 4.5 percent, but we thought that 2.5 percent, the same as all of the State employees and middle management will be getting was reasonable, this is a \$3000 reduction only and I ask for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I oppose this Amendment. It is my understanding that Representative Catania offered this Amendment to all of the higher education Bills which were presented in Committee on the day that they were considered. Her Amendments to all of the other Bills failed and this one was adopted in Committee. I feel that it is unreasonable and it is not needed and it should be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Boyle."

Boyle: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I concur with Representative Madigan, and regrettably, I must oppose this Amendment at this time. At the time it was offered, it was the intention of Representative



Catania, I believe, to put this Amendment on all of the Appropriation Bills that dealt with education and unfortunately, this was the only one that the Amendment was affixed to and I think it would be unfair and discriminatory for us to affix this Amendment to the Illinois State Scholarship Commission when the Amendment didn't go onto the others and also I think it would place this Bill in a Conference Committee posture and for the minor reduction of \$3000, I frankly, Mr. Speaker, I just don't think it is worth it and I think the Amendment should be defeated."

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

Ryan: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Amendment. This Amendment is a token \$3000 and that's correct, but it reduces the personal services salary increase for administrators from four and one half to two and one half percent and I think it is Representative Catania's desire to try and put these on the rest of the remaining Bills that were in Higher Education, there isn't anything wrong with this, it's \$3000 bucks, it's money that the State can use and it is certainly a fair Amendment. I think that most of the other agencies that have gone through at two and one half percent. I see no reason why this agency should ask for a four and one half percent increase, two and one half percent more than anybody else so I would urge for the adoption of Amendment #3. "

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "Will the sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "She will."

Anderson: "Over all, Representative Catania, if we put this on all the Higher Education Bills, how much will we save?"

Catania: "We will be able to save a little over one million dollars if we put this on uniformly for all the Higher Education Bills, Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "Thank you very much, I would like to speak to the Amendment. I am certainly in favor of this. One million dollars is hard to find these days and this is one place we can save the administrators two and one half percent is plenty for them. I urge you to vote



yes on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Well Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of this Amendment as was pointed out by Representative Ryan, that there were no other State agencies that actually received a greater than two and one half percent increase as far as salary adjustments. All we are doing is being very consistent in what we've granted to the other State agencies. I don't believe that there should be any difference as far as the difference of whether it be this Bill or the other education Bills. I think we should be consistent and this Amendment should be adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, would the sponsor yield for a question please?"

Speaker Redmond: " She will."

Barnes: "Representative, as I read your Amendment, it addresses itself to page 1, line 9. And in fact it reduces dollar amount of \$3000 on that line. Is that correct?"

Catania: "That's correct, Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "And also, in your Amendment, I see there is additional language that says in fact that this reduces the salaries of the administrators from four and one half percent to two and one half percent. Is that correct in terms of the statement in your Amendment?"

Catania: "No, that's not in the Amendment, that would probably be substance of language. This is in the line for personal services to allow maximum flexibility to the administration in deciding who will get large percentage increases and who will get small percentage increases. This in no way dictates that certain people will get reductions. This allows them to take their highest paid administrator, their director and their five associate directors, for instance, and provide that they won't have enormous salary increases while lower line administrators will have higher percentage increases."

Barnes: "Well, Representative, is it not a fact that all this Amendment does, in fact, is take \$3000 out of the personal services line, it has absolutely no relationship to the response that you just gave me



because you're dealing solely with dollars, dollars only, does not in fact, does not in fact address the Scholarship Amendment, Scholarship Commission or any other, any other part of the high education budget to do anything. It does not in fact direct them nor does it in fact impart on them to do anything; all it does is reduce the dollars in that line item and they still can, they still can at their own discretion pay whatever increase that is available for the dollar in that particular line. Is that not a fact?"

Catania: "They certainly can spend the money according to their own discretion but this does not take money away from money for scholarships in this case; in the other high education amendment it doesn't take it away from teaching salaries. It only takes it away from administrative salaries."

Barnes: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and...Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "May I address the Amendment?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as was pointed out in the questioning that I just had with the Sponsor of this Amendment, this Amendment in fact does nothing but one thing and one thing only, and you should address this Amendment in that fashion. This Amendment reduces the personal service line item by \$3,000 and that's all that it does. It does not in any way, in any way does it address itself to reducing the amount of compensation for cost of living for any category, any category of employee for this agency or any other agency because if it did in fact it would be unconstitutional and it could not be done so what happens here is we will reduce the amount if we adopt this Amendment, will reduce the amount of money available for personal service in that agency and that's all that we do. In fact with the contractual arrangement and other prevailing work wage...wages involved in the personal services. The only thing this Amendment would do is make less money available to the Scholarship Commission for compensation for the employees. It will in no way, it will no way reduce the amount of compensation for the administrator nor will it reduce the amount of anyone else, it will simply



have less money available to them to compensate the employees. That's the fact of this Amendment, this Amendment should soundly be defeated because in fact it does not do anything that the Sponsor says that it addresses itself to."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Will the gentleman standing between the Member and the Chair please be seated? Representative Huff..."

Ebbesen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "...In front of Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "It is true that the highest paid administration that are included in the...this Amendment, I think it's directed at them, but there are also numerous counselors and financial aid administrators and other employees who earn a great deal less than \$20,000 annually and they're included there also. In fact the Amendment would really penalize employees who earn less than some of the civil service employees and less than the average faculty member and even though you're...the Amendment would reduce the available salary adjustment funds for other employees you've got to keep also in mind that for those employees that Representative Catania believes should receive less than the 4-1/2% adjustment then shouldn't we add funds for employees who would, or must receive more than the 4-1/2% adjustment? And of course this will include, as an example, people who fall under prevailing rates as employees and student workers subject to the new minimum wage requirements? I certainly think it's a very, very bad Amendment and I think we should be very consistent in our vote that if we do this here that we're going to have to consider this in the other areas of higher education. I certainly would encourage everyone to vote no on this proposal."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski, you seek recognition?"
Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't often rise to support setting a budget, particularly education institution but I'm doing so on this occasion because I think it's the glutted mental management that has been soaking up the money that the students



need and from the reports I get the management people in this particular agency don't do such a good job anyway. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is shall the main question be put, all in favor indicate by saying aye. Aye. Opposed, no. The ayes have it. Representative Catania to close."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Representative Lechowicz the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee as I think put it very well when he pointed out that state employees in middle management are being provided funds for a 2.5% salary increase. These are state employees in the higher education systems. To be consistent we should provide funds for a 2.5% salary increase for them. As I pointed out earlier in response to Representative Barnes' question, we do provide flexibility here. They can give larger percentages to lower level employees and smaller percentages to the high level administrators. The director and the five associates directors, for example, that the Illinois State Scholarship Commission has. Six employees who are high paid employees. We're only talking about \$3,000 here. This Bill has already received one amendment in the House so it's going back to the Senate for concurrence anyway. I ask for your support of this good, sound fiscally responsible amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is on the Lady's motion for the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1684. All in favor vote aye; opposed vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 59 ayes and 71 no and the motion fails and Amendment #3 is not...Representative Catania."

Catania: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I did want to explain my vote. As we said earlier if we would be consistent in applying this Amendment to all the higher education bills we would save the state over a million dollars. I request a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "Lady's requested a poll of the absentees. The Clerk



will poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "...dt, Capuzi, Chapman, Davis, Ewell, Fleck, Friedrich, Grieman, Griesheimer, Hart, Jim Houlihan, Hudson, Emil Jones, J. D. Jones, Katz, Keller, Kent, Kucharski..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan, no."

Clerk O'Brien: "Laurino, Luft, Madison, Mann, Marovitz, McAuliffe, McAvoy, Merlo, Mugalian, Peters, Pierce, Polk, Randolph, Rayson, Rose, Sangmeister, Schlickman, Schneider, Sevcik..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sevcik, aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Sharp..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keller, no."

Clerk O'Brien: "Stearney, C. M. Stiehl, Tispword, Van Duynes,..."

Speaker Redmond: "McAvoy, no. Yourell, no."

Clerk O'Brien: "...l, Williams, Winchester, and Younge."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tispword, no. What's the count, Mr.

Clerk? Question there's 60 ayes and 76 no's; the motion fails and the Amendment is not adopted. Any further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4. Polk, Stone. Amends Senate Bill 1684 as amended on page 2 by inserting immediately after line 19 the following, and so..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, this provides \$250,000 for matching grants to the Scholarship Fund. This was before our Committee, unfortunately we had a hostile witness on that morning and we were not successful in getting it on. This is...once in a lifetime type thing where a student has an opportunity to participate and the students themselves have contributed nearly \$280,000; we're asking for \$250,000 to match it. It's a chance where the students participate. They help to pay for their own grants to assist them going through school and I would very much like to see this Amendment added to this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan. Any discussion? Question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #4. All those in favor say...Representative Byers."

Byers: "Resentative Polk, will you yield for a question?"



Speaker Redmond: "Indicates he will."

Byers: "Is this the first year we have funded this program?"

Polk: "No, Sir, this program has been in existence for quite a few years and this will be the first year that we didn't fund it if we don't pass this today."

Byers: "How much...how much was it last year, did we fund it for? What level?"

Polk: "I honestly don't know."

Byers: "Pardon?"

Polk: "I don't have that figure."

Byers: "Would you like to venture a guess?"

Polk: "\$188,000 someone tells me."

Byers: "And then this year you want \$250,000?"

Polk: "That's correct. Because the students contribute \$280,000 themselves last year."

Byers: "I congratulate the students for contributing that much and I would recommend a no vote on this Amendment. Here's another case of where we're spending money that we don't have and then we're going to blame someone else for it and I think it rests solely with us to stand up and say no on this. This is a four amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Would the Sponsor yield for one question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Brinkmeier: "Yes, Ben, I understand this is an outright grant, this money is not repaid, it's not a loan, it's a grant."

Polk: "That's correct, it's a grant."

Brinkmeier: "Well, I'm sorry but I'm going to have to support the previous speaker, too. I think we'd better determine where our priorities are; this should be a loan I think I could go with you but if it's an outright grant under the circumstance that exist today I think we better take a good, hard look at this. It's a quarter of a million dollars and I would urge a no vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly, I would rise strongly to support this Amendment because what we're talking



here is an effort that's made by the students themselves. This program was started by students who are in colleges and universities, they raise the money. Each student voluntarily contribute \$10.00 of their own money to this fund and it's developed to help the most needy students that they can find. The students that have fallen between the cracks in all other kinds of grants and scholarships. It's a student to student helping program that we are simply asking for money from the state to match the amount that students on campuses all over Illinois have already raised to help fellow students. It is needed; it is certainly a way of bringing students in a positive way into a helpful program for higher education. I strongly urge a yes vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite. Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I too, rise to support this Amendment. The programs that this will help to fund has been in existence for several years and it has certainly proved its worth on the campuses. We find that in addition to tuition costs there are many unmet needs of the very low income students. Even though they may be able to pick up I.S.S. fee funding to cover their tuition there is an extreme hardship on the families of the low income students to have them away from home; to have them in a situation where they are not providing money for their families and the families can not afford to provide them with some of the other essential needs that they have on campus. We do not provide our students for the money they need for extra clothes, for transportation, for the books they need to have and various other kinds of expenditures that they have to absorb when they come to a university community. This program has proven itself to be very worthwhile in helping many of the low income students remain in school. And I think it is very deserving of our support. It gets us not only the money from the Legislature but additional dollars above and beyond a matching contribution from the students themselves and I urge your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to support this Amendment be-



cause this is one of the few programs that we have an opportunity to vote upon and restore that not only pertains and addresses itself to education which we're already sensitive to, but that which we're very interested in seeing is the young people taking part in it. Now they are participating in this not only in spirit but in a monetary basis and I think it would be a real disservice to the young people to kind of undercut their initiative on this by not funding this. This is something that they want, they're participating, they are putting their own money in it and I think we ought to tack this Amendment on with no other discussion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedland."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put. All in favor indicate by saying aye. Aye. Opposed, no. The ayes have it, the motion carries. Representative Polk to close."

Polk: "Well, I think it's been well discussed here this morning. You think in terms this is an opportunity for the kids to participate in their own program. We talk about all the loans and the grants that we give but here's an opportunity where the kids actually put their own money in to help other kids. And I'd certainly like to see this tacked on."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is on the Gentleman's motion. The question is on the adoption of the motion. All in favor vote aye; opposed vote no. Have all voted who wish? Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "I really don't want to waste the time of the House on explaining my no vote but I think the people should know that this is a check off system when you enroll in college among the thousands of things you check is whether or not you want to give up \$10.00 and then the state matches this and it is not a very highly committed organization that goes behind this thing when it comes to hustling money from fellow students for a good cause. It's a well greased paper machine that delivers the front money and I object to that method of raising money."

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



On this question there's 86 aye and 19 no and the motion carries.
Any further amendments?"

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment #5. Coffey. Amends Senate Bill 1684 as amended on page 2, line 2 by deleting '68,320,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '67,070,000'.

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Coffey."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Shea in the Chair."

Coffey: "Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, this Amendment reduces the amount monetary award program by 1, 250,000. This amount was requested by the Scholarship Commission to increase the maximum award from 1.5...1,500 to 1,550. Senate Bill 1679 which gives this authority increase is presently in the Senate Education Committee. I would like to move that this amount be deleted from the appropriations. The FY-76, the program was awarded at \$64,800,000 and with this reduction of a 1.250, the new total will be \$69,680,000. I would like to point out that with this reduction that it does not affect the public schools only the private institutions. I would also like to point out in 1976 there was an increase to the award program from \$1350 to \$1500. I think in the year of financial difficulty that this is the wrong time for such an increase in this program."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Coffey, moves for the adoption of Amendment #5. Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, the Assistant Majority Leader, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I first learned of this Amendment approximately ten minutes ago when it was put on my desk by one of the pages and at this time I still do not understand what the Representative is attempting to do. I've been told by a Member on my side of the aisle the Scholarship Commission proposes to raise the level of the monetary grant award by approximately \$550 but this authorization is contained in Senate Bill 1679 which is now pending in the Senate Education Committee and that the appropriations for that increase in the grant award is contained in this Bill, Senate Bill 1684. I further understand that Representative Coffey is now attempting to renew...remove the money from this Bill, even



though there has not been final action by the Senate on the proposal to raise the amount of the grant award. As I said I first learned of this Amendment approximately ten minutes ago. It stated on the document which was given to me that this Amendment was requested by the Scholarship Commission and I have to state in all honesty that the Scholarship Commission has not communicated that desire to the Sponsor of this Bill. I'm the Sponsor of the Bill for the Scholarship Commission. They have said nothing to me and I stand in opposition to the Amendment."

Speaker Shea: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House this Amendment should be a surprise to no one especially the Sponsor of the Bill. This is the same Amendment that failed in Committee, it was Committee Amendment #2 and I'm sure that if Representative Madigan would refresh his memory he'd know that with this Amendment the Scholarship Commission still has approximately \$5,000,000 more even with this million, three reduction. That's an increase of almost \$5,000,000 with this reduction and so I think this is a very responsible Amendment and should be adopted. And I would encourage an aye vote."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, and my...recollections of what took place in the Committee, I had not remembered them...Amendment being offered but the Minority Spokesman is correct. The Amendment was offered and defeated in the Committee. The reason the Amendment was defeated as indicated by the Sponsor of this Bill, the Assistant Majority Leader, is that there is an enabling legislation that is being...it is proposed and now on Third Reading in the Senate which raises the level of the scholarship grant per capita from \$1500 to \$1550. What the Scholarship Commission did testify to in that Committee was that the funding, the actual dollars for that program was proposed and the Scholarship Commission, fiscal 1977 appropriation, because they will be ...administrating agency. What this Amendment attempted to do in



Committee and what it is attempting to do here, and the reason it was defeated in Committee was because they're trying to cut off that increase by defeating the Senate Bill through the back door. If that Bill comes out of the Senate successfully and it seems that it will and we delete this amount from the Scholarship Committee in fact that Senate Bill will be dead because the money for that program is vested right here in Senate Bill 1684. So what is being attempted by this Amendment is not only to reduce the appropriation of the Scholarship Commission by this amount of money but is also trying in fact to defeat the Senate Bill through the back door. It was solidly defeated in Committee; it should be soundly defeated here."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Coffey, to close."

Coffey: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to point out that at our checking late yesterday afternoon that that Bill was not on Third Reading in the Senate and that it was still in Committee. And I think that's very important for you to hear that. I'd like to also point out again that this only affects the private institutions not the public schools. I'd also like to point out that it doesn't cut back on the '76 fiscal year appropriations but it increases it approximately 5,000,000 more than last year. I'd also like to point out in '76...FY-76 that there was increase from \$1350 to 1500 last year and now we're attempting to for another increase. We are with this reduction giving them the...still the increase of \$5,000,000. This is only a 1.250 reduction and I think that with the time when the...when this economy is like it is today, it's time for us to look over these spending procedures that we have been taking on. The authority for this increase and the Senate Bill like I pointed out earlier is still in Committee and I think that that's for all practical purposes that Bill is dead and I think this money ought to be removed from this appropriation. And I would ask for a favorable vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Coffey, has moved for the adoption of the amendment. All those in favor will say aye. Those opposed will say no. In the opinion of the Chair-there's been a



request for a Roll Call. All those in favor will vote aye; those opposed will vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the Roll Call, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 38 ayes and 73 nays and the Gentleman's motion fails. Are there further amendments? Third Reading. On the order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1604. Is Mr. Richmond on the floor? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1619, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, J. M. Are we ready with that? Read the Bill a third time, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill 1619. An act to provide the ordinary and contingency expense of the Illinois Commerce Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. J. M. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1619 provides for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Commerce Commission and it...as you recall yesterday we restored the funds so that this Commission could operate effectively particularly in this time of increasing inflation and increasing requests by utility companies in the state of Illinois for review...rate review and other regulations that have been coming upon the Commerce Commission. This budget is a budget composed of dollars from the Public Utility Fund and the Motor Vehicle Fund and not...any dollars from the General Revenue Fund. And I would ask a favorable Roll Call for Senate Bill 1619."

Speaker Shea: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Cook has moved for the adoption of Senate Bill 1619. The question is shall Senate Bill 1619 pass. All those in favor will vote aye; those opposed will vote nay. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 113 ayes; 3 nays; 3 Members voting present. Senate Bill 1619 having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of Senate Bills Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1600."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill 1600. An act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Revenue. Second Reading



of the Bill. One Committee Amendment. Amendment #1 amends Senate Bill 1600 on page 8, line 16 by inserting immediately after 'personal services' the following and so forth."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Chairman, the Department of Revenue has no objection to this, this allocates the expenditure of funds on a half year base at a time so that half will be expended in the first half of the fiscal year and the second in the second fiscal year. And I would move the adoption."

Speaker Shea: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder, moves for the adoption of Amendment #1. All those in favor say aye; those opposed nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted. Is there further amendments? Third Reading. On the order of...Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1636. The Gentleman from Cook...or Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill 1636. An act making an appropriation and reappropriation the Board of Higher Education. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Kane...from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, yesterday Representative Mann had a problem with this Bill and I think that's been cleared up."

Speaker Shea: "He's in front of you, Doug."

Kane: "Could we take it out of the record?"

Speaker Shea: "All right. At the request of the Sponsor, take it out of the record. The order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1604. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill 1604. An act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Mines and Minerals. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you recall 1604 was on Third Reading yesterday and we passed it without any problems and then returned it to Second Reading for an amendment



which would provide \$2,000,000 for the emergency fund as a result of the recent tornadoes in northern Illinois. I move for the adoption...to pass this Bill on to Third Reading."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentlemen from Jackson, Mr. Richmond, moves for the adoption of Senate Bill 1604. Is there discussion? Is there discussion? The question is shall Senate Bill 1604 pass. All those in favor will vote aye; those opposed vote nay. This...all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 134 ayes; 1 nay; 11 Members voting present. Senate Bill 1604 having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1863. Is Mr. Maragos on the floor? Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 1934. Mr. Terzich, are we ready with your Bill there this morning? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Selcke: "Senate Bill 1934. An act making an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Judicial Inquiry Board, et cetera. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Shea: "Turn Mr. Terzich on."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1934 is the appropriation for the Judicial Inquiry Board, the Judges Retirement System, the Court of Claims, the Appellate Defender and the Prosecutors Advisory Council and the appropriation..."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Senate Bill 1934. On that question the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It was my impression yesterday that the gentleman had agreed to take this back to Second Reading for purposes of an amendment. I don't know whether he's changed his mind about that or not...I think he agreed to that yesterday."

Terzich: "I...I just had a discussion with Representative Stearney and personally I don't have any objections one way or the other."

Ryan: "Well, would you take it back then, Representative Terzich?"

Terzich: "Well, I'd like to have permission to take it back to Second Reading."

Speaker Shea: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection the



Bill will be returned to the order of Second Reading. Are there amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #10. Stearney. Amends Senate Bill 1934 as amended by deleting all of Section 5."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, just a parliamentary inquiry prior to going into these amendments. This Bill was on Second last night in the latter stages of our meeting and I have tried to find out what amendments were passed and get copies of the amendments that were passed so we could have a whole look at them and I haven't been able to get that information yet. Can the Clerk tell me what amendments were passed so we can know where we go on these?"

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Duff, the Clerk's office informs me that didn't you request this last night and they said if you went upstairs they'd get you the amendments numbers?"

Duff: "I did but I never received it. That's why I'm asking now if I..."

Speaker Shea: "Well, perhaps, the Sponsor knows. Do you know, Mr.

Sponsor, what amendments were adopted and which ones failed yesterday?"

Stearney: "All the Committee Amendments were adopted..."

Speaker Shea: "Which numbers were those, Sir?"

Stearney: "That was Committee Amendment #1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7.and..."

Speaker Shea: "And #5 was tabled."

Stearney: "Correct. That failed in Committee."

Duff: "And #8 and 9 was...were defeated?"

Stearney: "No, #8 was tabled and #9 was adopted. That was \$8,000."

Duff: "So 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7 and 9. Is that correct?"

Stearney: "Correct."

Speaker Shea: "That's what the records indicate, Sir."

Duff: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Shea: "All right, the Bill is back on the order of Second Reading.

The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stearney, seeks to adopt an amendment and Mr. Epton you had a question on that, Sir?"

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, no, I did not have a question but I suppose this is just as good a time



to suggest that I do have a conflict of interest in this matter. I have an older brother who has been on my back for several years and notwithstanding I will everything I can to help him financially so I will vote in favor of these Bills."

Speaker Shea: "All right, now, on Amendment #10 the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stearney."

Stearney: "Well, Mr...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment here would delete the appropriation of \$387,000 for the Prosecutors Advisory Council. Now you must remember that four years ago this agency was created and was funded by the I.L.E.C. which meant that all federal funds pay for all the services of this agency. Now the federal funds have terminated and the state now is being asked subsequent to the passage of a certain Bill last year to fund this entire agency. Now the reason I am opposed to...to having this agency, the state funding \$387,000 is that the director of this agency, mind you, is going to be paid \$38,500 next year which is a 19% pay increase for him. Now if you recall the Director of Labor only is paid \$35,000 a year and he supervises 5,500 employees. The Director of the Department of Corrections is paid \$38,000 a year and he supervises 5,000 employees. This here director of the Prosecutors Advisory Council is going to make \$38,5 and he is only going to supervise 5 employees. Now what is even worse and atrocious about this here particular agency..."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Stearney, would you wait one minute, please?"

Stearney: "May I proceed, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Shea: "When we get some quiet in the Chamber. All right, proceed, Mr. Stearney."

Stearney: "What is even worse about this here appropriation is just last year we have these individuals who belong to the agency and the director himself traveling to Los Angeles, California for a seminar, Las Vegas, Nevada on a seminar, San Francisco, Houston, Texas, Orlando, Florida, New Orleans, Louisiana, and I don't believe I've ever been to any of those places. Now, mind you, the travel vouchers show \$373, \$489, these people are traveling around the country at...at the taxpayer's expense and I don't think this is entirely fair. As



a matter of fact we have one individual who gives the cab driver a \$3.00 tip. Now,...a 25% tip. Now this is absolutely inane. There's no reason whatsoever to have such an agency in the...state government payroll. We can do without it all together and save the taxpayer a few dollars. I really think it's terrible when people can travel around the country and if you and I ever tried by God there'd be 15 investigative agencies behind looking at what we just did. So I don't think that this director should make \$38,500 a year nor should he or any of the individuals on his staff or anyone else be allowed to go traveling around the country to all the plush luxurious spots at the taxpayer's expense. So I ask you for a favorable Roll Call on this particular Amendment to allow these individuals to seek gainful employment in our society."

Speaker Shea: "The...Lady from Lake, Miss Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Shea: "He will as soon as we get some quiet in the Chamber.

Would the Members please be in their seats and could we have some quiet in the Chamber, please?"

Geo-Karis: "Ah, Mr. Sponsor...."

Speaker Shea: "Now wait 'til we get some quiet in the Chambers please."

Geo-Karis: "Okay."

Speaker Shea: "Would the Members please be in their seats? All right, now, the Lady from Lake, Miss Geo-Karis is being recognized for the purpose of a question. Proceed."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Sponsor, will you...with all the din that has occurred earlier, it's been hard for me to follow you. Will you please tell me what your Amendment does? What...what does your Amendment do? Would you restate it please?"

Stearney: "Well, my Amendment abolishes the appropriation for the Prosecutor's Advisory Council for \$359,000."

Geo-Karis: "Well, this Prosecutor's Advisory Council, you say comes under the...the I.L.E.C?"

Stearney: "It did formerly but now the state is being asked for the first time to fund this agency entirely with state funds."

Geo-Karis: "Well, you mentioned that one of the reasons that brought



this up is the various trips all over the country. Now if this agency was not under I.L.E.C. before is it now? I don't quite follow it, this is what I'm trying to find out...."

Stearney: "Well, these same actions are going to continue, Representatives, they aren't going to stop."

Geo-Karis: "Okay."

Stearney: "They aren't going to change their modus operandi just because the state is funding the operation."

Geo-Karis: "Well, the Prosecutor's Advisory Council, can you tell me what it...what their main duty is?"

Stearney: "Well, they...they have some language here, Representative, 'this agency is mandated to advise, assist, coordinate training of programs and disseminate information for local states attorneys'."

Geo-Karis: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, the Assistant Minority Leader, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would also like to point out that in some of the vouchers which our staff has gathered some people, or one of the attorneys who traveled at state expense billed the state, I think the figure was \$38 a night for a hotel room when the law you can only bill the state, I forgot, \$18 or \$19. Now these are attorneys who are supposed to know the law and yet they apparently knowingly break the law or they don't bother to look at the statute which governs their travel expenses when working for this agency. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd be the last one to deny that I'm one of the big spenders in the Legislature and it's rare that I vote red and vote against an appropriation but for four years now I've been surrounded by Totten and Waddell and I'm catching it from Ewing on the other side of the aisle here. And I must...and I must say it's beginning to sink in. And I would like to particularly address myself to those others in the House who spend as well as I do. This is your chance to give a conservative vote for those constituents in your district who ask you why we spend so much in state government. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think Representative Stearney is absolutely right. This Amendment is a



terrible waste of money. We're using this money to train prosecutors and yet when Representative Catania and others try and get more funds for public defenders the money isn't there. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I hope that everyone of you votes in support of Representative Stearney's excellent Amendment."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington."

Washington: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question? Mr. Stearney, your...your Amendment 10 moves to strike Section 5, is that right?"

Stearney: "Yes."

Washington: "Has this Bill been renumbered? Section 5 would include the Appellate Defender's Office according to my..."

Stearney: "I'm...I'm told that it has been renumbered, so it would not include the Appellate Defender project."

Washington: "Do you know what section the Appellate Defender's project would now fall under?"

Stearney: "Believe it would be 4, that's an appropriation of \$2,000,000 ...of approximately \$2,000,000."

Washington: "I see. Well, I think you've got a good Amendment. Thank you."

Stearney: "Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Thanks, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I couldn't agree more with this Amendment after being on the Committee and asking some questions. First of all Representative Terzich, we had asked for information from this agency before this Bill was to be moved and they haven't supplied any of it. We asked how many counties were helped, they couldn't tell us for sure but they thought about 50 in the state of Illinois participated in this program. But we asked for a list of those counties and the people involved and we got nothing to this date. They were rather arrogant during the course of their testimony and seemed to be bothered by the fact that we asked them a few questions. It seems to me that this agency is a playground for a few individuals to take their junkets and their trips to go wherever they want to go as Representative Stearney has pointed out. And so with this Amendment I think we can bring a halt



to some of this nonsense and I would certainly encourage the adoption of Amendment #10."

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

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I find it unusual that these comments about lawyers on the floor of the House could be true. They don't make mistakes like that. So I really don't understand it but the...we had testimony of approximately four hours with regard to the director's salary, the reasons for that and the only reason for that is because of the statute required that his salary be increased from 32,000 to 38,000. We voted for this program by the General Assembly to incorporate the training program for these prosecutors, the state's attorneys and to take out the whole appropriation from this program I think is out of order and I would urge a no vote on the adoption of Amendment 10. They do have a purpose that they have trained many, many student lawyers and as a matter of fact I believe we're appropriating another additional \$108,000 for the summer intern program to bring a little knowledge to these poor lawyers. And I would urge a no vote on Amendment #10."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan, for which purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I thought that I had asked the Sponsor...the Sponsor of the Bill a question. Maybe I didn't put it in the form of a question, if I may now I will. Representative Terzich, did you receive any information that the Committee requested or did the Committee Chairman, that you know of, receive any of the information that was requested from this agency?"

Terzich: "I don't recall what information was requested."

Ryan: "Well, we requested a list..."

Terzich: "...From the agency, Representative..."

Ryan: "...Of the counties that were involved. Who took trips. What... what counties were helped, to what degree, and they promised to supply us with information and as far as I know it's never been received."

Terzich: "Well, Representative Ryan, you had all the travel vouchers in



front of you. We had quite an extensive discussion on the travel vouchers and I...I...I don't think that that's proper. You had the information at...at the Committee meeting. The reason for the excess charges on some of the hotel charges were of course the fact that if the convention or the seminar was held at the Conrad Hilton Hotel it was appropriated..appropriate that they would stay at the hotel that the convention was held."

Ryan: "I...I...that wasn't my question, Representative Terzich, my question was that we asked for a list of counties that had participated in this program and that was to be forthcoming at that time."

Terzich: "Well, I do not have the report."

Ryan: "You don't have that?"

Speaker Shea: "All right, now, before we continue with this I've been asked to make any announcement. If anybody has a car parked on Spring Street they are going to start to blacktop it and they are going to tow the cars away. So that if you have a car parked on Spring Street they've asked that they be moved and if they are not moved they will be towed away. Now on the question of Amendment #10 the Gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Boyle."

Boyle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, are they going to blacktop the street or the cars? Representative Stearney, does this Amendment do away also with the legislative...with the Intern's Program? That... that does away with the Intern Program as well as the Advisory Council, is that..."

Stearney: "I'm told no."

Boyle: "Well, you're told...what does it do-it's your Amendment you ought to...I mean I don't want to know what your heresay is, I want to know what your Amendment does."

Stearney: "Well, my Amendment abolishes the appropriation of \$380,000..."

Boyle: "It also abolishes the appropriation for the intern, I wonder if Mr. Stearney, would you be willing to offer a like Amendment to do away with the appellate defender's system? Mr. Speaker, if I could address myself on this..."

Stearney: "Well, in answer to you, Mr. Boyle,..."

Speaker Shea: "Proceed."



Stearney: "Let me..."

Boyle: "That was a rhetorical question, you don't have to answer that."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Boyle, proceed."

Boyle: "In answer, on the Amendment, Mr. Speaker, I, too, sat there and heard the questioning. The...the gentleman had the travel vouchers and yes it was true that some of the people who attended these meetings, yes, it was true, some of these prosecutors were indiscreet in ...in...on some of their charges and some of the travel vouchers that were filled out and I think they admitted that. And I think that they admitted that they had made mistakes because they had misconstrued the...these provisions of the law. Now I think it would be a terrible miscarriage of justice to penalize the whole system because you had a couple of prosecutors there that were indiscreet, made some mistakes of filling out their travel vouchers. I daresay I'll bet there's been some Legislators that's made some mistakes in filling out their travel vouchers but there's nobody in here trying to abolish the General Assembly, it's a terrible Amendment; should be defeated."

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

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker on a point of order. And the point of order is that I went up to the Clerk's desk to ask to look at a copy of the Amendment and the Amendment that's filed with the Clerk strikes all of Section 5. Representative Washington asked if that was the renumbered section and as you take a look at the Amendment I think you're striking more than the Illinois Prosecutor's Advisory Council and my point is exactly what's being struck by the Amendment. And number two, whether the Amendment's been distributed?"

Speaker Shea: "Have the Amendments been distributed, Mr. Clerk?"

Lechowicz: "No, Sir, they have not."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Stearney, you have a copy of the printed Amendment in your hand?"

Stearney: "Yes, I'm advised that Amendment #1 was adopted to this Bill and therefore my Amendment #10 is in conformance with Amendment #1 and there..."

Speaker Shea: "Now, I'm asking if the Amendment's been distributed."



Committee said it was filed last Friday but if it was filed last Friday why wasn't it heard last night? I'm informed that Mr. Stearney wasn't here."

Lechowicz: "That is correct."

Speaker Shea: "Well, why don't we take this out of the record for the time being...and the Gentleman from Grundy, the Minority Leader. House Bill 19, or Senate Bill 1934 is out of the record and will remain on the order of Second Reading. The Gentleman from Grundy, the Minority Leader."

Washburn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Mr. Speaker, I'd like...ask leave that we stand in recess until 11:30 for the purposes of a Republican conference in Room 118. Republican conference in Room 118."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Before we leave, Mr. Speaker, would the record show that Representative Hart is excused because of illness in his family."

Speaker Shea: "The record will so show. Mr. Kosinski, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, I have permission from the...Mr. Redmond to make an announcement. May I proceed?"

Speaker Shea: "Proceed."

Kosinski: "The announcement was that the Italian-Polish Dinner was a success. The Soul Food Dinner was a success. The German Dinner is running into problems in terms of attendance and those Members of that Committee request that anyone who wishes avail themselves of them today, the dinner is tonight."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, moves that the House stand in recess until the hour of 11:30 and Mr. Washburn, the Minority Leader, has announced that there will be a Republican conference in Room 118. All those in favor of Mr. Madigan's motion say aye. The ayes have it. The House stands in recess until the hour of 11:30. Mr. Grotberg now that the House is out of Session do you wish to make an announcement or inquiry? Mr. Sevcik's microphone has been turned on. "

Grotberg: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I thought I heard Representative Kosinski just say that the German-American Dinner is tomorrow."



Speaker Shea: "No, he said it's tonight and he said that if you have..."

Grotberg: "I have my tickets but he...he said the Dinner's tomorrow and..."

Speaker Shea: "No, he said it was tonight and he suggested, Sir, that you help sell some more tickets."

Grotberg: "God bless you, Son, I shall try."

Speaker Shea: "Now, we'll turn on Mr. Choate."

Choate: "The only reason that Representative Kosinski got confused on the dates is he's only half German."

Speaker Shea: "Turn it off, George."

Doorkeeper: "All persons not entitled to House floor please retire to the gallery."

Speaker Shea: "The House will come to order, the Members will be in their seats. We're on Senate Bill 1934 and Amendment #10. Is Mr. Stearney on the floor? Well, if he's not here then we'll just move the Bill to Third Reading. ...Senate Bill 1934 has ...it's on... been moved from Third to Second Reading. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stearney, has offered Amendment #10. There's been questions raised whether the Amendment's been distributed. I checked with the Clerk's office, the Amendment has been distributed and the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, on Amendment #10. Might I tell our friends in the gallery that there will be no picture taking in the House unless the red light behind the Speaker is on. And might I remind the doorkeepers to remind our guests that there will be no picture taking. Mr. Totten, do you seek recognition on Amendment #10? Proceed, Sir."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's indeed with pleasure that I note the enlightenment of Representative Telcser regarding the proposed Amendment #10 and what it seeks to do in Senate Bill 1934. Let me remind the Members of the General Assembly that this is another case of the federal government funding a program over a period of time and then deciding to turn the funding over to the state and we pick up the entire bill



which is in this amount \$329,000. The question is as Representative Stearney has so aptly put it, do you want the people who are involved in getting funds from this grant, now a state grant, to be running around doing what they're doing on what was before federal money, now doing it on state money at a time especially when we have to look very carefully at every dollar we spend. Not only is the grant which is now entirely state funded, probably not needed, but I think the actions and performance of those that have been using the federal funds in the past warrant the adoption of Amendment #10 to abolish this Prosecutor's Council?"

Speaker Shea: "Is there further discussion? Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stearney, to close."

Stearney: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, this agency is the most glaring example of a government bureaucrat taking advantage of the taxpayer. If the Members of the Legislature have to live under stringent requirements and standards so, too, should government bureaucrats. The agency appears to be nothing more than a rip-off. It's sole function it appears is to provide posh, luxurious holidays for those lucky enough to be on the in. Further, as an analogy, Bernard Carey, the State's Attorney of Cook County, received 42.5 a year and supervises over 275 employees day in and day out. The director of this agency next year will receive 42.5 a year because his salary is tied to the state's attorney's salary. But he only supervises a mere five employees and one of these is paid \$18,000 yearly as staff director. I imagine most of the time is spent considering where he and his staff will be spending their next monthly holiday. Now, let me remind you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that the purpose of this agency is to advise prosecutors how to apply the law in a criminal action. But the director of this agency himself violates the law. Where he is only allowed to spend \$18 a night for a hotel room while in Chicago he, nevertheless, spends \$38 for a hotel room. He is in violation. Now how can he establish an image for all prosecutors and citizens in this state to follow? Gentlemen, there is no justification for the existence of this agency. Pure and simple it has no purpose or rationale. It is a boondoggle.



It's a \$359,000 rip-off of the taxpayer who deserves...deserves better treatment from us. Now I say...I suggest that we send a message to every bureaucrat that we are not going to tolerate these junkets to New Orleans, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Las Vegas, Orlando, Florida, or anywhere else in this country; nor are we going to allow a high paid bureaucrat to sit around with his feet on the desk. I think we should send them to work. Now we can not create anymore of these good programs. I say to you the taxpayer cannot stomach anymore of these good programs. If we give 'em anymore of these good programs we are going to fall...force all the middleclass taxpayers into declaring bankruptcy. They cannot tolerate anymore of this. So I say let's save the taxpayers and abolish this agency. I ask for an aye vote on this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stearney, has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. All those in favor will vote...I'm sorry, Mr. Stearney has moved for the adoption of Amendment #10, all those in favor will vote aye; those opposed will vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Art, ...take the record, Mr. Clerk. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich. Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, rather than taking up the time of the House to question the...I don't believe that there's a 100 people in the Chamber, I think it's kind of ridiculous that we as a legislative body set up the Prosecutor's Advisory Council and then want to take out the total funding or the appropriation of that so at the appropriate time then I would like to ask for a verification and I will question the quorum."

Speaker Shea: "On this question there are 77...Berman, no. On this question there are 77 ayes and, Byers, no, 25 nays. Craig, no. Aye? Craig, aye. Stiehl, aye. Cissy Stiehl, aye. All right, the Gentleman from Cook has requested a verification. There are 81 ayes and 25 nays. Do you persist in your verification, Sir?"

Terzich: "Well,...well, I think I'll question the quorum, Mr.... I mean, there's...either that or I would like to dump this Roll Call and have one honest shot."



Speaker Shea: "All... you want..."

Terzich: "I'll just question the quorum then. I believe I have a right to question the quorum, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Shea: "Pardon me?"

Terzich: "I have the right to question the quorum..."

Speaker Shea: "You have that right and I'm trying to figure out how to dump the Roll Call. A question of a quorum takes precedent as I read the Rule over the motion before and I'm trying to figure out how to save the Roll Call so that if there is a quorum in the Chambers I can announce it. Now, Mr. Washburn, the Minority Leader, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Washburn: "Well, I think to be safe, Mr. Speaker, the best thing on a Quorum Roll Call would be an Oral Roll Call."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, I wish they would stop these dilatory tactics."

Speaker Shea: "Withdraw your request..."

Terzich: "Especially all the lawyers, quit it."

Speaker Shea: "You withdraw your request, Mr. Terzich, for a Quorum Call?"

Terzich: "Oh, no. No, I...I insist on... ..Not legal, I'm going to check with my attorney."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, on a point of order."

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the Rules call for when a certain Roll Call shows that there isn't a quorum present, I think we've got the procedure right here. We've got a Roll Call and if this Roll Call shows that there's not a quorum then Representative Terzich finds that we don't have a quorum and he's in order but I think that's the way to go because we have a Roll Call on the board."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Boyle."

Boyle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time I'd ask for a poll of the absentees and a verification of the affirmative vote."

Speaker Shea: "All right. That, I think, will solve our quandry. All right. Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Arnell, E. M. Barnes, Beaupre..."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Terzich, for which purpose do you arise?"

Terzich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe my request for a Quorum Call takes



precedent, doesn't it?"

Speaker Shea: "You're in the middle of the Roll Call and I can solve the problem with the request for verification."

Terzich: "Well, I still say mine holds...precedence, Mr. Speaker, so why don't we just dump this Roll Call like all good guys and... otherwise, I...I request a quorum. That's all there is to it. If they want to take up the time of the House, let 'em take it."

Speaker Shea: "Continue with the poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Boyle, Gerald Bradley,..."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Boyles wishes to be recorded as no."

Clerk O'Brien: "Gerald Bradley, Brandt, Brinkmeier,..."

Speaker Shea: "Turn on Mr. Brinkmeier, please. Brinkmeier, aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Campbell."

Speaker Shea: "Campbell, aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Capuzi, Choate, Daniels, Davis, Deuster,..."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Deuster, aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Downs, Ewell, Ewing, Fleck, Garmisa, Getty, Giglio, Grieman, Grotberg, Hart, Hill, Gene Hoffman, Huff, Jaffe,..."

Speaker Shea: "Record Representative Choate, no. We have a couple of late starters. Arnell, aye. Mulcahey, aye. Stubblefield, aye. Garmisa, no. Sangmeister, no. ...Got Sangmeister as no, Mr. Clerk? Can I give you a couple more late starters, Mr. Clerk? Van Duyne, aye. Sharp, aye. Laurino, aye. Mr. Lauer, aye. Continue with the Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Giglio, Grieman, Grotberg, Hart, Hill, Gene Hoffman, Huff, Jaffe, Emil Jones, J. D. Jones, Kane, ...Kane votes aye."

Speaker Shea: "Kane, aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Katz, Keller, Kelly, Kent, Lechowicz, Londrigan, Lucco, Luft, Lundy, Madison, Maragos, McAvoy, McGrew, Mudd, Mugalian,..."

Speaker Shea: "Mugalian, aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "O'Daniel..."

Speaker Shea: "O'Daniel wishes to be recorded as aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Palmer, Pierce, Porter,..."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Porter, how do you wish to be recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Randolph,..."



Speaker Shea: "Randolph, aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Rayson, Riccolo,..."

Speaker Shea: "Riccolo, aye."

Clerk O'Brien: "Richmond, Rose, Schneider, E. G. Stiehl, Vitek,..."

Speaker Shea: "Wait a minute, Mr. Clerk, Porter now wishes to be recorded as aye. Mr. Everett Steele, the Gentleman from Madison, wishes to be recorded aye. Mr. Simms, the Gentleman from Winnebago, wishes to switch his no vote to an aye vote. Now Mr. McGrew wishes to get on the Roll Call as aye. Mr. Huff wishes to be recorded as aye. Maragos, Maragos is no. Mr. Sam Wolf is aye. Vitek, aye. Cunningham wishes to go from aye to no. And Mr. Madison wishes to be recorded as aye. Now could I have the Roll Call that we're going to start with on the verification? Oh, we still have got to poll some absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Von Boeckman, Wall, Younge and Yourell."

Speaker Shea: "Record Yourell as no. And Londrigan as aye. There are 105 ayes and 32 no's. Record Mr. Daniels, the Gentleman from DuPage, as no. Now Mr. Boyle has requested a verification of the affirmative vote. Mr. Boyle."

Boyle: "Mr. Speaker, in view of the added starters I would at this time withdraw my request for verification."

Speaker Shea: "Now, Mr. Terzich, for which purpose do you seek recognition?"

Terzich: "We're sending a copy of this Roll Call to the state's attorney for all the lawyers."

Speaker Shea: "On this question there are 105 ayes and 33 nays and the Gentleman's motion carries and Amendment #10 is adopted. Are there further amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #11. Stearney. Amends Senate Bill 1934 as amended in Section 5 and so forth."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman wishes to table the Amendment. Is there objection? Hearing none the Amendment will be tabled. Further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #12. Duff. Amends Senate Bill 1934 as amended on page 3, line 9 and so forth."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff, on Amendment 12."



Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #12 is a response to what I consider to be an inadequate debate on an earlier amendment which took off more than the Senate had amended the original request on for the public appellate defender's office. What it does is it restores - the Amendment restores the \$71,636 which was reduced by Amendment #6. Now the public appellate defender's office unlike many other agencies of state government is, in my opinion, responding to a very great need statewide to some extent required by not only legislation enacted here but by court opinions as to the necessity of providing coverage for indigents, particularly appellate work. Everybody in here in this Body who represents a small county knows the great difficulty that your counties are having in offering mandated and required defenses. This original request that was made by the Public Appellate Defender's Office was reduced substantially by the Senate and then more substantially by the House. This increased...this keeps the present standard of the Bill except in four items, the \$60,000 on personal services, \$33,991 on retirement, \$2,114 on social security and only \$5,000 on printing. And I do believe that had we had more full more debate on this matter that Amendment #6 would not have passed the House and this is an effort to restore what I consider to have been an error in that regard. I would move for passage of the Amendment."

Speaker Shea: "On the Gentleman's Amendment, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this was heard in the Committee and the reduction of \$71,636 was not really opposed by the Appellate Defender's Office. It does provide for the 2-1/2% adjustment and I really don't see any need for spending additional taxpayer's money especially when it's not required. The amount is equal to the amount appropriated for the estimates of 1976 and therefore I would have to object to the Amendment. So I appreciate a no vote."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Amendment #6 was offered by myself in Committee and the Appellate Defenders in the testimony before the Committee agreed, and I want to emphasize



that, agreed to this reduction. The testimony was given in the Committee on this particular Amendment. The director of the head of the program of the Appellate Defenders were in attendance at that Committee meeting and did agree to this reduction and said that this was within their programmatic aspects for the current fiscal year so I see no reason to add additional money to a budget in which the director of that particular program had already agreed to the reduction that we have enacted on in this particular Bill. I would agree with the Sponsor of the Bill we should not attach additional money that the director does not request nor seek. We should defeat this Amendment."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington,"

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I regretably join issue with my distinguished colleague, Representative Barnes and Tuerk, but it seems to me if you say the director agreed to this you're resorting somewhat of a euphemism. The amount of money of was originally in the budget put together by the appellate division. They were cut drastically in the Senate and then in turn the Subcommittee or rather the Committee in the House cut them an additional \$71,000. They didn't agree to it, they was...seemed to them as though they were afraid to fait accompli before the Committee and so they had no choice but to go along. But as Representative Duff said the funds are needed in the area of personnel particularly in this field. As you may recall we fought rather hard over a period of time to get not only this particular agency funded but funded on a substantial level so they could really give some added, some necessary relief to indigents defenders and they tried to appeal from criminal courts to cases. It seems to me that we're taking a backward step if we cut out in this particular area. This money is absolutely necessary in that division. We don't want to clutter up our courts with cases that can't be heard because indigents don't have the funds to appeal. And that's all this does. Now I can understand the trepidation and the fear and the quandry that a director is in when he comes before Appropriations Committee and they indicate to him in various soft terms you either take this cut or else. But



what is he supposed to do but actually acquiesce quietly. But in the final analysis it's up to this Body to determine whether or not a credit is necessary. If they came in with too much money it's our prerogative to cut it and frankly if they came in with too little it's our prerogative to increase it. They start off with a budget which was cut substantially in the Senate and then we in turn cut it another \$70,000 notwithstanding the very careful consideration that perhaps was given to this budget by Mr. Barnes and his Committee, I think in the wisdom of the House we should restore this \$70,000. Not only that, last week, yesterday, rather when these funds were cut the House was in somewhat of a turmoil, I doubt very much if the Members of the House heard the debate. I hadn't seen the Amendment and we voted on it before I knew what we were voting on. I think we should restore this... these funds. I support Amendment #12."

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

Totten: "Question of the Chair, if I could. Is this Amendment in order technically?"

Speaker Shea: "Let me check it. Could I have the Bill please and the Amendment? Have a problem, Mr. Totten, trying to figure out from the Amendments, and again I might add, take this out of the record because it appears from the Amendments that, as I read them, the Illinois Defender...Appellate Defender may have been taken out by Mr. Stearney's Amendment. Gentlemen, I can only look at the Amendments, there are 12 of them and it appears from a cursory glance that instead of taking out the Prosecutor's Council that Mr. Stearney may have taken out the Illinois Appellate Defender's Office. So with leave of the House we'll take this out of the record and remain on Amendment #12 while we try to get the Amendment in the process of knowing at least for the Chair's sake what is going on. Now, Mr. Washington, for which purpose do you arise?"

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, if you'll look at Amendment #1 it resections the Amendments."

Speaker Shea: "I understand that but there are later amendments that change it back."



Washington: "I see."

Shea: "So with your leave we'll take this out of the...record to see if the Illinois Appellate Defender wasn't removed. Mr...Mr. Stearney says that makes no difference either. On the order of Senate Bills Second Reading...the University Bills and we're holding those. On the order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1947, Mr. Lechowicz, is he on the floor? Senate Bill 1976, the Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1976, a Bill for an act to amend an act in relation to the civil administration of the state government. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill...or Senate Bill 1976 is the same Bill as House Bill 3972 that was passed out yesterday. Recently as you folks are aware, the Comptroller stopped payment to Amtrack and the Rock Island Railroad for subsidy payments in connection with the innercity passenger rail service. The Comptroller stated that while the Legislature was appropriating to I-DOT funds for the payments, I-DOT lacks specific stationary authority...stationary authority to sign contracts for the Amtrack and railroad. Now this Bill would permit the Department to make these payments. It's agreeable with the Comptroller and also the Department of Transportation and I might add again if this Bill isn't passed before June the 30th that they've already notified the Amtrack trains, the inner city Amtrack trains and all train service would be stopped. It affects most every area in every district, for instance, the Chicago to St. Louis and many others. And therefore I would appreciate an affirmative vote on this and get it to the Governor as quick as possible so he can sign it."

Speaker Shea: "Is there debate? The Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff, has moved for the passage of House Bill 1976 and on that the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would appreciate an affirmative vote on...Senate Bill 1976. It's a Bill that's sorely needed in Illinois. We have to keep the Amtrack running



and I would ask for a yes vote on this very good Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "Is there further debate? Mr. Neff and Mr. Garmisa move for the passage of Senate Bill 1976. The question is shall Senate Bill 1976 pass. All those in favor will vote aye; those opposed will vote nay. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there 139 ayes, 3 nays, House Bill... or Senate Bill 1976 having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. You wish to be voted twice Miss Geo-Karis or will the...all right. The Gentleman from Cook, on the order of Senate Bills Third Reading is Senate Bill 1947."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1947. A Bill for an act making additional appropriation for printing for the Senate of the 79th General Assembly. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want to thank the Speaker for his courtesy coming back to this when I was off the floor temporarily. Senate Bill 1947 provides an appropriation of \$45,160.06 to pay the amount owed for printing Senate Journals and Calendars in the year 1975. During the 1975 Session the company which had originally been awarded the printing contract was unable to fulfill his obligations under the agreement. Another company took over the printing but at the same time printing costs become higher, became higher than were originally anticipated. Consequently, the amount of this appropriation is still owed to the printing company and I'd an aye vote."

Speaker Shea: "Is there debate? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz, moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1947. The question is shall Senate Bill 1947 pass. All those in favor will vote aye; those opposed will vote nay. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This question there are 134 ayes, 2 nays, 4 Members voting present. Senate Bill 1947 having received the constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we recess until 3:30."



Speaker Shea: "The Gentleman's motion is that the House stand in recess until the...hour of 3:30. All in favor will say aye; those opposed nay. In the opinion of the Chair, the ayes have it and the House stands in recess until... Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to make an announcement if I may. Appropriations I will be meeting here on the House floor at 1:30 this afternoon. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The same announcement, Appropriations II will be meeting in Room 118 promptly at 1:30. Promptly at 1:30. We have about a dozen bills."

Speaker Shea: "Mr. Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Transportation Committee is supposed to be meeting at 1 o'clock in Room A-1. That meeting is called off, we transacted all our business. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "Transportation has cancelled. Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, the Republican Members of the House Appropriations Committee will meet in Room 220 in ten minutes."

Speaker Shea: "Representative Leon."

Leon: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Committee of Financial Institutions will meet promptly at 2 o'clock in Room A-1, I would appreciate all Members being present. We have two bills and I believe they're very important. Thank you."

Speaker Shea: "Laurino."

Laurino: "Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Committee on Elections will meet exactly at 1 p.m."

Speaker Shea: "Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "The Executive Committee, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the calendar was in error yesterday, we don't meet until Thursday, Thursday at 1 o'clock. We do not meet today."

Speaker Shea: "Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Committee on Cities and Villages will meet promptly at 1:30 in Room D-1, State Office Building."



Speaker Shea: "Representative Houlihan, D. L."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, the Committee created pursuant to House Resolution 883 will meet at 1:30 in A-1 in the State Office Building."

Speaker Redmond: "House will come to order and Members please be in their seats. Committee reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Laurino, Chairman of the Committee on Elections to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 15, 1976, reports the same back with the following recommendation, do pass as amended House Bill 3810. Representative Schneider, Chairman of the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education to which the following Bill was referred, action taken June 15, 1976 reported the same back with the following recommendation, do pass on Senate Bill 1643. Representative Taylor, Chairman of the Committee on Cities and Villages to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 15, 1976, reported the same back with the following recommendation, do pass Senate Bill 1564 and Senate Bill 1565; do pass as amended Senate Bill 1581. Representative Maragos, Chairman, Committee on Revenue, reported the following Committee Bills for introduction: House Bill 3995. Action taken June 14th 1976."

Speaker Redmond: "Introduction First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3994. Deuster. A Bill for an act to amend the Regional Transportation Authority Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3995. Committee on Revenue. A Bill for an act to create the Illinois Raffles and Chances Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Leon, Chairman of the Committee on Financial Institutions to which the following Bills were referred action taken June 15, 1976, reported the same back with the following recommendations: do pass House Bill 3970 and Senate Bill



1713."

Speaker Redmond: "Senate Bills Second Reading. Senate Bill 1934. 1934, Amendment #1?, who's the Sponsor? Who? Representative Duff. Next amendment."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #13. Van Duyne."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne. Van Duyne. You've shortened up a little bit there."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amend Senate Bill 1934 as amended in Section 5 by deleting the following: 'for summer intern program 1,155'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Mr....thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry but our Committee is still meeting down in 114. This Amendment is to remove the interns from the state's attorneys program. Now we passed the substantive legislation sometime back which I did not support and this is the funding for it. It's a \$1,155. As far as I'm concerned..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washburn, are you seeking recognition?"

Washburn: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Representative Van Duyne is correct when he states that Appropriations II is still meeting down in Room 114, it is and I think that's contrary to our laws that we're in Session, or our Rules. Perhaps we should either wait until they get finished on whatever Bill they happen to be hearing or stand in recess for a few minutes until they can be up here on the floor."

Van Duyne: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't mean to bring up any technicality I was just trying to explain why I wasn't on the floor. If I may proceed?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washburn is correct. I think maybe the Appropriations Committee should recess. House will stand in recess for five minutes. Representative Schraeder, do you seek recognition?"

Schraeder: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday the last of the Session there was a House Bill introduced, House Bill 3991, that was listed under my Sponsorship. That is not correct. I want no part of that Bill and...and I would suggest that the original Sponsor go to the podium



and get his on name and take mine off, I...I don't want to table,
I just want my name off."

Speaker Redmond: "What number is that?"

Schraeder: "3991."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection to removing Representative
Schraeder as the Sponsor? Hearing none his name will be removed.
Representative Lucco, do you seek recognition?"

Speaker Redmond: "House will come to order. 1934, Representative
Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I understand that Mr. Stearney's...
Representative Stearney's Amendment #10 took care of what I wanted
to accomplish..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duff, for what purpose do you arise?"

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, for the same purposes as we recessed for #12
...for 13. I have Amendment #12, I'd like to have it called if I
could so we can stay in order."

Speaker Redmond: "You weren't on the floor at the time it was called
Representative Duff. Proceed with Amendment #13..."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, as you pointed out yourself, the Committee was
still in Session."

Speaker Redmond: "We're on 13, we'll go back to 12."

Duff: "Thank you, Sir."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have leave of the
House to table Amendment #13."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Hearing none, Amendment 13 is tabled.
Amendment #12."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #12. Duff. Amends Senate Bill 1934 as amended
on page 3, line..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duff."

Duff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as was
pointed out earlier when there was a question as to whether or not.
Amendment #12 had, a question from Representative Totten as to whether



...Amendment #12 had a contradiction to a prior adopted amendment. It has been determined since then that they were not contradictory at this time. Before I present the Amendment I would like the Speaker, if he would, to confirm that."

Speaker Redmond: "Parliamentarian advises me they are not."

Duff: "They are not contradictory."

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct."

Duff: "Thank you, Sir. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #12 restores what was taken out of the Bill by Amendment #6. As I pointed out earlier today, the Senate had already reduced the appropriation for the Public Appellate Defender's Office by \$152,000, a rather considerable amount. As Representative Washington was able to point out in debate earlier, there was a suggestion that the Public Appellate Defender's Office had agreed with this Amendment whereas in fact in Committee they were confronted with the...with a much, much larger reduction on a House Amendment and they very reluctantly accepted this reduction. In fact, Mr. Speaker, there has been for years an inadequacy in the parity between the Public Appellate Defender's Office and the amounts that we have put forth for the prosecutorial services. Now I have oftentimes, not always, voted for those increases. I would point out that this year we put as many as a \$100,000 additionally on for an intern program..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich, for what purpose do you arise?"

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, just a little point of order. As the Sponsor of this Bill, am I correct in your ruling that the exact amount of money that we voted on and approved the Amendment to take out of this appropriation are...is your ruling that this Amendment #12 which...which replaces the identical amount is in order?"

Speaker Redmond: "Would you phrase your inquiry again?"

Terzich: "Well, the amount of money that Representative Duff is requesting that we put back in was...exactly the same amount of money that the House adopted the Amendment to remove from the appropriation. Now would it be in order that if this passed that I can put in another Amendment requesting...the like amount be taken out?"

Speaker Redmond: "Let's see Amendment #6, Mr. O'Brien. Representative



Washburn."

Washburn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, might I suggest that you take five or ten minutes to check that Amendment as Appropriations #II advises me that they'll be in session in Room 114 or 118 for another five or ten minutes? Contrary to our House rules."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, we'll stand in Session until 4:30. Well, Representative Downs, can you tell us what is Appropriations is... is doing? You just recessed. Well, okay, then we'll recess...4:25. Representative Terzich in light of the advice of the parliamentarian where I held that the...this was not in consistent with the previous Amendment, I think the way to proceed on this now is to let Representative Duff move to adopt the Amendment. Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Well, then, if that's the case, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we do wait a couple of minutes until at least the Members of Appropriations II Committee who did hear this appropriation bill..."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, we'll take it out of the record, then. Take this one out of the record. ...Bill Second Reading. Senate Bill Second Reading is...Representative Boyle."

Boyle: "Yeah, thank you, Mr. Speaker, we're...the Members of Appropriation II are back on the floor so maybe Mr. Duff would like to go ahead and we could...he could re-explain his Amendment, we could just go right ahead and see..."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Senate Bill 1934, Amendment #12 and bring your explanation to a close."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, have I been recognized?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duff."

Duff: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Explain it."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we seem to be having a lot of ups and downs of House Bill 1934. Last night when it was on Second Reading I think many of you will agree and have agreed and pointed out to me that there was not the degree of attention paid to it that perhaps it deserved. At that time Amendment #6 was adopted which deleted a significant additional amount of money from the Public Appellate Defender's Office. What I had



pointed out earlier today was that for some years there has been a lack of parity between what we have done in this Assembly for the prosecutors office and the public defenders office. In fact earlier this year we put forward a \$100,000 on this Bill for a special intern program even though we Members of the House don't get that kind of money for interns for ourselves. I pointed out to all of you who come from small counties and I think this is particularly...a particularly significant point to all of you who come from small counties, you know the difficulties that you are having in paying for the mandated defense of public indigents. Mandated not only by statutes but also by United States Supreme Court decision. The Public Appellate Defender's Office has been able to be of great assistance to the small counties in many, many ways. This Amendment restores after the Senate had already reduced the appropriation by \$152,000 and the House then went further and reduced it by another 71 plus, 71,636 to be exact. This restores under personal services \$60,000, under retirement \$3,991 - I don't think an enormous amount - under social security \$2,114 and under printing only \$5,000. And this, in light of the fact that this office has...has unlike many others had a burgeoning responsibility over which it has no control. I think it is only fair that the...what I would consider the accident of our decision last night might be brought back into line. I have in fact had a number of Members ask me to put forward this resolution. I would ask you that the...I would comment to you that the \$152,000 already reduced by the Senate over the initial budget appropriation is a large amount. I would further point out that while it was commented that the Public Appellate Defenders accepted this it was also mentioned by another Member of this House that they accepted it really to some extent under gentle duress, gentle being the kindest word I can suggest. Another Amendment having been suggested to them in an amount more than twice this much and so yes in Committee they said they supposed they could live with it but in fact they did not want it, they do not want it and they have...they have justified the additional money. I would suggest...



ask for a favorable Roll Call. If anybody has any questions I'd be glad to answer them."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Boyle."

Boyle: "Well, Representative Duff, I...I don't know whether or not you were here earlier but ...are you aware of what Representative Stearney did with his Amendment #10 to this Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duff."

Duff: "Representative Boyle, I was interrupted by a young man here, I didn't hear your question."

Boyle: "I said are you aware of what Representative Stearney's Amendment #10 did to this Bill?"

Duff: "Yes."

Boyle: "All right, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak to the Bill. I oppose this Amendment. I think that...what's good for the goose is good for the gander and if it's the will of this House to wipe out the Prosecutor's Advisory Council then I don't think that we ought to overload the Appellate Defender's System. Now when these people were before my Committee they agreed to these cuts and I think that we may be in a situation where this House is becoming a great deal in favor of the defendant and you're putting...an unjust burden on the state's attorney. So be it, if it be the will of the House to cut by wiping out the advisory council for the state's attorney then let's not unbalance the scales of justice; let's not appropriate these additional funds for the appellate defender's system."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Fleck."

Fleck: "Will the Sponsor...would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "Indicates he will."

Fleck: "Representative Duff, does this Amendment attempt to put back in funds which were removed by Representative Stearney's Amendment?"

Duff: "No, this is a completely different subject. I was in favor of Representative Stearney's Amendment."

Fleck: "Does this Amendment attempt to put back funds which were removed by any other Amendment?"

Duff: "Yes. This does refer to funds that were dropped out by Amendment #6 passed last night on a voice Roll Call when none of us were



really paying attention."

Fleck: "Then, Mr. Speaker, if that's true I'd like to raise a point of order in regard to this Amendment on Roberts Rules of Order, Section 12, dealing with improper amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Fleck: "Roberts Rules of Order improper amendment states that the 'following types of amendments are out of order. One that merely makes the adoption of the amended question equivalent to a rejection of a original motion or one that would make the question as amended identical with or contrary to one previously decided by the Assembly during the same session'. I would suggest that under the clear ordinary meaning of that rule that this amendment is out of order and improper.' It's quite clear in Roberts Rules of Order which should be the rule..."

Speaker Redmond: "Parliamentarian agrees with you now and agrees that the Amendment #12 is out of order. Representative Duff."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, you already made a ruling on that matter.

I don't know if Representative Fleck heard it or not and I think it's a shame that the parliamentarian has to change his mind in midstream because I was asked to get up and propose this motion after a ruling from the Chair that it was in order. If, Sir, you are going to say that it was in order I then will say, Sir, that having voted on the prevailing side on Amendment #6 I would move to reconsider. I would not like to take that course of action. I think it's more appropriate for this House to be able to offer amendments up or down. I spoke to the Minority Leader in fact prior to offering this amendment who was, as you will recall, an excellent chairman of the Appropriations Committee two years ago and he told me that in his recollection this kind of action had never been prevented before in this House. Now Roberts Rules pertain to this House only when the House Rules and precedents don't. If, Sir, you are going to now rule out of order after having ruled it in order, I would then like to be recognized for a motion to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #6 was adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Unlike all the rest of the Members of the General Assembly, this Chair has erred in its previous ruling. I now



rule that the Amendment #12 is out of order, Representative..."

Duff: "...Might I be recognized at the appropriate time for a motion having voted on the prevailing side..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duff...is recognized."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, having voted on the prevailing side of the adoption of Amendment #6 I hereby move that the vote by which that Amendment was adopted be reconsidered."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has moved that the vote by which Amendment #6 was adopted...Representative Fleck, for what purpose do you arise?"

Fleck: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not clear but if that motion is made and it isn't made the same day that the original motion was, doesn't it have to be in writing and appear on the calendar?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Boyle."

Boyle: "Well I'd like to raise the same...the same objection, it's not the same day and was Amendment #6 a voice vote or..."

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, it was a voice vote."

Boyle: "Well, how do we know he voted on the prevailing side on a voice vote. There's no Roll Call and I object."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I could in this instance bring to Representative Boyle two points. First of all I would not question his word and secondly, as a matter of fact when that Roll Call, voice vote was taken I immediately turned to Representative next to me, having said aye and said 'My God, what did we just pass, we're against that' and I immediately went to several Representatives including at least one on your side of the aisle and he agreed with me that since the Bill was going to be held on Second for Amendments 10 and 11 that if we could at that time make the motion if I would offer alternative to you, Sir, if the Speaker will not accept my motion, I will then ask to be recognized for a motion to table Amendment 6."

Speaker Redmond: "Now you're cooking with gas. The correction motion is the motion to table. Representative Duff on the motion to



table."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I hereby make a motion..."

Speaker Redmond: "...the Chairman wants to get going here at 6:30, it is now 5:30."

Duff: "...Well Mr. Speaker, the skill of the opposition is admirable, sir, but being undaunted, I would like to at this time move to table Amendment #6 to House Bill 1934."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Boyle."

Boyle: "Well Mr. Speaker, is he the sponsor of Amendment #6?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know whether he is or not. Rule 66 says an Amendment adopted on a voice vote may be tabled by a motion and that's what we are proceeding under."

Boyle: "Alright, well that was my next question."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Well Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I've never known of a Member tabling another Member's Amendment when that other Member was in attendance. That Amendment was offered by myself and adopted in Committee and again, offered to this Body on the House floor and adopted by this Body. I've never know in the six years that I've been here that any other Member could table an Amendment that has been offered and adopted in the orderly fashion of the rules of this House."

Speaker Redmond: "Shame on Mr. Duff. Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The Lady has moved the previous question. The question is shall the main question be put. All in favor say aye, opposed no, the ayes have it. Representative Duff to close on the motion to table Amendment #6."

Duff: "Well Mr. Speaker, I don't want to belabor the point, there are Members on this House floor that agree with this rule..."

Speaker Redmond: "...Representative Barnes, for what purpose do you rise?"

Barnes: "Well I raise a point of order, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I may be out of line, if I am, say so. But how can we



determine on a voice vote who voted on the prevailing side? Now that's the..."

Speaker Redmond: "...that's the reason the motion to table is in order rather than the motion to reconsider. This is not a motion to reconsider. In order to do that, you have to have been voted upon the prevailing side and have a record vote. But if it's a voice vote, then the motion is a motion to table."

Barnes: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Rule 62(b). Last sentence. Representative Duff."

Duff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I had no idea that were such parliamentary skills available and I'm delighted to see it in spite of the difficulty and I am delighted that we are able to get at this final point so that we can get a Roll Call on this item. I pointed out, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that this Amendment was adopted last night where many many Members were not really conscious of it. We were all moving fast, it was one of the very last items on the agenda. I will..."

Speaker Redmond: "...Representative Fleck."

Fleck: "Mr. Speaker, isn't a motion to lay on the table non-debateable?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's just explaining what he's doing here.

Let him finish, let him finish, please."

Duff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Once again, I pointed out that this Amendment was adopted without the House floor being...paying much attention. I pointed out that many Members of the oral Roll Call shouted aye without a total consciousness of the particular item. I noted that many Members have suggested to me that it should be tabled and should never have been adopted. I further pointed out that the reason for that was because the Senate had already reduced this office by \$150,000. I further pointed out that the disparity between this and the prosecution office is great, that the mandated programs, both by statute and by the United States Supreme Court have increased the responsibilities of this office enormously. I think, to avoid a conference on this point, when we go back to the Senate, and they see that we have added another \$71,000 reduction to their substantial \$152,000 reduction, we will be in conference



and have yet another vote on this. I would sincerely believe that this is a very legitimate point and that this Amendment should be tabled. I would be happy to answer questions if it is appropriate."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion to table Amendment #6. Those in favor vote aye, opposed vote no. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, is it...was Representative Barnes the sponsor of the Amendment even though his motion to table is not debatable, I think in fairness to the sponsor of the Amendment, we should have heard from both sides, although looking at the board I don't think Eugene Barnes needs any help, so I'll withdraw what I said."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Well Mr. Speaker (tape trouble)."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes. Have all voted who wished?"

Barnes: "Well Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think the vote is right so I won't go into a long speal. But I'm just saying I'd like for the Membership to know that this Bill had a full hearing in Committee, it was discussed fully on the House floor, the Amendment was adopted in Committee and the Amendment should stay on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think that it is not entirely accurate to say that this Bill had a full hearing in Committee in which this Amendment..."

Speaker Redmond: "...Representative Fleck, for what purpose do you rise? Representative Fleck, for what purpose do you rise?"

Fleck: "I thought the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes, was given leave because he was the sponsor of the Bill to give an explanation of the other side when Mr. Duff gave his explanation, are we going to be explaining our votes on these?"

Speaker Redmond: "I didn't hear...I have no way of knowing for what purpose Representative Barnes arose or Representative Catania



arose, but if they arise for the improper purpose, why there's..."

Fleck: "...I would suggest the Lady from Cook, or the Gentlelady from Cook is out of order, she's going to be debating..."

Speaker Redmond: "...I hate to agree with you and I'm not going to do it and I'm not going to do it for thirty seconds, but thirty seconds from now, I will agree with you. The Gentleman's motion fails. Take the record. Take the record. On this question there's 26 ayes, and 85 noes and the Gentleman's motion fails and I'd like to report that this last half hour has been time very well spent. Any other Amendments? Let's see, we're on Amendment #13. Amendment #13 was tabled. Any further Amendments? No further Amendments. Third Reading. House Bills' Third Reading appears House Bill 3318. Representative Hanahan. Representative Hanahan?"

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 3318. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections 3, 4, and 6 and to add Section 4(a) to the Minimum Wage Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Scouts and skirmishes out. Representative Hanahan,"

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave to have House Bill 3318 returned to the order of Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any objections? Hearing none, we will return to the order of Second Reading."

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #4. Hanahan. Amend House Bill 3318, as amended, in paragraph 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Amendment #4 is an Amendment that I discussed yesterday and thought was part of Amendment #2 and that is in the Minimum Wage Law on the time and one half provision for the motion picture theatres that those employees who are not covered under the federal Act that they would receive time and one half after forty-five hours in a work week. I move for adoption of Amendment #4."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #4. Representative Geo-Karis."



Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, will the sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan for a question."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Sponsor, correct me if I'm wrong, but didn't we pass a like Amendment the other day?"

Hanahan: "Yes, the language wasn't in the Amendment. I knew what I'd ordered from the Reference Bureau, but the language was not in the Amendment and this..."

Geo-Karis: "...well what language..."

Hanahan: "...the time and one half provisions for the motion picture theatres was not in the written Amendment. It was in my head and I had told the Reference Bureau to type it up that way, but they overlooked it in the typing of Amendment #2 so this just corrects Amendment #2 into the form that I had talked about yesterday in adopting Amendment #2."

Geo-Karis: Okay, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is on the Gentleman's motion on the adoption of Amendment #4. All those in favor say aye. Opposed no. The ayes have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments? No further Amendments. Third Reading. 3313."

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 3313..."

Speaker Redmond: "...Representative Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you rise?"

Geo-Karis: "Inasmuch as this Amendment is a new Amendment that I have to refer to 3318, then what happened to the other one that wasn't correct?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan, we have an inquiry here on 3318."

Hanahan: "Yes Amendment #2 is correct, it didn't go as far as I agreed for it to go and it was deficient that this language was left out and I just added this language. Representative Jones called me from the hospital over it and it was at his request that the added language was added."

Speaker Redmond: "What was that? Phantom language? Representative Ryan."



JUN 15 1976

66.

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 3313. A Bill for an Act to amend Section 24 of an Act to provide for in relation to counties. Third Reading of the Bill."

Ryan: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I would like to have leave to take this back for purposes of an Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: Is there any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted."

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #1. Ryan. Amend House Bill 3313, page 4, line.."

Speaker Redmond: "...Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "This is a technical Amendment that inserts language that is presently in the Act, it was left out in the drafting of the Bill and I would move for the adoption."



Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #1 to House Bill 3313. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments? No further Amendments, Third Reading. House Bills, Second Reading, appears House Bill 3417.

Clerk Selcke: "House Bill 3417, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Department of Transportation for expenditure by the Division of Water Resources. Second Reading of the Bill. Seventeen Committee Amendments. Apparently, Committee Amendment #1 was tabled in Committee. Committee Amendment #2 amends House Bill 3417 on page 1, line 17, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment #2 is a departmental Amendment just changing within the General Revenue Fund figures in order to come up with the exact amounts in the line items that can be done. There are no changes in the dollar amounts, and I move the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The question's on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #2. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendments 3 and 4 tabled in Committee. Committee Amendment #5 amends the House Bill 3417 on page 9 by deleting lines 8 through 18."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Amendment #5 . . . may I just start out here, this is not my Amendment, it was a Committee Amendment. The . . . so everyone knows what Amendment #5 is, this is a controversial, Middle-Fork deletion Amendment; and I would like to say this, that there has been, as we all know, a lot of controversy, a lot of emotionalism involved around this project. I would like to say that there are other things involved here with the people from the area of Vermilion County and Champaign County here to want to look ahead and down the pike, to provide an adequate source of water supply



for their people, and the reservoir is a project that is, not just a new one that was spawned on the Rock here recently, it has been developed since, I think, 1967. I see, through Governor Kerner, through Governor Ogilvie and now through Governor Walker. I would like to say that we have to take this kind of attitude in looking ahead for our water resources. We, in northeastern Illinois, who stand right on the shores of the greatest water supply in the World of Lake Michigan, find that 15 miles away from us there are communities without water. I think the people there in Danville and Vermilion Counties are to be complemented on going ahead to provide for their citizens in order to increase a potential, industrial development down there and not just come up with a source of water that may be good for only 10 or 20 years; but for one that will provide them a good and pure source of water for 50 years. This does, incidently, contain some flood control benefits. There are approximately 17 percent of flood control benefits that will be derived here from the Middle Fork. I would like to say that the department and I would oppose the adoption of Amendment #5."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I offered Amendment #5 in Committee based on a number of reasons. We spent in excess of probably three or four hours, maybe as many as six, on the Middle-Fork Reservoir project. I think through the hearings that we had in Committee and along with the . . . my colleague from the 5th District, Representative Williams, we heard testimony in Committee that to the best of my knowledge I believe it was Doctor Eisel, who runs Water Resources, that there were no flood control benefits to the project. There may be some, but very limited. This project has been put forth for the reasons of a water supply. There have been studies to prove that now, after two or three years later, there is no, in fact, need for a new water supply; and if there was a need for a new water supply, there are two or three alternate methods for a water supply for \$1,000,000 or \$2,000,000 (says, '\$1,000,000 or \$2') . . . Mr.



Speaker, could we have a little order, please? . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "I'll try. Give the Gentleman order."

Leverenz: ". . . I suggest that we should look as far as the Cost Benefit Study that was produced. I suggest to the Members of the House that the Cost Benefit Study may include things that are not really there that could be produced. For example, an item of \$6,000,000 of private investors' money. If that be true, we are possibly about to make a Lake Geneva in the middle of the State of Illinois; and I question why we should then build a reservoir, and they have not appropriated any money to run the pipe from the reservoir to the town, and they not have . . . they have not provided the money to relocate over 300 homes out of the area that will probably be then devastated by the project, and that I don't know that there has been a local sponsorship agreement finally completed. I propose with another Amendment to take the money here, which I personally classify as a want, and put it into very needy projects, flood control. I think here we have to also, as the earlier Representative discussed, I talked about fiscal responsibility, this is a 5.5 Amendment, which stands for first year funding. The total the State of Illinois would plow into this project is \$25,000,000. When we take money out of General Revenue to pay for these bonds, we are indeed talking about how you people here want to mortgage the General Revenue Funds of the State of Illinois. This Amendment was adopted in Committee very easily. The Department of Water Resources, the proponents to the Middle Fork could not justify the water resource, and to that end, I'm open for any questions with regard to the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Coffey."

Coffey: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to speak in favor of this Amendment. I would, first of all, like to point out that the last Speaker that had . . . I'm speaking against the Amendment, I'm sorry . . . I'd like to point out the last Speaker was saying there was some 300 homes in the Middle-Fork Reservoir area that was going to be . . . that hadn't . . ."



where there had been no plans to . . . to take care of these homesites; but on the . . . if the Gentleman that had just spoken had taken the tour or knew the area well enough, that there's not 300 homes in the area, first of all. So I think there has been . . . in many cases there has been some misgiven information on this whole project. The citizens of the City of Danville have voted in favor of a referendum to tax themselves for this project. All of our letters from our constituents in the area, which some of my colleagues have mentioned that they don't feel that the citizens of Danville or the Vermilion Countys is in favor of this Middle Fork, but I think that our mail and we know our constituents well enough that the . . . they are in favor of the Middle Fork and there is certainly a . . . a great need, not only for water supply, but for recreation in many other areas in the Vermilion County. I would also like to point out that one of things that was mentioned earlier, that there was some misguidance given by one of the Legislators in a neighboring district in a letter that was put out to each one of the Legislators here on the floor that there was . . . the project would take 5,400 acres of prime farmland out of production with this alternate water source for Danville. First of all, this individual that put this letter out to each one of you people here on the floor, have also . . . should've also took a few minutes out of their time and went to the project site, and if they knew anything about agriculture land, they will soon see that there's not 5,400 acres of farm, agriculture land to be taken out of production. I've been . . . I've dealt with agriculture farmland all of my life, and I've been brought up in that . . . I was born in that community; and I know that this land is . . . there's a lot luft . . . rough terrain, there is a few acres of farm, tillable ground that will be taken out of production, but nothing in the amount of 5,400 acres; and I would just like to point out that there's been so many things that have been said about this project that has been not . . . that has not been true, and that we certainly need this project. The . . . I think it is fiscally responsible.



I think it's a project that needed, not only for the 53rd District, but the neighboring area; and I would just like to point these things out to you, and thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell. Give the Gentleman order, please. Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I agree wholeheartedly with what the last Speaker said with the exception that we want a 'no' vote on this Amendment. I'll make that very clear by the time that I've finished my statements. First of all, since I've been a Member of this General Assembly in 1963, this is the first time, and I've seen a lot of things happen, but it is the first time that I've ever seen a Member of this Legislature try to gut the funds out of another district that doesn't concern him and try to put those funds in his own district. Now, if that's going to be the game strategy of this General Assembly, then I can say to you in the future there's going to be the damnest set of bookkeeping that you ever saw, and there's going to be a complete lack of cooperation in this General Assembly and future General Assemblies if we adopt this policy. Personally, I've voted for practically every flood control project for the northeastern Illinois since I've been a Member, which results in millions and millions of dollars, and as most of you know on this House floor that there is no local contribution concerning those. Let me give you . . . could I have a little order, Mr. Speaker? . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman order, please."

Campbell: ". . . let me give you a brief and a very brief history of the Middle-Fork Reservoir. In 1965, a feasibility study in the amount of \$30,000 was asked for in this General Assembly, and passed and adopted. In 1966, after we found out that the feasibility study was going to recommend the building of the Middle-Fork Reservoir, we had a referendum in Vermilion County, which passed overwhelmingly five to two, for the enactment or organization of the Vermilion County Conservation District. One of the main ideas that everybody voted on in that county at that



time, they knew that that was to promote and to help organize the Middle-Fork Reservoir. In 1967, this General Assembly appropriated \$1,650,000 for the acquisition of the land; and at that time, the City of Danville in Vermilion County had agreed to go with the Middle-Fork Reservoir, rather than alternative plans. You cannot wait until you get into the crisis period to do something about it. As late as 1975 in December after the Governor had put a stipulation on saying that, 'The City of Danville should purchase the water or the water rights to the reservoir', we had a referendum on December the 18th. This was when 92 percent of all referendums were failing in the United States. The people voted three to two to appro. . . to give to the state 3.15 million dollars of local tax money. That in addition to 1.25 million from the Conservation District for a total local contribution of 4.4 million dollars. This project has been supported by four Governors, namely, Otto Kerner, Sam Shapiro, Dick Ogilvie and Dan Walker. Now, regarding some of the gross statements that have been made concerning the reservoir, one of which has been that it's a wonderful canoeing area, the Illinois Canoeing Guide suggests it's not fit for canoeing during the summer months. As previously stated about the prime farmlands that have been taken out of existence, this is absolutely not true because these were submarginal lands from the very beginning. I can point out to you a number of gross inaccuracies and have prepared a sheet on it pertaining to the staff report. One of the statements made there is that the Corp of Engineers rejected this project. The Corp of Engineers rejected the . . . the Vermilion Basin, but they did not reject the Middle-Fork Reservoir. It was not a flood control project to begin with. Now, let me give you some of the reasons why that this is a good feasible and sound project, and it's a case where people are trying to help themselves, and this being a deliberative Body, I would hope that you would listen to some of these reasons and arguments. First place, this is now in capital bonding. As I mentioned before, for flood control projects there is no local commitment. There's



any number of capital bonding projects of this state which have as little as a 5 percent local commitment. This commitment for needed water supply is almost 22 percent, and is not water supply as great a need as sewage treatment and flood control? There has already been a precedent established by this General Assembly when we had the late Kincaid project, which is a parallel to this one. We in this General Assembly have also heard of the misuse and abuse of eminent domain. Since the commitment was made in 1967 to the Middle-Fork Reservoir, is it fair to those landowners, whose lands that we've taken for the purpose for a reservoir, not to build it? We also talk about costly projects to enact to keep people downstate and to keep them out of the densely populated areas up north. This costs many millions of dollars, as you well know; and I can tell you there's no better way to keep those young people at home and also . . . if you have job opportunity and continued growth and also recreation. I want to mention to you one other thing, the costs on this have risen to \$35,000,000. I can tell you that this was not our intent in the first place, this includes any number of projects concerning . . . concerning wildlife areas for the Department of Conservation. So what we're basically talking about is the \$19,000,000 commitment to the Middle-Fork Reservoir of which \$3,500,000 have already been expended, and it would take only 14.6200 dollars to complete. In 1967, as I said to you before, the commitment was made. We got our orders at that time, and this is the way that we have decided to go. The alternative plans are only 25-year plans, and this is a 50-year plan or more. So I say to you Members of the General Assembly honor this commitment to the people of Vermilion County, who have been trying to help themselves, by voting 'no' on this Amendment. Let us have the needed water supply, then all of you and the rest of the people of the State of Illinois come and enjoy the recreation benefits therefrom. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hirschfeld."

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



I'm sure I'm not the one that the distinguished Gentleman referred to who said I want to take the money from his district and take it back to mine; but as I've been down here six years now, I'm reminded in the Old Testament, Book of Ecclesiastes, which says, 'All things have their season, and there's a time to plant and a time to reap that which was planted', and for the six years I've been down here, the people that have pushed these pork-barrel projects have planted many a reservoir throughout the State of Illinois, or at least the seeds; and I see no reason for this General Assembly to allow them to perpetuate that by reaping millions and millions of dollars in a year we can ill-afford it. Now, the simple fact of the matter is, if you heard the testimony in the Committee or read it in the newspaper, Danville does not need a water supply. It's just that simple. They may not need it until the year 2000. So the only way they can justify this is with recreation; and it seems to me there's a lot more to be done with farmland, whether it's 5,400 acres, or 54 acres, or 5.4 acres or any other amount, there's a lot more to be done with water and with farmland than motorboating and water-skiing. I'm 100 percent opposed to this reservoir, not because it's Middle Fork, but because I'm opposed to all these reservoirs. It seems to me the Corp of Engineers or, as I've called them on this floor before, the Corp of Beavers have nothing else to do but run around the State of Illinois with the Wabash Valley Authority and others building reservoirs. Now, I think you people should know what's really at stake here. You've got a lot of people who are buying land up very, very cheaply, a couple of hundred dollars an acre, and along comes the Corp of Engineers that has eminent domain right, of course, and they condemn the land, and they pay very, very dearly, and then these entrepreneurs take that money, turn around and invest it in good farmland, and it's all tax free. Now, I think it's time we stop that, I don't care whether it's Helm, or Rend Lake, or Louisville, or Oakley, or Middle Fork or even Shelbyville, if it were coming up today, which has proved to be a disaster, I might add. These reservoirs have



got to stop. There is better ways of recreation. What Vermillion County is trying to do now is drag Champaign County into it and say, 'Well, we're going to provide recreation for Champaign County'; well, to set the record straight, I want you to know that my mail is running over 500 to 1 from Champaign County against the Middle-Fork Project. There are better ways of recreation than taking land out of use and putting it in another reservoir. I think all things have had their season. I think it's time we stop logrolling these water projects up and down the State of Illinois; and with all due respect to those that are opposed to Amendment, I think we should support this Amendment and get rid of the Middle-Fork Project once and for all."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "I wonder if the Sponsor would respond to a couple of questions? Teddy, my colleague from the 5th District, my understanding is that if you delete this \$5,500,000 from this Bill that by Amendment #17 you then want to take about \$1,500,000 and use it in our district for flood relief on Addison Creek, is that correct?"

Leverenz: "Let me answer that and add to that, Eddie, previously I was criticized for gutting a Member's project, and in answer to your question, taking that amount of money . . . Mr. Speaker, could I have some order? . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman order."

Bluthardt: "Let's not interrupt . . . Teddy's show, please."

Leverenz: ". . . and putting that money into my own district projects, I respond both to the previous Speaker and yourself in that in Committee I offered the program of taking the 5.5 out of a recreational project, which I don't think the state goes around buying for people, into four . . . four flood control projects in eleven Legislative Districts, and that Amendment did not make it. I then proposed, and I believe you pointed it out correctly, Amendment #17, and the Members of the Committee agreed with me that we should return \$1,600,000 of that to the Addison Creek Project for the reason that that was what the state promised us in January',



when the State of Illinois, specifically the Department of Water Resources, chased Representative Williams and myself all over . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman order, please."

Bluthardt: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would object to the long response.

I asked for an answer that simply could be answered 'yes' or 'no'."

Leverenz: ". . . not true."

Bluthardt: "One other . . ."

Leverenz: "I think you deserve a full explanation."

Bluthardt: ". . . one more question. If . . . if this Amendment succeeds, and I think it's only proper that it does, and by Amendment #17 we in the 5th District and suburban Cook County will be getting some of that money that the downstaters took away from our school districts under . . . under the Jaffe Bill, which you supported; and I think that's only right and proper, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Well, I think you're wrong there, but I do believe that it, too, was an insult to the Sponsor of the Bill, Representative Williams, that the Department of Water Resources, after promising he, and myself and others that we would receive 3.4 million dollars for the Addison Creek, that they come back with a line item for \$1,800,000. I thought that was wrong, too, and that's why I put on the other Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, following the Gentleman from Champaign County in this matter, is kind of like following the horses in a parade. Downstaters . . . downstaters should never join in such a shameless effort to divert the money that we're entitled to to another section of the state. The only thing of value that's involved in this particular case is the solemn word and honor of the State of Illinois as given to the people of east central Illinois by the Governor of this state. It's a matter of record that about eight months ago his excellency, Governor Walker, went into the Danville community with the trumpets blaring and had announced



for all mankind to hear that the State of Illinois was going to build Middle Fork; and well he had a right to make that guarantee to those people because it's been pointed out for others since 19 . . . since the 74th General Assembly, every General Assembly of the State of Illinois has committed, has committed this state to that construction. You have no right to tell people in such solemnity that you're going to do something and then just say, 'We've changed our minds and going to take it elsewhere'. The offense is exactly as been pointed out before in regard to the offer of this Amendment. He seeks to divert the money that has been pledged . . . promised to these people to have. I wish that you folks could've been to the Committee hearing that took place on this. You wouldn't have believed what happened. We had a very estimable gentleman, Director Eisel, there, and the misinformation was everywhere; the environmentalists ran rampant, when the shouting and tumult died, we found that east central Illinois and Vermilion County had been shafted. Now, the Director couldn't remember anything that he had been told about this. He had put out a very . . . a very commendable sheet that outlined in some detail the justification for the project. He pointed out in that sheet, but he'd forgot it when it came time to testify, that the long-range need for water in the Vermilion County area was 25,000,000 barrels . . . gallons, excuse me, a day, and that the capacity of the present source of something like 10,000,000 gallons, that the capacity of the new reservoir would meet that long-range need. He pointed out in his sheet that the Department of Conservation estimated that they would lure in to us in the millions, 2.7 was their projection, and that the profits would mean many, many millions to the community. Everyone rubbed their hands and said, 'Well, this is a good business deal for the whole State of Illinois'; but then all at once a newspaper in Chicago came out with an editorial. A shameless hour, the . . . I think the name of the paper was the Sun Times, and if you read their article, when it got through, all in the name of God it said was that these people are too far



from State and Madison to be entitled to any state money. Now, basically, that's wrong. You know it's wrong, and you can't support that type of proposition. The main argument that they have against the construction of the project is that there's no federal participation. You have no right to penalize these people just because they haven't been able to get a state . . . federal grant. That'll come along. We ask you to keep faith with five General Assemblies, with the judges that have . . . with the Governors that have pledged the word of this state, make their word good in this matter. You have no right to destroy the hopes and aspirations of so large a section of the . . . of the State of Illinois. Any downstate Legislator who votes against this project deserves to have any project that he ever offers crushed in center and any Cook County Legislator who has a conscience will vote 'no' on this Amendment in the name of justice."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider. He's back there with his colleague, Representative Gene Hoffman."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is a rather sophisticated Amendment because what we're dealing with over a long period of time has been a serious problem that we got into the momentum of building reservoirs and dams, and now we have a habit that is difficult to break. I think we ought be very conscious of the fact that, not only is this financially going to be a problem for us over the next couple of fiscal years, but that the element that we really have to deal with is whether or not we're conscientiously concerned about the nature of the land we are trying to save in Illinois. There are very few areas that remain in our state that are pure and maintain such a natural state as the Middle-Fork area. Therefore, those of us who are concerned about that, I would ask that you support the Amendment, not only to save money, but to make a new kind of commitment and a new kind of ambitious drive for saying that Illinois still has rivers that are worthy of salvation, rather than trying to buy the notion that the Corp of Engineers is going to be the ultimate determiner of the way our land is used. So I solicit an 'aye' vote."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it. Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. We've heard arguments on both sides of this issue. I don't think the program or the Department of Water Resources is just flood control. We have a responsibility also here to future water resources and water supply. In answer to some of the questions that I've heard, there is a very great potential for some federal money coming into this, actually through the Department of Conservation; as much as 50 percent of their cost actually could be reimbursed through the Federal Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. I heard one of my colleagues from Champaign was quoting the Bible, and I'd like to also quote the Bible. I'm from northeastern Illinois, but certainly our brethren from southern and central Illinois are also deserving of a good water supply, and as the Bible said, 'Whatsoever you do to the least of my brethren, you do also unto me'. So again I would emphasize this does not take away any money from the flood control projects for northeastern Illinois or any other part of the state; and let me point out to you that in every one of these projects, everyone of us in the State of Illinois is involved because a drop of water that falls in my district in the 5th ends up down at the Gulf of Mexico. We're all involved in this; and I urge a 'no' vote on this Amendment #5."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Craig. Representative Deavers. No, pardon me, the ques . . . the question is on the Gentleman's motion . . . Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Mr. Speaker, do I have a right to close on my Amendment?"

Speaker Redmond: "I thought Representative Williams was . . . I thought it was his Amendment. The question's on the Gentleman's motion . . . who is the Chair . . . the Sponsor of the Amendment? Committee



Amendment? Representative . . . well, then we had two people to close. Representative Leverenz to close the second time."

Leverenz: "Well, I suggest we may be closing on opposite sides here; but very simply there, again, was no reason given in Committee for a water source. I suggest the farmland that was purchased could be sold back at the original price. I don't think it's an upstate versus downstate because there may be a few people upstate that will be voting red on this; and I suggest to you that we are not living in the past, what started in 1967. The state has a new financial picture that we have to deal with. I ask for your support in the adoption of this Amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #5. All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Craig."

Craig: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, there's been much said about this and about the letters and about the people that you have seen, and the letters and the people that have called out here in the Gallery, has called out here . . . the Legislators, and the Legislators in that district have been talked to by these people for the last six or eight years, and they are a group of people which were opposed to the election that they held in Danville Illinois this last December, and that election carried 63 to 37 percent, 63 percent to raise their taxes and 37 against this reservoir project; and there's been already about \$1,500,000 . . . \$2,000,000 . . . \$1,500,000 to \$2,000,000 of local money put into this, as well as \$1,500,000 . . . \$3.15 million that they voted in the bond issue . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Will you please give the Gentleman order?"

Craig: ". . . raised here in . . . in December. Now, I've served down here for 22 years, and when this project was first taken out of this Bill, I believe that I've voted for as many projects in this General Assembly in the 22 years, I suppose, unless there's about three or four ahead of me in seniority, for McCormick Place, for Chicago Transit, R.T.A., four civic centers in downstate, Rend



Lake, Crab Orchard Lake, all the rest of the universities in the State of Illinois; and I'll . . . to get started with the University of Illinois, if you please, these are the professors that have been going around, a lot of 'em here, pigeonholing legislators against this project. It kind of bothers me for the Champaign County to try to tell Vermilion what we ought to do; and there wasn't anyone that even heard about the Middle Fork 'til this project started; and I want to say this, maybe we ought to be taking some money away from Vermilion . . . from Champaign's University of Illinois to help keep these professors at home and doing what they ought to be doing. Now, by the consulting engineers of Henry, Meisenheimer, Gendi, which made a study. They said in summary, 'We are of the opinion that the pro . . . proposed Middle-Fork Reservoir is a feasible and desirable alternative for solving the water supply problems of the greater Danville region. Costs indicated are not unreasonable. They're compared similar to installation in the state and elsewhere. The proportionate share requested of the city for water supply is no less than comparable costs for connecting a water supply'; and they talk about prime farmland. Last December they was buying farm . . . this farmland that they've been calling prime farmland for the tune of \$350 and \$50 to \$75 an acre. Anyone of you know that you can't buy prime farmland at no price like that; and this . . . the farmland that is farmed and it is tillable, certainly is not anyway near prime farmland; and I urge a 'no' vote on this because this is something that every candidate that's running for office on both tickets has . . . all of them but one has come out for this project wholeheartedly for this particular project. Now, this is a small group and I've faced them and this is funny to me that the Legislators in the 53rd District, there's not a one of them that have yielded to this particular . . . these particular environmentalists. So I say I want . . . I appreciate some more 'no' votes. I thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

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



explaining my vote, I'd say that a few years ago in my life I was involved in a lobbying effort to try and continue construction of a project. It happened to be a project like this, it was carefully planned, it had been developed for many years. It happened to be the supersonic transport, and the Russians and the English and the French were doing the same thing, and we had a carefully laid American plan that was going forward, but then some envir . . . some environmentalists came down to Capitol Hill and they said, 'Oh, the supersonic transport will cause breast cancer, it'll cause all sorts of things, and a lot of noise, you'd better drop it'. So our Congress listened to the environmentalists, and what we've done is cause a considerable amount of the aviation industry to go overseas as a result. I think we must be very careful when we listen to the environmentalists who come down and lobby. Now, I told the environmentalists who have been in my office and out in the hall and all over that I would give this very careful thought and consider it. Up in the Chain of Lakes as representative I . . . are represented by Representatives Pierce, and Matijevich, and Geo-Karis, and Griesheimer and some of us who are not powerful Legislators, we have a puny amount of money, \$250,000 to do some dredging; and we know that many people up there think that dredging isn't a good idea, that it's gonna' disturb the dirt and everything; but nonetheless, we thought it was a carefully thought out project and we're going forward with it. So I think you should be careful, and cautious and not listen to somebody who's down here telling you about a project, especially where the people of the area in a referendum have carefully considered that subject and had an honest vote, I presume it was an honest vote, and overwhelmingly supported the project. I think we ought to respect the integrity and the intelligence of the people of this district where this project is involved; and I'm happy to vote 'no' on this Amendment, and I encourage your 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. It may seem that



. . . a Legislator from Chicago would have no interest in this matter; but many of us do because we are painfully aware of the diminishing inventory of natural resources in our state; and it seems to me that at one point or another, we must say, 'Halt', we must say that, 'This must stop', and that we've got to keep this terrain, this water in its natural state because to go any further is going to turn our state into a sea of cement and a sea of bridges; and I don't think we can afford it, and I'm not speaking only from the dollar point of view. I'm speaking from the point of view of our sanity. I recently drove through that part of the State of Illinois where the Middle Fork is located. It's beautiful, beautiful terrain for those of you who have not seen it. I think we ought to preserve it and let the dam builders go elsewhere, but preserve this remaining piece of environmental beauty. We need it there. Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lauer."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, once again we come to that situation of the midget in the nudist colony. This time it's the rabbit environmentalists that are running around, sticking their noses in everybody's business. The Gentleman before quoted the good Book and said, 'That which you do to the least of these, you do unto me', but I am moved to quote the good Book and say, 'They toil not, neither do they spend'. The environmentalists, unfortunately, do not pay the bill. They simply running around . . . they run around looking for things to preserve. Conservation is the wise use and reuse of the natural resources; but the environmentalists wish to preserve it like a fly encased in amber. You can't even use it if we would let these idiots have their way; it is unfortunate, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that so much sound and fury has been generated by these nonproductive, empty-headed idealists that wouldn't recognize reality if they'd hit them in the face with a baseball bat. I strongly suggest a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the debate on



this issue took many hours in the Appropriation's Committee. At that point both sides had their opportunity to present their case in full; and I wish to remind you that this is an Amendment that was accepted by the Appropriation's Committee. The people who were there and sat through those hours of debate made a rash in judgment that the project did not have as much merit as was justifiable for spending this amount of state money. It was clearly brought out in those discussions that the dam had only two purposes. One for water supply for Danville, the other for recreation. Danville has said they will take the obligation for the water supply expenditures; but the water supply expenditures that they have taken the obligation for do not even include pipeline to get that water to the City of Danville. The state at this point can not afford to have another \$5,500,000 of bonded indebtedness this year and many, many more millions of dollars of bonded indebtedness in the years to come to finish this project. It is a good recreational area as it now stands. It is a beautiful area; it is full of wild flowers, wild birds, endangered species of fish that are found no where else in Illinois. We will be ruining a number of the advantages of that area by providing that area with a dam. If we want to make . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew, for what purpose do you arise?"

McGrew: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

McGrew: "According to the House rules, she has 60 seconds, and she has passed that many times over."

Speaker Redmond: "Pretty close. Bring your remarks to a close."

Satterthwaite: ". . . if the state really wants to invest in recreation in this area, the alternative is clearly presented to us by the Department of Conservation in a project to make a natural river park with far greater benefits for the dollars invested, and I suggest a 'yes' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all . . . Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to explain my vote. As testimony indicated in the



Appropriation's Committee, when the department brought this project before us as a recreational and as a water supply project, the argument regarding water supply as some Members have indicated here was entirely falacious. Water supply usage by the water company that is supplying the City of Danville has steadily decreased from 315 . . . well, from 3,000,000 gallons in 1967 to less than 282.8 million gallons in this present year. As the project stands before us now, it is an entirely recreational project, that the 5.5 million dollar appropriation will cost us 9.5 million dollars in debt service out of the General Revenue Fund in the ensuing years. The total project cost, and that which should concern everyone of us the most, out of \$19,000,000, will cost almost \$33,000,000 in debt service that's coming from the General Revenue Fund in ensuing years; that's over \$1,000,000 a year. That's money that could be used for education of our children, for payment of those needy under our welfare programs, and not for a project whose benefits are 95 . . . for recreational . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Bring your remarks to a close, your time is expiring."

Totten: ". . . thank you, Mr. Speaker; I urge an 'aye' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I didn't intend to speak on this Bill; but I see some funny things going on here. One of them is that the Representatives from Champaign County have both got up and spoke against this Bill. I don't know any place that's had better benefits from the taxes of the State of Illinois than Champaign County. I have voted over and over for questionable things that went to Champaign County and for projects for the University of Illinois. Not a single Member from Sangamon County is voting for this, and yet all three Members voted for a \$15,000 a car parking space across the street. Now, don't talk to me about saving money. Where are you guys? You want us to spend money in Springfield and Champaign, but none over in there. Now, let's be consistent around here. We're talking about a very small amount of money.



We're talking about millions of dollars in Springfield, we're talking about millions of dollars in Champaign, and you sit here and be bias and want to say, 'Let's save money'. It doesn't go over with me."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there's 73 'aye' and 78 'no' . . . Representative Skinner, for what purpose do you arise?"

Skinner: "Well, there's sure no way this is not going around without a call of the absentees and a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Downs, do you seek recognition?"

Downs: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like permission to be verified 'aye' now. I have a matter of emergency, and I have to catch a plane and I ask leave."

Speaker Redmond: "Is leave granted? Representative Downs is verified as 'aye'. Representative Washburn."

Washburn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before the poll of the absentees and the verification begins, we have with us this afternoon five very proud supporters of one of our Members who is not seeking reelection of this Body, and it's probably the last time that together at least they will have the opportunity to witness their favorite Legislator in action on this House floor, and in the Speaker's gallery there is Mrs. Brian Duff, Florence; sons, Brian, Jr., 16, Roddy, Ken, Kevin, 9, and Danny, 6. Would the proud Duff family please arise? We're happy to have you with us."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brinkmeier, do you seek recognition?"

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker, could I be verified at this time, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brinkmeier desires to be verified.

Any . . . verify Representative Brinkmeier as 'no'. Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "The same thing, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The same thing for Representative McGrew. Okay, call the . . . call the absentees. Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker, since we were courteous enough to verify three Members from that side of the aisle, may I be verified at this



moment? I have some constituents from out of the . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "From out of the district."

Dyer: ". . . from in the district."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? The Clerk . . . the Clerk suggests that we all go home. Any objections to verifying Representative Dyer? Okay, now the poll of the absentees."

Clerk Selcke: "Brandt, Capuzi, Davis, Hart, Hudson . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brandt. Representative Brandt is 'no'."

Clerk Selcke: ". . . Hudson, Emil Jones, Dave Jones, Kane, LaFleur, Madison, Maragos, Mulcahey, Mulcahey 'aye', Rayson, Rose, Schoeberlein, Stubblefield, Wall; that's it."

Speaker Redmond: "Fred, what's the score?"

Clerk Selcke: "The score is 74 'ayes' and 79 'nays'."

Speaker Redmond: "74 'ayes' . . . Representative Stubblefield."

Stubblefield: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stubblefield 'aye'. Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I've been waiting for 20 minutes, and I just wanted to make sure the electronics was still working."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I'm the verifier."

Speaker Redmond: "Was there . . . was there verification requested? The score now is 75 'yes' and 79 'no'."

Skinner: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Please proceed. Verify the affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk Selcke: "Anderson, Arnell . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lundy, for what purpose do you arise?"

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. A point of parliamentary inquiry. I thought our rules provided that the prevailing side was verified first?"

Speaker Redmond: "I thought the rules provided that the affirmative be verified first?"

Lundy: "I believe the rules used to provide that, but I think it was changed . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Well . . . it's prevailing, I understand. In 1959 it



was the other way. Verify the . . . availing the negative."

Clerk Selcke: ". . . J. M. Barnes, Beaupre, Birchler, Boyle, Bennett Bradley, Jerry Bradley, Brandt, Brinkmeier, Brummet, Campbell, Darrow, Choate, Coffey, Craig, Cunningham, Daniels, Deavers, Deuster, DiPrima, Domico, John Dunn, Ralph Dunn, Farley, Fleck, Flinn, Friedrich, Gaines, Garmisa, Giglio, Giorgi, Hanahan, Dan Houlihan, Huff, Jacobs, Katz, Keller, Klosak, Kornowicz, Kucharski, Lauer, Leon . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Laurino."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'present'."

Laurino: "I'd like to be recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'no'."

Clerk Selcke: ". . . Laurino, Leon, Lucco, Madigan, Matijevich, McAuliffe, McAvoy, McClain, McCourt, McGrew, McLendon, McMaster, McPartlin, Mudd, Nardulli, O'Daniel, Patrick, Polk, Pouncey, Randolph, Riccolo, Richmond, Ryan, Schisler, Sevcik, Sharp . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative LaFleur, for what purpose do you arise?"

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

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as being absent."

LaFleur: "Vote me 'no', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman 'no'."

Clerk Selcke: ". . . Shea, Stearney, Taylor, Terzich, Tipsword, Tuerk, Vitek, Von Boeckman, Washburn, White, Williams, Wolf, Younge and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the count?"

Clerk Selcke: "The count now is . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Londrigan, for what purpose do you arise?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from 'aye' to 'no'. Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Selcke: "74 'ayes' and 82 'nays'."

Speaker Redmond: "74 'ayes' and 82 'nays'. The motion fails. Okay, if



you want to ask some questions, go ahead?"

Skinner: "Well, it probably doesn't make any difference, but just for form's sake to make sure that Representative Hanahan is known to be on the Record on both sides, and usually I like to verify him."

Speaker Redmond: "Is he your colleague, Representative Hanahan?"

Skinner: "He's the one that told people in the district he was against a Middle Fork and in favor of it to the Danville . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed, proceed, proceed."

Skinner: ". . . Representative Daniels?"

Speaker Redmond: "Daniels is back in the aisle."

Skinner: "Representative Klosak?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's back in the aisle."

Skinner: "I'm sorry, but the aisle is so crowded I can't see what's . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "They're all in their seats, like the rules provide."

Skinner: ". . . yes, I know. Now, Representative Hudson, is he around?"

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Skinner: "Oh, he is? Maybe he wants to vote then. Representative Daniel Houlihan?"

Speaker Redmond: "D. L. Houlihan?"

Skinner: "D. L., like in Daniel, he's a good Houlihan."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Houlihan here? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Take . . . remove him from the Roll Call. Representative Hudson."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is Representative Hudson recorded?"

Clerk Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as being absent."

Hudson: "Vote me 'no', please."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the Gentleman 'no'."

Skinner: "Representative McPartlin?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPartlin? Take him off the Roll Call."

Skinner: "You got a pretty tight Roll Call there. Is Representative Sevcik here?"



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sevcik is there."

Skinner: "Well, how can I miss . . . how can I miss that shirt?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative D. L. Houlihan has returned. Put him back on the Roll Call. Any further?"

Skinner: "I think that they're on the floor, Mr. Speaker. Yeah, I give up."

Speaker Redmond: "No further questions. On this motion there's 74 'aye' and 82 'no'; and the motion fails. Any further Amendments?"



Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #6. Amend House Bill 3417, page 3, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the sponsor?"

Clerk Selcke: "Meyer."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. This is an Amendment offered on behalf of the Illinois Sportsmen Club and the Illinois Wildlife Federation. It removes any study that may be done prior to channelization of the Kankakee River and I move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #6. All in favor indicate by saying aye, opposed no. The ayes have it; the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendment?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendments #7, 8, and 9 were tabled in Committee.

Amendment #10. Amend House Bill 3417, as amended, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Where..."

Clerk Selcke: "#10."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment #10. Representative?"

Clerk Selcke: "Hart.:"

Speaker Redmond: "Hart. Representative Cunningham, for what purpose do you rise?"

Cunningham: "Well Mr. Speaker, number 9 was offered in the Committee, but my recollection was it had a tie vote offered by Representative O'Daniel and myself and we'd like to present it again at this time, Amendment #9, if you'll call it."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, do you have Amendment #9? We don't have it here."

Cunningham: "You mustn't make us the insurers of the system, we offered number 9 in Committee and that should be enough to get it up here on the floor."

Speaker Redmond: "The records show that it failed in Committee. We don't have it here."

Cunningham: "Well..."

Speaker Redmond: "Put it on in the Senate. Representative Lechowicz."

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



Amendment #9, which was offered in Committee, was defeated and it should not be offered on the floor at this time under any circumstances. He knows the rules as well as anyone else."

Speaker Redmond: "Represen...number 10. Representative Hart...and then Lechowicz?"

Lechowicz: "Well thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Committee Amendment #10 was offered in Committee by Representative Hart and it was pointed out to me just now by Representative Choate that he's absent because of illness in his family. I move for the adoption of Committee Amendment #10. This provides the dollar amounts that are necessary for various projects along the...I'll just read them to you...Kaskaskia River, Carlyle Dam, \$189,000. This is the State's share for the operation and maintenance cost as the local sponsor of the federal project. When this Amendment was offered in Committee, the Department agreed with the dollar amount and then, in turn, it provides for the Kaskaskia River, \$189,000; the Shelbyville Dam. at \$103,000; the Rend Lake Dam, \$251,000; Carlyle Dam, \$138,000. Again the Shelbyville Dam at the State share of construction as a local sponsor, \$216,000. The Rend Lake Dam, \$7000, and I move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any question? Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would just like to point out that I believe the Amendment is perhaps, if anything, premature insofar as the Department is in negotiation on this and although the idea is all right, I would have to oppose the Amendment at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "I wonder if the sponsor would yield, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Hirschfeld: "Representative, could you tell me what was spent on these projects last year, if anything?"

Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, I can't answer that question in detail."

Hirschfeld: "Well perhaps Representative Williams can."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "\$455,000."



Hirschfeld: "And what is the total this year?"

Williams: "This year we actually don't know because that's what is under negotiation and that's why at this time, I feel that this is premature for this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the sponsor of the Amendment yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Schlickman: "The line item totals...or the line item total approximately \$1,000,000. Is that correct?"

Lechowicz: "Yeah."

Schlickman: "And this is general revenue money?"

Lechowicz: "That is correct."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schisler."

Schisler: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, this Amendment is the Amendment that provides for funds so that there will be monies available on the State's contract with the federal government with the corp of engineers for the operation of facilities along these various lakes. It is true that this is under negotiation at this time for these various projects. However, the time is running out here in the General Assembly and it appears to me that we have to have something in this Bill that will provide for this when and if the negotiations are finally completed. At the start of the season on these various lakes, this year, this matter was in dispute as to how much the State felt it should pay under the existing contracts with the U. S. Corps of Engineers. Now when the dispute first arose or shortly after it first arose, I asked the Department to prepare an Amendment of this very nature and at that time they prepared an Amendment that was in a larger sum. The Amendment that is now offered by Representative Hart is a later Amendment prepared by the same Department indicating that they felt that this figure was more in line with what the...was under negotiation and what might be the possible results and so Representative Hart presented the Amendment. We have to have



something in this Bill to cover these negotiations when they are finally completed so that these facilities can operate. If the money is not provided there's a possibility that the facilities will not operate at the millions of visitors days that these recreation facilities upon these various lakes will simply be lost by virtue of the fact that they are shut down and the economy around each one of these projects will be severely, adversely, effected as will, therefore, the revenues of the State of Illinois from the sales tax and the gasoline taxes and all of the other revenues that will be coming from the visitors who flock to these areas from throughout the State of Illinois and from the surrounding States. I would urge that we adopt this Amendment. I think that it is maybe somewhat premature in the amount that the final negotiations may be, but it may not be. But a figure must be in there and this Bill still goes to the Senate, at least there will be a figure there and if the negotiations arrive at some figure at that time, they can be amended downward and I would urge very strongly the Members of this House to support this Amendment, adopt it so that there will be something from which these contracted costs to the federal government can be paid when the final figure is arrived at."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Committee Amendment #10 adds funds to support Carlyle, Shelbyville, and Rend Lake and the reservoir projects. It adds approximately \$683,000 for operation and maintenance costs that's out of general revenue and it adds \$361,000 out of C.D.B. for minor construction. As was pointed out by Representative Tipword, this money is a local money matching for federal funds. Now if you want to stop the project, these three projects down in Southern Illinois, three worthwhile projects, I might add, then vote no on Amendment #10. If you think these projects deserve the continued support of the State of Illinois and the federal government, I would strongly recommend an aye vote on Amendment #10."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion to adopt



Amendment #10. Those in favor say aye. Opposed, no. Those in favor vote aye. Opposed vote no. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 61 ayes and 50 no, and the motion prevails and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #11 was either lost or tabled in Committee.

Amendment #12. Skinner. Amend House Bill 3417, page 9, by deleting lines 25 through 28."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "This is such a biggie, I'm almost ashamed to present it to all the big spenders in the House. Throughout the Capitol Development Board debate, we've been asking questions like should we really borrow money for twenty-five years to paint picnic tables? Well in this case, what we are doing is borrowing money for twenty-five years to build a fence. And I just couldn't let that pass without offering an Amendment to take it out. And that's what it does, it suggests that if we have to build a fence, we'll pay it out of this year's money if, indeed, there's any left."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I agree with Representative Skinner, I believe this could be done under operation and maintenance and I move the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you ready for the question? The question is on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #12. All in favor say aye. Opposed, no. The ayes have it and the motion carries and the Amendment is adopted."

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #13. Amend House Bill 3417, page 9, and so forth. Meyer."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Mr. Speaker, this is an additional \$50,000 which provides money for a spillway at the North Girard Dam which was completed this year. It would provide a new spillway, this is supported by umpteen canoing people and it's the only dam that I know of in the State of Illinois that they support. I have twenty-two of them and I move for the adoption of Amendment #13."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I would have to oppose this Amendment on the basis it's really not budgeted, it's purely a recreational type of program, although I have empathy for the canoers who like to get around the dam without having to ford it, but at this time, I don't really feel this fits into the program of water resources or flood control for the State of Illinois and I would oppose this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what Representative Williams just pointed out to you is absolutely true, this Amendment now...I would hope that the Membership would know exactly what they are voting on. We're providing \$50,000 out of C.D.B. money as a canoe by-pass at the Aurora Dam. Now I know that many of us have read the paper and we've seen two major canoeing events transpire within the State of Illinois within the past month. One being on the DesPlaines River and the other being on this tributary. Unfortunately, I can't see the justification at this time to use C.D.B. money to provide \$50,000 canoe by-pass that is used once a year or twice a year. Canoeing is a sport that we all probably enjoy, but in turn, part of canoeing is also the sport of taking that canoe and actually having a walk or by-pass around an obstacle area. Unfortunately, this is not budgeted and I would hope that the Membership of this House would be more conservative in the expense of \$50,000 for a project of this note. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, when this project was proposed by Representative Schoeberlein several years ago, it was included in the budget, it was included in the original plans, there was some mix up and as a result rather than in a no-cost overrun, and it was money that was for this spillway, converted for other dredging projects and therefore it's just a conglomerate in the nature of a reappropriation although not a reappropriation."



Speaker Redmond: "Okay, ready for the question? The question is on the Gentleman's motion to adopt the Amendment 13. All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there's 14 'aye' and 51 'no'; and the Gentleman's motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendments 14, 15 and 16 either tabled or lost in Committee. Amendment #17, Leverenz, amends House Bill 3417 as amended and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment restores the amount of money that was promised to the Addison Creek Project; and I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I certainly would not oppose this Amendment since it does restore most of the funds for the Addison Creek Project, but I say I will not oppose this; but the next Amendment coming up actually contains the exact amount of dollars that will fit into the program that was agreed to by the rest of the municipalities . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz, for what purpose do you arise? Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: ". . . turn it on. Thank you. I believe that . . . that the Amendment would do the same as Amendment #1, which lost in Committee, and would be out of order as Amendment #18 . . ."

Speaker Redmond: "We're addressing ourselves to Amendment #17."

Leverenz: ". . . that's entirely true. I, again, move for the adoption of our Amendment that Representative Williams supported in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Would the Sponsor yield, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will. Representative Leverenz."

Ryan: "How much money in this Amendment?"

Leverenz: "\$1,650,000, I believe."

Ryan: "Thank you."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise now . . . I rise now to oppose Amendment #17. We've restored \$5,500,000 for the Middle Fork. We do have money in this present budget for Addison Creek; and I think at this time, that appropriation is sufficient to do what can be done this year, and this money should not be appropriated in this Bill as we do not have it. It can come later when that Addison Creek Project can be finished, and this Amendment should be defeated now."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just want to point out the fact that, and, Jack, I would hope you'd correct me if I'm wrong, that the Bill as it was submitted to the General Assembly calls for an expenditure of \$1,850,000 for the . . . for this project; and it was pointed out in Committee that you and Representative Leverenz worked very hard within the respective district in getting the support of the local municipalities in the county involved as far as this project for the Addison Creek Reservoir, and it was also pointed out in Committee that Doctor Eisel pointed out that this \$3,400,000 was the proper dollar amount; but he pointed out in Committee, as well, that in all justification for the total budget as it was submitted that this was the fair share that the state could afford at the present time of \$1,850,000. I, reluctantly, have to oppose the increase based upon the testimony that I heard in Committee, based upon the total budget as it was submitted; and, unfortunately, I have to vote 'no' on Amendment #17 in all fairness."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further? Representative Lechowicz to close. Representative Skinner."

Leverenz: "I just move for the adoption of the Amendment, Mr. Speaker. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner, do you seek recognition?"

Skinner: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully suggest to the Chairman of the Appropriation's Committee that we are past the point of considering what is fair. We certainly can defeat this Amendment



because Representative Leverenz has the guts enough to try to cut out a project that is totally unjustifiable from the benefit cost analysis' viewpoint; but if you want to put the money where the flooding is, into aid, that this is going to obviously be the last year of pork because there won't be any money after this year's budget passes. We might as well finish the job."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #17. All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there are 28 'aye' and 57 'no'; and the Gentleman's motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Selcke: "Amendment #18, Williams, amends House Bill 3417 on page 6 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

Amendment #18 now does include the funding for the way all of the flood control projects should be done. This adds the amount of dollars on an agreement that has been worked out with some 14 or 15 units of local government. We have signed agreements from municipalities of North Lake, Melrose Park, Stone Park, Bellwood, Elmhurst, Broadview, Westchester; townships of Addison and Leydon and the Addison Creek River Conservancy District, and negotiations are underway for more funding to come actually from the County of Cook and from the County of DuPage. What this will do is, incidently, this has a benefit cost ratio of somewhere anywhere between 5.6 to 10 to 1, the other part of this Amendment, which would add \$300,000 to the Bensenville ditch, the flood reduction plan for the village or the surrounding flat lands, incorporates a series of small detention ponds and associated improvements. Actually cooperative arrangement began, the village of Bensenville is going to come up with the acquisition of about \$1,000,000; and the construction costs will be an additional \$3.2 over the whole period. As indicated, actually the village will be providing about 24 percent of the total plan costs. I point out again, all projects should be like this, where the local units of



government in cooperation with an established, actually, flood plan, a basin plan, a flood water management plan. The other part of this is for the North Branch of the Chicago River that will help the north shore areas there, the flood reduction plan for the water shed located in Cook and Lake Counties, actually covers a drainage area of 102 square miles; and this plan will reduce the flood damages by the installation of seven flood water retarding structures, and also flood plain zoning and land use regulation. Now, the state's overall share would be about \$5,000,000, which is only about 39 percent. To date, actually two sites have been actually acquired, the one in 'Peckney' and one in Deerfield. I say to you that actually the funding is there. I have spoken actually to the Senate. There is a C.D.B. bond Bill, which will cover this. I ask of the Members of the House to actually support a project like this which . . . which has been worked out with all of the local municipalities. They are putting up their money up front; and I think this is the way these projects should be done. Again I could make that quotation from the Bible, but believe me what we will do there upstream, actually to protect the people downstream, this is the type of a program that we want; and I wholeheartedly urge every Member here to support Amendment #18. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. How does this Amendment differ from Amendment #1 that was offered in Committee?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Amendment #1, which was my Amendment put on in the Appropriation's, would, I'm sure, have been adopted; but at that time the Appropriation's Committee was waiting for the C.D. bond Bill to come over; and on the basis of the fact that the Bonding Authority at that time was not there, I had to agree with the Appropriation's Committee to hold this. I understand now talking to Senator Rock and . . . and people over there, they will see that there is actually the Bonding Authority. These are projects that the State of Illinois has made a commitment; and



. . . and as I've said before, the units of local government have put up their money. This is all a part of a flood water . . . flood plain management plan. So it is, indeed, the same as Amendment #1; but now that the Bonding Authority is there, I move the adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is identical to Committee Amendment #1, which was offered in Committee, and defeated by 11 'ayes', 7 'nays' and 1 'present'. I might also point out the . . . if you look at the original Bill as submitted by the department, it called for certain dollar amounts; and, unfortunately, Amendment #18, which again was defeated, and Amendment #1 in Committee, same Amendment, increases the Addison Creek Reservoir Project by \$1,594,000, the Bensenville ditch by \$314,000; and, yes, Ladies and Gentlemen, I think, in my district by \$500,000; but, in turn, in all fairness, I still have to oppose Amendment #18. It was not originally incorporated in the budget request, and in turn, I think in all fairness, it should be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further questions? Representative Williams to close."

Williams: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is agreeable to the department and actually to the Governor's office; but when it was appointed out that the other units of government have come up with their money, and I say it is a part of an overall flood plan, and certainly the Bensenville ditch, the Addison Creek Projects and the North Branch Project is something that all of us in the State of Illinois will ultimately be the beneficiaries of. Again, I would ask from the bottom of my heart a 'yes' vote for Amendment #18. These are really and truly flood control projects."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #18. Those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there are 61 'aye' and 48



'no'; and the Gentleman's motion carries, the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #19. Schoeberlein. Amends House Bill 3417 on page 9, by inserting between lines 32 and 33, the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, Representative Williams...Representative Schoeberlein."

Schoeberlein: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment #19 is similar to the Bill that we had, number 3141, last October regarding a new dam at North Aurora for about one hundred feet of a six hundred foot dam has washed out or approximately 50 feet of it is where the water is cutting through the main dam. Now I, for one, will not ask for this dam to be built, the repairs that they've been talking about since last October are completed. I spent Monday morning, up there, watching all week long, last week, there wasn't anything done to this cut in the dam. The...except where a truck fell into the water. The contractor is loosing his fanny on this particular job because they are not moving the equipment to the site or bringing it near the dam so he can haul it to the cut. I will not ask for the building of this dam if it holds, and I can show you that, and I told Representative Lechowicz last year that we've been waiting now for nine months for work to be done on this particular site and all we have is mud plats above the dam and I would appreciate, and so will the other three Representatives, Meyer, Kempiners, and Hill, of the 39th District, oh, Meyer is not in the 39th District, I'm sorry."

Speaker Redmond: "...he wishes he was."

Schoeberlein: "There was a project in the 39th District that he tried to pass, but I'd appreciate your support on this and again, I reiterate that I will not ask for the dam to be built if the bolders that they are moving in there are there to preserve the dam temporarily. I would ask your support for the dam."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, with all due respect to my good friends from the 39th District, the Department



at the present time is repairing that dam at a cost of about \$20,000 and they don't feel at this time that there is anymore need for anymore money, certainly the repair of the dam they would like to look at to see that it will indeed, you know, hold up. So for the sum of about 20,000 which is being spent we can accomplish what this Amendment for \$925,000 asked to do and I would oppose the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #19. Those in favor of the Gentleman's motion indicate by voting aye; opposed by voting no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 65 aye and 13 no and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Any further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #20. Lechowicz. Amends House Bill 3417 as amended on page 5 by deleting lines 2 and 3 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #20 makes a change in the 5% transferability clause in the House Bill 3417 dealing with both the General Revenue Funds and the CDB Bond Project. The clause as it stands now allows a 5% transfer between line items of the amount appropriated in an ...entire section. This Amendment would still allow a 5% transferability but would restrict it to a 5% increase or decrease in any individual line item. The need for this Amendment is twofold. First, without this Amendment and taking a Bill as introduced the Department would have been allowed to transfer \$655,000 in CDB Bonds funds to any project listed in Section 2..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Berman."

Berman: "Well, Mr...Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Could we have a little order for the Gentleman speaking?"

Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman order. Representative Geo-Karis, Representative Lechowicz is complaining he can't be heard. Representative Lechowicz, do you desire to proceed?"

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I've never complained about Adeline Geo-Karis in my life nor do I intend to but let me just point



out to this House that this is a very important Amendment. It pertains to the transferability that's available to the water resources area. Without this Amendment the...and taking the Bill as introduced the Department would have been allowed to transfer \$655,000 in CDB Bonds funds to any project listed in Section 2. As a result a \$500,000 project approved by the General Assembly could have been changed to a million dollar project without consulting this Membership. With Amendment 20 this cannot happen...the second...the second important facet of Amendment #20, a recent opinion by the Attorney General of this state file #S-1097 dated May the 27th 1976 in reply to an inquiry from the Comptroller's Office ruled as unconstitutional an 8% transferability clause relating to the Department of Transportation. Amendment #20 rewords the transferability clause in House Bill 3417 so as to satisfy the Attorney General's opinion. This Amendment has been worked out with the Comptroller's Office, they're in total agreement with the Amendment and this House should be in total...total concept of Amendment #20 for your protection and the protection of the Department. I strongly recommend an aye vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I heartily concur with the Sponsor of this Amendment 'cause at least we won't have to worry about the public till being increased way out of proportion. There is a control in this Amendment and I certainly speak for it."

Speaker Redmond: "You ready for the question? The question is on the Gentleman's motion...Representative Williams."

William: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to rise to say that I do fully...fully support this Amendment. I think it's a good one and I urge the adoption of Amendment..."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is on the Gentleman's motion to the adoption of Amendment #20. All in favor indicate by saying aye. Aye. Opposed, no. The ayes have it and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"



Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #21. Mautino. Amends House Bill 3417 as amended by inserting below the last line of Section 2 the following..."

Speaker Redmond: "Any...Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Amendment #21 to 3417 is...appropriates the sum of 786,000 for...so much therefore is needed from the Capitol Development Bond Fund to the Department of Transportation for the Division of Water Resources for dredging and maintaining Lake DePue which was included in the Capitol Development Authorization Bill of 3656 which included Busse Woods Reservoir, Addison Creek Reservoir, St. Joseph's Creek Channel, Bensenville Ditch, Kingery West, Wood River Improvements, Lake DePue, Pekin, Park Lake, Middle Fork Project, Harrisburg Raw Water Intake Structure and Sully Valley Conservarcy District and I ask for the favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Indicates he will."

Byers: "Representative, didn't you pass an amendment for this late year?"

Mautino: "Yes, Sir."

Byers: "What happened to that?"

Mautino: "Somebody on the second floor vetoed it."

Byers: "Is this that lake that's a foot-and-a-half deep?"

Mautino: "It might even be about 8 inches by now."

Byers: "Well, I think we suggested last year you should fill it up and make it into a park and maybe you could plant rice or something in it."

Mautino: "I don't know. Maybe you should talk to the people from the State of Illinois who bought it for \$738,000 in 1971."

Byers: "I don't know that spending more money on this project would be necessary. I'm going to oppose this again this year, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Well you're consistent."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With all due respect to my good



friend, Representative Mautino, I would like to point out to the Membership that a dredging...cannot be done from CBD funds. It is not in the budget and therefore I would have to oppose this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I think if you can recall back to last year the Amendment, I believe, went on in Committee and it went on very easily with a voice vote. One of the reasons for that too, was that the Governor says appeared here on a number of occasions, very similar to the Middle Fork Reservoir and yes to the local people that...indeed was a good project and I think it should be amended onto the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this did come before the House last year and I spoke in favor of it then and I still strongly support this appropriation. I think the point that we keep leaving out when we consider the dredging...this lake is the fact that for many years we held in our state's motor...motorboat, outboard motorboat races here and it was a national event held in this area. We've lost many dollars of revenue because of our failure to maintain this lake. So I urge you urgently to ask all the Members to support this and if we can get it in here we'll figure out how to pay...the money out to do it. It's urgently needed in that area."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino to close."

Mautino: "...Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to correct one statement that was made, the original appropriation for the Lake Depue Project was in water resources for the Department of Transportation. At that time it...became a hot potato and went over to the Department of Conservation. I submit to you that under the Capitol Development Bonding Authority it can be done, it should be done, because it is state owned property and I ask for your affirmative votes."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #21. Those in favor vote aye; opposed vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 53 aye and 42 no and the Gentleman's motion carries. Amendment's adopted. Any further amendments?"



Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #22. Luft. Amends House Bill 3417 as amended by inserting between the last line of Section 2 the following..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams, what purpose do you rise?"

Williams: "Mr. Speaker, I don't have Amendment #22. I just wonder if that has been distributed? Oh, thank you. Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Luft."

Luft: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, a couple of years ago the Department of Conservation Advisory Board became aware of a lack of any public lake in the tri-county area in central Illinois which encompasses Tazwell, Peoria and Woodford Counties. The Advisory Board asked state and federal engineers and wildlife representatives to come into the area and try to find a site suitable for a lake that would service the people there. The Pekin Park District at that time was acquiring 500 acres of additional land for its park facilities. In that park which is now called Dirksen Park there was a place for about a 40 to 50 acre lake. The Park District hired a consultant who drew the plans for a dam that would make this lake possible, paid \$10,000 for those plans; at that time the state did not fund it, now I think it is time that we fund this dam and Amendment #22 appropriates \$500,000 in the Capitol Development Bond Fund for the construction of this dam and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He says he will."

Totten: "I was looking at the CDB authorization and there is an authorization in there for Lake Pekin, is Lake Pekin the one that could be built behind this dam?"

Luft: "Yes."

Totten: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I...I'm not opposing this just because this one, it seems like this is the appropriate one because the one that is coming up next which is the last one probably is a tongue in



cheek amendment. But it seems to me that all we've done this afternoon is prove the folly of the Legislature because we've poured millions and millions and millions of dollars including in this Amendment into reservoirs and water projects in the state none of which are really mandatory and yet two weeks ago we couldn't find enough money for education, for elementary and secondary schools and I find that rather enigmatic to say the least that that we cannot give the money for education but we can give it for recreation. But perhaps that will be the answer because the way the schools are going there won't be any room for schools anymore and the kids are going to have to have some lakes to play in so perhaps all is not lost after all."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Leverenz: "Is this a state owned piece of property or lake?"

Luft: "Pekin Park District."

Leverenz: "Is there a reason why we are taking care of the Pekin Park District?"

Luft: "Yes, it is, the Pekin Park District doesn't have the money. As I said earlier this was recommended by the Advisory Board of the State Department of Conservation and also by the state and federal engineers and wildlife representatives."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would have to say that we're beginning to get into the pork barrelers here which is really not the intent of House Bill 3417 which are all programs which have been worked out to all of the things that had to be done, anything that's in the budget now has gone through the aerial mapping flood plains studies, the effects of flooding, the economic environmental studies, overall B. C. cost sharing agreements, detailed studies, designed implementation and so forth. And unfortunately this is not in the program at this time. I would have to oppose the Amendment."



Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Question is on the Gentleman's motion. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment 22 vote aye; opposed vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Campbell, no. Representative Byers."

Byers: "Well, I'd like to speak to Representative Luft's dam, if he needs it I think we should give it to him. Everybody else has got theirs and I...I'm going to vote green on this. I think Pekin needs a little bit too."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there 47 aye and 57 no and the motion fails and the Amendment is not adopted. Any further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment 23. Skinner. Amends House Bill 3417 on page 9, line 18 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I noticed that the last time we discussed Middle Fork that Representative Griesheimer and others didn't have a chance to give the impassioned speeches that would have convinced the people who decide on the base of emotion rather than fact to vote for the Middle Fork. And so I decided to give them another chance. Amendment #23 is amendment which I offer in order to keep Governor Walker, the Bureau of the Budget and Members of the General Assembly intellectually honest. We all know that the Middle Fork Dam is not a 5.5 million dollar project. We know it's really a \$20,000,000 project. I would voice the objection that Representative Kane made in Committee that this is the only Capitol Development Board Project that we can find which does not have the total cost of the project in the first year of the appropriation. Now this is my bread and circuses amendment. Certainly we're going to need something to entertain the people when the dam collapses after it goes into those hidden coal mine shafts, those uncharted coal mine shafts and the people downstream-few though they be-end up being washed down the streams the same way that they did at the Teton River. Why for the \$20,000,000 we could rebuild two-fifths of the Teton Dam and I'm certainly it has at least as much value. For that reason I would



suggest that we go all the way and completely cork the Middle Fork by voting for this Amendment. Why should Charlie have to come back and do everything he went through this year twice? Or three time. Or four times or five years or however many times it would take to build that big a dam. I would urge that we vote for this Amendment so that we may keep face everyone. Let's give Daniel everything that he deserves."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'm really reluctant to speak at all on this because this is absolutely ridiculous. It's really making a Bill that is intended to do the flood control and the water resources projects for the state a sham and I think enough said that let's defeat this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question. The question is...

Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Oh, yes, Mr. Speaker, considering the Sponsor of this Amendment is Sponsoring a Bill for which the total cost of all the other projects are out front, I cannot understand his inconsistency in opposing this Amendment. I can, however, understand the inconsistency of the Bureau of the Budget and Governor Daniel Walker in not wanting the people of Illinois to know the total cost for which he has voluntarily committed himself by supporting the Middle Fork Dam. I remember very well when he attacked my candidate for governor recently saying the people know where I stand on the issues, they know where I stand on Middle Fork - course he didn't say which side he was on - but he's in favor of it in case anybody hadn't figured that out outside of..."

Speaker Redmond: "Bring your remarks to a close."

Skinner: "It is in order to keep the Governor intellectually honest that I would suppose we support this Amendment and also in order to keep Representative Campbell, Representative Craig and Senator Coffey from having to go through all those machinations that they have had to go through for the last months in order to get a yes vote for all the money that it will cost..."



Speaker Redmond: "Question is on the..."

Skinner: "...91.73 which is what the interest will be."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #23. Those in favor say aye; opposed no. Motion is lost. Any further amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #24. Cunningham. Amends House Bill 3417 in Section 1 on page 4 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's Amendment? Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Embarras River, also pronounced embarrass, starts in Champaign and it winds a 125 miles through bucolic countryside to the Wabash River in Lawrence County and it has the bad habit of annually flooding its banks and inundating thousands and thousands of acres of rich farmland. For \$50,000 a substantial...improvements can be made and can alleviate a very serious loss. The amount of farmland that would be improved by this project has been estimated as high as 50,000 acres, so for a dollar an acre or slightly less you can measurably increase the amount of rich productive soil that's available to keep Illinois number one in ag products throughout the world. We urge you to vote aye on this Amendment. We represent to you that there is no serious opposition to it. We have discussed the matter very carefully with Director Eisel and the very fine Department of Waterways. Will appreciate an aye vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz. Representative Lechowicz."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Lechowicz: "Is this similar to Amendment #9 which was defeated in Committee?"

Cunningham: "Well, it has a different number and it has - just a moment - and it has different Sponsors so that you cannot say that it's similar. If...the similarity is that it's the same river and the same amount of money but the...your distinctions are as I've noted."

Lechowicz: "It failed in Committee, is that correct?"

Cunningham: "Well, it was a tie vote in Committee, as you said, thanks



to the heavy-handed impartial chairmanship. Do I make it clear?"

Lechowicz: "No, I think it was about 17 to 2."

Cunningham: "No. No. You don't think correctly and..."

Speaker Redmond: "Confine your remarks to the Amendment."

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

Cunningham: "Can I respond to these malicious attacks?"

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, unfortunately I'm going to have to oppose Amendment #24 as I opposed Amendment #9 in Committee. And really the Sponsor's pronouncement of the river, the second pronouncement is correct, it should be embarrass...we should be embarrassed that we're even considering this Amendment at this time. He pointed out to you that this tributary overflows its banks occasionally and then at that time it causes some crop damage. He knows as well as I do that there are funds available to reimburse the farmers if that's the situation that occurs. Unfortunately this will not correct the situation of...the \$50,000 is a mere drop in the bucket as far as the length of this river is concerned. I would hope that these...this House would find better use of \$50,000 than for this project. I recommend a no vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham to close."

Cunningham: "I have two other sponsors with me if they wish to add anything but I want to say that ignorance is a hell of a thing to contend with; there are no funds available, there are no funds available to pay farmers the flood loss and you know that when you made that particular remark. Now, it's significant and should be persuasive with all of you who attempt to be objective that the Department is not objecting to this particular Amendment. Fair play indicates that we're entitled to an aye vote. We ask for a Roll Call vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "On a point of order, Mr..."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Lechowicz: "To my learned colleague from Lawrenceville, there are



JUN 15 1976

113.

federal funds available in a situation like that. Check with your congressman."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers, for what purpose do you rise?"

Byers: "Move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put. All in favor say aye. Aye. Opposed, no. The ayes have it. Question is on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #24 to House Bill 3417. All in favor vote aye. Opposed vote no. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? ...All voted who wish? Representative Duff, aye. Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 43 aye and 68 no and the motion fails. Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise at this point to make a motion to table Amendment #6 which we adopted by a Roll Call vote. And let me in doing so, explain the reason for...for that action and also tell you that I'm joined in this motion by Representative Ryan. In Amendment #2 we decreased a line item from \$10,000 to \$5,000 in regards to doing engineering studies and surveys for two tributaries on the Kankakee River. Amendment #6 dealt with those same line items and the Sponsor when he made the motion, and I wish he were here and I've waited 'til we got to the end of the Amendments that are being offered so that he might be here, when he offered the motion he indicated that the line item involved was for the channelization of the Kankakee River. Let me suggest to you that Representative Ryan, Representative Washburn and myself are violently opposed to any channelization of the Kankakee River or any studies being done in regard thereto. But the line item that was involved here and inadvertently described incorrectly by the Sponsor offered two ongoing projects; one that's been going on for some 15 years that was started out by former Governor Shapiro and Senator McBroom..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre, I've been advised that 6, 7, 8 and 9 have already been tabled, that they were not adopted on House Bill 3417. I don't know where we are, can we table the... amendment that's been tabled? What is that - two tabled amend-



ment or tabled square?"

Beaupre: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if that's correct I'm very happy and I'll sit down and be quiet but I...that wasn't what was announced I don't believe after the Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "That's what the Clerk advises me. Representative Totten."

Totten: "I...I believe if the Clerk will check the records, Amendment #6 was adopted and 7, 8 and 9 were, I believe, tabled in Committee. ...I believe was a \$10,000 reduction? Five thousand dollar reduction? And it was adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "We're checking the minutes. In the meantime proceed Representative Beaupre, I'm sorry for the interruption but...Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, there was not a Roll Call on 6, it was by..."

Speaker Redmond: "According to the rules, the correct motion is to table, it's not to reconsider. So I think that...a voice vote."

Schlickman: "Well, it was adopted. How can you table it? Shouldn't it be by a motion to reconsider and..."

Speaker Redmond: "No, not if it's a voice vote according to Rule, what is it, 62-B?"

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd also mention that the Sponsor of that Amendment, Representative Meyer isn't here and we all know why he isn't here. And I would respectfully suggest that the matter be held until his return tomorrow."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, I don't know what he isn't here. Representative Ryan and I both talked to him about this matter and he said that he would take a look at the background material in regards to the motion because we pointed out to him that he indeed misstated what the Amendment was about. I presume that he's doing his research but he hasn't returned to the floor and I don't want to see this Bill go to Third Reading before this matter is reconsidered."

Speaker Redmond: "I've been advised that Amendment #6 was adopted by a...voice vote and the only way to undo the adoption was... a motion to table. Representative Arnell."



JUN 15 1976

115.

Arnell: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, inasmuch as Representative Meyer is not here at the present time, can't this be held on Second Reading until tomorrow and be taken up at that time? I think it's a courtesy to Representative Meyer who is not here, it should be held."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I interpret the Rules of this House correctly this Bill will be held on Second Reading because I filed a request for a fiscal note covering all of the Amendments and I think that might be appropriate considering that we're...talking about striking an amendment placed on this by a Member who isn't even present tonight so a few of us can get to a function which has been planned for quite a few weeks. And I don't think that there's any doubt that my request is proper and is in writing and I want to know specifically what this God-awful thing of this spendthrift Legislature is going to cost the state of Illinois?"

Speaker Redmond: "According to Chapter 63, 42-31 which provides for the fiscal note it says 'every Bill except those making a direct appropriation the purpose the effect', in other words the fiscal note applies to all bills except in appropriation bills so I don't think that the request of the fiscal note is in order. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, in all fairness we get Ron a copy of the enrolled and engrossed copy of the Bill first thing in the morning which will give him his total figures that he's looking for."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't think that the statutes that provides for fiscal notes covers appropriation bills. I so rule. Representative Walsh. I can't see Representative Walsh. There are people standing between him and the Chair."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, we lose no time whatever if we pay Representative Meyer the courtesy of holding this Bill on Second Reading and giving him an opportunity to be here when the Amendment that he had adopted is tabled, or an effort is made to table it. I can't see any reason at all for not holding it."



Speaker Redmond: "The Chair is powerless. The Gentleman is within his rights to move to table and I must put the motion. Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, if that is the case and without putting us in an embarrassing position here to either vote no on the tabling motion or vote Representative Meyer's Amendment down the tube, so to speak, I really wish that Representative Beaupre and Representative Ryan would recede a little bit from this. You know, we come, Representative Sangmeister, Representative Leinenweber and myself, come from Will County and which has the Kankakee River going through it and if they have onerous little rumblings about channelizing the Iroquois River and the creeks over there and are going to dump this...four-and-a-half inches of water they've got up there around Lemont down on us someday without our understanding of this project I wish...could be explained and I've always had the highest respect for Representative Meyer so I would make the same request as other Members have that we just put this off until tomorrow as much as I'd like to see this Bill go to Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Well, Mr. Speaker, much of the conversation really doesn't go to the issue raised in the motion. I would be very happy to wait 'til tomorrow, if this Bill does not go to Third Reading, to have this motion considered by this House. I...I...if...if I can get that sort of agreement from the Sponsor of the Bill I'd be very happy to hold this until tomorrow; otherwise I persist in my motion to table Amendment #6. I have discussed this with Representative Meyer, we haven't really received any satisfactory answers, I presume that he would get back to it; maybe he has some other important business and I'm not being critical of that except that this is an important matter for area, involves flood control within the metropolitan area of Kankakee, Bradley and Bourbonnais, and it's important to us."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams, you seek recognition?"

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that the Bill



now, this Amendment is on it, it is ready to go to Third Reading. If there is a problem tomorrow, I would bring it back from Third to Second but I think I would this advanced to Third, it's probably one of the last Appropriation Bills here and I would like to see it move. If there is a problem tomorrow, I will bring it back ...at your second for the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "I...I don't mean to be dilatory but the...the problem is that the Amendment is on and I think automatically you would have to, in order to accommodate us, bring it back to Second Reading and if you're willing to do that I withdraw the motion."

Williams: "All right, that's what I said I would do. Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "Motion withdrawn, is that correct? Any further amendments? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "May Representative Griesheimer and I have leave to file an objection to your ruling, that this does not need a fiscal note in lieu of the fact the Department of Transportation Division of Water Resources project chief says \$17,000,600... \$600,000 in the future in addition to the amount presently in the Appropriation Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "I believe the rules provide that you have a right to file an objection."

Skinner: "Thank you..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Point of inquiry, Mr. Speaker. If the Bill does go to Third Reading and it's enrolled and engrossed, is it then possible to bring it back and then take the Amendment off after once it's been through that enrolling and engrossing process?"

Speaker Redmond: "Think it is possible, we've done that very frequently."

Simms: "Fine."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Any other Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Hudson."



Hudson: "Mr. Chairman, point of parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Hudson: "What would it take to change my vote on Amendment #5 on House Bill 3417 from yes to present? Would it take unanimous consent of the...it will not change the...pardon me?"

Speaker Redmond: "Is...verified?"

Hudson: "From no to present. It was a verified vote, it will not change..."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't believe it's possible under the Rules, Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "...Would it be...not possible with...unanimous leave of the House?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner, do you seek recognition?"

Skinner: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, as the one who asked for the verification, I certainly would have no objection whatsoever to Representative Hudson voting his conscience."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washburn. I can't see Representative Washburn, will the people standing between him and the Chair..."

Washburn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What means would be available to Representative Hudson? Would it be unanimous consent of the House or..."

Speaker Redmond: "We're researching it right at the moment."

Washburn: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk for announcement...until we get back to the Rule Book here."

Clerk O'Brien: "Conference Committee announcement relating to House Bill 3068. Members appointed are Representative Chapman, Downs, McClain, Grotberg and Kempiners. The Committee will meet in Room 212 at 3:45 p.m. on Thursday, June 17, 1976. Conference Committee announcement relating to Senate Bill 31; Members appointed are Representative Katz, Matijevich, Yourell, Kent and Lauer. The Committee will meet in Room 212 at 3:45 p.m. on Wednesday, June 16, 1976. The postings will be on the bulletin board outside the main door."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jesse White, you wanted to make an



announcement with respect to the softball game of the Republican and Democratic secretaries. I think the notice was sent out to the effect that that was...Representative Madison, the assistant coach."

Madison: "No, I'm not speaking for Representative White, Mr..."

Speaker Redmond: "There's Representative White."

Madison: "I raise the point in terms of the...in terms of the Parliamentarian's research that it is my understanding that verification is provided in the Rules and with unanimous consent we can suspend any rule we want to suspend."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative White."

White: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, yesterday a notice was sent out with regard to the Democratic and secretary... Democratic and Republican secretaries game which is to be held tomorrow. They said that the game was to be played yesterday. Tickets are on sale for a dollar, the game will be played tomorrow at Lincoln Park at Diamond 4 at 6:30."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "I can't see Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Right here. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, announcing that a recessed meeting of the Revenue Committee which did not finish its work last night will be tomorrow at 1:30 in Room B-1. So those of you who have work...there, the Bills will be in tomorrow morning's calendar but it will have the three Bills that did not finish last night in B-1."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further announcements? Parliamentarian advises me that under Rule 47-B which provides that no Member may change his vote as recorded after the Roll Call has been verified and the results declared; that Representative Hudson can achieve the result by voting to suspend the provisions of Rule 47-B and that will take 89 votes. Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "If that be the case then, Mr. Speaker, I should like to change my vote on Amendment 5 from present to yes which will be an even exchange vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Fredrich."



Friedrich: "May I suggest it can be done by unanimous consent and since one wants to change it one way and the other; it doesn't change the outcome, I'm..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well..."

Friedrich: "...Has to be unanimous consent."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I...you know I have some sympathy because I..."

I recognize that Ray Hudson gave an emotional vote there based on what another Member did but let me tell the Members of the House I think this is a bad precedent. Once we verify a Roll Call I think it ought to stick and I think it's a bad precedent and let's leave it that way. We can all justify our votes, you know, I...I made a bad vote with the environmentalist but I can justify it. Let's leave it with that and justify it back home the best way we know how."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you persuaded, Representative Hudson?"

Hudson: "Well, no, Mr. Speaker, I'm not."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, the Gentleman moves to suspend the provisions of Rule 47-B; and Representative Randolph requests the same motion; Representative Palmer to Representative Kempiners, they want to join in the motion, is that correct? Representative Madison. It seems to me that the purpose...the question is to suspend the provisions of Rule 47-B and I don't think it relates to any particular Member's voice...vote right at the present time. Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I think one thing to take into consideration

is whether or not all of these changes will change the outcome."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, why don't we put this to the vote. It takes 89 votes and the question is on the Gentleman's motion to suspend the provisions of Rule 47-B. Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Point of order please. I'd like to know what this Amendment is so I'll know how to vote whether I shall allow them to do it or not. Will you please tell what the subject matter of Amendment #5 is that they're trying to change? Oh."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, the question is on Representative Hudson's



to suspend the provisions of Rule 47-B to permit him to change is vote from no. to aye, is that correct; and the question is on the Gentleman's motion. All in favor...Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "I wanted, Mr. Speaker, to change my vote from no to present which...which I could explain..."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Change his vote from no to present and the question is on...on that motion. All in favor vote aye and opposed vote no. Takes 89 votes to suspend the Rules. Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, is this motion strictly on Representative Hudson..."

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct."

Madison: "...Or does it include the other individuals."

Speaker Redmond: "That is Representative Hudson. Will take 89 votes to suspend this Rule. Have all voted who wish? Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Mr. Speaker, I...I'm not going to oppose this motion because I think the Rules are very clear, I would...I see Representative Katz standing on the floor, he's done a lot with the Rules and I might suggest to the House that this may need to be reworded because when you have a motion as close to the Middle Fork and I was on the other side and I'm...those who want one... when you have a motion as close that the fact that somebody has not voted and you poll the absentees and he votes yea or nay at that particular emotion laden time often does have an effect on the outcome because it starts to throw impetus one way or the other and that's why I think this Rule is probably a bad rule and ought to be changed but since it's in the books I'm going to go ahead and give Representative Hudson a vote but I would like to see it...changed...back."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 49 aye and 19 no and the Gentleman's motion fails. Representative Duff, for what purpose do you rise? Representative Mann..."



Duff: "My purpose was on that...on an inquiry, Mr. Speaker, which is now moot. Thank you for recognizing me."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Any other announcement? I'm getting some calls and beeps, several phones, from the German Dinner. Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "Well, Mr. Speaker, then I would make the motion also to change my vote on Amendment #5 from present to yes and that would not change the outcome."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't see how it can be done unless you have Rule 47-B, provisions of that Rule suspended."

Palmer: "That's...that is correct."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has moved to suspend the provisions of 47-B, all in favor vote aye and opposed vote no. Representative Duff."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this second motion on the same subject does cause me to want to make the inquiry that I would have on the other one and I'm harkening back to prior ruling at a point in time when their votes which were cast as present were included in the determination of the Rule which said 'the majority of those voting present'...excuse me, 'a majority of those voting must vote aye' and in those prior rulings the present votes were included as not being aye votes. That ruling has never been asked this year but because I haven't thought of it until these motions were made I wonder if the Chairman...Speaker can tell us, or the Clerk can tell us, what the ayes, nays and present were so that we may in fact discover whether or not any of these motions would change the outcome. It was so close on the reds and the greens that the present in fact might have brought it closer."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is on this particular motion, has anybody...have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 31 aye and 40 no and the Gentleman's motion fails. Representative Duff, I believe the Rules with respect to verification provide that the...those voting present will also be called and I can advise the...the Gentleman that, yes, it does. Anything further? Representative Lechowicz. When the...when the motion to adjourn is made the Clerk needs about four or five



minutes. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on the order of motions, I have a motion on file with the Clerk and it has been cleared by both sides of the aisle as far as the posting procedures that were necessary to hear three appropriation bills this coming Thursday in the Appropriations Committee. What happened, the Bills came over from the Senate Friday afternoon and in turn we posted those Bills that day. Unfortunately the Clerk did not have in his possession in the Clerk's office Friday night and for this reason even though the Bills that were posted in time, the Rules also provide that the Bills be available on the same day. I am asking leave of the House to use the Attendance Roll Call to have those three Bills for Appropriations this coming Thursday."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections leave is granted. Attendance Roll Call will be used on that motion. Anything further? Representative Bradley on the Adjournment Resolution."

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I now move that the House stand in recess for a period of five minutes and at that time the House stand adjourned until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning."

Speaker Redmond: "And the question is willst du haben? All in favor indicate by saying aye; opposed, no. The ayes have it. Incidentally, it looks like we're going to have to be here Friday we didn't do very well today."

Clerk O'Brien: "Committee Reports. Representative Boyle, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations II to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 15, 1976, reported the same back with the following recommendation: do pass House Bill 3553, 3903. Do pass as amended House Bill 3430 and House Bill 3610. Representative Lechowicz, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations I to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 15, 1976, reported the same back with the following recommendation: Do pass Senate Bill 1511, Senate Bill 1610. Do pass as amended



Senate Bill 1627. Messages from the Senate. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representative that the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of the Bill of the following title, to-wit: House Bill 2736 together with five Amendments. Passed the Senate as amended June 15, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in passage of the Bills of the following titles, to-wit: House Bill #3148, 3329, 3338, 3428 and 3686. Passed by the Senate June 15, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed Bills of the following title and the passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House, to-wit: Senate Bills 1561 and 1967. Passed by the Senate June 15, 1976. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Introduction to First Reading. House Bill 3996. Huff. A Bill for an act to amend the Dram Shop Act. First Reading of the Bill. No further business, the House stands adjourned."

