

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

JUNE 22, 1975

Doorkeeper: "All those not entitled to the Floor, please retire to the Gallery."

Redmond: "The House will please come to order. The Members please be in their seats. The prayer this morning will be by the Clerk, Jack O'Brien."

Jack O'Brien: "Let us pray. Lord, bless this House, and all those who appear and work here. Amen."

Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. While we're taking the roll call for attendance, we'll go to the special order. I'll turn the microphone over to an anonymous county superintendent."

County Superintendent: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House of Representatives. I represent the State Office of Education and also the Regional Superintendents to present one of your constituents the championship golf jacket of the Illinois Education Golf Classic. He's your coach for your softball; It's Representative Joe Lucco. Would you come up, Joe, please. We felt it was fitting doing it here. He wouldn't take time out to come to the golf tournament this year on Friday afternoon, but he did win the jacket legitimately. We have pictures of him making a 30 foot putt and ah.... you should be proud of him. He was with us as an educator. He'll never win it again, I'll assure you."

Lucco: "Thank you."

Redmond: "Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, I'm a little bit shocked here. I wonder if Representative Lucco and yourself are aware of paragraph 333 set out by the Federal Congress, Senate and House of the Federal Congress, concurring just last March in relation to this matter. Do you realize, that there is this Amendment to one of the House Bill and Joint Resolution 333, during the Bicentennial time, it is illegal for anyone to wear a red coat in this United State of America and are definitely breaking the



Resolution of Congress."

Lucco: "I'm not so sure that's red, are you? Not only that, I'm now professional."

Borchers: "That's what is called a Lobster in those days, two hundred years ago, and I hate to see you a Lobster back."

Redmond: "I don't know if that's red or orange and if it's orange, you better go to the neighborhood where I grew up. Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, first of all, Mr. Lucco's jacket is Fuisia color. Second of all, the House seems to be depressing today by 29 to 7, and Bill Lucco was coaching the House. I almost had to throw him out of the game, though, because he started getting onto the field, but....."

Lucco: "You'll never read that in any of the papers, I bet."

Geo-Karis: "24 to 9, I stand corrected."

Redmond: "Joint Resolutions, Constitutional Amendments, Third Reading."

Jack O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment Number 10. Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 79th General Assembly, the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein that there shall be submitted to the Electors of the State for adoption or rejection of the General Election next occurring at least six months after the adoption of this Resolution, a proposition to amend Section 4 of Article IX of the Constitution to read as follows: 'Article IX, Section 4. Real Property Taxation. A. Except as otherwise provided in this Section, taxes upon real property shall be levied uniformly by valuation ascertained by the General Assembly, as the General Assembly shall provide by law'."

Redmond: "Take Number 10 out of the Record. Everybody be in good order. There's a visitor from South America. He wants to take a picture. Yes, Representative Schoeberlein, tell him to go ahead."



Jack O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment Number 12. Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 79th General Assembly, the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that there shall be submitted to the electors of the State at the General Election next occurring at least six months after the adoption of this Resolution, a proposition to amend Section 4 of Article IX of the Constitution of the State of Illinois by addition of a new paragraph to read as follows: 'Article IX. Revenue. Section 4. Real Property Taxation. D. The General Assembly may provide by law for incentive or rehabilitation for improvement of residential real estate through deferral of any increase in assessment that real estate'. Third Reading of the Constitutional Amendment."

Redmond: "Resolution, having been read a third time, we'll have to take it out of the Record, but we won't have to read it the next time we call it for vote."

Jack O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment Number 13. Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 79th General Assembly, the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that there shall be submitted to the Electors of the State at the General Election next occurring at least six months after the adoption of this Resolution, proposition to amend Section 2 of Article X of the Constitution to read as follows: 'Article X. Education. Section 2. Superintendent of Public Instruction. A Superintendent of Public Instruction shall be elected by the electors of the State and shall hold office for four years, beginning on the Second Monday of January, after his election. To be eligible to hold the office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, the person must be a United States citizen at least 25 years old and a resident of this State for the three years proceeding the election. The Superintendent of Public Instruction



4.

shall be the chief educational officer of the State, having general supervisory responsibilities in relation to public, elementary and secondary schools and shall except, as limited by law, establish goals, determine policies, provide for planning and evaluation of education programs, recommend financing and have such other duties and powers as provided by law. Schedule. A Superintendent of Public Instruction, elected at the General Election next occurring after the General Election, at which this Amendment is approved by the Electors and shall take office on the second Monday of January after his election, at which time the State Board of Education shall cease to exist.' Third Reading of the Constitutional Amendment."

Redmond: "This having been read a Third Time, we'll take it out of the Record and call for a vote when attendance is a little better. It will take a 107 votes and I only counted 106. Agreed Resolutions."

Jack O'Brien: "House Resolution 391. Younge. House Resolution 392. Redmond. House Resolution 393. Maragos. House Resolution 396. Ron Hoffman. House Resolution 397. DiPrima."

Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Two things, before we go to that. On House Resolution 393, will you take that out of the Record at the request of the Sponsor for now. The Sponsor ah.... those people are going to be here later, and I thought we'd handle it when they are here, and would the Record reflect that Representative McGrew is excused in his absence today. Now with the Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 391 by Representative Younge, commends Mrs. Marvin Wright of East St. Louis, for the dedicated service which she has rendered in the field of special education in the East St. Louis area. House Resolution 392, Speaker Redmond et al, commends Alan J. Newman and Mary Claire Newman were married on June 28, 1930, made their home



in Chicago and raised four children. That there is created a special committee, consisting of five members of the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker, and five members by the Minority Leader to study all of the aspects of the contemplated marriage of Charlie Fleck. House Resolution 396 talks about Fleck is now a lawyer borned on Law Day and another special committee to look at his proposed marriage and one by Representative DiPrima where Chief Violet will be honored at a dinner dance on June 28 in Chicago for her outstanding services to the City of Chicago, and I'd move for the adoption of these Agreed Resolutions."

Redmond: "Gentleman has moved for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor, indicate by saying 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Any further resolutions?"

Jack O'Brien: "House Resolution 394. Brummet et al."

Redmond: "Committee on Assignments. On the Speaker's Table appears House Joint Resolution 40. Representative Hart. House Joint Resolution 40."

Hart: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Joint Resolution Number 40 was suggested to me by the Mr. Nichols down in the Legislative Reference Bureau, and what it does is that in the event the Legislature passes two Bills amending the same sections of the statutes, sometimes, when we write a Bill, we put in the new language, we reuse the old language that has been changed by legislation, so what this would do is require the Reference Bureau, at the end of this year for instance, before we come back next year, to go through the Bills and see if there is any old language that should be stricken out and changed by Amendments as they are when the Bill is passed this year. This came out of the Executive Committee unanimously and I think it would be an improvement in our procedure, and



I recommend the adoption of the Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Questions on the adoption of the Resolution? House Joint Resolution 40? All in favor of the adoption, indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it. Representative Hart."

Hart: "I'm not sure whether this needs...ah...89 votes, it is an amendment to the rules. It would be a joint rule."

Speaker Redmond: "Well then let's all in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'."

Hart: "Yea, I think it would be a good if we got 89 votes."  
...Ah...I've been asked to explain it again. This, this is rule, a joint rule, which would require the Reference Bureau at the end of, for instance, this year to go through the bills after the governor has acted on them, the ones that he signs into law and where we have amended the same section of the statutes in 2 bills, many times we pick up the old language...ah...without the changes that have been enacted. So the Reference Bureau would go through and see if there are amendments to bills that need to be put on so that we not, do not incorporate old language in bills that we pass in the second year of the session. And they advised me that they can handle this and I think it would...ah...would work, be a better procedure when we ...ah... come back in the second year of the biennial."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Palmer. Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "If the sponsor would yield for a question."

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Palmer: "...Over here Dick. In a lot of places in the Illinois revised statutes, we find three sections, as many as three...ah...ah...three part, or three sections with the same number. What would the Joint Resolution do, insofar, the operation of that Joint Resolution, insofar, as those various sections are concerned bearing the same number?"



Hart: "I'm not sure that this would effect that, Representative Palmer. But it would eliminate the reincorporation of amended language in the bills passed subsequent to the amendatory acts which are signed into law. In other words if we amended the Civil Administrative Code and put in a new section then in order for us to understand what we're doing there the Reference Bureau, according to our rules may, you know, show several sections before and after the new language, then we may have a, that bill would go through the legislature, be signed into law and become part of our statutes. Then there may be a bill pending changing the same section of the act which hangs over to the second session of the legislature, second year. When that bill is passed, we may incor...reincorporate the old language that was changed by the bill...in the first year. To avoid that happening the Reference Bureau would be required by this,.....75 to go through all the legislation that still hangs over and prepare amendment to put in the new language that we adopted in the bills that were signed into law by the Governor during the calendar year, 1975."

Palmer: "Alright, thank you."

Hart: "I think it's a good bill, or a good Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword. Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Would the gentleman yield please?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Tipsword: "Representative Hart, I believe we've also passed here, have we not, perhaps you recall the some authorization to the Reference Bureau to set up a special section on statutory revision which could be very well utilized in doing this sort of thing that you ask for in this amendment."

Hart: "I think they would be complimentary to each other that's right."

Tipsword: "Right, thank you."





Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Katz."

Katz: "Ah...what is this an amendment to, Representative Hart?"

Hart: "Well it's a joint rule."

Katz: "Well it sort of seems to me that since the joint rules are, first of all, I'm not sure that we have joint rules at the moment do we?"

Hart: "Well we have one. This would be...this would be a second one."

X  
Katz: "Yea. Well...well I have the feeling that it ought to be considered in relation to all of the joint rules. This apparently was referred to Executive rather than Rules. We are one of these days going to take up joint rules and I have a feeling that rather than this kind of piece meal approach that it ought to be considered in relation to all the other joint rules and, and accordingly I'm not able to vote for it on this kind of piece meal basis and I would have to vote 'no'."

X  
Hart: "Well I understand your feeling, however, a bird in a hand."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Frederich."

Frederich: "I think it's too late to ask a question, but I think is of such a serious nature that possibly the chair would indulge me. What happens in a situation like yesterday, where you might have had the...ah... be handling the bill which did have the, was prepared by the reference bureau and so on. But we get up here and we have 22 amendments, some of which we're shooting from the hip and some which weren't. Now the Reference Bureau, obviously, wouldn't have time to do that because some of them you have to amend right here while you're in action. It seems to me like you're creating something which creates an impossible situation. I know what you're trying to do and I favor it but I also wouldn't want to see us tie our hands where some member of this



House could not amend a bill or amend an amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "No that wouldn't happen because this, this would only take effect after we get done in the fall, then the Reference Bureau would go through the bills that have been signed into law by the Governor and where we have changed a section of the statutes by the...you know, Governors signature often times in other bills amending the same act we have the language that we changed is still in that bill. So this, the Reference Bureau would go through and clean up the bills by way of amendments and we'd put them on when we come back in January."

Frederich: "This is similar to the alterizationary bill that use to come out of the Reference Bureau in the first place?"

Hart: "It's similar but ah, I think it covers some areas that were not covered."

Frederich: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 106 'aye' and ' 'nay', the Resolution is adopted. Message from the Senate."

Jack O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker. I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles on passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence in the House of Representatives, to-wit: Senate Bills numbered 554, 555, 1492 and 1500. Passed by the Senate June 17, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "On the order of concurrence appears House Joint Resolution 5. Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Joint...er...House Joint Resolution 5...ah...was amend...the finance clause was amended out of it in the Senate. It's the Joint House Senate Committee on Child Care and...ah...I move that the House do concur in the amendment to House Joint Resolution 5."



Speaker Redmond: "Will you state your motion again please?"

Grotberg: "I move that the House do concur in Senate amendment number 1 to House Joint Resolution 5."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman has moved that the House concur in Senate amendment 1, to House Joint Resolution 5. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I'm still a little bit lost trying to catch it. Where are you on the, in the calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "Concurrence right now."

Schraeder: "What page?"

Speaker Redmond: "This came over from the Senate, it's a message from the Senate...House Joint."

Schraeder: "Okay, I'd like, I'd like the sponsor to give us an explanation, I'm not sure."

Grotberg: "Ah...Representative Schraeder, you remember the Joint Committee of the House of Representatives Members, six of them, and six from the Senate on Child Care, this is the enabling legislation I'd like to get it through and get those people picked so we can maybe later this week we may need them."

Schraeder: "Right, in favor of it."

Speaker Redmond: "89 votes."

Grotberg: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "I would understand it, because there are no other, there are no funds necessarily going to be expended by this that a voice vote would do it."

Speaker Redmond: "There are 89 votes present here?"

Grotberg: "It doesn't matter, we can take a roll call, if there are 89. Once more with feeling."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk. And the House concurs in Senate Amendment number 1, to House Joint Resolution 5. The order of nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 5...4. Representative DiPrima. Representative Grotberg. Representative DiPrima is



addressing this bill. What's the desire of the Representative the sponsor of this."

DiPrima: "Is that that Resolution on Panama?"

Speaker Redmond: "Illinois Municipal Code. We put a House amendment on it."

DiPrima: "Oh, yes, I refuse to recede, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "What was that? You do what?"

DiPrima: "I refuse to recede."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is does the House, refuses to, Representative Schraeder. Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I don't have, I'm trying to find them on the..."

Speaker Redmond: "Nonconcurrency, page 16."

Schraeder: "And which number?"

Speaker Redmond: "4."

Schraeder: "Okay could we have some explanation of the amendment we're not going to concur with."

DiPrima: "Well what the amendment does, it...ah...deletes Home Rule. And I refuse to recede."

Unknown: "We're going to work it out. We're going to work that out."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Fine, I'm fine."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Would the gentleman yield for a question?"

DiPrima: "Yes."

Walsh: "Did the Senate strike the Home Rule amendment."

DiPrima: "Yes sir."

Walsh: "You want the Home Rule amendment in there and what does the..."

DiPrima: "Well we're going to resolve it in a conference."

Walsh: "Well, generally I feel that...ah...that the Home Rule amendment ought to be stricken. I would tend to agree with the Senate in this matter."

DiPrima: "I'm inclined to agree with you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."



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

We've never had any debate before on a nonconcurrency motion. And I think if we're going to start going into a debate on a nonconcurrency we're going to be here to the end of July. And I just want to point out to the minority leader that...ah...just as a reminder, it's always been up to the sponsor of the bill as far as to move to concur or nonconcur and in the past it's always been the policy that the sponsor indicated nonconcurrency, especially on the first time, that it was always by leave."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Well Mr. Speaker, I disagree with the man that just spoke, Representative Lechowicz. But by some of these amendment is changes the entire content of the bill and there's a couple of bills that've come back from the Senate that are on concurrence and nonconcurrency that I violently disagree with. And if we don't do it here on the House Floor, when it gets to Committee we've lost the bill and I on this bill it doesn't make any difference one way or another as far as I'm concerned but some of them it does."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the sponsor would yield for a question I know normally the sponsor has a champion of Veterans rights and I thought this was a bill that strenghtened the rights of Veterans and as I would understand the amendment that we're trying to not concur with it's an amendment that would exempt Chicago and all the Home Rule units of government from this bill that strenghtens Veterans Rights. Is my understanding correct or is there something that escaped me?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative DiPrima. DiPrima."

Unknown: "C'mon let's wake up."

DiPrima: "Yes sir. I'm telling you the thing is going to be resolved now why don't you just let it lay at that



and I'll take care of it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I just want to one of the things that Representative Lechowicz had indicated. On nonconcurrency it's only a customary thing that we concur with the sponsor with the sponsor that he is nonconcurring with the amendment. And I don't think there should be any dialogue, any debate or even a roll call on that matter. We're conforming with the sponsors wishes to nonconcur."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker."

Hoffman: "I think that if we refuse to recede."

Walsh: "Yea, I respectfully disagree with those who say that we have no input in this. We have a vote on it, generally it is by voice vote and usually we go along, but certainly we can debate the matter, the bill is going to be changed."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, the reason we don't debate is that the House has already by majority vote sent that amendment on the bill and by refusing to recede we're only saying we believe what we have already done. So that's why we've never had debate on the refusal to recede."

Speaker Redmond: "Question, the gentleman has moved that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment number 1, to Senate Bill 4. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes', have it and the House refuses to recede from House amendment number 1. Do you request a conference committee? Conference committee has been requested. Senate Bill 57 on nonconcurrency. Representative Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we refuse to recede from House amendment number 1. House amendment number 1



was put on by Representative Skinner from effective date on entire set bill, it's unintelligible, we have to re-do it and so I would suggest that we move to non-refuse to recede go for conference committee."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House amendment number 1, to Senate Bill 57. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it and the House refuses to recede from House amendment number 1. Conference committee requested? A conference committee is requested. Senate Bill 211. J. D. Jones."

Jones: "I would move, Mr. Speaker, I move the same action on this."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman has moved that the House refuse to recede from House amendment number 1, to Senate Bill 211. Those in favor vote, say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it, the House refuses to recede from House amendment number 1 to Senate Bill 211. Conference Committee was requested. 295. Representative Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "Speaker. The House should refuse the defeat of ...ah...ah...amendment 1, House amendment 1 on Senate Bill 295."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman has moved that the House refuse to recede from House amendment number 1, to Senate Bill 295. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it and the House refuses to recede from House amendment number 1, to Senate Bill 295. Conference Committee will be appointed. 419. 419. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House. I move that the House refuse to recede from House amendment number 1, to Senate Bill 419 so that a conference committee may be appointed."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall the House refuse to recede from House amendment number 1 to Senate Bill 419? All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it



and the House refuses to recede from House amendment number 1. Conference Committee will be appointed. 444. Representative Richland."

Richland: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that...ah...we ah...recede from amendment to House Bill, er, Senate Bill 444. I move to recede."

Speaker Redmond: "Did you? Will you say it again?"

Richland: "I move to recede to..."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman has moved that the House recede from House amendment number 1 to Senate Bill 444. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. It takes 89 votes. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 99 'aye', no 'nay', and the House recedes from House amendment number 1, to Senate Bill 444. That was final action. 454. Representative Willer."

Willer: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "I...I don't mean to interrupt now, but I that after the baseball game somebodys shoes, male shoes, ended up in my car. So if anybody's looking for their shoes, I've got them."

Speaker Redmond: "454. Full confession is good for the soul Adeline."

Willer: "I move that we refuse to recede on the amendment House amendment number 1 on Senate Bill 454."

Speaker Redmond: "Would you state that again please?"

Willer: "Senate Bill 454 is an Ambulatory Surgical Treatment Center act, and I move that the House recede from House amendment number 1."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall the House recede in House amendment number 1 to Senate Bill 454? Final action, 89 votes. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The clerk will take the record. On this question there's 102 'ayes', no 'nays'. The House recedes from House amendment number 1 to Senate Bill 454. 432. I





missed Representative Washington. 432. Harold Wash...  
Representative Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Even though the Senate failed to concur in House amendment number 1 to 432. Senator Partee feels that a conference committee would resolve it. So I move that the House refuse to recede from House amendment 1, to Senate Bill 432."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall the House refuse to recede from House amendment number 1 to Senate Bill 432. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the House refuses to recede from amendment number 1 to Senate Bill 432. And a conference committee will be requested. 638. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Ah...Mr. Speaker. I move that the House refuse to recede from House amendment number 1, 2."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall the House refuse to recede from House amendment number 2 to Senate Bill 638? All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House refuses to recede from House amendment number 2 to Senate Bill 638. 640. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "I move that the House refuse to recede from House amendment number 2 to Senate Bill 640."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall the House refuse to recede from House amendment number 2 to Senate Bill 640? All in favor vote 'aye', say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it. The House refuses to recede. Representative Rigney. 682."

Rigney: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House refuse to recede from House amendment number 1, 2 and 3 and I ask for a conference committee."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall the House refuse to recede from House amendments number 1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 682. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it and the House refuses to recede."



Representative Willer. 642."

Willer: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House refuse to recede on amendment number 1 to Senate Bill 642."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall the House refuse to recede from House amendment number 1 to Senate Bill 642. Representative Shea."

Shea: "Re...refuse?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Willer."

Willer: "Yes. Refuse."

Speaker Redmond: "454 was the other one Representative Shea. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it the House refuses to recede from Senate Bill 642. A conference committee will be appointed. Representative Campbell here? 944."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House refuse to recede from House amendment number 1 to Senate Bill 944 and ask that the conference committee be appointed."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall the House recede from House amendment number 1 to Senate Bill 9...or refuse to recede from House amendment number 1 to Senate Bill 944? All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the House refuses to recede. Conference committee requested. 945."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House refuse to recede from House amendment number 1 from Senate Bill 945 and that a conference committee be appointed."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall the House refuse to recede from House amendment number 1 from Senate Bill 945? All in favor say 'aye', oppose 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the House refuses to recede. Conference Committee requested. The pages are in the process of handing out a synopsis of all of the bills which appear on concurrence. The thought being that perhaps if the sponsors will advise us, at least those



who...who do not agree, do not want to concur will advise us perhaps we can have an agreed list on the concurrences and save some time. You will get a print out of everything. Well I'd say a couple hours. Yea it's in the process. Normally the wishes of the sponsors are acceded to and ah, we might be able to save some time. House Bills Second Reading. House Bills Second Reading appears House Bill 83...Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I...I have 1176 and I'd like to have nonconcurrence on it also. And request a conference committee."

Speaker Redmond: "1176...that appears on concurrence I take it."

Mautino: "Yes sir, it does. It's on concurrence. It's on the print out."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the number? 1176?"

Mautino: "Yes sir. 1176."

Speaker Redmond: "On the order of concurrence appears House Bill 1176. Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "I'd like to ask leave of the House to put it into a nonconcurrence and I ask for nonconcurrence not because of the amendment but because in printing a line was left out of the bill as amended which designates which part of the administration, either the Department of Agriculture or the Department of Labor will do the inspecting. So I'd like to have a conference committee so we can put that back into the amendment. So I move that we do not..."

Speaker Redmond: "Have you looked at the original bill to see whether or not it's in proper shape?"

Mautino: "It wasn't sir. It did not designate who was going to do the...ah...ah...inspection and we have 2 Departments did not communicate between each other and therefore we have 2 departments of government."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is does the House concur or adopt in Senate Amendment number 1 to House Bill 1176."



Mautino: "Nonconcur."

Speaker: "The gentleman has rul...moved that the House nonconcur in Senate amendment number 1 to House Bill 1176. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it and House nonconcur in Senate amendment number 1 and the conference committee will be appointed."

Mautino: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "...Advise the Senate. 1697. Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker. I move that the House nonconcur with Senate amendment number 1 to House bill 1697. It is on the concurrence calendar. It's a good amendment it only has one deficiency. In tidying up the School Code the Senate repealed the Section which is the subject of another House Bill. And so we need to move to nonconcur so that we can remove the repeal of this particular, repealer of this particular section."

Speaker Redmond: "The lady, the lady has moved...to nonconcur the House nonconcur in Senate amendment number 1, to House Bill 1697. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no' and the 'ayes' have it. The House nonconcur in Senate amendment number 1 to House Bill 1697. 1949. Representative McLain."

McLain: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would ask that the House nonconcur in Senate amendment number 1 to House Bill 1949. And appropriate conference committee be appointed."

Speaker Redmond: "We don't do that yet. We send it back to the Senate and give them a chance to act on the Senate amendment."

McLain: "That would be fine. Whatever your will."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, does the House refuse to concur in Senate amendment number 1 to House bill 1949? All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it. The House refuses to concur in Senate amendment number 1 to House Bill 1949."



On concurrence appears 16, House Bill 1683. Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Senate amendment to House Bill 1683 is an amendment that provides that ...ah...that this is not a limit on any county which is a Home Rule unit and I move to concur in Senate amendment number 1 to House Bill 1683."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall the House concur in Senate amendment number 1 to House Bill 1683? All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "If the sponsor will yield."

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Palmer: "Does that mean in Cook County? Let me put it this way. How are the fees then set in Cook County, if it's not to be governed by this bill? By the Board?"

Yourell: "Pardon me?"

Palmer: "County Board?"

Yourell: "No the fees are set by this legislation."

Palmer: "Then you put on a Home Rule amendment."

Yourell: "This is not a limit to a Home Rule unit."

Palmer: "Well does that mean that the Board of County Commissioners of Cook County can do more or put more fees on or.."

Yourell: "This is the standard meaning of an amendment that says that this legislation is not a limit on a Home Rule unit. So as to clarify and make certain that this is exactly what it says. That's still by ordinance the county can do other things."

Palmer: "Alright, thanks."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Takes 89 votes. Representative Peters."

Peters: "Will the sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Peters: "Representative Yourell are there now a House and a Senate amendment saying the same thing? I...I'm just



looking at."

Yourell: "Yes. It appears that the truth that I believe that the amendment and the piece that you're referring to is in error because the amendment I don't believe was put on in committee and it was caught over in the Senate and put on."

Peters: "So then then the, both the print out and the digest are incorrect."

Yourell: "I believe that's correct."

Peters: "Alright thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Takes 89 votes. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 94 'ayes', no 'nays', the House concurs in Senate amendment number 1 to House Bill 1683. Representative Shea. The order of concurrence is 2788 it was left off the list in error it should be on. Representative Rigney."

Rigney: "Well Mr. Speaker, House Bill 2788....bill went over to the Senate they put on the standard Home Rule exemption. I move to concur in Senate amendment number 1."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The gentleman has moved that the House concur in Senate amendment number 1 to House Bill 2788. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 107 'ayes', no 'nays', The House concurs in Senate amendment number 1 to House Bill 2788. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker you're skipping around on these concurrences...quite a bit, now did you say that you were doing it to pick up noncontroversial ones?"

Speaker Redmond: "That was what I was hoping I was doing."

Walsh: "Well how can you tell whether they're controversial or not?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well the sponsors have come up and indicated to me they thought they were."



Walsh: "Well it'd be a whole lot easier to follow if you<sup>22.</sup>  
would go in order."

Speaker Redmond: "Well I agree, I'm not too sure this is the  
way but.."

Walsh: "And it's in clear violation of the rules also."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rigney came up and called  
our attention to the fact that it wasn't on the list  
and he asked us to call it, and that was the reason  
for that one, now I had called the order of business  
to Senate Bills Second Reading and I think maybe it's  
easier to go back there. House Bills Second Reading  
rather. House Bills Second Reading appears House Bill  
835. Representative Luft. Luft. Luft. 835.  
Representative Van Duynes. 835."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 835. A bill for an act, making  
an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses  
of the Illinois Fire Protection Personal Standards and  
Education Commission. Second Reading of the Bill.  
Committee amendments 1, 2, 3 and 5 were tabled in  
Committee. Committee amendment number 4, amends House  
Bill 835 on page 1, by deleting line 39 and inserting  
in lieu thereof, the following; Section 2 and so forth."

Van Duynes: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. That  
amendment is the one that Mrs. Catania or Ms. Catania  
is putting on everyones bills. The bill simply is the  
budget for the Firefighters Commission throughout the  
state, so I move for your concurrence or favorable vote.  
It's your usual amendment I believe, that no funds are  
suppose to be used from this may there may be some  
type of discrimination in hiring or salaries. I haven't  
got a copy of that bill right in front of me so I can't  
tell."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, I think this is another one of those  
line item reduction by 6 and a half per cent, if I'm  
not mistaken. I would hope if anybody is going to be  
passing some more amendments to some of these appropriations



that they'd just put a 6 and a half per cent line cut in there on overall to allow these Departments to do their own cutting. I think that that's the fair and equitable way to do it and I would hope that if anyone's drafting any more amendments that they might take this into consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne...ah...have you explained the amendment?"

Van Duyne: "I don't know, Mr. Speaker, I think...ah...the amendment is Susan Catanias amendment and it has to do with funds being expended that are in any way discriminatory, she's been putting this amendment on all of our bills and so I think that's what it is. If...if I don't have a copy of it in front of me, but if the Speaker would, the Clerk would read it why we'd all be enlightened."

Peters: "Mr. Mr. Speaker, I was just going to suggest that the Clerk would in form us just exactly what this amendment does because there was a little bit of confusion as to the numbering."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, will you read the amendment? Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of it. It just simply says, no funds appropriated in this act may be expended in violation of the rules and regulations of the Illinois Fair Employment Practice Commission or the Federal Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, that's what I thought it was and that's what it is."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes, do you seek recognition? Representative Barnes, do you want recognition? The question is on the adoption of the Resolution. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'."

Van Duyne: "By the way, Mr. Speaker, if...if...maybe we're going a little bit too fast. But I am not recommending that we adopt this ah...this amendment to this bill. I voted against it in committee and the only reason I'm





responding to this is because somebody asked me what the amendment was. If I have the right, well really I guess I'll just..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well let's put the question. The question is on the adoption of the amendment. Those in favor of the adoption of amendment number 4 to House Bill 835 indicate by voting 'aye', and those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Catania."

Catania: "Well thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Since this apparently is an amendment which I offered I assumed that I would have the right to explain. This is the amendment which has been offered and adopted on several bills now. It's been offered in Appropriations I by Representative Younge, it's been offered by me in Appropriations II. This is the amendment which simply says that no funds appropriated in this act may be expended in violation of the rules and regulations of the Illinois Fair Employment Practices Commission or the Federal Equal Employment Opportunities Commission. Now most of the Departments said that they were certainly tempting to be in compliance with these provisions and they had no objections. Now I certainly would hope that the Local Fire Protection People would feel the same way and that they would not have any intention of violating this provision, It has been generally accepted as something which is standard and acceptable language and I would hope that we would get more green lights up there to insure that there would not be discrimination in the hiring practice of this agency against blacks and latino's and women."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 59, 53 'aye', 59 'no', the amendment is lost. Representative Catania."

Catania: "I respectfully request to call the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will call a roll of the absentees."



Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I suggest that that's not timely  
the Speaker distinctly said that the amendment was lost."

Speaker Redmond: "I think you're correct. Representative  
Deuster."

Deuster: "I was going to say Mr. Speaker that I think you're  
fair. Last week I lost an amendment like this and I  
wasn't timely."

Speaker Redmond: "I did declare the result. Representative  
Catania."

Catania: "Well Mr. Speaker, I was standing and asking for  
recognition before you declared the results. Now I'm  
sorry if I'm not noisy enough to get your attention,  
however, I would point out that there are several people  
here who are verifying what I'm saying, that is that I  
was asking for recognition before you announced the  
results. This is an extremely important amendment.  
I would suggest that not enough people were paying attention  
and I would hope that we would be able to get the  
amendment adopted."

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

Frederich: "For a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Frederich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I  
pointed out to you the other day and I would like to  
remind you of it again. This nothing amendment has  
probably cost this session of the Legislature 5,000  
dollars. It takes 200 copies of this amendment every  
time it's introduced, it's been introduced around here  
over and over and over again. And all it says is you're  
suppose to obey the law. The State Constitution says  
there shall be no discrimination, we have a Fair  
Employment Practices Commission where Federal money is  
involved we have the Federal Loan, The Fair, Federal  
Fair Employment Practice thing and I say that the amendment



should never have been introduced in the first place. If you think our printing costs have gone up, this is one of the reasons. If we're going to introduce amendments let's introduce amendments that mean something. Not nothing amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "The hour of 2:00 having arrived and this is the, the time set for the House to meet in the Committee as a Whole. The Speaker will turn the chair over to Representative Matijevich. Third Reading on 835. Any further amendments? Third Reading. Where are we on this bill? Any further amendments on 835?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment number 6. Eugene Barnes. Amends House Bill 835 of page 1, line 13 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment number 6 makes a net reduction with the appropriation by 41 thousand 800 dollars. The net reduction is 36 thousand 900 in contractual, 3000 in travel, 500 in commodities and 2000 in equipment. Now when this bill was heard in Committee I suggested to I believe, a Mr. McCoy, who is the Director to come in with some figures so that we could amply reduce this amendment. Reduce this appropriation. The amendment that I am offering here. The amendment that I am offering here is in fact the staff amendment. Now the FY 75 contractual was 51 thousand 700. The FY 75 contractual was 51 thousand 700 and they request the FY 76 as 87 thousand 700. Now the director did not come in with any substantiating figures on this area of their budget. Therefore, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House I would move that we would adopt amendment number 6, to House Bill 835 and reduce its proportionally by about 41 thousand eight."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Can the sponsor yield on amendment?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."



Ryan: "Representative Barnes is this one of the amendments that was withdrawn in committee?"

Barnes: "Yes it was. This was one that was. Yes. This was one that I had originally introduced and as I said the director, I believe he was director, was there and I spoke with him about it and told him that as I'm sure you remember that it did not receive any figures to substantiate that large increase in contractual services that this amendment would be offered. And this is the amendment."

Ryan: "Alright, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This committee, the committee had this bill before it for an hour or an hour and a half totalled up the other two days. The commission had, in 1974, had 32 people that he's talking about working and they cut it down to nine. Now, throughout the State of Illinois there has been demand for services in this, by this commission and so they are trying to raise this to 15, if I am not mistaken. I resist this amendment very vigorously, if I can, there has been all kinds of, facetious little things said about this because the personality is ah... disagreements. Throughout the whole thing this budget was held up a month because of these little pickyish disagreements and ah...the...the...ah committee heard it, they turned these amendments down the very amendment that Representative Barnes is trying to put in now. I haven't the slightest idea why, we turned the other day or rather to be more specific. He withdrew it and ah...so if he didn't want to do it then I...I see no reason to bring it up now where there's 160, 70 people 50 people that know nothing of what went on and I resist this amendment and I wish you'd turn it down."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman has moved the adoption of amendment number 6 to House Bill 825."



Unknown: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's talking?"

Barnes: "Representative Barnes."

Speaker Redmond: "Oh. Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you. Just briefly in closing. I believe the gentleman spoke quite clearly but he spoke about the wrong bill and so that's the only problem. He was speaking about the Liquor Control Bill, this agency only has eight employess. Never has had more than that and aren't requesting any more now. What we're doing here is reducing a very large request to adhere for contractual services that this agency did not bring in any figures to substantiate and the director would put on notice any committee that if the figures were not forthcoming before this bill came on Second Reading that we would reduce it proportionally. Now what he has did in FY 75, has requested 51 thousand and received it and in FY 76 he's requesting 87 thousand but he has not shown any figures to substantiate any of the requests he's over budgetted for rent, hes over budgetted in other certain areas and he's shown no substantiating figures. So as was offered in committee, he's correct that the amendment was there, the director knew of the amendment and was put on notice to please give us some substantiating figures prior to Second Reading, he hasn't did it and that's the reason for offering of this amendment. I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Rep...Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the amendment and the bill have been passed out. We just heard this in committee Friday and there's some 12 amendments filed and I don't really know if they've all been distributed."

Speaker Redmond: "They indicate they have them."

Ryan: "All twelve?"

Speaker Redmond: "We're only considering six. Can't tell you about anything else. Representative Leverenz."



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

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Leverenz: "I...Representative Barnes I understand that the additional money sought for contractual services was specifically outlined for part time supervision of testing across the state, rather than put on additional full-time employees. Is that correct?"

Barnes: "I'm sorry Ted, I didn't hear you."

Leverenz: "I'll put the question to you again. I understand the additional money sought in contractual services for the budget, was for additional people that would be employed on a part time rather than on a full-time basis for the supervision of the testing that they conduct across the entire state. And the put these people on part time instead of in full-time."

Barnes: "Okay fine. Part of the request was for 22 thousand for that purpose and we allowed then 15 thousand of the 22 thousand they requested. Now the..the problem here Ted, is that there's over and beyond their request, this 36 thousand that's in contention here over and beyond what they showed us that had figures to deleniate the need for that money. They did not show anything to deleniate the need for the additional 36 thousand. One of the problems is a number of their programs thay they had included in the FY 75 request as one shot programs for that year is included again in FY 76 with the same dollar amount for the one shot program that was suppose to have been in FY 75. That's the problem."

Leverenz: "I understand too it contained money for additional test preparation and materials..."

Barnes: "We gave...we gave them a additional 15 thousand."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I want to reinerate what I said before. This bill was passed out of committee without any amendments to it except



Mr. Catanias. Now the idea being that we are going to adopt a bill, a rule, a resolution or what any of you call it about the 6 per cent impoundment. Now, this is the whole idea behind passing this bill out as, as it was presented to us. You all understand that the hours and weeks and months of going to, to, through the effort of presenting these budgets and so we decided, or at least the majority felt that we would let this bill go through committee and if we did adopt the 6 per cent impoundment resolution that this bill would fall under that category. So, without delaboring any more I will just ask for a negative vote and allow this thing to go out without this 6 per cent reduction."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Appropriations II Committee has deliberated long time on this bill. Has reached an amendment which I think is agreed in terms of the cut. At least to some extent by both sides of the aisle in terms of the need for cut and I would respectfully request that the Members of the House abide by the decision of the Appropriations Committee in these cuts which are agreed upon."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birchler."

Birchler: "Mr. Speaker. I agree with the last two Representatives that spoke, we spent much time in the Committee on this. It's a bad amendment and I move that we vote it down."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes, I wish you'd enlighten the chair as to what this amendment is."

Barnes: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I thought I had closed on it once. This is a staff amendment, this was worked out in conjunction with both staffs. It was not introduced in committee because I had the amendment. Mr. McCoy who was the director was informed of this amendment and he stated in committee that he would submit documents substantiating the request for an increase. Now let's



understand what we're doing here. In FY 75 this very small agency received an appropriation of 600 and 21 point 3 thousand. Now they're asking for in FY 76, 1 million, 1 hundred and 85 thousand. That's over a half a million dollar increase. And what we're saying is we needed some substantiating figures. Now in all of that the only thing that we're reducing or asking to reduce in this amendment is 41 thousand dollars, that we say they have not substantiated. That's what we're talking about here. The gentleman did not, did not, I reiterate I've talked to both the minority staff and the majority staff, the gentleman did not bring in any figures to substantiate not taking this reduction out and that's why I'm offering the amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Then the amendment does in effect, reduce the appropriation. Is that correct?"

Barnes: "Out and out."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman has moved the adoption of amendment number 6, to House Bill 835. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker to explain my vote. What Representative Barnes says is not all together true you know. He stated that this was an agreed amendment with the staff. Now, I was the sponsor of this bill in Committee and this amendment was tossed out at us by our staff. Now the staff did not even consult with me as the sponsor of this, this appropriation or of this bill and they threw it out and then we got into a little hassle and Representative Barnes agreed to withdraw this. Later on when we did pass the appropriation with, without the reduction somehow or another he got in a little hassle with Mr. McCoy and said that if it wasn't amended, he was going to throw this out today. But by no way shape or form did he ever consult me or was this agreed upon by me. Now, I want to also bring out one other thing. That most of these gr...most of this increase is by





Federal Grant money, it's not the State of Illinois money."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan, 5 seconds."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Five seconds over."

Ryan: "Representative Barnes made it very clear before this bill left committee that if the materials that were asked for were not supplied and the information was not forthcoming that he would amend this bill on Second Reading and it looks like he's got the job done."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 68 'ayes', 69 'ayes', 41 'nay', the amendment is adopted. Any further amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment number 7, Ryan. Amends House Bill 835 on page 1, line 13 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to table amendment 7, 8, 9 and 10 and go with amendment number 11, which I do not believe has been distributed."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the gentleman have leave?" Table 7 through 10. Hearing no objections 7 through 10 are tabled. Further amendments."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment number 11, Ryan. Amends House Bill 835 as amended and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "There's nothing distributed so I presume that we'll have to just stay where we are. Take it out of the record until it's distributed. Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now resolve into the Committee of the Whole for hearing House Bill 3118."

Speaker Redmond: "All in favor of the motion indicate by saying 'aye', 'no', the 'ayes' have it. Resolved. Representative Matijevec."

Matijevec: "The Committee of the Whole, having been convened



under the direction of the Speaker of the House and appropriately announced that according to the rules of the House the purpose of considering the House Bill 3118. The chair calls on the majority leader, Representative Gerald Shea. The gentleman from Cook, Representative James Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the Committee of the Whole. I wonder if it would be appropriate or if it would be possible to have leave of the committee to also consider House Joint Resolution 67? That Resolution in accordance with the Constitution of the State of Illinois, sets up what the expected revenues are for the, I think, the first time by resolution of what we might expect those revenues to be and then deals with what this revenue crisis will be providing in terms of the State of Illinois, in terms of expected revenues and expenditures. It's, I think appropriate, it's similar to a Congressional Resolution concerning appropriated funds. And I wonder if it would be appropriate, since we have this Committee of the Whole to after we consider, or while, or jointly, we consider this Resolution while we're considering House Bill 3118. In a real sense, this Resolution describes the crisis of the problem that we're dealing with and that House Bill 3118 is in a sense to remedy, and I wonder if I could have leave of the Committee to have this Resolution discussed in this Committee of the Whole also."

Matijevich: "Representative Houlihan, the Committee can not give you leave to consider that Resolution. The Committee of the Whole has been convened pursuant the direction of the Speaker on specific subject matter the House Bill in question. You can however, discuss that Resolution as to its subject matter and how it pertains to this House Bill. But as to considering that Resolution, we do not have authority to do so. The gentleman from McLain, Representative Bradley."



Bradley: "Well Mr. Speaker that was the point I was going to make was that the House was convened by, into the Committee of the Whole from, on the calendar to specifically address itself to House Bill 3118 and I don't think that we could address that Resolution at the same time."

Matijevich: "Thank you. The assistant minority leader, well the minority leader is also seeking recognition. Representative Washburn."

Washburn: "Well thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't know just exactly what Representative Houlihans Resolution contains or the dollar amount but from what little he said it appears as though it might be the proper approach to take in this fiscal crisis and it is a related subject and I would suggest that it be heard at this particular time, along with Representative Sheas bill."

Matijevich: "All I can say, Representative Washburn, is that it can be discussed in a general nature with the House Bill. However, the Committee of the Whole received its jurisdiction from the direction of the chair as, as to what it is considering and it is not, it is not been convened as to subject matter but convened as to a specific House Bill and that's all the authority we have right now except that one can include the Resolution in the general subject matter. The assistant minority leader, Representative Walsh from Cook."

Walsh: "Well Mr. Speaker, I suggest that that ruling is incorrect, since this Committee of the Whole is not properly organized anyway, since the Speaker announced it yesterday and invoked a rule, improperly, Rule 18D, yesterday was not the week preceding June 30th and he had no right under the rules to do that. Now I, I further point out that I attempted to get his attention when Mr. Shea was recognized and he walked off the rostrum without recognizing me for that or any other purpose. Now, since we are not properly in a Committee of the Whole, I suggest



to you that we can easily discuss Mr. Houlihans Resolution or any other Resolution that might come before this body certainly Mr. Houlihans sounds to me like it is the same subject matter and I would suggest to you Mr. Chairman or Mr. Speaker or however you are there standing that we can discuss this and if you insist on ruling that we can not I would move to appeal the ruling of the chair."

Matijevich: "The Chairman rules that you are out of order on your point, that point was made in the session yesterday and the only recourse you have now from what this chair determines is to be joined and show your defense on the Journal."

Walsh: "No sir! I can appeal the ruling of the chair, that of course can be done in any kind of a proceeding whether it's be a committee or a meeting of the full House."

Matijevich: "Could you give me what you are appealing? And mention the rule."

Walsh: "I am appealing your ruling that says that we may not consider the Resolution that Mr. Houlihan is offering in this meeting. That is what I am appealing."

Matijevich: "Alright, that you can do. The assistant minority leader appeals the chairs ruling that... Representative Berman from Cook on a point of order."

Berman: "Mr. Speaker, I think...ah...we're a little bit ahead of ourselves. The question in order to even be presented has to be presented before the proper body. We are a Committee of the Whole, we can not determine what we're going to hear and I don't think that he, that the question of appealing the ruling of the chair is proper either because this is not the House. This is the Committee of the Whole. And therefore we can't, we aren't even within jurisdiction to consider what is the subject matter. The subject matter was set when the Committee of the Whole was called."

Matijevich: "Mr. Berman I agree with you except that the assistant minority leader disagrees with both of us, I



agree with you in that the, the...ah...both the calendar the..ah..order by the Speaker that the specific subject matter is the House Bill, but the minority leader disagrees and appeals the ruling. Ah...Bill Walsh we, the chair has now resolved that this matter, the House, the Resolution to which you and Representative Houlihan refer has not even been introduced I understand. So that ought to resolve the whole matter."

Houlihan: "Mr. Mr. Chairman."

Matijevich: "Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "I have introduced the Resolution and the Clerk has given me a number. It's House Joint Resolution 67, I think you're in error on that point."

Matijevich: "Well...the Clerk tells me it's waiting to be introduced. They give a number but they, they know the number but it, it is, it's not official until it's been read. They very often tell you the number it's going to be, but until it's filed that number is not official. So, it really has not been introduced yet. So there's nothing now before the chair except Representative Peters is now recognized, the gentleman from Cook."

Peters: "Mr. Chairman, I don't want to break in on whatever's happening here but that's been resolved, I just have one parliamentary inquiry. Having only been a member of the Committee of Whole once before. We discussed the RTA I would ask the chair to refresh my memory and the new members of the House as to exactly what may happen or occur in the Committee of the Whole. Is it my understanding that this is for discussion of the bill, no amendment to that can be offered here and if in fact the House does vote this bill out it does come on the calendar on Second Reading? Is that right?"

Matijevich: "Representative Peters, the Committee of the Whole is for the purpose of discussing and considering legislation, whatever is referred to, there can be witnesses, there can be debates amongst the members, there are no



amendments to be offered and if the Committee arises then the bill goes on Second Reading."

Peters: "At which point amendments can be."

Matijevich: "At which point amendments can be offered."

Peters: "Thank you."

Matijevich: "The minority whip, Representative Duff, from Cook."

Duff: "Well Mr. Speaker, on the point a Committee of the Whole may once it has convened consider any matter it chooses. And Mr. Representative Houlihans Resolution could most appropriately be considered at the same time since Committees function under the House rules, and with the House rules under rule 37, second paragraph, which says that the Speaker may upon entering upon any given order of business may call bills or resolutions pertaining to similar subject matter for consideration at the same time or in Executive order so that the House may consider and resolve the subject matter at one time. Or he may call bills or resolutions in the order in which they would be tabled, and so forth. Now since this Committee is functioning with the rules of the House, it is possible to do this. And I.."

Matijevich: "Rep...Representative Duff, I hate to interrupt you but the rule to which you're referring is the Speakers authority when we're on reading of bills, where he may go out of the order to call certain bills on the same subject matter. That has nothing to do with this and I would appreciate that the Membership of the Committee of the Whole getting on to the subject matter. The Rep..Representative from Cook. Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Yes. Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Under rule 31C, which sets up the Committee of the Whole procedures, no bill may be considered in the c...or resolution may be considered in the Committee of the Whole unless the provisions of rule 18 have been complied with. Now in the last week of the session, Rule 18 does



say you don't have to post, but you do have to announce at least one day in advance on the floor of the House. That was not done with respect to House Joint Resolution 67, and therefore I would submit that it is not proper under the rules for it to be considered in this Committee of the Whole."

Matijevich: "Your, Representative Lundy, your objection will be noted, however, I might say that the announcement was made yesterday and today is the week preceding June 30th, and as far as I'm concerned. Oh...no he said 31. Alright. Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker, just to clarify. I'm not objecting to the Committee of the Whole I think that was properly noted what I said was that it would not be proper to hear in the Committee of the Whole a bill or resolution notice of which was not given on the floor of the House yesterday. And that's why I would object to hearing House Joint Resolution 67 in this Committee of the Whole. Proper notice was not given."

Matijevich: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, yesterday I tried to get a copy of House Bill 3118. The pages told me there were no printed copies, there's been none on my desk, I requested it a while ago and I am again told that there are no printed copies. Now perhaps I'm the only one that hasn't gotten it, but I would appreciate a copy of 3118 without having to do this every day."

Matijevich: "There appears to be many offers, Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Thank you. It's about time."

Matijevich: "Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee of the Whole. I appreciate your support in considering House Joint Resolution, I'm sorry that it wasn't timely in terms of introduction and the House rose rather abruptly



to go into the Committee of the Whole. I would just request that we might consider this Resolution, at least the subject matter of this Resolution during the Committee of the Whole, because what the Resolution attempts to do is for the first time."

Matijevich: "Representative Houlihan I have already said that if the subject matter is germane to the House Bill in question, you may so bring up the subject matter and how it is germane." Now on the bill, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3118 would allow the various elected and appointed state officials to take by line item and impound 6 per cent of that line item in what is referred to as a contingency reserve. They would file with the Comptroller a written statement that that amount is designated with a contingency reserve. That amount then could not be, and I look at paragraph 4, line 20-21 and 22, that appropriated amount designated as a contingency reserve, reserve, could not be obligated, incumbered or expended upon the certification of the appropriate certifying officer. And those funds could only be released for either obligation or expenditure upon the written authorization of that certifying officer with the appropriate person, the Comptroller and the State Treasurer. The Governor has explained to us within the last two weeks, that the State of Illinois faces a fiscal crisis in its general revenue fund of an amount, according to the Governors calculation of some 120 million dollars. Coupled with deficiencies from this fiscal year, it was the Governors opinion that we in the General Assembly should reduce general revenue expenditures by some 250 million dollars. There are approximately 90 appropriation bills at various stages in the appropriation procedure with that amount of money of general revenue. It is almost, and I say almost, an impossible task to just go ahead and reduce those 90 appropriations bills





by that amount. By the passage of this bill, it would allow those officers that are responsible for the various budgets to use the word 'to impound' that much general revenue from expenditure until we find out exactly where we are or if indeed we do have a financial crisis in the general revenue fund. We will return if we, when we adjourn, we will return to Springfield, sometime in late October to consider veto's of the Governor. By that time, we in the General Assembly could see what fourth quarter spending was and if the appropriate order and officer in light of the term fiscal crisis, if that appropriate officer put the brakes on spending on those agencies and departments under his control. We would also see what kind of spending we had in the first quarter spending for fiscal 76. We would have an opportunity to find out what the fourth quarter revenue was for fiscal year 75 and what the total revenue picture was. We would have an exact picture of what the lapsed balances were for fiscal year 75, rather than now anticipating them because all expenditures from fiscal year 75 must be completed by September 30th. We would have an opportunity to review and look at the revenue from the first quarter of fiscal year 1976 and we would further have an opportunity to review the veto's of the Governor whether they be total veto's, line item vetos or reduction veto's. The bill has a self destruct clause and would become a nullity at the end of fiscal year 1976. The officers that are designated as the appropriate certifying officers would be the lieutenant Governor as to the appropriations for which that officer is authorized to approve expenditures, the attorney General, The Secretary of State, The Treasurer of the State of Illinois. On page 2, line 16, Section E, that should read Auditor General and that will be corrected hopefully by an amendment on Second Reading. The Comptroller for appropriations to his office, The



Speaker of the House, The President of the Senate, the minority leader of the Senate as to his appropriations, the minority leader of the House as to his appropriations, and the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate acting jointly as to appropriations to the Board Commission Bureaus or agencies which part, are part of Legislative Brance of Government which are not included in the foregoing paragraphs, to the Chief Justice for those expenditures on behalf of the Judicial system, and to all other, to all other budgets than those enumerated above. The Governor of the State of Illinois. There is then a clause that for the purposed of this section obligation, incumberrance and expenditures shall not include any obligation incumberrance expenditure for the payments of grants under the Illinois Public Aid Code, so that all Public Aid Grants would be excluded from those items that could be reduced by the appropriate certifying officer. And as again I say that the act the amendatory act of 75, would have a self destruct clause in it and the act, section 3 of the act would say that it would take effect upon it becoming a law. Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, I shall try to answer any questions with regard to the bill."

Matijevich: "The minority leader, Representative Washburn, did you have question at this time?"

Washburn: "Yes, would the sponsor yield to a couple questions?"

First of all...ah...Representative Shea, it appears to me that this is strictly a politically motivated piece of legislation, because I note that you have the Republican Attorney General listed in here twice. Are you giving him double duty or just recognizing him as he should properly be, two times instead of one over the others or."

Shea: "As I explained as I was going through the bill on page 2, line 16, I did mention the fact that the word attorney is used there and it should have been 'auditor'.



Washburn: "Alright now, as I understand this, all it does is give the constitutional officers and a few others the authority to withhold or impound 6 per cent of the appropriation that's approved by the General Assembly."

Shea: "Yes sir."

Washburn: "Now, it's my understanding over the past years that when appropriations are approved by the General Assembly and signed by the Governor, that there is no mandate that the officials listed in this bill must then control appropriation, is that true?"

Shea: "No sir."

Washburn: "That is not true?"

Shea: "No sir."

Washburn: "They have to spend every dime that's appropriated to them you mean?"

Shea: "Sir, there are instances such as with the common school fund, that those items must be expended according to a statutory formula and if we appropriate there is nothing the officer that certify those expenditures can do to withhold the fund. There are certain other areas that the people certify in the expenditures are not the people mentioned within the persons that can withhold. When we make appropriate appropriations to those institutions of higher learning throughout the State of Illinois, those appropriations have been approved by the appropriate certifying officer or the Universities. With regard to the other elected officials, they are the ones that may make the appropriations and would have some, some say with regard to whether those funds should be expended or not. The Governor, the Governor although he is not the appropriate certifying officer, with regard to the expenditures of agencies for commissions and departments directly under his control, has a mechanism that the budget and approval of expenditures from those departments must be approved by the Department of Finance and if he does effectually control the certifying officer



of the Department of Finance he could effectually control the spending of those Board, Commissions and Departments and that is one of the things that I brought out, that we in the General Assembly would have a chance to observe through the appropriate appropriations committees to see if the chief executive officer caused the spending in those boards, commissions and departments under his general control. If he did in fact cause that spending to be substantially reduced in the fourth quarter in light of what he terms a financial crisis. With regard to capital expenditures from the General revenue fund most of those are tied to an appropriate release by the Governor of this state."

Washburn: "Well in other words, then your proposal is additional authority to the Governor?"

Shea: "To the Governor and to certain other elected officials."

Washburn: "Through the Governor over agencies...ah...ah... which he has at the present time, little or no control, such as the Election Board. He would be able to impound 6 per cent of the appropriations of the Election Board I assume."

Shea: "At the time this bill was drafted the Election Board was under the control of the Department of Finance or at least a number of people thought so, since this bill has been drafted, I am informed that the President of the Senate held that the Governor's veto of a bill was returned to the Senate on the 61st day therefore, became law by him not acting on it, within 60 days. I think that will be a litigable point between the chief executive officer and other branches of state government. Had that been law, and that agency was not subject to the Department of Finance, I think it would have been appropriate to let the chairman of the board of that agency control the spending of that agency."

Washburn: "In other words he can impound 6 per cent of the



Election Board appropriation, as approved by the Senate and the House..."

Shea: "Sir, aside from Senate Bill 61, 71, which the President of the Senate has said he can not consider the veto and that the bill is law because the Governor failed to act on the bill within 60 days after he reached, it reached his desk. Because that bill is now what I might call in a state of flux or limbo, but had that bill been law, I would have made the chairman of the board of the State Board of Elections the appropriate certifying officer. But prior to this time, the State Board of Elections submitted their expenditures subject to approval and control by the Department of Finance which is an agency by which the Governor may control spending of the various departments, boards and agencies."

Washburn: "Alright, how about the common school fund, the State Board of Education, he could impound 6 per cent of their appropriations if approved."

Shea: "Sir, yes. And I might say that that was one of the areas the Governor recommended a 6 per cent cut to this General Assembly. The total appropriations from the common school fund, and I could be off, contains an appropriation of 1 billion six hundred and 14 million dollars. Of that amount of money, it went up almost 2 hundred million dollars this year. The increase that it went up is at least to the expenditure of money to elementary and secondary approximately a 15 per cent increase. A 6 per cent reduction would hit the expenditure to the common school fund the hardest because it would in effect not reduce it by some 6 per cent, but would reduce it by almost two-thirds, because a substantial amount of the increase will use, be used to fund the teacher pension plan, the amount of funding, almost 30 million dollars, that increase sir is on a pay out basis and in my opinion could not be



reduced or less those people on Pension would go without payment so that although he is asking for a 6 per cent in, decrease across the board in the Common School Fund it would decrease the amount of money to by the, the amount of this years increase by approximately two-thirds and under the formula I requested and received a computer print-out from the Office of Education and the ones that would be hardest hit by that reduction would be in particular your downstate, metropolitan areas and I use the City of Springfield as an example. With a 6 per cent reduction in the Common School Fund, applying that to the amount of money to be expended on the School Aid formula and providing that reduction pro-rata, the city of Springfield educational system would receive a reduction of 25 per cent of State Aid compared to what they received last year and would in my opinoin and after talking to Members of the, that are connected with the schools in Springfield, almost almost certainly because a dramatic increase in local property taxes."

Washburn: "Well aren't, as long as your on the schools, I believe and I'm certainly no expert in the educational field, but aren't school districts preparing or have already prepared their budgets for next year and the, they're paid on a monthly basis, I understand, through the School Aid formula and if each one of those payments were reduced by 6 per cent...ah...certainly cut-backs in...ah...ah...teachers or, or courses or something would be very necessary in most school districts at least throughout the State...I would think it would throw them in a chaotic position."

Shea: "Mr. Washburn I could not...I could not agree with... I could not agree with you more. In my opinion a 6 per cent cut in the Common School Fund even though it was increased by some 15 per cent as I say, this cut would mean only a 5 per cent reduction and under the equalizer for...under the School Equalize Resource Formula, passed



by this Assembly, many school districts are having their local share, what they pay for education reduced that we would find many school districts, and again I reiterate those in Down-state, Illinois, from the major metropolitan areas would find themselves in a fiscal crisis; the likes of which have not been seen since the depression. That would be my opinion."

Washburn: "Alright, ah, let's take Income Tax refund for existence, for example. Will an Income Tax refund that ...ah...ah...a citizen might be entitled to, would his check be reduced by 6 per cent?...Under this Bill it's possible apparently...that's his own money."

Shea: "I don't...No Sir, I would think...Let me tell you what my opinion would be about that. Under the Bill presented to us by the Department of Revenue, the Director requested 125 million dollars. The Committee had thought that that item ought to be 134 million dollars, but in light of the Governors request for a, put the brakes on spending, in general revenue, they left that item as requested by the Department of Revenue. In fact, in light of the April and May collection it would be my considered opinion that the Income Tax refunds for the next fiscal year be substantially, substantially, Sir, go over that amount. It would be my feeling that since we will be back in November, we will be back in January and in March, that we will be asked for a deficiency appropriation in that item or if not asked we will be in a position to provide a deficiency to insure those people that have a refund coming to insure that they will get that refund in the full amount."

Washburn: "Now, I wasn't clear in the Bill. Does this...ah... permit the 6 per cent impoundment of total dollar amount held in a bill Gerry, or is it line item by line item?"

Shea: "It permits a 6 per cent impoundment if you'd like, line item by line item and does not go to the total bottom figure."



Washburn: "At the discretion of the Governor?"

Shea: "At the discretion of the appropriate certifying officer."

Washburn: "Or the elected officials, they're both listed in the bill."

Shea: "Yes, sir."

Washburn: "Well isn't the answers you've given to most of my questions, you've said that in your opinion that this is that and...ah...I'm not questioning your opinion in most cases but how thoroughly have you discussed this proposal with the Governor? What are some of his opinions on this and your discussions with him?"

Shea: "Sir, I have not discussed the proposal with the Governor. I did discuss and was privy to the information with regards to his speech approximately 3 hours before he made it to this General Assembly. I like you, sir, set in the audience and heard the speech and have heard the reaction of a number of people in various groups throughout the State. I have heard the reactions of my fellow colleagues in the General Assembly. I have noticed that the Director, the newly appointed Director of the Bureau of the Budget has stated that in his opinion that this bill, if it passed should be vetoed by the Governor. He has also said that that was no solution to the financial crisis, perhaps cause he didn't want to be the one going through all those budget bills and finding where to find the money. He talked about the Constitution not, not allowing this, but I suggest he stick to numbers and not the law. He does not make a very good lawyer."

Washburn: "Well Represent...Well Representative Shea, I don't believe and I don't believe you would disagree with me that a 6 per cent across the board cut is feasible or reasonable or workable. Is that your opinion as well as mine?"

Shea: "Absolutely sir and I will tell you why, if I might expound for a minute. We were led to believe some time





in March and then in April that there were sufficient State funds available to appropriate for budgets those 90 bills I talked to you about that were introduced at the request of the Governors Office. When those bills were supplied to us sometime between April the 4th and introduced sometime about April the 10th. Evidently we were not in any financial or fiscal crisis. Had we been I'm sure those funds or at least it would have been, had I made the decision, would have reduced those requests at that time. Some 45 or 60 days later, we are told that a fiscal crisis faces this state and yet I have not seen any hard figures to prove that, perhaps we are. I know we're faced by large unemployment and I've known that for a long time but this is one of the proposals and the reasons that some of us suggested this and again I reiterate, it gives us at least until we return in November a chance to look at what those responsible persons have done about putting on the brakes on spending in the fourth quarter when this apparent financial crisis came upon us. It gives us a chance to look to see if the supposed change in Revenue in the fourth quarter, really did in fact take place. It also gives us a chance to look at the total lapses that we know what we are working with with regard to the total lapsed revenue for fiscal 75 and where it came from. We will also have an opportunity to look at first quarter fiscal 76 revenue and first quarter fiscal 76 spending and a chance to review in depth and I might say our revenue in Appropriation Committees can work over the summer to review in depth the vetoes of the Governor if there be any in the Appropriation process."

Washburn: "Well, I don't know Gerry, I think since last December our two elected fiscal officers of the State, our Comptroller Lindberg and State Treasurer Dixon have been sending up warning flags that there was a fiscal



crisis and certainly the Governor failed to take heed and did introduce the largest budget in our States history. But to me, this piece of legislation that you have before us right now does nothing more and I think this is important, it does nothing more but give the Governor additional power to what he already has and I think Gerry that your proposal here in House Bill 3118 is a complete advocacy of the legislative responsibility and I...I have to tell you right now that I'm totally opposed to your idea. I think that it's nothing more than a gimmick by, by the Democratic majority to meet another deadline either that or an indication of their inability or unwillingness to accept the responsibility. I think it's another example in addition to the infamous user list of May 23rd by passing and killing bills without permitting Democrat or Republican Members to hear the bills explained or to debate their merit. Now I don't know why you do this...ah...ah...certainly it would appear to everyone that quantity is more important than quality to your side of the aisle and I just don't know why you don't want to take the time to go through these Bills and cut them on our own priority basis."

Shea: "Well Mr....Mr. Minority Leader, I am not suggesting that we...Mr. Minority Leader I am not suggesting that we in the Legislature advocate or go away from our Legislative duties and that we do through the appropriation process continue to put the Appropriation Bills in a form that we think are enough to run state government. You and I sir, both know and I hope that when these Bills leave both the House and the Senate and go to the Governors desk that will, they will be in a dollar amount that we think think those boards, agencies, departments of state government absolutely need to run state government. That there will be no fat in any of them, I think that is our duty, but I further think for the Chief Executive Officer to say in the last 2 or 3 weeks of the session



that a fiscal crisis has come on us overnight and that you in the General Assembly make 6 per cent across the board cuts sir, I don't think it's possible and I say through this bill the Chief Executive Officer, we have set the dollar amount appropriations the amount that we in the General Assembly think is needed to run state government. If you feel that the financial crisis you talked about is real then you may impound up to 6 per cent of those monies until we find out where we're at and if you find out that perhaps you've erred in the depth of the crisis and you might have in the amount of available revenues that you could release those at a later date."

Washburn: "Well Gerry, for the last week or so, since the Governors speech the 2 spokesmen, the Republican spokesmen on the Appropriation Committee and other Members have been introducing amendments to a great number of Bills just trying to do that and I don't see and, and certainly the majority of the people on your side of the aisle have been rejecting each and every one of them with few exceptions. So I don't know why under your proposal you want to force our job on the Governor...and that's just what you're doing under this.."

Shea: "Sir I don't think that's what I'm doing...."

Washburn: "Well...well you certainly are because we've been trying to reduce these and you wouldn't go along with them and now you're saying, well, let the Governor do our job...and I don't know...don't you want to take the heat or what is it?"

Shea: "Mr. Washburn, I like you have been taking heat all my life, I like you sir must stand for Election and go back to my district and whether the people of my district want to..."

Matijevich: "Representative Lechowicz on a point of order."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I don't believe heat or that portion of it is included in House Bill 3118 and I think that



there's a debate going on and I would hope that the Membership would ask questions and there would be a response."

Matijeovich: "Keep the bill on light rather than heat, Representative..."

Washburn: "Well I think there's some heat in these Bills Teddy, there's commodities....."

Matijeovich: "Excuse me. Representative Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Mr. Speaker, I just want to make this observation in the event the press corp or somebody is going to give awards for excellent acting, I think both of these gentlemen would qualify."

Matijeovich: "Well, they're, they're trying to outdo the Governor, Representative Caldwell. Proceed Representative

Washburn: "..."

Washburn: "Well anyway just let me say this to wind up ah, my remarks on this. I want you to know and it's been indicated here as I said earlier, since the Governors speech is the Republic, the Republican Members of this House stand ready to cut this budget and bring it in line with the Revenue estimate and I don't think that the answer to this fiscal problem is your proposal, Gerry, I think it's nothing more than an unwarranted delegation of our own Legislative powers. Now the General Assembly has a mandate to pass a balanced budget and the Republicans in both Houses are dedicated to just doing that and I recommend Gerry, that you withdraw this proposal and I suggest that we get down to the business at hand, the states business and cut these budgets on this Sunday afternoon instead of fooling around with a nothing, a nothing Bill that's no more than a gimmick to meet another deadline."

Matijeovich: "Thank you Representative Washburn...ah... Representative Lundy. There's about 10 lights up here and I'm going to call them on the order that they lit up on the board. Representative Lundy."



Lundy: "Yes. Thank you Mr. Chairman. I wondered, I have 3 or 4 areas that this Bill relates to that I'd like to ask the Sponsor about and get his feeling about how the Bill might operate and I think in light of the fact that we are really sailing in sort of uncharted Constitutional waters that the, the history we make may be of some interest to the courts and others. First of all, Representative Shea. You're aware that under Article 8, Section 2B of the State Constitution the Appropriations may not exceed what the General Assembly estimates it will be available revenue. Now my question is, since we only authorize but do not direct the certifying officers in the Bill to impound 6 per cent of the appropriated funds, have we complied with the Constitutional requirement that appropriated funds shall not exceed estimated revenue?"

Shea: "In my opinion, yes, because it is my opinion that the General Assembly will present to the Governor those amounts in Appropriation Bills that they think that State Government can reasonably, reasonably run on, that the budget that's introduced by the Governor called for a zero balance at the ending of next fiscal year, that there has been substantial budget reductions made in many areas and the apparent lack of revenue for next fiscal year can at best be in estimate by either the Bureau of the Budget of our own Fiscal and Economic Committee. That we will be back in November and have an opportunity to again look at some of the items I mentioned and we might be in a position or would be in a position to then if we had to either pass new Appropriation Bills reducing or increasing items of appropriation. I might remind you sir, that during the next fiscal year, that begins on July 1st, that we will be in Springfield, we know of October and November by law we will be back in January and will be back in March to act on the budget for the following



fiscal year."

Lundy: "One more question on that point. Sponsor, I note that 1 amendment has already been introduced to House Bill 3118 which would change the first 'may' in the Bill that is the fact that the certifying officer 'may' impound a 6 per cent contingency reserve to 'shall', so that we are directing the certifying officers to make the ah, the reserve. Wouldn't that clarify the question of whether we had met our Constitutional responsibility to not appropriate or authorize more spending than we have revenue? Wouldn't that be a desirable amendment to the bill?"

Shea: "I have thought about that amendment when we originally talked about the bill. We talked in terms of 'shall' or 'may'. If you make it mandatory upon the State Officer or whether you make it discretionary, it was my considered opinion that with regard to the proper certifying officer he could if he wanted to, impound by line item that amount of money. It is my opinion and I have not, although, fourth quarter revenues are supposedly down and revenues for next fiscal year will be down, I have not yet seen the figures that will show that the reduced appropriations will be more than the revenue of the state, sir. And again we're only talking about the general funds, we are not talking about other items."

Lundy: "Alright, thank you. I...I have questions about another area of the Bill and that is the, the release certification which can be made by each of the certifying officers. At the present time the Bill only requires that in order to, to certify the release of the contingency reserve that the certifying officer states that the expenditure is necessary. Now it seems to me that if our basic purpose in passing the bill is to assure that we do not spend beyond the revenues that are available, that it might serve a purpose to include it



as part of the required certification the fact that the revenue will be available in the general revenue fund to cover the expenditure and I believe there will be an amendment to that effect offered. How would you as the sponsor of the Bill review, or view that kind of a requirement? That the releasing certification include a statement that the funds will be available to cover the expenditures?"

Shea: "I had not thought about that until this time, but I certainly will give that some consideration."

Lundy: "Alright, on a, on another point. I have some question as to how the 6 per cent contingency reserve would work in the case of periodic payout. For example, the, what I believe is the 11 installment payments from the common school fund and I see that you and I have introduced what I think are similar amendments to insure that it works one way. Is it your intention to add that to the bill on Second Reading."

Shea: "I have no objection to that amendment and I'm at least led to believe by those people that I feel are knowledgeable in the field of education that that would be the preferable method of doing it because that would then almost assuredly assure the school people of mon... of enough money to get through this fiscal year and give them a chance to rearrange their priorities on a local level for the next fiscal years, sir."

Lundy: "Alright...so that..."

Shea: "And I commend you and the other people such as Representative Berman that brought that to my attention."

Lundy: "Alright. The way that works then if the amendments were adopted is that the.."

Shea: "If the 6 per cent were impounded it would be the last 6 per cent available for expenditure from that line item and that the periodic payments from the school fund would be based on the full amount during this fiscal year."



Lundy: "Then until the 94 cent, per cent were paid out the installments would be at the full amount?"

Shea: "Yes sir."

Lundy: "Fine..."

Shea: "Again under the Bill that is if the appropriate certifying officer shows to withhold back from incumbrance."

Lundy: "My last question would be this. One area of concern it seems to me, with the Bill is that once the impoundment is made whether it's discretionary with the certifying officer or mandatory that the General Assembly has really no input in the release decision and I'm not thinking so much of forcing the release of funds as, as having the power to veto the release of funds, which we, which we in the General Assembly may feel is not justified. How would you view and, and attempt to, to give the General Assembly within say a 60 day period an opportunity to pass upon or to disapprove ah...a release certification by a certifying officer?"

Shea: "Sir, I think we have in effect that power, now. Without this bill that the Governor chose to line item a veto or reduce it we would have an opportunity to review it. If the appropriate certifying officer ties up funds that we feel is improper we could come in and amend this Bill, we could take the Appropriation act and amend that by another law so that again I say, on at least three or four occasions during this fiscal year, we will be in session. We further have the ability by the action of the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate acting jointly to call a special session if we find ourselves where we need to be returned to the State Capitol to act in this area."

Lundy: "Thank you Mr. Sponsor and Mr. Chairman if I might may I just say to the Sponsor that contrary to some of the remarks that were made by earlier...ah...questioners I think this is quite an imaginative and constructive





piece of Legislation and I think that in fact I'm interested to note that a number of other states use this on a continuing basis, as a way of insuring that state spending does not exceed state revenues. I think perhaps in the midst of this crisis we may have happened upon a good solution to a problem which the General Assembly has never found a very satisfactory way of dealing with and perhaps it may have application beyond just this...ah...limited crisis that we're dealing with now. I commend the Sponsor on putting the Bill in."

Matijevich: "Thank you Representative Lundy. Representative Walsh. William Walsh. Your light has been on. Representative Walsh declines, Representative Deuster, from Lake."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of brief questions that maybe we'll summarize with the Sponsors testimony. All of us in the General Assembly, all of us in the General Assembly, you and I and all of us are bound by the Constitution. I think we're all interested in making sure we do live up to our responsibilities. Article 8, Section B says that the General Assembly shall make appropriations, that's what we've got to do and it also says appropriations for a fiscal year shall not exceed funds estimated by the General Assembly to be available during that year. Now I gathered and correct me if I'm wrong that you earlier stated in response to a question by Representative Lundy that you felt there was no violation of this Constitutional provision and I'm not sure whether the basis for that was that a. We have not estimated funds available, or b. We in the General Assembly just don't know. What is the reason that you feel there is no violation of this provision?"

Shea: "Sir, at the present time can you tell me what the general revenue of the State of Illinois available for expenditure in fiscal year 76 is?"



Deuster: "Well one of the interesting techniques, when someone asks a question you don't have the answers to ask another question. You're the Sponsor of this Bill I'm not and I'm just wondering what is the estimate is the answer that you don't know or we don't know?"

Shea: "Sir, I think it would be almost impossible to know because the best we can do is take what the Governor, the Bureau of the Budget and our Fiscal and Economic Commission said would be the lapses from Fiscal Year 75. Fiscal Year 75 lapses can be substantially increased if the appropriate officers have put the brakes on spending and have not hired additional people to fill jobs as they come do. Those same officers could make large expenditures from both capital and operating and we could find ourselves with lapsed balances substantially less than those we estimated. We will not have those exact figures until sometime in October. I think that the Comptroller of the State and I don't know if you had an opportunity to go there or not sir, did an excellent job by charts and graphs showing how the Chief Executive officer could influence the general revenue fund."

Deuster: "Well...I."

Shea: "And that is my question, what are the lapsed balances in the fund and what are the lapsed balances in the general revenue fund and what are the transfers in and out of that fund so that we might know with some amount of specificity the amount of available revenue."

Deuster: "There we go again. Well I'd like to thank you for that answer and I guess the answer is that we don't have an estimate that we can work on. Isn't that it that we're, I don't want to have a breakdown in communications but....we just don't know. Right?"

Shea: "The revenue estimate....the revenue estimate is influenced by so many factors that we have no control over."

Deuster: "Okay thank you. The second question is this. I



think the experience of mankind is that every time there's a crisis the Legislative Branch gives more power to the Executive Branch and I was just. Is it true? The Republican staff report says that this bill that you're proposing as a Member of the General Assembly or the Legislature gives the Governor authority in two areas that he doesn't have now and that is to dip into the Higher Education funds and to the Elementary and Secondary Education funds from the common school is, is that analysis correct, that this does give him those two new broad areas of power?"

Shea: "Sir. The Governor now has the right to line item or perform a reduction veto on those amounts, they would then come back to us for his, for our action."

Deuster: "But this bill would give him the power to cut it without coming back to us, is that not correct?"

Shea: "Yes sir."

Deuster: "All right, the last question I have is that the morning newspaper indicates what you've indicated I think what you've indicated I think prior that the Governor will definitely veto this bill and not only that, he has already used his reduction power on three of our Bills, the Appropriation for the Commission on Children, the Institute for Environmental Quality and the Auditor Generals Office. In other words the Governor thinks he's got the facts right now and can reduce these budgets. What is the reason that the Governor knows what the facts are and we don't?"

Shea: "I suppose again sir, we look at what we base our decision on by what we know, or the apparent economic indicators and if I might with your permission and the permission of the Chamber I would like to yield on that question to Representative Lechowicz who's chairman of the Fiscal and Economic Commission. The agency that helps us make a determination of revenue."

Matijeovich: "Representative Lechowicz."



Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In response to Representative Deusters comment I would just recommend that he read the March revenue estimates that were published and distributed to every member of the House and to the media. At that time there was a difference between the Bureau of the Budgets estimate and what we foresaw in the coming economic picture. The difference was I would say large in degree but it was substantial. I would also point out the fact that we also reviewed it at the end of May and there was a tremendous difference, now what is our responsibility to that. What we did was we in turn work along as the Governor presents his budget message and in turn work with the Revenue Committee and I'd like to point out the fact that Revenue and Appropriations and Leadership is assigned on this commission and we have expertise staff, Doctors of Economics and Economic Indicators we subscribe to a number of different models of the column projection as far as economic tendencies not only in the state but throughout the nation and it was pointed out in every one of our reports that there was substantial amount of difference between the Bureau of the Budget and what we were recommending. Now it's each of our responsibilities to work accordingly. We tried to advise everyone that we knew of of our concern in this area and in turn we are working on the budget in, along the same line as far as trying to trim wherever we could. But, I think if you were to watch 'Face The Nation' this morning, where they had the noted Economic Professor, Doctor Frederick VonHagler who in turn indicated that is not only a policy concern of the United States but throughout the world and there is a tremendous amount of difference of opinion of what Economic factors have to be considered and what actually has to be done. This is a very technical and a very difficult area of prediction, I think that Representative Shea has pinpointed



the difficulty of the task and in turn is trying to adjust himself and the rest of the Membership of the House and the Senate to try to come up with a very workable, pliable way of addressing this very technical situation within a short period of time. Now, Representative Deuster if you have a specific question I'll be more than happy to try to respond."

Shea: "Might I respond.....May I respond to you in a very specific manner?....No but can I just respond in a specific manner with regards to revenue sir?"

Deuster: "Well there's a lot of essays going on....Yes sir."

Shea: "The Governor based his revenue projection on that of the Bureau of the Budget, when Director Alpin was in reve...or in the Appropriations Committee we discussed with him some of the changes in revenue. He mentioned in passing two things that I think have made me want to delve much deeper into this apparent fiscal crisis. One, that the Bureau of the Budget had not consulted with him, the Director of Revenue prior to the time that it put together its estimate and that, Two, through a improved process in the Department of Revenue that there was an absolute speed up of May collection that were made in April. One of the things that I had noticed people base their motto of revenue drops on were the May collection of taxes. Now, if we have in fact had a dramatic shift of May collections into April that only the Director of the Department of Revenue was cognizant of because our Fiscal and Economic Committee or Commission was not until it was brought out that had that dramatic shift in revenues taken place without informing everybody in State Government of them, that the May projection could give us a very dim outlook when in fact they were not a true picture of past and future collections."

Matijevich: "Representative Deuster."



Deuster: "Representative Shea suggested that Representative Lechowicz was the expert on this subject and I did want to ask.... this is the last question, a brief question. I hope the answer can be brief too. The Constitution indicates that we must live within our income, and that we in the General Assembly and not the Governor, but us must not spend more money than we expected coming in. Now the line in the Constitution says 'Appropriation for a fiscal year shall not exceed funds estimated by the General Assembly and I would like to ask Representative Lechowicz ....."

Matijevich: "Turn around and ask him, he's right behind you."

Deuster: "Well, that's right, and he'll respond from my leader's position. What is the estimate of our revenue and what are our appropriations? I think the taxpayers want to know. They don't want a long elaborate essay on how difficult it is to project, but what is our estimate? What are the appropriations and have we estimated that there is less money then appropriated, and just what is it? I think we can have two dollar figures and that will be the answer."

Matijevich: "Representative Lechowicz from Representative Ryan's microphone."

Lechowicz: "Well, first of all you have to consider the Budget Bills as they were introduced and as amended, and as they go through the amendatory process by the Governor, what items he amendatory vetoes or what items he kills, so as to your first question, the budget bills as submitted amount to approximately five billion, six hundred million dollars."

Deuster: "The first question was revenue. What is our estimate of revenue?"

Lechowicz: "For fiscal 76?"

Deuster: "Yes."

Lechowicz: "About five, four."



Deuster: "five point four, and what....."

Lechowicz: "It was revised as of June 6."

Deuster: "And what's your estimate of what the appropriations now are that are heading toward the Governor's desk?"

Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, I'm not Houdini to know... can answer as far as what the Senate and the House are going to do."

Deuster: "So there's no estimate?"

Lechowicz: "All we can do is go on based what was presented to us."

Deuster: "I thank you."

Matijeich: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Let me preface my question by saying that I think this is one of the most crucial issues facing us today, and I don't think we should inject any kind of partisan politics into it. It hasn't been at this point and I'd like to continue it this way. With that statement, I would like to ask a couple of questions of the sponsor? First of all, Representative Shea, do you believe that the, or is it your position that the legislature can give empoumment rights to the Governor or any other State official in difference to the Constitution?"

Shea: "I thought about that long and hard and had the Commission headed by Representative Hill, which I thought could do the best job in the shortest period of time, look into that subject. That power has been utilized by at least three other States and in the way the Bill is drafted, I think we are within our Constitutional rights."

Schraeder: "If we are in our rights, is it your belief that we or you as an individual should give that right to the Governor. Is that going to be a philosophy of the State of Illinois?"

Shea: "Sir, I don't know what's going to be a philosophy. It would be my feeling and as you noticed, this Bill has a self-destruct clause, so I don't say we should do this



forever, but I do say, Sir, with this apparent fiscal crisis, it was brought to our attention twelve days before or some three weeks before it was necessary for those items to be on the Governor's desk. Yes, Sir, I think this is the way to do it."

Schraeder: "If we pass this piece of legislation, giving empoundment rights, does that not set a precedent for any future action before this Legislature or before the Court?"

Shea: "Not in my opinion, Sir?"

Schraeder: "All right, now we've been appropriating money. The Appropriation 1 and 2 have come out with their study of these appropriated matters that have been before them at this point, and some of them have been before the General Assembly. Do you feel in face of the Bureau of the Budget, Comptroller, the Fiscal and Economic Commission, having each and every one indicated a loss of revenue, that we cannot live within the appropriated amounts without a substantial reduction in those appropriations? Do you feel we're within our Constitutional duties, by appropriating more money even though it may have only occurred to us within the last few weeks?"

Shea: "I would only say to you that I have watched the appropriation system work and I think they are making substantial budget reductions from Bills in the dollars amounts that were introduced.. Again, I reiterate to you, Sir, that we will be back in October when we will have a much firmer grasp on the financial situation within this State. If when we came back, we found after taking into account spending revenue and the Governor's action we could ourselves introduce new appropriation Bills, rearrange the ones that we have passed, or take whatever action is desirable in light of the facts that we then have available."

Schraeder: "Some of the Bills that came from Appropriations 1 and 2 and we've acted upon since the Governor's message,





were left in tact as far as the Members of this House were concerned. In view of our responsibility to maintain expenditures in line with revenues, don't you think it would have been more appropriate for this General Assembly to re-refer those back to the appropriate committees, and yet those Bills still pending on the Calendar that are not acted upon by the House should again be re-referred to those Committees for further study?"

Shea: "Sir, I think when those Bills came out of the Appropriations Committee, it was the opinion of the majority of the Members of those Committees that the Bills were in the shape that they should be to be presented to the Floor of this House."

Schraeder: "Do you mean by that statement, that the Appropriations Committees 1 and 2 probably thought that these did not need the revenue as anticipated?"

Shea: "Yes, Sir."

Schraeder: "Well, let me ask you about empoundment again? Do you believe that empoundment of funds is the proper duty and responsibility of the Governor, or shouldn't we be the ones to set the budget appropriated amounts?"

Shea: "We....."

Matijevich: "Representative Schraeder, that question has already been asked. I think the Members who are asking questions, I've heard a lot of repetition now....."

Schraeder: "I'll try not to be repetitious, Mr. Speaker. This is extremely important, Mr. Chairman. If you feel I'm repetitious, please call it to my attention."

Shea: "I'd like to answer that, because perhaps I didn't make it clear to you before. I think that the General Assembly, the Members of this House, and the Senate will pass Bills in dollar amounts we think are sufficient to run the Departments and agencies. The Governor could use his Amendatory Veto and that would be final action on behalf



of the Chief Executive, subject to a review by the House and the Senate. It also, I feel in a time when a crisis has been brought to our attention, so very late, that we have the right to react in the manner I'm suggesting, because perhaps by November, we can find out that we should have cut budget further, or we might find that the financial picture has increased substantially, so that no cuts will be necessary. At that point, if we find out the revenue picture is such in either November or January, we could then repeal this Bill."

Schraeder: "All right, Mr. Sponsor, following that statement isn't it just as wise to send to the Governor the appropriated amount as the General Assembly finds to be the most efficient ones and let the Governor come up with a line item veto in his wisdom, since it is his budget, for the most part and then if he vetoes them in any line item fashion, it can come back before the General Assembly in October, November at the veto session, and if that time we find out he has made a mistake, we can correct by an override. If he is correct, we can sustain his veto. Isn't that just as easily done?"

Shea: "Yes, in one respect, Sir, but that would only give us the first quarter in effect to utilize. By this process, we would in effect be getting almost a full fiscal year before, and particularly in school aid, before that decision had to be made."

Schraeder: "All right, one final question. We still have pending before the House, before final action, appropriation Bills. In view of what you've said here today, in view of what the Governor has said, the Bureau of the Budget, the Fiscal and Economic Commission, and the Comptroller, don't you feel we still sufficient time to reconsider some of those Appropriation Bills that are still pending in view of the fact that apparent revenue is going to be lacking?"



Shea: "I would hope that when each of us cast our vote, because we are each allowed to do that, and when each of us get to the point on second reading when a Bill is introduced or a Bill comes on the Order of Second Reading, that we would, we would do just that."

Schraeder: "Thank you."

Matijeovich: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well thank you, Mr. Chairman. Representative Shea, are you really serious about this Bill?"

Shea: "I'm as serious about this Bill, Mr. Ryan, as you were about playing golf with your Son this morning."

Ryan: "Well, that was pretty serious this morning."

Shea: "Then I'm very serious about the Bill."

Ryan: "Well, then you're serious about delegating the authority of this Legislative branch to the Second Floor of the Executive Branch. Is that correct?"

Shea: "Yes, Sir."

Ryan: "Well, if this is such a good idea, and you think it is the right way to go, why do you have the self-destruct clause in this Bill."

Shea: "Because I think it is the proper thing to do for this fiscal year. Now, if future legislatures, future sessions of the General Assembly, where we in the General Assembly during the 79th, for next fiscal year want to do that, we may extend that or we could let the next General Assembly, of which you or I may not be a part of, make that decision on their own."

Ryan: "I believe that you stated earlier that other states had programs similar to this. Is that right?"

Shea: "Yes, Sir."

Ryan: "Do they totally advocate their powers of the Legislative Branch to the Executive Branch in other States, or do they have more Legislative feed in?"

Shea: "I don't know....."



Matijevidch: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Point or Order, Mr. Speaker. I don't think the term of 'advocation of powers' is in the Bill, nor is it intended."

Ryan: "It's certainly there, whether its intended or in the Bill."

Matijevidch: "Your point is well taken. Representative Ryan is acting also. Go ahead."

Ryan: "You want me to rephrase the question or do you know what I'm talking about."

Matejevidch: "You did all right. We understood it. Proceed Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Representative Shea, other States, do they not allow more legislative feed in than you do in your Bill?"

Shea: "Might I read you, Sir, from a memorandum dated June 16, 1975, by Don Lattimer, on the Commission of Inter-governmental Cooperation? 'About 1971, Michigan employed the following procedure for reserving funds from expenditures: The legislature appropriated the full budget according to usual methods. Each appropriation bill contained the stipulation that the Governor for reasons of efficiency or lack of funds could refuse to spend up to a certain percentage. The money not spent would be transferred to a special contingency fund and could not then be spent without Legislative authorization, which would be given by a joint budget committee'."

Ryan: "All right, now I think in the last week or ten days, we have amended ah.... some of the Governor's departments, and I can't tell you which ones. Three I know of, or four, that we have agreed on to do, as both Republicans and Democrats. And they have taken the Department Heads and selectively or maybe.... it was a line item, six percent in each lines in those Departments. If this Bill passes, and goes to the Governor and he signs it, then will those Departments have to be part of this six percent impoundment



again?"

Shea: "Yes, Sir."

Ryan: "That will then indicate a twelve percent reduction for those Departments that have tried to cooperate with the Governor then. Is that correct?"

Shea: "Sir, those Departments that you speak of, are they not under Executive control now?"

Ryan: "Yes, they certainly are. They're also subjected to Legislative amendments in their budgets, that we've put on."

Shea: "All right, we have.... and let's take a dollar amount. We have said to Department A, we think it takes \$100 to run your Department instead of \$107 or \$108, we took six percent off, and we said \$100 is what we think it takes and you agree with us. The man responsible in the long run for that Agency is the Governor, and we are saying to him that you may further reduce the expenditure by six percent if you so desire. And I might say, Sir, that the money so reduced would become a lapsed balance and would be considered revenue for fiscal year 77."

Ryan: "Well, I understand that, Representative Shea. I'm ... talking about the reduction that's already been mandated by at least this House, and some cases I think they were Senate Bills, so they were mandated by both bodies. Assuming that the Governor signs those Bills, as they are, and this Bill passes and those Agencies will be twelve percent short of what they were requesting initially."

Shea: "No, Sir."

Ryan: "Why won't they?"

Shea: "Because the six percent could be released anytime during the fiscal year by the appropriate certifying officer."

Ryan: "I see. Ah.... knowing full well, Representative Shea,



that the Governor, by all indications that I've had, and I think everybody publicly, from the Director to the Bureau of the Budget, in his statement to the press of a few days ago, that the Governor was going to veto this Bill. Now, assuming that we know that now in advance, and we have to assume that that's correct if the Governor is a man of his word, if that's the case....."

Matijevich: "Representative Houlihan, just a minute."

Houlihan: "Mr. Chairman, I think that Representative Ryan was out of order in that case. I think what he should have said was the Director of the Bureau of the Budget indicated that he would advise the Governor to veto this piece of legislation and there was no statement made by the Governor about legislation. As you know, it's his policy not to take a public position on matters that are before the Legislature until they come to his desk and he's able to act on them."

Ryan: "You represent him well, Representative Houlihan, and ....."

Matijevich: "Point of order by Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "My point is, he took a position as far as on the congressional reapportionment supposedly, so that statement is inaccurate."

Matijevich: "I'll answer that. He hasn't yet, I hope, ah... Proceed, Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman....."

Matijevich: "Just a minute, Representative Houlihan has some other facts at hand."

Houlihan: "I'd like to remind Representative Lechowicz that the Governor has not taken any position on the maps, and he will probably view that when it reaches his desk as it ties with this legislation and other legislation in its own merit."

Matijevich: "That may come up today, too. Representative Ryan, let's proceed."



Ryan: "Ah....."

Matijevich: "Representative Lechowicz on another point."

Lechowicz: "Just on a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker, because according to the article that I read in the Chicago Tribune with a picture of a number of his people, it was stated that he would veto it as I mentioned."

Shea: "Well, perhaps I could check....."

Matijevich: "All of that is irrelevant. Go ahead, Representative Ryan."

Shea: "Perhaps, Representative Ryan, I could check some light on it. I was informed by one of the Governor's aids they were attempting to get Mr. Schaeffer, who I understand now is the Director of the Budget, so perhaps if he does testify, you can ask him that question."

Ryan: "Well, I haven't completed my questions, Representative Shea. Ah..... at least I thought, it was my thinking the Governor was going to veto this Bill, if it passes. My question is, do you think, with knowing that, that we should proceed in more than a prudent manner and continue to....."

Matijevich: "Representative Ryan, that question was asked by your Leader, Representative Washburn, and will you try to reduce these further?"

Shea: "Well, Representative I think we are trying to reduce and put the appropriation bills on the Governor's desk in the form which the majority of this General Assembly think is proper."

Ryan: "Well, Representative Shea, I think only time will tell that. I would like to address myself to the Bill. I think, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a total attempt of the regular Democrat organization to embarrass the Governor of the State of Illinois. I think further it's an attempt to



meet the pseudo deadline that's been set up by the Speaker of the House, to ramrod everything we can through here, and advocate our responsibilities, and I think that's what is contained totally here in this Bill, and I would certainly hope that we would not recommend that it be passed out of here as a Committee of the Whole. Thank you."

Matijevich: "Representative Tipword. By the way, I might say that the Speaker said he hopes to go back to ah.... Third Readings and be here until about 6:30 or 7:00, so we'll try to eliminate as much repetition on these questions as possible from the Members. Representative Washington, do you have a question?"

Washington: "Parliamentary inquiry."

Matijevich: "Go ahead."

Washington: "Was a time ascertained as to when the Committee of a Whole should arise?"

Matijevich: "No, there has not been a time certain."

Washington: "Could you indicate a time?"

Matijevich: "Well, if I've got anything to do with it, it will be another half hour, but I have nothing to do with it."

Washington: "Well, I don't know, we may give you something to do with it."

Matijevich: "Well, the ones that have something to do with it, are all sitting out there."

Washington: "Thank you."

Matijevich: "Representative Tipword."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker, if I might ask the Sponsor of the Bill to yield for a question, please?"

Shea: "Yes, Sir."

Tipword: "Ah.... Representative Shea, I know you've had the privilege, as have I, as serving on the Committee, Fiscal and Economic Commission and over these years, and please correct me if you find I am wrong, we have found if





anything to be the most exact fact that we could come up with that we could not in any way estimate the revenues of the State of Illinois with exactitude and certainty.

Isn't that correct?"

Shea: "Yes, Sir."

Tipsword: "And in fact, perhaps you may be acquainted with a document that was put out by the Illinois Fiscal and Economic Commission, about the first of this year, if I remember correctly, that tried to explain to us the differences during the fiscal year 1975 that they have found in the estimates that had been prepared heretofore by the Fiscal and Economic Commission by the Illinois Bureau of the Budget and also by Agencies of the United States Government and then tried to indicate how far each and everyone of them had been off. Fortunately, the Fiscal and Economic Commission had been fairly close and I was delighted with it, and ah..... actually, we have found that the only time we come up with real hard exact facts is after the fiscal year has come to an end. The reason, I ask that is you had indicated something about the suggestions that we reduce this budget by six percent, was that we could not do so because we hadn't been provided with any hard figures, and I wondered what you really meant by that."

Shea: "Sir, I have not been presented at least to my knowledge with any figures that would show that General Revenue would drop some 300 million dollars next year."

Tipsword: "Now we have had figures, have we not, from Fiscal and Economic that would suggest that or more and also from the Attorney General and also the Bureau of the Budget, but of course, without any exactitude."

Shea: "Well, this is what is so hard, as you say, at best we make a guesstimate. A one percent plus or minute in that guesstimate is a hundred million dollars. I have yet to



find any economic forecaster that can forecast with complete accuracy to 99 percent, so that would still leave us a hundred million dollars one way or another. We have made substantial budget cuts. We have no way of knowing if the lapsed figure supplied by the Bureau of the Budget will be accurate because of the ability to put the brakes on spending and to withhold the expenditure of capital funds that come from General Revenue and we will not be able to know that with any degree of certainty until in my opinion, October the 15th."

Tipsword: "Under the terms of our present constitution, I think that the history of this Body has found out anything, please correct me if I'm wrong, the history of this Body with regard to the provision that says to us that we cannot and must not appropriate over a figure that we find to be the estimated taxes or revenues that would be available during the coming fiscal year, we have found that provision to be ah... with any certainty unworkable and impossible of absolute application in this Body. Have we not, Sir?"

Shea: "Yes, Sir, but have you a copy of the, never mind."

Tipsword: "In fact, the Fiscal and Economic Commission has indicated by Representative Lechowicz, has both last year and this year updated and upgraded the estimates they have suggested to us on a continuous basis. In fact the Commission has required that that upgrading be done on a periodic basis for the General Assembly. Isn't that correct."

Shea: "Yes, now, might I ask you this and you were a Member of that Commission a long time with me. I think back in 1971, when we found ourselves in a bit of recession, and then Director of the Bureau, McCarter, came to us almost on a monthly basis where he and the Commission certainly disagreed on the amount of sales tax and income tax revenue and predicted at the end of the fiscal year we would be substantially short of our estimate and yet by



the end of that fiscal year, because of the, in the last quarter as I can remember it, of the dramatic upturn of sales tax revenue by a tremendous surge in new car sales, and by some dramatic surge in wages that for the entire fiscal year, the General Revenue was substantially, and I use the word substantially, I suppose, in a ..... I'll strike the word 'substantially', the revenue for that year was above our estimate at the beginning, although we had several bad months within the fiscal year."

Tipsword: "I think that's absolutely correct, and in fact if I recall right, ah.... Fiscal and Economic came out surprisingly close, even though there was this margin of error that you spoke of earlier, but much closer than most of the other areas of estimate and in fact, however, in that year, we only decided in this General Assembly, that there were sufficient revenues to cover the appropriations that we had made, and so far, that hasn't been challenged. One question further that I would like to ask you, and it's in the way of clearing up something that I have been seeing in the news media and hearing from the media; that is, again maybe I shouldn't use this term, but the term's been used here before, that we've been advocating or at least abandoning the legislative prerogative or the legislative duty. Whereas, in fact, many, many, many of the major agencies and departments of State government have through the actions of the Appropriations Committee or the actions on of the Floor of the Senate or the House, had substantial reductions in their budget, so far as their expenditure of General Revenue funds have been concerned and you'll find that a very large percentage of the budget has been reduced in that very area by the ah... actions of the General Assembly. Is that correct?"

Shea: "Yes, Sir."

Tipsword: "And so consequently, what you're proposing with



this Bill would be to.... to continue to provide a means whereby the six percent figure might be met by agencies or through the lack of authorized spending in various agencies, without crippling or handstringing the Departments to use those funds that do hereafter become available actually to provide the Government and the economy of the State of Illinois the expenditures of our revenues. will actually authorize, that we cannot with any degree of accuracy really now anticipate. Isn't that correct, Sir?"

Shea: "Yes, Sir, and I think you, too, were privy, and I again commend Comptroller Lindburg for the job he did in showing that in operation of State government, employment of people is a substantial amount of General Revenue expenditure, and if those people who are responsible for hiring or replacing personnel as they retire or quit would just not fill those positions or would wait three months to fill those positions, that a six percent savings in that area could be accomplished with little or no reduction in the delivery of services to the People of the State of Illinois."

Tipsword: "By the way, along with that might go, if I'm correct, we should as the Legislature, consider that in adding additional expenditure projects to the State of Illinois that we provide some means of saying that those projects should serve and be carried forward only if sufficient funds are available and provide those personnel to oversee them and really your suggestion here goes somewhere along the lines of paying these agencies, is that correct?"

Shea: "Yes, Sir."

Tipsword: "Thank you very much."

Matijeovich: "Thank you, Representative Tipsword. Representative Anderson."



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

Shea: "Yes, Sir."

Anderson: "If in the future, Governor continue to come in with a zero balance budget, aren't we locking ourselves in by passing this Bill?"

Shea: "No, Sir, this Bill will self-destruct on July 1 of 1976."

Anderson: "But won't we have to consider the same thing again?"

Shea: "Perhaps other Members or another General Assembly can be more innovative than we."

Anderson: "All right. My other question is, since the Bill allows the permissive negative appropriation, would you consider this Bill to be an appropriation Bill?"

Shea: "No, Sir."

Anderson: "No, Sir."

Matijevich: "Representative James Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Ah..... Representative Shea, is it your judgement that in introducing this Bill, you're addressing yourself to the current financial crisis that the State is in?"

Shea: "If there is one, yes."

Houlihan: "Well, then, let me step back and ask you, you do not believe that there is a financial crisis?"

Shea: "Real or apparent, it's being talked about, Sir, and I must address myself to that."

Houlihan: "I want to ask you your opinion as a Legislator and the Chief Sponsor of this Bill, do you feel that there is an economic crisis, that there is a lack of revenue to meet the expenditure of funds in the appropriation Bills before the House?"

Shea: "Sir, I know that there are nine percent unemployed in the Nation today. I was informed....."

Houlihan: "Mr. Shea, would you respond to my question."

Shea: "I'm trying to, Sir. If I don't do it in the way that you ask it, you might ask, or might state that the answer



is nonresponsive and ask that it might be stricken."

Houlihan: "Would you try to answer the question now."

Shea: "Would you rephrase it."

Houlihan: "Do you feel there is an economic crisis, that the revenues that we extract will not cover the expenditures we are now appropriating in the ah... appropriations process of State government?"

Shea: "I think that's three-sided or a three-prong question. One, I'm informed and have reasonable belief to believe that it is true that the Treasurer and the Comptroller say revenues will be reduced. I'm reasonably informed by the Fiscal and Economic Commission that they think Revenues will be reduced at least in the first quarter. I have not seen or have been privy to those figures available from the Bureau of Budget, with regards to revenue estimates. I am not privy or have I seen how the Chief Executive Officer has put the brakes on spending in the fourth quarter with regards to those appropriations under his control, consisting of General Revenue."

Houlihan: Well; I think, Jerry, you're really trying to avoid the question, and you could be privy. All you have to do is go to the Bureau of the Budget and ask them for their revenue estimates. Let me ask you, on June 6th, the State Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission issued a staff report, and in that report, they describe that the funds and the revenues that they extracted were reduced significantly from what they had estimated in March. Have you read that report?"

Shea: "I was present when the Director Chadwin discussed it with the Members of the Commission. One of the big items that the Director based his projection on and Representative Lechowicz and the Members of the Commission may say I misunderstood it, was the drop of revenue in May. I later found out from Director Allphin, that the



May collection, a substantial amount of those May collections were really collected in April under a stepped up procedure that he followed. He also said that the Bureau of the Budget had not discussed with him the revenue estimates that they were projecting. So that perhaps both the Bureau of the Budget and the Economic and Fiscal Commission would like to make a new revenue estimate now that we found out what Director Allphin through efficiency has done with May collections."

Houlihan: "You mention that the Treasurer and Comptroller have issued certain information that would lead you to believe that there was some crisis in revenues expected in terms of them being able to cover our expenditures. Are those official reports? Are there anything that is public record?"

Shea: "I don't know what you mean by official reports or public records, but I took the opportunity to take advantage of a series of educational, if you might, opportunities offered by the Comptroller, where he went through a series of graphic to more accurately depict for somebody such as myself who was not familiar with the revenue and expenditure process in the State, showing where the money comes from and where the money goes and having a very illucid discussion with him and Mr. Manderville about how the Chief Executive officers, through transfers or transfers in or transfers out, could have a dramatic effect on what is actually in the General Revenue Fund. At that time, Comptroller Lindburg thought that we ought to at least have a hundred million dollar cushion and a hundred million dollar contingency in General Revenue, so that what he was talking about when we talked about a found hundred-fifty to five hundred million dollar balance that we were led to believe that we had in General Revenue was that perhaps that we would get down close to



that cushion."

Houlihan: "Representative Shea, I understand the educational presentation in the figures.... that he made available in terms of helping us make our evaluations and judgments. What I was referring to was whether there was any official or ah.... I suppose a public access, any figures that they make available so that we could use them to make a reasonable judgment as to how many dollars are available to us in the Appropriations Process. I think one of the difficulties we have here right now and you've pointed it out, is that we've had a lack of leadership. We've had a lot of people describing a crisis, a lot of people saying that we don't have enough funds, but we haven't had any official stance by the Legislature itself. The Legislature has not said how many dollars they expect or estimate to be available for the revenue process. I think that's evasive so your moving on this House Bill assuming that there's a crisis and yet in response to my questions, you're saying you're not sure whether there's a crisis or not."

Shea: "I would imagine, Sir, that one of the most knowledgeable men in State government, with regards to that crisis, would be the Governor who has a Bureau of the Budget that was authorized by this General Assembly that.... and the Department of Revenue that are certainly more privy to information than I am. The Governor supplied to this General Assembly revenue, or supplied to us appropriation Bills in an amount in excess of 5.6 billion dollars as late as April the 10th of this year. Now, certainly, between April the 10th and June 10th, which is some sixty days, he's evidently found out this knowledge because of the expertise that he has available to him, that you and I might not have available to us."

Houlihan: "Well, ah.... Representative Shea, that's precisely what I was trying to do in the House Joint Resolution, try





to make available at least for purposes of a discussion, those figures and some of those estimates that we might be able, as a Legislature, to make a concrete projection of what we estimate will be the revenues, and then to make some official statement about that problem."

Shea: "Representative Madigan attempted one time to get a Joint Session of this Body together with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget but as I remember, he vehemently fought that process, and I then wondered if for some reason, we should not be privy to that."

Houlihan: "No, Representative Shea, that was your misunderstanding. Let me ask you, Jerry, on another point, you talked about this common school fund of not ah.... appropriating, or of appropriating the entire amount each month and then not appropriating at the end, the six percent reserve; in effect, wouldn't that mean the last six percent wouldn't come if there were a crisis and the schools would have to close down?"

Shea: "If you were to introduce an Amendment to the Appropriation to the Office of Superintendent, or whatever we have now, for the School Budget that is the Common School Fund, which is a billion and six-hundred and four thousand dollars and that fund were cut by six percent, and we made periodic payments, the City of Springfield alone, there the amount that they would be reduced in this fiscal year, would be 25 percent. Perhaps the approach that we take here may put off the inevitable but I think this is better than perhaps New York has done and found folly in providing operating income with bonds."

Houlihan: "Mr. Chairman, may I speak to the Bill."

Matijevich: "Proceed."

Houlihan: "It seems to me that we have legislation here that acknowledges, although we have no official position of the Legislature, that there is a crisis in Illinois in



economic finances. I would think though, that the Bill would be in better form if it was mandatory legislation, if it had a provision in there that required legislation approval of any requests to spend those six percent. After the six percent is put aside and the appropriate person certifies that there is a need for those dollars and in fact that those dollars are available, I think that certification ought to be approved by this Legislative Body, so that we would not be advocating our responsibility over to the Appropriations Process. I think with those Amendments and those changes, this might be tolerable. We might be able to act responsibly, and in fact bring this Session to a close, having taken into consideration the downturn in our expected revenues and then review them later in the fall. But, I think without those Amendments, without those changes, this Bill really is, as was described in the press, a kind of appreciative passing of the buck."

Shea: "Well, first of all, I would like to say that I don't intend it to be that way. Those of somebody else's words. And might I ask you, Sir, are you saying that we should in effect amend this Bill to make it mandatory empoundment of the funds, that the certifying officer would then find the reasons to release those funds and that release would then be subject to Legislative approval?"

Houlihan: "That's correct."

Shea: "Thank you."

Matijevich: "The Majority Whip, Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, or Chairman and Members of the Committee of the Whole. I think that the Gentleman ah... the Sponsor of the Bill explained it well and has answered all the questions. It seems to me that questions have become repetitious, so I now move that the Committee of the Whole does arise."



Matijevich: "Just a minute...just a minute...just one moment...The chair will state the motion and we'll proceed after that but I must state the motion. Representative Bradley has moved that the Committee of the Whole resolve pursuant to the direction of the Speaker and duly announced according to the rules to consider House Bill 3118 do now arise. I...I might like to comment that the Chairman I have to agree with the maker of the motion that the subject matter now has become repetitious, I...I think that I and all of you have been enlightened by the, the whole issue but ah...considering that the Speaker has said that we have other business to, to do tonight I think it is a proper motion and ought to be considered..."

Shea: "Mr. Chairman, might I as the Sponsor of the Bill ask one question?"

Matijevich: "Proceed."

Shea: "And I don't know who I ask it to but has any other witnesses registered to testify on this bill."

Matijevich: "No...no that is what I was going to ask, before we did proceed with that motion. I wanted to ask specifically if the Bureau of the Budget Director were here and, because it was, someone did elude to the fact that he was on his way and that was about a half an hour ago. I don't think he's here and there are no other witnesses registered. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "That't exactly what I wanted to point out. Is there anybody from the Administration here that wants to testify either on behalf or against this piece ..."

Matijevich: "Nobody has registered."

Lechowicz: "Thank you."

Matijevich: "Are there any witnesses in the Chamber? Now Representative Palmer go ahead you've been waiting a long time and I'm sorry."

Palmer: "I certainly have been Mr. Speaker. Mr. Chairman and my light has been on for a long time but it would



seem to me..."

Matijevich: "Mr. Palmer. Before you proceed, everybody's light has been on...and I have a list here and Representative Mahars name is before yours and so are others so, I'm sorry about that but go ahead and proceed."

Palmer: "Mr. Chairman, now I'm not one to try to delay the proceeding here but if this matter is as bad as has been stated here I think that there should be at least some more questions asked perhaps not repetitious and there's one other thing Mr...Mr. Chairman."

Matijevich: "All right, Representative Palmer I...Representative Palmer, I think I'm going to help you out a little bit. Representative Bradley. If you'd listen Representative Palmer I'm going to help you out. Representative Bradley would you hold that motion, we have, I understand that the Bureau of the Budget is on the way and he ought to be heard, the Director and we have, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11...by the way Representative Palmer your're way down on the list I might say...."

Palmer: "I may be sir, but I'm still one of the 177 Members of the Legislature..."

Matijevich: "Right, I just want to let you know where you're at so you can relax. If...if those who are called would limit themselves to 2 minutes, we'll get through with this thing and everybody will be heard because the, I want to say precisely that the questions now have become repetitious and I think I've got about 177 witnesses to that fact. Now while we wait for the Bureau of the Budget Director, Representative Mahar."

Bradley: Mr. Mr. Chairman...Mr. Chairman."

Matijevich: "Yes, Representative Bradley:"

Bradley: "I will, I will hold the motion that I made, but I'd like to remind the Members also that I'm sure that I've seen as many as 8 amendments to this Bill that we're going to be debating it again on Second Reading



so that some of those questions I'm sure will come up at the same time. I was attempting to save some time of the House, I'll hold the motion."

Matijeich: "Thank you...thank you for holding the motion and I think that's a very good point, that this whole issue will be again deliberated on Second Reading with amendments and I think it has had a good airing. Representative Mahar for appeal."

Mahar: "Thank...thank you Mr. Chairman. Representative Shea what effect will the passage of this Bill have on appropriated funds of local government, municipalities and townships?"

Shea: "Those come out of a special Appropriated fund sir and will not be effected from and information that's been supplied to me."

Mahar: "None whatsoever?"

Shea: "No sir, those come out of the Local Government distributive fund and would not be, what would be classified as general revenue funds. I was specific, in my opinion, in having the Legislation drafted that would it, it would not effect the distribution of sales tax or income tax rebates to local government. I would ask you particularly people like yourself and Representative Palmer that are extremely familiar with the ways that the local governments get their grant. I...I'm sorry I can hardly hear him.."

Matijeich: "Can we have order? I think I made the point that things are getting repetitious the attention quotion has really diminished on this, on this issue."

Shea: "I would be very concerned sir, about those grants and I have thought that because those are formularized and they do go up or down by the economy and if there is a reduction in State Revenue there would already be a light reduction in those amounts, I specifically do not want to include them nor do I think I have, but I would if you would desire or Representative Palmer or



other Members would desire include an exclusion within the body of the Bill similar to that which I did for Public Aid payments."

Matijevich: "Representative Beaupre. Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Thank you Mr. Chairman. These questions I want to ask ah...ah...basically 2 questions, I would hope that the questions go to white rather than heat and they are in no way intended to advocate some political philosophy, either that of the Governor or the Republican party, but what I would, it..it seems to me that we may, in this measure be making the same mistake that the Governor made, I think, when he made his speech about cutting 6 per cent across the board. I think all of us know that there are some appropriations and I'm sure the Governor knew that there were some appropriations that couldn't be cut 6 per cent across the board, such as Public Aid and Unemployment Compensation and so forth and that being the case, when we set up a contingency fund in effect for 6 per cent aren't we indeed going to end up in the short end of the balance sheet, so to speak, when you look at the overall budgetary picture and I'd like to ask Representative Shea if ah...ah...that, the, the 6 per cent has been considered and that, you know, what are the, what's the input in regards to choosing that percentage?"

Shea: "I thought about that specifically with the School Aid formula, that had we tried to figure out that percentage of the Common School Fund that was used to pay teacher retirement and that percentage of the formula that was used for aid to local schools the 6 per cent reduction can only be made in the amount of distributive fund to schools and could not be made with regards to pay outs on pensions so that a 6 per cent reduction in an overall area would be far more drastic if not catastrophic to one particular segment but if you will notice, we have specifically allowed the impoundment not by total



gross but by line item, so that then the appropriate certifying officer knowing full well that the amount of pay out saved for teachers pensions is on a pay out basis, would not want to impound those, but would perhaps want to impound 6 per cent of that paid to the distributive funds. I would make the net effect less dramatic than just a 6 per cent slice out of that fund."

Beaupre: "Well, I think I've indicated to you, Representative Shea, that, that I'm in favor of this proposal, I think it's a contingency plan and I think we're dealing with circumstances and that we're talking about an emergency and yet we do not know exactly what the income of the State is going to be, the reference to the Economical and Fiscal Commission report of June 6th has been made many times but everyone seemed to overlook the fact that on the very front page and in the first 3 or 4 paragraphs the, our Economic and Fiscal Commission indicated that all the Economic indicators national..nationwide, such as housing starts, such as depletion of inventories and so forth have indicated that the Economic picture probably and I say probably will indeed turn around and that could do nothing but resolve an increased revenue to the State whereby we might very well want to include in our appropriations those things that are necessary to delivery of services to the citizens and the taxpayers which at this point we might think about cutting and it seems to me that this is a valid approach, but I am a little concerned about that upper limitation of 6 per cent because I think by your own admission, we're suggesting that when you look at, do it by line item that we won't end up with a contingency fund of 6 per cent cut you know, for the entire year, across the board and that is a bit troubling to me."

Shea: "I can only answer this, that a 6 per cent cut in the amount of budget that the Governor introduced would create perhaps 300 million dollars, that this body



acting in a responsible manner has probably cut close to between 50 and 100 out of that already so that a 6 per cent based on the way on the way we're talking would probably end up close to the figure he wanted."

Beaupre: "The second question and the last one is that the alternative of course, to this plan is for us to gear up our Appropriations Committee staff and to review each and every item and each and every Appropriations Bill and I wonder for the benefit of those of us who have not worked on Appropriations and have not been involved in that sort of process before...ah...how long would it take and is it even feasible for us in this last week to go over all the Appropriations Bills?"

Shea: "I can only take what the Chairman and other people close to the Appropriation process said and that as it passed was ney impossible."

Matijevich: "Representative Cunningham and then I understand that the Director of the Bureau of the Budget is in the back here somewhere and I think that the orderly procedure ought to be after the next questioning by Representative Cunningham that we hear from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget he may have some of the answers to some of these repetitious questions we had."

Cunningham: "Representative Shea, what's the rational for leaving out public assistance. For exempting them?"

Shea: "Because if I am lead to believe what is correct, that the amount to public assistance is and I think perhaps Representative Mann could better explain this being on the Legislative Advisory Concil to Public Aid, that the amount of dollars that those people presently are receiving is a bare minimum living dollar amount now and that were we to cut that 6 per cent perhaps we would cut their living standard below a point of subsistance and I could yield to you if, with permission of the Committee, Representative Mann."





Cunningham: "This isn't on my time is it? This dialogue going on between..."

Matijevich: "Yea...You're out of time already. Go ahead Rep.."

Unknown: "Representative Mann wants in."

Matijevich: "Oh, Representative Mann, proceed."

Mann: "Well thank you Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to say that the amount actually given monthly to persons on Public Aid is below the standard of needs set by the Illinois Depart..by the Department itself. In other words, the Department itself admits that the amounts given are insufficient for the maintenance of what is set forth on its own statute as a minimum standard of life but the Department says that there just isn't enough money so, if the Department says it's below the standard needs I think the Sponsor of House Bill 3118 is quite right in excepting Public Aid from the coverage of, of the Bill."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker or Mr. Chairman."

Matijevich: "Go ahead Rosco."

Cunningham: "I wasn't advocating that it be included, I was just pointing out or trying to underscore the fact that it makes this whole procedure a bit non-physical because it's like having a, a leaky life raft in the field of financing."

Matijevich: "Could I interrupt you Rosco, there will be some silent filming going on, I...I've asked them to wait till you're finished so."

Cunningham: "Well, that's very kind of you, I appreciate that but the point I want to make Representative Shea is that in as much as Public Assistance is such a large percentage of the general revenue fund, to exempt it is to submit only a partial response to what is represented to be a dire financial crisis. Is there anywhere else that the money could be made up? Certainly not if you limit the impoundment to 6 per cent, would it not make more sense to raise the impoundment to a percentage



that was high enough to equal when applied the entire sum that we have to catch up, 300 million from other funds too, if we do conclude that Public Assistance should be exempt?"

~~Shaw~~: "I think the Governor in his speech even said that Public Aid grants should be exempt because of what the people get. I might say to you that out of 1 billion 600 million dollars budgeted for Public Aid, probably somewhere in excess of 800 million dollars of that is payments for Medical assistance. The Governor by his action of transferring general revenue from the general revenue fund to the Medical payment he could with little or no effort, as I understand the transfer system and the transfers are approximately 66 million dollars a month into that fund of general revenue, he could slow down those payments and extend the vendor payments very little and make a substantial savings in that area."

~~Cunningham~~: "Now if you'll just give 'yes' or 'no' answers on these last few I'll be done very quickly."

~~Maryjevich~~: "Rosco, let's finish with one because the Director of the Bureau of the Budget..."

~~Cunningham~~: "I'm going through in this, 2 or 3 more questions." "You mentioned that many other states had this impoundment system, do they have comparable veto arrangements as we?"

~~Shaw~~: "I can not answer that, but I'll be happy to supply it to you."

~~Cunningham~~: "What's the rationale for having the Governor rather than the Superintendent of Education determine whether or not funds for Public Education should be released?"

~~Shaw~~: "Because I believe that's the direct responsibility of the Governor."

~~Cunningham~~: "We Republicans are fearful joining with you on a un-holy alliance against the Governor for fear that you'll change sides on us, is there any assurance that that won't happen?"

~~Shaw~~: "I don't think that's what happening."



Cunningham: "Finally, I would point out that there was an unintentional misstatement of the record by you in regards to Senate Bill 433, the Department of Revenue bill, if I heard you correctly. The 9 million dollars was not taken out in compliance with the 6 per cent reduction, nor was it in response to the Governors recital of....."

Shea: "That was done by the Committee itself."

Cunningham: "Let me have...let me correct the record."

Shea: "Wasn't that done by the Committee itself?"

Cunningham: "Yes, the 1st amendment put it in, the 4th amendment took it out and the reason we took it out was the Director Alpin said that he had caught up the well and the machinery was working better the thing was paid, but we did make the reduction of 941 thousand 198 dollars which is 6 per cent of the general revenue fund. Has the film started yet Representative, Speaker."

Matijevich: "Representative Palmer, stay at you're seat, because I'm going to call on you, I think your questions were directed at Representative Shea, so if you're ready I'm ready and then we'll have the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "Well thank you Mr. Chairman, knowing you many years, I've known you for your fairness and impartiality. I wondered why we have no one other than Governmental Officials here testifying on this matter, I should like to have heard from the Taxpayers Association, maybe the Civic Association Economists who are outside of the Government so that we could have some input as to, insofar as the recession is concerned, whether it's bottomed out, etc. And that all goes to the question as to what our revenues might be. Mr. Shea, the budget for Fiscal 75 is about 8 billion dollars, more or less, is that correct?"

Shea: "Including all funds."

Palmer: "All funds, all right and is it the, I believe that



Comptroller Lindburg said that there would be about 134 million left in about this amount."

Shea: "Now, we're talking about Fiscal 75, not Fiscal 76, is that correct?"

Palmer: "Fiscal 75, all right

Shea: "All right, now with regards to Fiscal 75 that is one of the points that I brought out very early in our discussion. We had an estimated lapse based on a zero balance budget made by the Bureau of the Budget where you or I, the Chief Executive Officer and being aware of an impending Fiscal crisis, we perhaps would throw the brakes on spending in the fourth quarter and certainly stop the release of capital funds. We could using that Fiscal advise available to us, perhaps save as much in Fiscal 75 as an additional 100 million dollars of general revenue fund."

Palmer: "All right, let's take 100 million dollars. Now the Fiscal or the Budget for 76, Fiscal Year 76 is estimated at 10.8 without the 6 per cent."

Shea: "I'm informed and reasonably believe that 10.4 would be a closer figure."

Palmer: "Well, all right, then if you we applied a 6 per cent cut that would bring someplace to even figures of 10 billion dollars."

Shea: "Sir, the request from the Governor was not an overall budget reduction but only a reduction in those funds where general revenue was utilized."

Palmer: "Well, maybe I'm, I'm not a Member of the Appropriations Committee and perhaps I don't understand the language. What, would, would 10 billion dollars be a fair estimate of what the budget will be for Fiscal Year 76?"

Shea: "I would say that is a close estimate sir."

Palmer: "Mr. Shea, then where are we going to get the money to, to, I'll say 2 billion dollars additional in round figures to, not withstanding your bill, to pay



for this."

Shea: "A lot of that suggested increase comes from bonding."

Palmer: "What percentage?"

Matijevich: "Representative Lechowicz to answer that question."

Lechowicz: "About a billion and a half and that's been knocked out."

Palmer: "One billion and a half in bond issues so that would mean 500 million dollars?"

Lechowicz: "Well there's another question in addition 2 hundred million, so may be closer to 2 billion."

Palmer: "Two billion dollars, then where's the revenue going to come from then to, to, a billion and a half bondage."

Lechowicz: "The House disap...The House and the Senate disapproved that."

Palmer: "Well I understood that the revenues Mr. Shea you can tell me if I'm wrong, would be about 300 million dollars less for Fiscal..."

Lechowicz: "That was the Governors figure and our analysis is about 280 million."

Palmer: "Well that's close to it."

Lechowicz: "His statement on the floor was about over 200 million so that gives you a leeway from 2 to 3, the papers reported it at 300 million, our analysis is about 280."

Palmer: "All right, in approaching this problem would it not be better that, rather than to use an innovative type of addressing ourselves."

Shea: "Pardon me sir, I didn't understand that."

Palmer: "Innovative or innovative way of addressing ourselves as this bill has been characterized that we must use courage and cut the budget as it should have been cut."

Shea: "Sir, I don't think any Member of this General Assembly lacks courage after all we went out and all faced the public to run for this office, I, nor do I say



it takes courage to just 6 per cent cut everything but let me ask you this, for the average man, he said to his wife, I'm going to reduce what you spend on food by 6 per cent starting next week, could she then feed her family, "in light of the fact that inflation will probably go up? Not many of us sir, as tight as we budget our money could do that."

Palmer: "Well, I believe in collective cuts, but I also believe that there's a time when we must address ourselves realistically to the problem that we can't keep spending and spending and taxing and taxing because at this particular point in our history we have a lot of people out of work, our taxes are going down, the intake from taxes are going down as a result of this. Now my, my, my statement or my question is that why not? If we have to stay here a little longer, why not cut the budgets down to the realistic figure that we can deal with, a reasonable forecast instead of taking this approach."

Shea: "I think that's what we're attempting to do sir."

Palmer: "You mean cutting the appropriations?"

Shea: "Sir, if you would look at what appropriations were introduced at and what they are going through the House, you'll find that the appropriation process has reduced substantially the amount of general revenue, probably one or two per cent of what was introduced on an overall basis."

Palmer: "Well the Appropriations..."

Shea: "If, if. If in fact. Now sir, if in fact our appropriation process reduced it by 3 per cent that would be 150 million dollars, if in fact, if in fact, the estimates of revenue are off 3 per cent that could mean another 150 million dollars, if in fact we put the brakes on spending in the last quarter, that could be another 1 or 2 per cent so that perhaps what we're playing with is a range of close to 500 million dollars



and if you could come up within say 50 or 60 million dollars, I think you would be the foremost economist in the state."

Palmer: "Well, I, you know, I was here, as you were, in 1969 when we faced that fearful prospect and it was a fearful prospect of increasing or putting on an income tax and we did with courage put that on. Here we are some six years late and we're talking about a crisis and Mr. Shea and Mr. Chairman, you know as well as I do what those budgets..."

Matijevich: "Just a minute, a point of order from Representative Lechowicz.."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, my point of order is that there's nothing as far as an Income tax in Representative Sheas proposal."

Matijevich: "Your point is well taken, Representative Palmer try to bring you, try to bring your remarks to a conclusion because we do have the Director here and he may well answer some of the questions that many of you have."

Shea: "Well, I might say....I don't think like you sir, that a tax increase is necessary at this time, but if you feel that it is and you want to propose it, I'd be happy to look at it."

Palmer: "I'm not about to propose..."

Matijevich: "I...I'd be happy to be opposed to it, proceed Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "It is very implicit in what has been said here and the figures that have been proposed that at sometime we're going to face this problem again, that fearful prospect when we have to go to our people and say, look, you're going to be faced with an income tax increase, because if you're going to spend, you're going to have the money to spend it. My suggestion is, of course, let's live within our means, let's be fiscally conservative instead of going about with inovation and trying to figure out ways of getting more money. Or spending what



we've got. Thank you."

Matijeovich: "Thank you Representative Palmer, now let's give the majority leader some rest and call on Leonard Schaefer, Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Point of information be Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "I want to know if we'll be allowed to resume our questioning of the majority leader after the gentleman from the Administration is finished?"

Matijeovich: "You may yes. You may unless as I said it's all incontrol of the Mambership any motion may be in order and the majority rules, now let's hear from Leonard Schaefer. Point of order from..."

Geo-Karis: "Point of order Mr. Speaker, will we still be line as you have written us so we can interrogate Mr. Schaefer?"

Matijeovich: "Adeline, your next."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you so much."

Matijeovich: "And then there's Katz and then there's Borchers and then there's Maragos and then there's Tuerk and then there's Grotberg and then there's Waddell and then we go, we go on Third Reading after that by the way, so let's try to hurry it up. If it has it just came out in the last, well I didn't see it, I'll put it on now. I've been watching pretty close, Representative Gaines. Representative Schaefer."

Schaefer: "Well thank you very much."

Matijeovich: "Yea, you got a promotion I guess. Go ahead."

Schaefer: "Ladies and Gentlemen I'd like to apologize for the delay in arriving. I was not formerly notified and did not plan to be here but I'm happy to, if you have some questions. I made a statement in response to some questions from the press when the 6 per cent reserve idea was initially proposed and when I was given a copy of the initial, I've only now received a copy of the Bill that is before you. Mr. Speaker, I can either make a statement or answer questions depending upon how





you'd like to proceed."

Matijevch: "Well I think that if you'd make a short statement that would suffice and then we'll open it up to questions. By the way Representative Geo-Karis, I'm going to call on you first when we have questions in, I give the latitude for the Chairman of Committees or Spokesmen which I did before and after you Representative Lechowicz will ah...so go ahead Mr. Schaefer."

Schaefer: "The Bill as proposed and which was made available to me several days ago had a variety of procedurale and potential legal pitfalls associated with it I can briefly state some of those concerns, the first one had to do with the Constitutional provisions that provide a balanced budget. In essence the Constitution requires that the Governor not propose a budget where spending will be in excess of estimated revenues and the General Assembly not pass one where appropriations will be in excess of estimated revenues. It would be perfectly appropriate for the General Assembly to pass any amount of appropriations provided their estimates exceed their estimated revenues revenues exceed that amount. To my knowledge the most recent estimate from the Economical and Fiscal Commission is if anything a little more pessamistic than the Bureau of the Budgets estimate. Secondly there are some legal questions I've been advised by our council concerning the grant program and how they would be impacted by a reserve clause. Now there seems to be an argument that given the statutes concerning Elementary and Secondary Education that is one twelvth of the appropriated amount that's to be distributed. There is some question that perhaps a reserve requirement could not prevent distribution of a full appropriated amount and we best over expend in terms of estimating the revenues by 75 million dollars. There is a third issue concerning the enforcability of the reserve, I



give an existing statute and I've been advised that both the Treasurer and Comptroller would not be able to prevent expenditures up to the total appropriated limit. There's also the question of non-general revenue funds that do impact the General Revenue balance. For instance, the Agricultural Premium Fund, Fire Prevention Fund, Fire Protection Personnel Fund, Local Government Law Enforcement Fund, all directly impact the General Revenue Fund Balance, if they are not treated in the proposed legislation. There's also a question of responsibility or accountability. If the intention of the General Assembly to hold an individual accountable for a balance budget, legislation doesn't do so, then responsibility for both certify: the need for the reserve and releasing funds placed in reserve lie with the various elected and constitutional officers. There's also a question I'd like to raise here particularly concerning the appropriateness of the six percent. A six percent reduction is required assuming that the Legislature appropriates the Governor's budget as introduced. Any dollars added on, on top of that budget as introduced would not be appropriately handled by a six percent reserve amount, and there are a number of things...."

Matijevich: "Excuse me, Mr. Waddell, do you have a point?"

Waddell: "Yes, I think that we ought to have courteousness enough to the rest of us that would like to listen to this..... Courteous in this House so that we can understand what is going on."

Matijevich: "Your point's well taken. I might add that I think the Members have been very attentive today. In fact, if you recall, the RTA and the Committee of the Whole and a couple of others that we've had, this is the best I've ever seen. Proceed."

Schaefer: "Thank you. In other words, any dollars that are appropriated in excess of the budget as recommended by



the Governor and claiming the six percent reserve amount, will not be sufficient, and as you know, there are a number of appropriation bills and non-appropriation bills which if passed would impact the ah... total appropriated amounts actually in excess of the Governor's recommendations. A matter of fact, Illinois Chamber of Commerce which tracks these things yesterday announced that there were 704 million dollars in appropriations currently pending in excess of the recommended amounts. Obviously, if even some portion of that was enacted, the six percent would not be sufficient to pay for the problem we face. There's also by the way the problem of what happens in the case where a given agency, department what-have-you is cut by the Legislature, and then all the Governor has or the appropriate elected official has is the ah... six percent additional reserve requirement. Is that reserve absolute, can be more or less, et cetera. A flexibility question. There's also a question of the cost and efficiency of implementing the recommendation or the recommended Bill, presented Bill. The problem is with the paper work and with what exactly necessity means. I think we can all certify to the fact that each of us requires or feels that ah... the functions of a given agency are necessary. The point is not that they are unnecessary. The point is we do not have funds available to fund or to pay for all of the functions of government that we would like to have. Therefore, the whole certification process is a bit fuzzy and would be quite a paper-work log-in. Lastly, there is a lapsed of period spending. The Bill did not cover the lapsed period. Quite obviously, we could have reserves in effect throughout the year and the in the last period, complete the remainder."

Matijevich: "Ah... Representative Schaeffer, he's nervous just looking at you, so I'll call on Representative Geokaris first."



Geo-Karis: "Mr. Schaeffer, when did you take over as Director of Finance?"

Schaeffer: "Bureau of the Budget."

Geo-Karis: "Bureau of the Budget. I'm sorry."

Schaeffer: "May 19th, ten years ago today."

Geo-Karis: "Ten years ago today."

Schaeffer: "It feels that way."

Geo-Karis: "Well, oh, I see what you mean. Ah..... when you did take over in May of this year, what was the status of the finances of Illinois."

Schaeffer: "Well, ....."

Geo-Karis: "Roughly, Sir. I don't expect you to have the fine points."

Schaeffer: "Well, at the end of May, the ah..... we became aware of substantial short falls in revenue. When I took over on the 19th, the following week, ah.... maybe it was two weeks later, I attended a meeting of the Governor's Economic Committee, group that was just forming out a few weeks ago, and we took a look at the projections. The projections at that point were gloomy, but we did not have a figure in terms of petite until the end of May, which then indicated we were in financial difficulty."

Geo-Karis: "Now, you came in in May, and didn't your predecessor, to your knowledge, had no inkling about the fact that our revenues would be reduced considering that we have approximately 400 thousand people who are unemployed and cannot pay income tax, cannot pay sales tax and other related taxes, which would create revenue for Illinois. I mean, this wasn't even considered by your Department?"

Schaeffer: "No, there was substantial concern. The problem that you face in attempting to project revenues in this kind of economy is that we have two things happening that by classical economists are not suppose to happen. We have high unemployment, and we have inflation. We have



a recession and an inflationary economy, and concern was evident. We had in fact a very successful month in terms of receipts in April, and that's why the Governor convened a meeting of the joint Economic Council, and that's why I attended, and we began to see, we began to be quite worried about our projections. However, the receipts did not bear out the projections. We met again after we had our receipts and at that point, the Governor made his announcement."

Geo-Karis: "Well, in May, Sir, I submit that we had approximately 400 thousand unemployed, which just by simple figuring of \$50.00 on an average for income tax per year and an average of of \$200.00 worth of tax spending on a part of each citizen who is unemployed would bring it to about one hundred million dollars. Now, ah.... I'd.... I'm really perplexed because I cannot see why the fact that we did have all this unemployment wouldn't immediately alert the Department or your predecessor to notify this Legislature as soon.... or sooner than this Legislature was notified by the Governor. I don't quite understand this. Perhaps you can explain it."

Schaeffer: "Well, I can't explain ah.... the actions of ah.... it's not appropriate for me to explain ah.... Hal Hovey's actions, but I can tell you that ah.... you would expect with high unemployment that income tax would drop off. You would also expect that there be some spill over to income tax. However, given an inflationary economy, sales tax does not fall at the same rate. In fact, sales tax revenues were projected and did in fact increase due to the inflationary impact. The problem was that ah.... sales tax began to fall off toward the end of the year and that's when the problem began to be severe."

Geo-Karis: "Now under this Bill the General Revenue and Common School Funds are dealt with directly. Ah.... if the Common School Funds are reduced, wouldn't that increase



the ah.... real estate property tax, ah.... to the various citizens who own property in Illinois?"

Schaeffer: "Not necessarily."

Geo-Karis: "Well, if you reduce the constitution to the School District, then they're going to have to make it up another way and the only other way is by local taxation."

Schaeffer: "Unless they're able to cut their expenditures by six percent."

Geo-Karis: "I'd like to speak on the Bill if I may, Mr. Speaker."

Matijeovich: "Proceed."

Geo-Karis: "I'm....."

Matijeovich: "Adeline, could I have leave of the Committee to have two minutes per each Member from now on? Representative Kane?"

Geo-Karis: "I'll limit myself to two minutes."

Matijeovich: "Yeow, go ahead Representative Kane."

Kane: "The point I'd like to make is that ah.... Mrs. Geo-Karis is going to have plenty of time to speak to the Bill on Second Reading and on Third Reading, and that I think in a Committee hearing when we are not going to vote on the Bill, that we ought to limit the time to questioning the witness and I think that would be much better taken than speaking on the Bill."

Matijeovich: "The point's well taken and I believe from now on, whatever questions the Members have, that we will limit it to the questions because we are not voting on the Bill and there is no reason why I think, because of all the time we've taken that we need anymore concluding statements. I will now call on Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Will the witness respond to a few questions? Mr. Schaeffer, first of all, I want to thank you for coming here this afternoon. Ah.... It was unfortunate that you were just informed that this



matter was before us and that the rules were suspended and this matter was placed on the calendar yesterday, late afternoon, and I'm sure if you had somebody on the Floor looking out for the Department's position, you would have been informed earlier. This is a very important matter to the Members of the General Assembly; the reason we're having a Committee of the Whole at this time. May I ask if you had anything to do with the accountability budget as it was presented to this General Assembly by the Governor?"

Schaeffer: "I was involved in the development of the budget for the Department of Mental Health. To that extent, yes."

Lechowicz: "Now, as far as the overall budget, did you have a direct part?"

Schaeffer: "The preparation of the budget...."

Lechowicz: "And the recommendation of the dollar amount."

Schaeffer: "That was submitted to you in March."

Lechowicz: "Yes."

Schaeffer: "No."

Lechowicz: "As Director, do you think that you can explain to us that budget as it is... as it has been submitted and then reviewed by this General Assembly. Let me be specific. In the Human Services area, your fiscal 1975 budget called for an expenditure of two billion twenty-five million, four-hundred and forty-eight thousand dollars. In your fiscal 76 request, in the same area of Human Services, your fiscal 76 request is two billion five-hundred sixteen million, seven-hundred and twenty-three dollars, or an increase of twenty-three percent. Now, I'm asking you, on that twenty-three percent increase, if you take a look at the total budget, as was submitted in fiscal 75 and 76, the area of Human Services accounted for 25.6 percent of the total budget, and the fiscal 76 request accounted for 23.3 percent. I'm asking



you in what areas do you specifically recommend a six percent reduction out of General Revenue in those areas."

Matijevich: "Just a minute, Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "I know that ah.... Ted is Chairman of Appropriations Committee, but some of these questions, Ted, predate the budget book, predate the introduction of Bills. He joined us May 19th. Those things have all been published. They've been edited. They've been introduced. I think your questions irrelevant. I think you ought to ask him to the thrust of 3118, as how they can implement it or not implement it. I think you've impressed us enough with your appropriation knowledge, and I agree you're a knowledgeable man in appropriations committee, but I think your questions are irrelevant."

Matijevich: "Proceed, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Chairman, I would hope, and I preface my remark, with the understanding that you know this is one piece of an entire picture, and in order to understand the budget, and I think this is what this entire Committee of the Whole is trying to do, and to understand the revenue anticipated in fiscal 76, and then in turn come in and try to recommend a ten percent across the board cut, you've got to take it piece by piece, and that's exactly what I'm doing."

Matijevich: "Go ahead, Mr. Schaeffer, do you have anything further?"

Schaeffer: "Well, as I understand the question you asking what specific cuts would I recommend in Human Services area?"

Lechowicz: "Right."

Schaeffer: "Based on the.... our revised estimate of revenues, we are recommending that six percent be cut across the board."

Lechowicz: "Is that our General Revenue?"





Schaeffer: "Right."

Lechowicz: "O'kay. So that's going to be your answer as far as not only Human Services, to be Education, Environmental Natural Resources, right across down the line. Is that correct?"

Schaeffer: "Well, the theory of budgeting, assumes that when you're done with a budget, there is a mark of utility of adding one dollar to any given agency's appropriation is equal. Therefore, if you have to reduce the budget, you reduce it across the board six percent, which results in priorities being in place."

Lechowicz: "Well, the only thing that is the matter with that theory, Sir, is that that also is under consideration if you have the same percentage increase in the various budgets, then that would make it equitable. Let me just point out to you as far as in your fiscal 76 request, the differences, and that's why we're saying a flat six won't work. General Services increased 24.3 percent over 75. Education 18.1. Environment 49.6. Public Safety 49.3. Transportation 42.6. Business Regulation and Consumer Protection 55 percent. Economic and Community Development 24 percent. Central Management Services 120 percent increase. Services for working people 10 percent increase. Based upon what you just told me, how can you tell me that it is a justifiable way of cutting the budget?"

Schaeffer: "Your figures are based on the 75 budget."

Lechowicz: "75 to 76, Sir. Increases from 75 to 76." Not a proportionate share of what the Budget is because I can go through that if you want me to."

Schaeffer: "No, but the analysis is based on the 75 to 76."

Lechowicz: "Correct."

Schaeffer: "Right. Well, a budget is not always built on the assumption that you have a right to your 75 dollar amount. In fact, part of the budget building process is to analyze those programs that are on-going and make sure



they shouldn't be refunded."

Lechowicz: "All right, then give me a justification for an increase of 120 percent of Central Management."

Schaeffer: "I'm not familiar with Central Management."

Lechowicz: "Would you supply it to me please?"

Schaeffer: "Pardon?"

Lechowicz: "Would you supply it to me? Let's go on to the State revenue estimate in 75 and 76, and the tremendous change that you foresaw approximately a week or two ago. What's your projection in State revenue and personal income?"

Schaeffer: "I'm sorry, projection for revenue?"

Lechowicz: "State revenue sources. First one, personal income. For fiscal 76.

Schaeffer: "1.683."

Lechowicz: "1.683."

Schaeffer: "Income tax, personal income tax."

Lechowicz: "Does that also include, that includes corporation income as well."

Schaeffer: "Oh, I'm sorry, excuse me. Yeow. I'm sorry, it's 1.403."

Lechowicz: "Personal is 1.403, 280 for corporations. Is that correct?"

Schaeffer: "Yes."

Lechowicz: "What about sales?"

Schaeffer: "1.630."

Lechowicz: "Utility?"

Schaeffer: "2.83. I believe this was handed out in a press packet."

Lechowicz: "My question is, I don't know if it's been revised since the items have been distributed to the press or not."

Schaeffer: "Not to my knowledge."

Lechowicz: "What's your total base, then?"

Schaeffer: "Total from State sources?"

Lechowicz: "Yeow, five billion."



Schaeffer: "4.185."

Lechowicz: "4185? 4185?"

Schaeffer: "4.185."

Lechowicz: "It's been revised. Oh, I'm sorry. That's correct. Let me ask you another question. As far as the six percent reduction in the, or the reduction in the personal income, in the Appropriations Committee, the Department of Revenue, the Director Allphin stated to us publicly and on record that the reason that there was a drop was because the efficiency in the collection procedure in the Department of Revenue. Do you concur with that statement?"

Schaeffer: "The reason there was a drop in what?"

Lechowicz: "The reason there was a drop?"

Schaeffer: "Drop in what?"

Matijevich: "Excuse me, the Gentleman from Winnebago, ah... excuse me, Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "I hate to interrupt, Mr. Lechowicz, but I want to follow your debate and your argument. Tell me the Section of the Bill you're addressing to now on 3118. Can you give me the Section so I can follow you closer?"

Matijevich: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "I think that the revenue estimates are absolutely crucial to this Bill, because if we find out the revenue estimates aren't correct, perhaps we don't need the cuts or the Bill."

Matijevich: "I think the point's well taken, because that's what brought us here. Representative Hill. We're all going to get in the act now. It was quiet for a long time."

Hill: "Mr. Chairman, I certainly agree with the last gentleman, when he said that we should certainly get into the field of analyzing what the revenues. I have a few questions to ask the gentleman about the present Revenue Director, and one of the Bills that has been sponsored and I believe you cannot just hold to this particular piece of legislation,



3118, when we're trying to get the bottom of something, and I think what I have to ask the gentleman could be embarrassing to the Director of Revenue and to the Governor's office, but I'd like to get to the bottom of this because maybe this gentleman can explain to me. Maybe I'm wrong in my substance."

Matijevich: "Don't embarrass him in front of all of these people. Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, this apparently is going to be the only representative here from the Governor's office. Now I don't want a lot of time taken and then we are going to have to close debate, without an opportunity to find out what the Governor's office feels about the major impact of this Bill, so I just want to make sure that's covered. That's a very important subject."

Matijevich: "Your point is well taken. Representative Giorgi, I think you're over-ruled, but quickly close with your point."

Giorgi: "I have a point, Mr. Speaker. One of the problems facing the General Assembly is when Mr. Schaeffer leaves he leaves with his figures and then Mr. Lechowicz will quote to me from George Lindburg's figures and then the Bureau of Economic and Fiscal Policy Commission will have their's and we'll play ring-a-round the rosy with numbers. We ought to confine our remarks to 3118. I have all the figures in my possession, like we all do. Let's confine our remarks to what we think of 3118....."

Matijevich: "You have a point, except we have the right to see the Governor's figures. Representative Huff."

Huff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. Ah.... in listening to this debate, I've sensed a growing sense of frustration about ah.... the question as to whether or not we're going to find anything out about the state of this economy, with reference to the State budget, and I would submit to you Ladies and Gentlemen very seriously that



the answer to that question is, I'm self-imposing, is that we're not going to find the answer to..... Representative Lechowicz mentioned that what we're doing here is..... represents just a small piece and he's absolutely right. I think we're only going to find a solution to this thing when we look at the totality of this picture as it relates to every Director and to every budget that has.... that takes funds from the General Revenue budget. Now, just.... the budget...."

Matijevich: "Representative Huff, do you have a point? What is your point? State your point."

Huff: "Yes, I have a point. My point is that I was a little dismayed to find out that the Budget Director here came into his office on May 19th...."

Matijevich: "Representative Huff, that is no point of order. Proceed Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Director, ah.... for your figure as far as what you anticipate in receiving in state revenue sources remain constant, what you released to the press approximately a week ago. Is that correct?"

Schaeffer: "Yes."

Lechowicz: "May I ask you about your Federal aid and net transfers? Are those figures still the same? Your net transfers still the same?"

Schaeffer: "Yes."

Lechowicz: "What do you anticipate in the fiscal lapse of 75 to 76?"

Schaeffer: "I'm sorry, what do I anticipate?"

Lechowicz: "Yeow. Lapse. Budgetary balance."

Schaeffer: "120."

Lechowicz: "May I ask you how firm that figure is?"

Schaeffer: "It's as firm as it can be, given the uncertainties about deficiencies that are still pending."

Lechowicz: "Well, do you think that ah... depending, well we're talking, it's June the 22nd and ah..... there is a



tremendous amount of difference between 120 million and 54 million, and I was wondering what ah... is the soft ground?"

Schaeffer: "The 54 million is from the Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission. Right?"

Lechowicz: "Based upon the figure that we got from the Department of Revenue of the May receipts and according to the Director, and that was my question to you previously, before a point of order was raised. The Director pointed out that the economy is sound under his consideration, but he figured that there was a decrease in the personal and corporate income based upon the increased deficiency of the gathering process of revenue."

Schaeffer: "Well, I think Director Allphin was talking about these procedures for processing returns, and having need to improve, but the administrative procedures don't impact the dollar amount receipts."

Lechowicz: "Well, he told us it did. You're saying they don't. Right?"

Schaeffer: "I don't think so. I wasn't there. I doubt that he would say that they would impact the total dollar amount in receipts. They would impact the point in time which the receipts are credited."

Lechowicz: "Out of the 5.4, what's the general revenue portion of the budget? 5.4 billion?"

Schaeffer: "5.4 billion. 5.460 approximately."

Lechowicz: "Now, in your budget recommendations, are you also recommending a six percent cut in pensions and in grants as well?"

Schaeffer: "The recommendation is a six percent cut in all line items funded from General Revenue with a couple of exceptions that had to do with IBA rentals, food, and if you give me a minute, I'll get the list of exceptions."

Lechowicz: "I wish you would, please."

Schaeffer: "O'kay, refunds, the group insurance, State group



insurance, circuit breakers, IBA rentals...."

Lechowicz: "Now, wait a minute. The group insurance, is that the additional 10 million dollars they put in the Department of Personnel for the Blue Cross-Blue Shield?"

Schaeffer: "That's the plan. The insurance plan for state employees."

Lechowicz: "O'kay. What were the others?"

Schaeffer: "Circuit breakers, IBA rentals, workmen's comp, salaries affixed by law, judicial court act,....."

Lechowicz: "Will you go a little.... I'm sorry, will you just go a little slower, please?"

Schaeffer: "General Revenue Capital....."

Lechowicz: "Wait a minute. You've got refunds, group insurance, circuit breaker. What was after that?"

Schaeffer: "IBA rentals, workmen's comp, salaries affixed by law, juvenile....."

Lechowicz: "Now wait a minute. Salaries affixed by law. Does that also include all state employees?"

Schaeffer: "No."

Lechowicz: "It does not include them?"

Schaeffer: "No."

Lechowicz: "Which ones does it exclude?"

Schaeffer: "Exclude?"

Lechowicz: "Excludes."

Schaeffer: "It excludes those individuals, those state employees whose salaries are not specifically affixed by law."

Lechowicz: "How many..... There are approximately 100,000 state employees. How many does this....."

Schaeffer: "The dollar amount associated with the ah.... facts is about 45 to 47 million dollars in salaries affixed by law."

Lechowicz: "How many State employees do we have?"

Schaeffer: "There are about 61 or 62 thousand under the Governor and another similar amount in the college and university



system."

Lechowicz: "How many would be excluded? Just the State officers and the rest of the 120,000, 118,000 would be excluded?"

Schaeffer: "Right."

Lechowicz: "You would ask them to take a six percent cut in their salaries. Is that what you're recommending to this General Assembly?"

Schaeffer: "In terms of people who would be impacted, all right, you can say that individuals whose salaries are affixed by law would not be impacted, but any individual who is currently an employee or would be an employee in the coming fiscal year, would not have his or her salary reduced. The total dollar amount available for personal services would be reduced, but salaries would not."

Lechowicz: "All right, so what you're anticipating is that a layoff in lieu of a cut?"

Schaeffer: "I do not anticipate substantial layoffs at all. A matter of fact ah.... Senator Hines requested an analysis of the impact of the reduction, and there is approximately 31 million dollars in the budget as requested for new employees. You go through the six percent reduction, you reduce about 32 million dollars."

Lechowicz: "Well, on the premise that you're going to receive the new employees."

Schaeffer: "On the premise, what?"

Lechowicz: "That you're going to receive the authority for the new employees."

Schaeffer: "No, No, the assumption would be that a six percent reduction would eliminate most of the funding for the employees and there would not be new employees, and that's how you save the six percent Personal Services."

Lechowicz: "Well, that's our approach. Will you also..... Could you give me a total figures, as far as.... you say there are 120,000 under the Governor, 60 under the Governor





and 60 under the university system. Out of the 120,000 state employees, that means that they could have a reduction of six percent of their salaries."

Schaeffer: "No, absolutely not."

Lechowicz: "O'kay, the ones on board would not be affected."

Schaeffer: "No one would be affected in terms of salaries.

The dollars available to pay for additional employees would not be there and personal employees would not be hired."

Lechowicz: "What else?"

Schaeffer: "Civil defense, disaster relief and court of claims awards. I think I mentioned...."

Lechowicz: "Civil defense disaster relief, that's about only about a million dollars in General Revenue and about ten million in Federal aid. Right?"

Schaeffer: "Right."

Lechowicz: "Are those the only eight?"

Schaeffer: "Those are the items that would be exempted from the six percent calculations."

Lechowicz: "What about Public Aid?"

Schaeffer: "What about Public Aid?"

Lechowicz: "What's your recommendation in the Department of Public Aid?"

Schaeffer: "The Budget for the Department of Public Aid in its administrative areas has already been reduced by six percent. Director Trainor has developed recommendations to reduce the Medicaid portion by an equal amount."

Lechowicz: "Now wait a minute. What was the fiscal 76 request in operations of Public Aid?" 140 million?"

Schaeffer: "76, yes. I believe the amount has been reduced in excess of six percent, six and a half or almost seven."

Lechowicz: "Well, that's a 20 percent increase over 75, so all I want to know is in what areas were operations cut?"

Schaeffer: "I'm not familiar with cuts by the Committee. I'm not familiar with the cut."

Lechowicz: "What about grants?"



Schaeffer: "Grants were not cut."

Lechowicz: "What's the intention of the Department on grants."

Schaeffer: "Currently, the intention is to take a look at those and see if we cannot get some reduction in the total number of eligible individuals. The problem is....."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Schaeffer, did you..... how long have you been working for the Department?"

Schaeffer: "I've been with the State for over two years."

Lechowicz: "Well, I'm serving my seventh term and I remember Governor Ogilvie making this same rhetoric as far as taking off and getting all the headlines. But unfortunately, there aren't that many there. Now, people that are ineligible, and I remember this Governor making the same statement two years ago, and I'd like to know what the dollar figure is....."

Matijeich: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "I'd like to make a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The Representative is being argumentive rather than asking questions."

Matijeich: "Well, I didn't think that was argumentive. Go ahead and answer the question, Representative Schaeffer."

Lechowicz: "What's your total dollar of anticipation in the removal of ineligible."

Schaeffer: "We don't have a dollar total because of the recent supreme court decision, which leaves us to believe although we don't know...."

Lechowicz: "You don't have a total dollar?"

Schaeffer: "I don't think we can have a dollar total until we're able to evaluate the impact of what seems to be the Supreme Court's decision that individuals who are unemployed may choose between unemployment compensation and Public Aid. Unemployment compensation is funded by employer contributions and the Federal government. Public Aid is 50/50 State and Federal, so a switch from one to the other impacts General Revenue automatically."



Lechowicz: "The Public Aid request of fiscal 76 is approximately 1 billion eight hundred million dollars. What is your recommendation on that Department's Budget, "the dollar amounts and reduction?"

Schaeffer: "We're recommending that the administrative portion, 140 million, be reduced by six percent, that the medic-aid payments, which are about 750 million be reduced by six percent."

Lechowicz: "772 million."

Schaeffer: "All right, and the ah.... medic-aid portion be left alone, excuse me.... the grants portion be left alone pending an analysis of the Supreme Court Decision. Director Trainor is attempting to reduce the dollar outflow in that area, but it's not appropriate to hit a number if we don't know what the impact is, to transfer from unemployment to Public Aid."

Lechowicz: "So you're telling me you don't know?"

Schaeffer: "I'm saying....."

Lechowicz: "Six percent out of operations, that's the best of your knowledge. Right?"

Schaeffer: "Six percent of the administrative costs, six percent of medic-aid and then whatever can be reduced by attempting to limit ineligible by attempting to abide by the Supreme Court Decision. Right now, that is open-ended."

Lechowicz: "Well, you've only accounting for one hundred million out of the 1.8 billion dollar budget."

Schaeffer: "I believe the Governor said in his speech that ah... the Public Aid grants for an area that he was uncertain; that's why he set a deficit documented as 200 million and would go higher depending upon unemployment and the Public Aid situation."

Lechowicz: "What about Public Health."

Schaeffer: "Six percent."

Lechowicz: "In operations."

Schaeffer: "Yes."



Lechowicz: "What about grants?"

Schaeffer: "Yes."

Lechowicz: "You realize that you lose approximately 21 million in Federal money if you do that?"

Schaeffer: "I'm not familiar with that figure, no."

Lechowicz: "Take a look at it. What about Aging?"

Schaeffer: "Six percent."

Lechowicz: "Operations and Grants?"

Schaeffer: "Probably...."

Lechowicz: "Wait a minute, that's the Department you were with. What about Mental Health?"

Schaeffer: "Six percent."

Lechowicz: "In the Grants?"

Schaeffer: "Sure. If you don't reduce the six percent, where do you find it? You let anyone not take the six percent, in the given Department, you've got to find it somewhere else. As a solution, you can eliminate a whole Department, you can eliminate an entire function, but given that all of the functions that are funded are valuable, you attempt to spread the reduction evenly."

Matijeovich: "That's what Jim Taylor is trying to do, but we won't go into that."

Lechowicz: "Could you give me a listing of priority by Department, or Department priority listing?"

Schaeffer: "The Budget is a priority listing from the dollar."

Lechowicz: "Well, I'm just going through the human service agencies now and then if you want to go into higher education, but I'm requesting you as a Director, the new Director, to give me a priority listing, as you see fit, for a recommendation."

Schaeffer: "Well, the Budget is a priority listing in terms of relative priorities, the dollars associated with given activities indicate the priority placed on them. A six percent reduction leaves those priorities relatively speaking in tact."



Lechowicz: "Excuse me, may I get back to the Department of Public Aid, because Representative Shea just gave me a letter signed by James Trainor, the Director of Public Aid? When the Supreme Court Decision came about, we addressed, Representative Shea addressed a letter to the Director, requesting the impact so we could also make any adjustments in the Budget. Just let me read you here the response. It says 'Dear Representative Shea, with regard to your letter concerning the U.S. Supreme Court Decision, regarding unemployment compensation, I have had staff research the issues involved in the case to the extent that they can. In spite of the fact that the Court's decision in Filbrook Commission of the Department of Social Welfare vs. Glodgett, it is not generally available even in Washington and the Department believes at this point that the Decision will not affect Illinois (will not affect Illinois) given our current statutes and policies on AFDC-U and UCB. The Court held that Vermont cannot deny AFDC-U a person merely because he is qualified for UCB. You can deny AFDC-U for those periods when a person actually sees a UCB payment. Apparently, and this is speculation from Vermont's program, strictly reflects other requirements. To qualify for AFDC-U, a person cannot be receiving UCB and the State cannot claim Federal matching for AFDC-U payments to a person who has not received UCB. Thus a person has to elect which benefits he can have. The Courts held he can take the higher benefits, whichever it is AFDC-U or UCB. Illinois to the contrary did not require an election of benefits. IDPA treats UCB like any other type of unearned income in determining eligibility for AFDC-U. In other words, UCB is budget against AFDC-U needs. We don't claim Federal matching for these dual benefits of AFDC-U needs. We don't claim Federal matching for these dual benefits of AFDC-U cases, since we don't claim, Federal



AFDC-U regulations are not governing, although our program does reflect some of the Federal requirements, an example being employment is defined as less than 100 hours of work per month, and the focus of the program is on unemployment of the male wage earner. As we receive more information, I will keep you informed of the situation. Sincerely, James Trainor.' But again, the Decision will not affect Illinois."

Schaeffer: "I don't believe that Director Trainor has obtained a copy of the Decision. We have not..."

Lechowicz: "Well, all we can do is call upon a direct request of the Director, and we have a reply dated June 11. Now, I strongly recommend that you get a closer look...."

Matijevich: "Representative Houlihan, do you have a question?"

Houlihan: "Mr. Chairman, I'd like not to prolong this hearing, but I'd like to suggest that Representative Lechowicz is out of Order. The Director of the Budget, Bureau of the Budget, has indicated that there may be some significance or some small defect in that Decision. Now, he's entitled to his opinion. Director Trainor, as Director of the Department of Public Aid, is entitled to his Opinion if there may not be an effect. There may be some controversy. There may be some disagreement on that, but they're going to try to solve that problem, and it's a recent decision. Now to try to suggest, Representative Lechowicz, that ah..... that there's some contradiction, which is not proper, is really out of place. I think you were in line when you were talking about the basis for the six percent cut, but now what you're doing is trying to rehear the entire budget in this Committee of the Whole process, and I think that's out of place."

Matijevich: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Chairman, I think that's what we're trying to get at here. We have the Director of the Bureau of the Budget who says that we'll have a dramatic impact. We have the



Director of the Department of Public Aid that says it has none. When you're talking about a dramatic impact in a billion, seven hundred million dollar budget, you could talk .50, 100 million dollars. The Director says 100 million dollars in this area could solve all of the budget problems."

Matijevich: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I think the Majority Leader's introduction of 3118 agrees with this witness. We agree to the shortages, we agree that the money isn't going to be there, and we want to impound the budget so that nothing occurs. His Bill is in credence to the testimony of the witness. I think we're wasting our time. If these questions haven't been answered in the Appropriations Committee meeting, we ought to form a new Appropriations Committee."

Matijevich: "Well, I think the Majority Leader tried to make the point that his Bill has been introduced if he is right, so it's the big 'if' that we're all spending three hours here. Ah..... Representative Lechowicz, do you have anymore? Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sitting here in simple amazement. As I understand the appropriation for the Department of Public Aid will be before the Appropriations Committee #2 tomorrow morning, and I'm sitting here simply amazed by the questions. Some of the questions have brought up questions in my mind. I spent half of this day with the staff on this very budget, and I just wonder, what the heck we're talking about? Because some of the things being brought up here as I have reviewed the budget this afternoon, there's been no discussion about it whatsoever. Now, maybe I'm wrong. If I'm wrong, you know, put me in my place."

Matijevich: "Looks like you will wake up tomorrow."

Barnes: "But my God, if that's the case, if what is being said is the case, ah.... from what I'm hearing from my



side of the aisle, there's no need for an Appropriation Committee meeting tomorrow."

Matijevich: "Let me know what happens tomorrow, Representative Barnes. Representative Washington on a Point of Order."

Washington: "Well beyond that, Mr. Speaker....."

Matijevich: "Representative Barnes wants to.... go ahead."

Barnes: "Well, this is not so much a question to you or either to the Speaker here, but some of the analogies that have been brought up here bother me considerably because, as I've said I've been working on amendments and going over Senate amendments on this whole question this afternoon, and to the best of my knowledge, there have been no suggestions for doing anything whatsoever with amendment as it relates to grants. Now, we're talking about....."

Matijevich: "Representative Barnes, unless you have a point of order,....."

Barnes: "Well, my question then maybe is to the question - are we intending to cut grants by six percent? Because if you are, you're talking about 100 million dollars."

Matijevich: "To ask your question, you'll have to wait in line because others have questions. That is no point of order. Representative Lechowicz..... Representative Washington, what is your point?"

Washington: "Mr. Chairman, I agree with Representative Barnes and I agreed with him a week ago when the Resolution came to this Floor to have a joint hearing on this matter. At that time, I suggested that the whole matter go to the Appropriations Committee. I'm going to take a chance and move that we now arise as a Committee of the Whole, now do arise."

Matijevich: "God Bless you. Representative Washington has made a motion that the Committee of the Whole ah.... of the..... that have been resolved to consider House Bill 3118 do now arise. All in favor say 'aye'. Opposed 'no',





and the Committee of the Whole now do arise. The ah.... the recess session of the House will now convene. Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. You know, I think it is a little unfortunate that we only talked of one aspect of this whole problem of 3118. That when I asked for inquiries regarding the revenue, which I was trying to find out as a responsible member of the Chairman of the Revenue Committee, I was not alluded to. All of a sudden, it was an unfair situation."

Matijevid: "Representative Maragos, you will be allowed plenty of opportunity on Second Reading and Third Reading. Representative Hill."

Hill: "Ah.... Mr. Chairman, the Motion has been made, and it's been accepted. I wanted to talk in regard to Senate Bill 716, so I would suggest that those people who are for Allphin had better checked into the situation before it comes up."

Matijevid: "Anybody interested in 716, take note. Ah..... House Bills, Third Reading. House Bill 2103. Representative Chapman here? House Bill 2103 out of the Record. 2445. Yourell. Out of the Record. 2942. Brinkmeier. Out of the Record. 3006. Representative Younge. Read the Bill."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3006. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Metro-East Exposition Performing Arts Authority. Third Reading of the Bill."

Matijevid: Representative Younge."

Younge: "Take it out of the Record, Mr. Speaker."

Matijevid: "Oh, out of the Record. 3006 out of the Record. 3036. Representative Maragos. Out of the Record. 3040, Representative Peters. Out of the Record. 3041. Peters. Out of the Record. 3059 is Representative McClain ready? Out of the Record. 3062. Representative Berman. Out of the Record. I thought so. It's not your fault."



Representative..... 3054. Representative Mulcahey. Out of the Record. Representative.... 3067. Representative Chapman. Out of the Record. 3068. Representative Downes. Out of the Record. 3094. Representative Terzich. Read the Bill."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3094. A Bill for an Act to amend the Downstate Policemen's Pension Fund Article in the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Matijevid: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have leave to ah.... bring this Bill back to ah.... Second Reading for an Amendment."

Matijevid: "Is there objection? The Gentleman has leave to bring the Bill back to Second for purposes of an Amendment."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #1. Terzich. Amends House Bill 3094 on Page 1, Line 1 and so forth."

Matijevid: "Representative Terzich on the Amendment."

Terzich: "Yes, this simply ah... makes ah..... it eligible for the person to accept the option of coming into the program up to January 1, 1976. This is an annual amendment and I would urge the adoption of this Amendment #1."

Matijevid: "Representative Terzich has moved the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 3094. Is there further discussion? Hearing none, all in favor, say 'aye', opposed 'nay' and the Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Matijevid: "Third Reading. House Bill 3096. Representative Beaupre. Out of the Record. House Bill 3097. Representative Dunn. Read the Bill."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3097. Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois and create the railroad assistance and improvement fund. Third Reading of the Bill."



Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it is my understanding we're on Third Reading. Is that correct? The Board says Second Reading."

Matijevich: "Third Reading."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that has been worked out in Committee in connection with both staffs, with the House Transportation Committee. There is a program ah..... under way in Washington to provide assistance for ah..... those along the railroad lines to be abandoned in connection with the Penn Central of railraod abandon-ment. This program is the Federal Railway Relocation and Reorganization Act. We, in Illinois, hopefully and we expect we are are going to be eligible for some money. Approximately nine million dollars in operating subsidies 4-1/2 million each year over a two year period. In order to become eligible for these monies, however, we must have a state railroad plan in effect. This program has been studied, as I've said, by the Committees and worked out by the staffs on both sides, much more remains to be done, but at the present time, we are asking authority only for the passage of this Bill which will authorize the Department of Transportation to apply for Federal funds to take advantage of the monies that come from Washington for these purposes. How these monies will be spent will be determined later. There are to be sub-committee hearings this Summer going into the Fall, to decide exactly what form and shape the State Railway Plan will take. I urge a favorable roll call on this Bill."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Macon has moved the passage of House Bill 3097. Is there a discussion? Gentleman from Henderson, Representative Neff."

Neff: "Ah..... thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As Representative Dunn has explained, he's explained this thoroughly. It's ah.... this legislation



has been worked out under a subcommittee and also the full committee of the Transportation Committee. Representative Garmisa. This is a vehicle that we're ah.... hoping to put through that will give the Department of Transportation something that they can go to Washington with and get this Grant as it becomes available. We are going to make more permanent legislation. As Representative Dunn brought out, there is a subcommittee that's going to work on this and we hope by Fall to have.... to come back and have the full details worked out. But at this time, I'm for full support and I hope you'll give this favorable passage."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Tuerk: "What is the status of the Federal plan at this moment?"

Dunn: "The ah.... at the present time, it is my understanding that ah.... that the Federal plan is not definite and funds are not available yet. They will be available, it is my understanding, on the 70/30 matching basis - 70 percent from the Federal government and 30 percent locally, but the rules and regulations about how those monies will become available, to the best of my knowledge, are not yet available. They are expected sometime this summer, after hopefully we are out of session, and that is the reason for the need for this legislation so that we will have a vehicle to accept those funds and to be eligible for them."

Tuerk: "Well, as you know, there's been an outcry of opposition of the Federal plans throughout the State. Now, does your Bill speak to that at all?"

Dunn: "Not at this point. This Bill merely provides that ah... we are authorized to apply for funds. We are well aware of the ah.... interest of various groups around the State of Illinois about the Federal plan and about how State



monies should be spent and about how local participation should take shape in this plan, because these are matters that could not be worked out at this time. These are matters that will become the subject of the hearings of the subcommittee this summer and there will be no regulations, no laws put into effect at this time to ah.... implement the program other than to ah.... hopefully to pass the vehicle to make it possible to apply for and accept Federal funds."

Tuerk: "Will there be any input by this Bill which would speak to the problems of opposition toward the Federal plan? That's really my basic question."

Dunn: "Not at this point. There will, in all honesty, not be input, because the compromise that was worked out earlier this spring was to see if we could get this vehicle through to apply for the funds and to proceed with House Bill 2273, which was recently placed on the interim study calendar and subcommittee of the Transportation House Committee to look into the various problems that you are addressing yourself to at this time, and we have, in fact, a subcommittee meeting at...."

Matijevich: "Representative Dunn, I wonder.... Representative Garmisa, who was Chairman of the Transportation Committee, wants to speak and he may enlighten Representative Tuerk and all of us. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Benedict Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ah.... 3097 is a Bill, as the Sponsor of the Bill has explained, it is simply a vehicle that has been agreed upon by the Committee Members, by DOT, by Labor and the various railroad organization in order that we can affect this funding. Actually the calendar states that House Bill 3097 creates the Railroad Assistance and Improvement Fund. However, the funding proposed was not included in House Bill 3097, because all the parties that were



concerned here could not agree upon the source of the funds and the funding mechanics, so Representative John Dunn does have House Bill 2273, which we did put on an interim study calendar and we're going to have a working committee that is going to go into the various mechanics of the Bill and we will come up with, we hope, ah... establish a State Rail Plan and a funding phase, which this subcommittee will study this summer and this fall and come up with the answers we're looking for here. So what we're asking for in House Bill 3097 is actually limited in scope to just include the language that will establish DOT as the State agency that will be designated to establish, administer and coordinate a good State Rail Plan, so I do ask for the full Membership to come up with a unanimous vote on this very fine vehicle that is sorely need throughout the State of Illinois....."

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

Deuster: "I wonder if I might ask the Sponsor of the Bill a question?"

Matijevich: "He indicates he'll yield. Go ahead."

Deuster: "Every time the Federal government passes some new program, the problem is the States come running in with a special bill so that we can receive those funds, and I was wondering whether perhaps since this is on Third Reading, the Sponsor would consider over in the Senate at least adding some kind of an Amendment to provide that generally our Department of Transportation here in Illinois may apply for and receive all grants and all funds in the field of transportation that the Federal government may provide. I've been looking at the Statutes and I see the authority, as I understand it, presently is limited to make applications for mass transit grants and I would think this legislative vehicle would be an excellent vehicle for cleaning up the Statutes so we don't have to come back



here year after year, everytime the boys in Washington come up with a new program and .....

Matijevich: "Question to Representative Dunn?"

Deuster: "And would the Sponsor respond to that request."

Dunn: "I would ah..... if this Bill does pass in the Senate, I would certainly consider that Amendment. I want to make certain however that this Body does not advocate any of its authority in these areas of funding as has been discussed earlier today. We would have to be very careful with that."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield to a couple of questions?"

Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Schraeder: "Representative, under House Bill 3097 and apparently the companion Bill, 22 something, did not cover any appropriation for the subject matter. Is there an appropriation somewhere? You mentioned 7030."

Dunn: "At the present time, there is no appropriation."

Schraeder: "How is this going to operate without appropriated funds?"

Dunn: "I presume the cost of the subcommittee meetings will be paid from the Speaker's budget. Or DOT's budget."

Schraeder: "Well, I'm not so sure that's proper. Is it in the DOT budget?"

Dunn: "I don't believe so."

Schraeder: "Then I might suggest perhaps 3097 ought to be held until an appropriation measure catches up with us."

Dunn: "Well holding it is death."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I want to hold it until I get the ....."

Matijevich: "All right, the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn, to close."



Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I urge a favorable vote on this Bill. It has been approved by the Leadership on both sides of the aisle. It's been approved by the Chairman of the House Transportation Committee....."

Matijevich: "Question is, shall House Bill 3097 pass? All in favor, signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Record Representative Luft 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? Take the Record. On this question, there are 128 'ayes', no 'nays', 7 'present' and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3102. Representative Caldwell. Read the Bill. 3102."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3102. A Bill for an Act creating Department of Vocational Rehabilitation. Third Reading of the Bill."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, my former seatmate, Representative Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill ah..... was up a few days ago, but Representative Macdonald had some questions and we held it ah..... The Bill simply ah.... establishes the Department of Vocational and Rehabilitation as a code department and that became necessary because of some changes in the Department of Education. I would ah..... like for Mrs. Macdonald to respond to it and then ask for a favorable roll call."

Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Virginia Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I strongly support this Bill at this point. There were some clarifications that I wanted made. I also wanted to talk to the Council of the Handicap who had been working with me on a Bill that we had an interim study committee. They feel the Bill is now in the shape that they can easily support. My concern was that





possibly with the restructuring of the Department of Vocational and Rehabilitation that we would lose Federal funds coming into Illinois. I understand that that is not so under the revision of this Bill, and I strongly support it and urge each of you, not only on behalf of the handicapped of Illinois, but also on behalf of our beloved departed colleague, Bob Juckett, who put so much time and energy into this kind of legislation and for this good cause, so I urge the support of my side of the aisle as well as the other side also."

Matijevich: "Representative Caldwell has moved the passage of House Bill 3102, with the help of Representative Macdonald. Discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz."

Katz: "Ah..... Mr. Speaker, I, too, enjoyed working with our good friend, Representative Juckett, and ah.... I do not believe, however, that as far as the merits of this Bill, that it ought to be considered except on the question of the merits of this Bill. Now I would say to you that we have just been through a session of several hours, having to do with a revenue crisis in Illinois, and I hear it on the other side, and I hear it everywhere, and what is proposed to be done is set up another Department and every-time we set up another Department, we make it more difficult for the Governor to manage. We set up a whole new bureaucracy, a whole new heirarchy. We set up a Department of Aging and we open offices of the new Department and I would really like to respectfully suggest that in the interest of efficient management, there's nothing that I know of that can be done with a new Department that can't be done within the regular structure of government. Every-time we proliferate government and create new structures and new bodies, we increase the cost of it. One of these days, I assume, in the normal course of events, the People



on the other side will have a Governor, and we have Governors and the Governors need to manage efficiently. I haven't heard the Governor of the State this time or previously ask that new Departments be created. This is quite against every principle of modern management of government, to create new agencies everytime a group, that however well meaning they are, feel that in some way it adds to their honor to have a new Department in their field. We are quite able to take care of the field involved here. The Federal government takes care within a single department of health, education, welfare, of all of the problems. There is no reason if the Federal government can take care of rehabilitation in a single Department that Illinois needs to create a new Department and I would respectfully suggest that in the interest of efficiency, good government, sound principles of management, that we defeat this attempt to create yet another Department."

Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Christian, Representative Rolland Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address myself to the Bill and in doing so, I'd like to second all that Representative Katz just said to you. This Bill, 3102, is apparently an add-on on a Bill that was previously before this General Assembly and was turned down by the Appropriations Committee, pursuant to a hearing of the subcommittee that went into this thing rather thoroughly. At that time, it was pretty well decided, I thought, that ah... most of these things that they wanted to do in Vocation Rehabilitation could be done by some restructuring and changes in the Division of Vocational and Rehabilitation that exists. I would suggest to you that in order to accomplish this end apparently this time, for this year, an appropriation has been left of the creation of this Department. So for the first year, it creates a paper department, which will



then, of course, be in in another year with an appropriation for a director and an assistant director and several assistant directors, administrative assistants, legislative liaison and appropriations for new space, or renovation of space and all of these things that are absolutely not needed in order to bring vocational rehabilitation to the People of the State of Illinois. So I would certainly urge that we not consider creating another boon-goggled department in State Government."

Matijeich: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of this Assembly. I am on the Human Resources Committee and we heard this Bill. I think the main reason for the creation of this department is to have a better working relationship for vocational rehabilitation. You would be surprised how much great need there is and in our own county there's a tremendous need. I certainly urge you to adopt this Bill."

Matijeich: "The gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I rise in support and maybe to clarify a few things. One, is that the Bill was heard in Elementary and Secondary Education two or three times and I know it has a lot of activity surrounding it but I don't believe in one for Human Resources. Very simply, it's just a division within the, all three have departments, and its principal function will be that, aside from it's duty, is that it provides the code Department which can be the recipient of Federal money. Now, I think that's essential, we're not going to be adding new employees which already exist...ah...that's twelve hundred and ninety, if I'm not mistaken, they already exist. So we're not creating a new agency, it's just dividing the bulk rehab. portion of our educational system and I would indicate that an 'aye' vote is in order."



Matijeich: "Representative Caldwell to close."

131

Caldwell: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'm somewhat amazed that the...ah... the opposition to Representative Katz and feel that if he felt as strongly as he does, he probably should have conferred with me and got him some information. Certainly he is wrong in that...ah... that this Bill is a boon-doggle. I explained on this floor a half a dozen times when this Bill was 2161 and we closed down on the twenty-third day of May, just before we got to it, now it's a Committee Bill and it simply establishes the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation as a code Department. The reason that it's necessary to...ah...establish it is because we will loose a definitive fifty million dollars of Federal money if it is not established. I ask a favorable Roll Call."

Matijeich: "The gentleman from Cook has moved the passage of House Bill 3102. The question is shall House Bill 3102 pass? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye' opposed 'nay'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? They take a little longer on Sundays. Ah...Representative Shea."

Shea: "Might I...Might I explain my vote?"

Matijeich: "Yes. The Clerk will take the record and then we'll explain...Oh...All right. Go ahead, explain."

Shea: "Well Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we talk about unemployment, now here's a gentleman that's come forth with a proposal, perhaps with a little vocational development in this state, where we turn out people that can do things to help the civic economy so we can take some of the people that are unemployed and either retrain them or find for them some means of changing their occupation in to an area that we need. We can reduce the unemployment and if we reduce the unemployment perhaps those revenues will come up. I think this is a good idea and I would hope that we would get more green lights up there."

Matijeich: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Gaines to explain his vote."

Gaines: "Well, I want to second what the majority leader said, 'cause I come from an area where this is very valuable and I think that...ah..."



as we so often do, for the people that are trying to help themselves to our dollars rather than become effective."

Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Virginia Macdonald to explain her vote."

Macdonald: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. There is no one on this House Floor that is more concerned about the budget of this state than I am. But I think we are going to have to address ourselves to priority in the expenditure of funds for this state. We have three and a half million handicapped people in Illinois and they have been shunted from one place to another without a coordinating department in government to really address itself to their needs. I say that this is a very much needed Bill and even though we have problems, I think that our priorities have to be to help those that can not help themselves. I urge your support of this Bill."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Borchers to explain his vote."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House. First I have to correct what was just said about three and a half million...ah... people in the State of Illinois. Why that's impossible, we only have eleven million, you can just see for yourself in some way my good friend has made a mistake on percentages...why to knock off one half of them as children, it's just impossible. But let's go on to what I was going to say. In relation to rehabilitation I realize they're handicapped, but even those that are not handicapped and those that are handicapped right now many of them go from training course to training course, all we want is the money that they derive from this. They go from course to course. I know one woman with her family that have gone to three different schools not meaning to get a job at all, not exercising what their wishings, what they're suppose to try to do and to get work but going ahead and just making their work drawing money from the state for going to school. Now all we're doing is creating another bureaucracy that we're going to have to pay for, as far as the...the money from the Federal Government, figure the money we got to put up to match it, it works both...two ways, I'd rather loose the federal money and keep our money...when we need it so badly for so



many important things."

Matijevid: "Have all vote? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill the vote is 97 'ayes', 31 'nays', 6 'present' and this Bill having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3106, Representative Berman, are you ready? The Clerk will read the Bill."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3106. A Bill for an Act in relation to notice of an issuance of certain subpoena's. Third Reading of the Bill."

Matijevid: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Berman."

Berman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

The reason for the introduction of House Bill 3106 which came through as a Committee Bill from Executive Committee was an article, a news article that appeared in the newspaper and I want to read to you the opening paragraph. 'Records on financial assets of some public officials and state employes, filed with the Illinois Board of Ethics, were subpoenaed and are being used by a Federal Grand Jury in Chicago. Income tax returns and comprehensive disclosure forms required by 1973 Executive order by Governor Walker, were subpoenaed by U. S. Attorney, James R. Thompsons Office, for a Grand Jury investigation.' Now, as all of us are aware, as a result of the Governors Executive order....highly paid state employees and state employees in sensitive governmental positions are required to file with the Board of Ethics, very detailed, very involved, financial disclosure forms. These forms are in my opinion suppose to be used for the perusal and investigation by the Board of Ethics to determine con...possible conflicts of interest. Now we find that as a result of the filing of these forms Grand Jury subpoena's are being served, not on the individuals involved, but rather on the Board of Ethics. And this appears to me to deprive state employees or other governmental employees of their rights under the fifth Amendment of the U. S. Constitution, because it's not only income tax forms but also information that can only be determined by that individual, such as computation of net worth, disclosure of secret investments, etc. This Bill, House Bill 3106, seeks in some method, which I think is reasonable, to give that state employee the rights that the U. S.



Constitution grants him. Namely, the right to know when his records, which are on file, I have been subpoenaed...so that that individual could take advantage, if he wishes, to go before a court and ask for the quashing of that subpoena based upon his rights under the fifth Amendment. So this Bill, House Bill 3106, imposes the requirements of notice to the individual in the event that his records are subpoenaed, I would appreciate your favorable vote."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook has asked for the adop...passage of House Bill 3106. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, shall House Bill 3106 pass? Those in the affirmative vote 'aye', those in the negative vote 'no'. Vote. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question the 'ayes' are 131 the 'nays' are 1, 1 answering 'present' and this Bill having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3107. Is Representative Beaupre ready?...House Bill..."

Jack O'Brien: "3107, A Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to the practice of Beauty Culture. Third Reading of the Bill"

Matijevich: "The gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This particular Bill addresses itself to a problem that our downstate career centers who teach vocational and technical training for our high schools are faced with in regard to the teaching of beauty culture. It's a matter that I tried to resolve administratively and have made attempts to resolve since last November...ah...We ah...as a result of...of a...of a ruling of the beauty culture committee and therefore the Department of Registration and Education we're having some difficulty which is requiring increased expenditures to our school districts in regard to transporting students to beauty culture classes in our area career centers. As I indicated we've tried to resolve the question administratively, it appears that the only solution is by passing an Act of this General Assembly basically, the act does this. It allows for any student who has taken beauty culture courses in our area career centers to take the examination if...ah...if they have completed those courses for a beauty culture license...ah...the present problem is that under the



current rules, the Department of Registration and Education fifteen hundred hours of...of ah...schooling are required. Of those fifteen hundred hours a third of them must be taught in blocks of seven hours per day, this works an extreme hardship on our school districts, many of them are transporting students for distances as long as 25 or 30 miles to these area career centers, the administrators of the schools that are teaching beauty culture at the career centers tell us there's no, no reason whatsoever why beauty culture can't be taught in hourly blocks the same as any other course of instruction of technical and vocational education. The result of the ruling has...has ah...in effect placed our school districts in a position of having to transport students...ah... one and two students to...a day from each and every high school, back and forth to their classes and it resulted in an increase cost of transportation to the school district. I would ask for your favorable support of this Legislation."

Matijevich: "The gentleman from Kankakee has moved for the passage of House Bill 3107. Discussion? The Lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis."

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

Matijevich: "He indicates he will, proceed Adeline."

Geo-Karis: "Under this Bill, Mr. Sponsor, are you saying, according to the way this synopsis is, are you saying that a woman or a man who wants to be a beauty culturist has to have a high school education?"

Beaupre: "No we are not."

Geo-Karis: "Well how does that tally with the way it's written in the synopsis?"

Beaupre: "Well, what the...I think what the synopsis is...intends to say, is that if you have matriculated at a...a...a vocational or technical career center...ah...and have duly passed their course as prescribed by the educators at that center, that you may take the examination. Under current law, that is to say, that under the current rule promulgated by the Department of Registration and Education, regardless of whether you passed the course at an area career center...ah...you may not be able to take the current





examination given by the Department of Registration and Education if five hundred of those fifteen hundred dollars that you took was not taught in blocks of 7 hours per day."

Geo-Karis: "Are you talking about a Beauty Culture School now?"

Beaupre: "No, I'm not, we're talking about our high school vocational center."

Geo-Karis: "What I'm trying to say is this. Supposing I have had Beauty Culturists who have never gone to high school but went to Beauty School after Grammar School now. All right, are they in any problem...in any way jeopardized by this Bill?"

Beaupre: "No way."

Geo-Karis: "Okay."

Beaupre: "No way whatsoever, the Bill merely says...it does not exclude those from taking a examination who...ah...conformed to the standards by attending some private school which teaches Beauty Culture... all it says is that if you chose the route of going to a...ah... area career center and you have passed their course you're entitled to take the examination if you'd by the Department of Registration and Education."

Geo-Karis: "In other words you don't have to be a high school graduate."

Beaupre: "That's correct."

Geo-Karis: "Okay, thank you."

Matijeich: "The Gentleman from McHenry Representative...man...Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Will the gentleman yield? I've got the Bill in front of me and you're say...I don't have a staff analysis and you...you may be able to correct me if I'm reading it wrong. It says that right now for persons that take the examination for Beauty Culture...ah... practice of Beauty Culture License, that right now a person has to work 18 months and not less than twenty-six hundred and twenty-five hours as a registered apprentice under a Beauty Culturists registered under the laws and no school...or has graduated from a school of Beauty Culture approved by the Department of Registration and Education. No School of Beauty Culture shall be approved by the Department unless it has a minimum requirement of a course of study consisting of not less than fifteen hundred hours and you add the language 'Any person who has completed a Beauty Culture course, at a



high school or secondary school, including an institution or program conducted in a joint agreement pursuant to section 10-22 of the School Code and such courses acceptable as a credit towards graduation from high school or a secondary school meet the educational requirements to take the examination for a certificate of registration.' Now, my question is, of the fifteen hundred hours that the law requires, not a...not a rule or regulation of the Department but the statute calls it, how much...er...how many hours must be taken in the educational requirement towards that fifteen hundred hours of school...in order to apply right now and to take an examination?"

Beaupre: "Well, you have to take fifteen hundred hours of...ah...of Beauty Culture study."

Hanahan: "That's right. So now what you're doing is...if I follow what you had said earlier and what the Bill calls for, you're saying that a person in Illinois, no longer has to serve an apprenticeship or a person no longer has to take fifteen hundred hours of approved of...education under a Beauty...ah...Culture School that's approved by the Department and that you are now allowing a third requirement for a person to take a...a...ah...examination. Am I correct?"

Beaupre: "No...no I think that's a misunderstanding of...ah...of the Bill...ah...Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Well would you clarify it?"

Beaupre: "Okay, the current law is that there are the two alternatives as you've pointed out, one, the apprenticeship and...ah...second, the situation where you take...you...you enroll in and take a prescribed course in Beauty Culture which totals fifteen hundred hours of instruction. This Bill won't change that requirement in our area vocational and career centers...ah...mandating that students take fifteen hundred hours of Beauty Culture. All it will do is say that of that portion of those fifteen hundred hours which are now required which say...that the requirement being that five hundred of the fifteen hundred hours be taught in seven hour blocks of instruction, that requirement would erode away and would no longer be a part of the law...ah...that, so that, the problem that we're faced with here is that of the fifteen hundred hours in a school which teaches



Beauty Culture, five hundred of it is by...by rule of the Department must be taught in seven hour blocks. Now, if you've got twenty eight or thirty high schools feeding into an area career center..."

Hanahan: "No...no...excuse me sir...you're getting further in the question."

Beaupre: "Well, I'm trying to answer it..."

Hanahan: "Right now the fifteen hundred hours is within nine months, it is...and that's by law, it's not by rule or regulation. The law says that fifteen hundred hours of study of not less than fifteen hundred hours extending over a period of not less than nine months. That's the law, it's not a rule or regulation... so these seven hour blocks are to...in order to accomodate the law. Is that what you're really intending to change by this added language?"

Beaupre: "We're intending to change the law and the rule which will in effect allow persons who have taken fifteen hundred hours of..of study in Beauty Culture...ah...with an area career center and that's the references made into the Bill, to the Section which provides for establishing area career centers for allowing students who have taken the prescribed number of hours, the fifteen hundred hours to take the examination for Beauty Culture whether it was taught within a nine month period or whether it was taught in seven hour blocks or regardless of how it was taught as long as it was indeed taught and that they did receive fifteen hundred hours of instruction."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, I understand what the gentleman is trying to get to and I'd like to speak against the Bill then."

Matijevich: "Representative Hanahan on the Bill."

Hanahan: "It seems to me that if, if somebody were trying to reduce the requirements of how a person becomes a lawyer in this state, there would be a lot of hulabaloo by the lawyers on just how and what and why a change in the standards of high excellence is obtained by statue and by rule and regulation of whoever operates lawyers and the rest of the profession. If we're talking about a horse shoer change in examination there would certainly be a lot of input by both proponents and opponents on this, but for a Bill of 3107, which has hardly been noted by the Beauticians of this state or the Beauty



Culturists organizations of this state, to say that somehow we're going to allow by this Bill another standard and that's how I view it, another standard that is not going to meet the requirements set down by law. The fifteen hundred hours within nine months is set down so that people don't make a career out of going to a beauty school and that Beauty Schools don't rip off students for long term contracts in order to...for them to obtain their Beauty License approval and standard for them to take there...ah...test. I just view this as a...as a third way of people to obtain the right to take the examination and it seems to me instead of upgrading it, it seems to me that this Bill would downgrade the profession of Beauty Culturists in this state because it seems that it would not be conforming to what the law has now called for and that is the, the apprenticeship route or the educational route of fifteen hundred hours in nine months school. In the past many of the older Members remember that the Beauticians organization have come to this Legislature and have asked for an extension from the original eleven hundred hours, I believe Representative Davis is the one that handled the Bill, to upgrade to fifteen hundred hours the amount of hours it took in order to allow..."

Matijeich: "Will the Gentleman bring his remarks to a close?"

Hanahan: "A...a test for Beauty Culturists..I...I...I...unless someone can show me differently, I oppose this Bill."

Matijeich: "The gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Sponsor one or two brief questions..."

Matijeich: "He indicates he'll yield."

Deuster: "One, is this proposal supported by the Illinois Association of Beauticians and Cosmetologists?"

Beaupre: "They didn't oppose it, I didn't ask them to support it, I don't know that it address it....The Bill was introduced because it addresses itself to a problem that our schools are having...ah...in my particular area and a number of areas downstate."

Deuster: "Now, the second question. Has the Department of Registration taken any posture on the Bill?"

Beaupre: "Well the Department of Registration has a Beauty Culture Committee composed of five members, I tried to solve this problem



administratively by asking for a hearing to have them relieve this seven hour requirement over that five hundred hour period...ah... we appeared before their Committee in Chicago in January, I had the Superintendent of the Educational Region from my area there along with five school administrators and the Director of one of the Career Centers in my area, they testified as to the need for this for four months the Department told us that they have lost the transcripts of the testimony and therefore the Beauty Culture Committee couldn't make a decision. They finally got to me April 1st and told me that they didn't know what they were going to do, that they couldn't get a decision out of the Beauty Culture Committee and at that point I went to the Legislative Council, but that request for the drafting for the Bill went in on April 2nd, and as a result of that it wasn't completed."

Matijevich: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Okay, the last question is this. As I understand the Bill and you correct me if I'm wrong, we have not eroded, or you have not in this Legislation, the requirements of that they have fifteen hours of instruction, you are simply saying, please correct me if my understanding is erroneous, we're simply saying that if they go to a High School and take a Beauty Culture course there, they can count that credit toward the fifteen hundred hours, is that correct?"

Beaupre: "Well, they...not exactly."

Deuster: "Not exactly?"

Beaupre: "Well, the...the Beauty Culture courses that are taught in the High Schools of Illinois conform to the requirements for the examination, that is to say a total matriculation of fifteen hundred hours is prescribed for all Beauty Culture courses taught in the Area Career Centers, which are, are...our High Schools method of teaching Beauty Culture. Ah...that requirement under this Bill would still prevail, it would still be the law, the only thing that we're changing by this Bill is the...of the fifteen hundred hours, five hundred of it must be taught in seven hour blocks and you just can't ...can't get students from a high school that's thirty miles away from the Career Center to a Career Center for seven hours to sit in a classroom."



Matijevich: "Representative Deuster, have you concluded?"

Deuster: "The last question is this..."

Matijevich: "You said the last one, was the last one."

Deuster: "Okay, I'm sorry, that last answer led to another question.

Does this lessen the fifteen hundred hour requirements?"

Beaupre: "No."

Matijevich: "The gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen."

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

Matijevich: "The gentleman from DeKalb has moved the previous question.

The question is, shall the main question be put? All in favor say 'aye' opposed 'no'. The main question shall be put. Representative Beaupre to close."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a very simple proposition and the proposition is this, in our downstate Area Career Centers, when a student goes to his classes at eight O'Clock in the morning he boards a bus that gets to the Career Center at nine, classes are taught from nine to eleven, that bus probably transports thirty students from that high school to the Career Center. At eleven O'Clock he takes the bus back to his local high school, the same process is repeated again in the afternoon. The problem is that if you've got thirty students going from a high school and one of them, one out of the three happens to be taking Beauty Culture, you have to send an extra bus to take them to the Career Center early for that one student, transport the other thirty students...ah... at...ah...eight O'Clock, you have to send another bus to pick up the thirty students at eleven and you have to send a second...ah...ah... a fourth bus to pick up that one student that happens to be taking Beauty Culture. This in no way, no way would I point out, deteriorate from the requirement of, for the licensing of Beauty Culture except in that, that...a portion of the study...ah...ah... which now is required in seven hour blocks would no longer be required in seven hour blocks. The students could, could conform to the normal class schedule that all the other students in their high school conform to. It cuts down the necessity for transportation from our high school to the Career Center of extra buses each and every day on a round trip basis. I can't for the life of me..."



Matijevich: "The question is shall House Bill 3107 pass? Those in favor signify by voting 'aye' those opposed by voting 'nay'.

Does Representative Gaines wish to explain his vote...or...no?..."

Have all voted? Have all voted who wish?..."

Gaines: "I think...I think this is a very drastic way to solve one little problem and I think that this matter probably needs more study if there's...if they intend to have a...a comprehensive program, I think they should possibly have a study on this rather ah...ah...have this problem solved piece meal. Because there's several Bills introduced this session pertaining to the general subject of ah...Beauty Culture."

Matijevich: "Representative VanDuyne to explain his vote."

VanDuyne: "Mr...Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I...I really in my heart...I listened very intently to what Representative Hanahan had to say, but coming from the hairdressing business myself I really see nothing wrong with this except...ah...the fact that it gives to the people that are training in...in...ah...piece meal type of procedure. But, still in all it doesn't really detract from the end result of their training. If they do absorb the training whether it's in one or two or three hour sessions and they are able to pass the State Board Exam to...ah...to become a beauty...a Beautician, I really see where there's no prohibition against this in my way of thinking so I, that's why I'm voting 'aye'."

Matijevich: "The gentleman from Stevenson, Representative Brinkmeier to explain his vote."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'd particularly like to address myself to those of my colleagues who come from Northwestern Illinois and very specifically around Sterling. I know this is a very serious problem at the present time. Many of those schools that are trying to transport their youngsters into the Sterling ...ah...Center for this type of training are having serious problems with it, as a matter of fact, this year I don't know whether they're able to do it. As I understand the Bill, it does address itself to this problem and I certainly would urge those of you from that area as well as all of you to vote for this good Bill."



Matijeich: "The gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hudson to explain his vote. It looks better...Have all voted? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this...issue...the 'ayes' are 100 the 'nays' are 17, 9 voting 'present' and this Bill having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Beaupre, you've been asked by quite a few Members if you'd like to be recorded as 'aye' on your own Bill. Leave? And I'm leaving too. Record Choate 'no'."

Bradley: "On the Calendar appears House Bill 3108, Mr. Barnes. Read the Bill."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3108. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "Jane Barnes. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. My Bill provides for state to pay for all cost of public school and non-public school text books. It repeals and amends the section permitting school board levys for such purposes."

Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, after the explanation, I guess I'll just speak to the Bill. First off on the cost which...ah...we are all overly conscious of right now maybe, but none the less it's a substantial cost, it has been amended down to thirty-five million dollars and I think if the budget can absorb that, it can absorb just about anything including our depression. Secondly, I would suggest that the Amendment relates only to one thing and that is text books, but text books only at the request of the students. There's a presumption in there then that text books upon request of a school board imposes a duty upon the state. Now, it has been in most decisions relating to such questions as these that it is not the duty of public schools to aid those which are private. I would suggest that we have some Constitutional frailties beginning with that, I think it's reaffirmed in our Constitution in Article X Section III which indicates also that the state is not responsible and I think the language is very explicit on that. As to the practicality of the matter the section that was added does not





delineate between whether books that are requested...ah...should be granted for free or if they shall be granted in a rent form. Now, there are differences through districts, you would find for example if this became law that books which are rented to students in public schools would not have the same, would have...ah... different applicability to schools which are private, that is they would receive free books and the schools that are public would have to rent those. There's no distinction between that and I believe that's an important consideration if you're looking at some sense of equity in the program that Representative Barnes offered. Ah...fourthly, I would suggest to those of you...ah...who are concerned about state involvement in private schools, as you were in House Bill 389, you should also notice that one of the provisions of the section asks the Superintendents office to establish guidelines and programs as they relate to this section. So, I think the cry in...and the bad feelings that people have...ah...for that kind of restriction is evident in this section as well. So there are numerous reasons why we ought to oppose the Bill, I think basically we have a fiscal concern, we have a question of again, public and private entanglement in education of...of students that have chosen to go to private schools, I think the language is not clear on rental, I think we do not dare to impose a duty to public schools to be concerned for those that are private, I would then solicit a 'no' vote."

Bradley: "The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to speak in support of the Bill. The Constitutional questions on the Bill have always been satisfied by Amendments to the Bill and the provision in the Bill about the text books is fully described and covered and found Constitutional in the latest Supreme Court Case which took place in May, the Supreme Court of the United States and I believe the name of the case...the United States was a sitinger and therefore I respectfully request...the...respectfully your 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Bradley: "The gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Will the Sponsor yield?"



Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Dunn: "Perhaps I mis...What is the...ah...ah...significance or the differences between this Bill and a Bill that passed this House earlier that provided for state grants for text books?"

Barnes: "I didn't hear the last part of your question."

Dunn: "There was a Bill that has passed the House earlier that had money in it for...ah....text books and transportation and some other items and what is the difference between that Bill and this Bill."

Barnes: "That's...that was the Appropriations Bill for this particular Bill."

Dunn: "Oh...Okay, all right."

Bradley: "The gentleman from Stevenson, Mr. Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this issue has been debated and discussed very thoroughly before, and I would move the previous question."

Bradley: "Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is shall the main question be put? All those in favor say 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Lady from Cook, Ms. Barnes, to close."

Barnes: "I would just like to point out to Representative Schneider that there are always two sides to every issue and while he feels it is unconstitutional, I am very optimistic, since May 19, when it was declared constitutional in Pennsylvania and I do not feel that it is for us to decide what is and isn't constitutional. It's up to the Courts and I would recommend an 'aye' vote."

Bradley: "The question is shall House Bill 3108 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider, to explain his vote."

Schneider: "I wish the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker, Members, would have elaborated on the Pennsylvania Decision somewhat, since she's so certain that it is a constitutional proposal, but I just want to indicate that today also is a very sparsley attended day. I would encourage that the lights of the Members who are present only be voted, because I will verify."



Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan, to explain his vote."

Ryan: Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The appropriations for this Bill went out of here with flying green colors, and ah..... I see no reason why this Bill on the Constitutional question has been amended since the Supreme Court made its Decision, and so ah.... it's certainly eradicates any question as far as the Constitutionality of it, and I would certainly encourage everybody to get their green vote going here and see if we can't get this up to 89. The Appropriation Bill is gone and passed, and so there is no reason why this Bill shouldn't pass and I would encourage an 'aye' vote."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, to explain his vote."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of the House, I'm going to change my position for the simple reason we are in financial trouble and this, I understand, is 35 million dollars, and ah.... we need so many million, that though I sympathize with you completely, this is no time to exercise or start a new program that's going to cost so much money. I regret very much doing it."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Peoria Mr. Mudd to explain his vote."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, as alluded to previously, we did pass the appropriation to the House for this particular Bill. I think it would serve this Legislative Body very well to recognize the fact that we do provide free books to a lot of people in public schools, that are on welfare and that. I think that we should at least take this and give the same privilege to those people who are supplying those."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Grieman, to explain his vote. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. I'm sorry, the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson, do you wish to explain your vote, Sir?"

Hudson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have the greatest respect for the Sponsor of this Bill and I hate to rise and speak in opposition to it, but we spent about four and a half hours this afternoon or more maybe



talking about a financial crisis in the State, and indeed we may face one. It would seem to me that if we were all serious that we would vote no on this Bill. The fiscal implications of this measure are truly astronomical. Furthermore, as we begin to infuse State money or taxpayers money into this private sector, I'm going to suggest that we may be doing exactly the opposite of what we think we are doing which is to help the private sector, that is private education, but I'm going to say that private education will not remain private if we begin to witness a massive infusion of public or taxpayer's money into the private sector. As a matter of fact, it's going to ruin, I think, and eventually destroy private education and when we talk about private education, we're talking about all kinds of schools. Not parochial schools, but all kinds of schools. Back in my area, baptist schools and all sorts of private schools. I think that it's a bad course that we're on. My words here are not going to change the vote, but I would ask you as my colleagues to think a bit about what you're doing before you put your stamp of approval on something that actually in a few years can begin to undermine and destroy the very thing private schools that you hope to help and preserve."

Bradley: "Oh, I'm sorry. For what purpose does the gentleman from McLean, Mr. Deavers, arise?"

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker, having seen the lights, would you change me to green, please?"

Bradley: "Please vote the gentleman ..... record him as voting 'aye'. The gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider, what purpose do you rise?"

Schneider: "A verification of the affirmative, Mr. Speaker."

Bradley: "On this question, we have 95 'ayes', 34 'nos'. Mr. Collins 'aye'. Leinenweber 'aye'. 97 'ayes'. The Gentleman requests a verification of the roll. Ms. Barnes."

Barnes: "Can I have a poll of the absentees?"

Bradley: "You certainly can. Please poll the absentees."

Jack O'Brien: "Arnell. E. M. Barnes."

Bradley: "Mr. Barnes wishes to be recorded as present."

Jack O'Brien: "Bluthardt. Brandt. Byers. Caldwell."

Bradley: "Now, he's calling the absentees."



Jack O'Brien: "Craig. Epton. Ewell. Fleck. Frederick. Getty. Griesheimer. Grotberg. Hirschfeld. Gene Hoffman. Emil Jones. Keller, Klosak. LaFleur. Laurino. Madison. Marovitz. McGrew. McMaster. Merlo. Pierce. Polk. Rayson. Rose. Sangmeister. Schisler. Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Stearney. Tipword. Totten. Walsh. Washington. Willer. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Bradley: "Call the affirmative votes."

Jack O'Brien: "Anderson. J. M. Barnes. Beatty. Beaupre. Berman.

Birchler. Boyle. Bradley. Brinkmeier. Brummet. Calvo. Campbell."

Bradley: "Washington wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sangmeister, or from Will, I'm sorry, Sir."

Sangmeister: "Thank you, I don't believe I'm recorded at all. Is that correct, Mr. Clerk. Vote me 'no'."

Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Caldwell, wants to be recorded as 'aye'. Mr. Barnes would like to go from 'present' to 'aye'. Mrs. Willer, for what purpose do you rise?"

Willer: "Ah..... I would like to vote 'no'."

Bradley: "She ..... She is not voting. She wants to be recorded as 'no'. Proceed, Sir."

Jack O'Brien: "Ah.... Campbell. Capparelli. Capuzi. Carroll. Catania.

Chapman. Choate. Collins. Daniels. D'Arco. Darrow. Davis.

Deavers. DiPrima. Duff. Dyer. Farley. Fary. Fennessey. Flinn.

Garmisa. Geo-Karis. Giglio. Giorgi. Hanahan."

Bradley: "Mr. Schoeberlein, for what purpose do you rise, Sir."

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

Bradley: "How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as 'not voting'."

Schoeberlein: "Vote me 'aye', please."

Bradley: "Vote him 'aye'."

Jack O'Brien: "Hart. Hill. Holewinski. Dan Houlihan. Huff. Jacobs.

J. D. Jones. Kelly. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Kucharski. Lauer.

Lechowicz. Leinenweber. Kornowicz. Leon. Leaverenz. Londrigan.

Luft. Madigan. Mahar. Maragos. Matijevich. Mautino. McAuliffe.

McAvoy. McClain. McCourt. McLendon. McPartlin. Meyer. Miller.

Molloy. Mudd. Nardulli. O'Daniel. Patrick. Pouncey. Randolph



Richmond. Rigney. Ryan. Schoeberlein. Schraeder. Sevcik. Shea. Simms. Skinner. C. M. Stiehl. Stubblefield. Taylor. Telcser. Terzich. Tuerk. VanDuyne. VonBoeckman. Wall. Washburn. Washington. White. Williams. Winchester. Younge."

Bradley: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, arise?"

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, please record me as voting 'aye'."

Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. Questions of the affirmative roll call. Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Boyle."

Bradley: "Representative Boyle. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, arise?"

Matijevich: "So that everybody knows, where are we starting off on the 'aye' votes?"

Bradley: "We're at 102 'ayes'. Mr. Boyle on the Floor? How's the gentleman recorded?"

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

Bradley: "Take him off the roll. Leave Mr. Schneider on will you? Schneider."

Jack O'Brien: "Beatty."

Bradley: "Representative Beatty in the Chambers. Representative Beatty. Beatty. There he is coming in the side door."

Schneider. "Representative Campbell."

Bradley: "Representative Campbell's in his seat."

Schneider: "Capparelli."

Bradley: "Representative Capparelli in the Chamber? Representative Capparelli. Take him off the roll. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I can't see the challenger. There's too many informants around him."

Bradley: "Well, he was having difficulty seeing the 'aye' votes, too, so ....."

Schneider: "Capuzi."

Bradley: "Capuzi's here. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Merlo, arise?"



Merlo: "Ah..... Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Bradley: "How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as 'not voting'."

Merlo: "Will you please vote me 'aye'?"

Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'."

Schneider: "Carroll."

Bradley: "Representative Carroll. Is Representative Carroll in the Chambers? Take him off..... How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Bradley: "Take him off the record. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Perry, Mr. Dunn, arise?"

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

Bradley: "How's he recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Dunn: "Change me to 'aye' please."

Bradley: "Record him as 'aye'. Continue. Questions of the affirmative."

Schneider: "DiPrima."

Bradley: "Representative DiPrima. He's in his seat."

Schneider: "Where? Fennessey."

Bradley: "Representative Fennessey on the floor? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Bradley: "Take him off the roll."

Schneider: "Representative Dyer from DuPage, 41st District."

Bradley: "She's in her Chair."

Schneider: "Representative Hart."

Bradley: "Pardon, Sir?"

Schneider: "Hart."

Bradley: "Representative Hart here? How's he recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Bradley: "Take him off the roll."

Schneider: "Jacobs."

Bradley: "Jacobs is in his Chair."

Schneider: "Walter Kozubowski."

Bradley: "Representative Kozubowski. How's the Gentleman recorded?"



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

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Schneider: "Representative ah.... MaAuliffe."

Bradley: "McAuliffe. Representative McAuliffe. Is he in the Chambers?  
How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: Ah..... the Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Schneider: "Representative McPartlin."

Bradley: "Representative McPartlin is right here in front of me."

Schneider: "Sorry. Representative Miller."

Bradley: "Representative who, Sir?"

Schneider: "Tom Miller."

Bradley: "Representative Miller back there? He's in the Chambers? How's  
the Gentleman recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Schneider: "Representative Meyers."

Bradley: "Representative Meyers. He's right here in front of you, Sir."

Schneider: "Representative O'Daniel."

Bradley: "Houlihan?"

Schneider: "O'Daniel."

Bradley: "O'Daniel. Representative O'Daniel back there? He's in the  
Chambers? How's he recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Schneider: "Representative Nardulli."

Bradley: "Nardulli. He's in the back of the Chamber, Sir."

Schneider: "Representative Sevcik."

Bradley: "Representative Sevcik in the Chambers? How's he recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Schneider: "Representative Terzich."

Bradley: "Representative Terzich. How's he recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Schneider: "Representative Skinner."





Bradley: "Skinner. He's in his seat."

Schneider: "Representative VonBoeckman."

Bradley: "Representative VonBoeckman back there in his Chair. How's he recorded?"

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

Bradley: "Take him off the roll. Tom Miller is coming down the center aisle, so we will put him back on."

Schneider: "Who are you putting on."

Bradley: "Miller."

Schneider: "That's all, Mr. Speaker."

Bradley: "Okay."

Schneider: "Representative Stearney, I'm sorry."

Bradley: "Representative who, Sir?"

Schneider: "Representative Stearney."

Bradley: "Representative Stearney. The Gentleman in the Chambers? How's he recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as 'not voting'."

Schneider: "One last one, Representative Calvo."

Bradley: "Representative Calvo. He's in Hanahan's seat."

Schneider: "That's all the questions of the affirmative roll call, Mr. Speaker."

Bradley: "Okay, Mr. Clerk, do you have a count? On this question there are 93 'ayes', 34 'nays', 5 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared..... Mr. Palmer, Mr. Palmer would like to be recorded as voting 'aye'..... is hereby declared pass. House Bill 3109. Read the Bill, Sir. Mr. Luft on 3109."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3109. A Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Tazwell, Mr. Luft."

Luft: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. House Bill 3109 deletes the prohibition against a Board Member....."

Bradley: "Pardon me, Sir..... Could we give the Gentleman some order, please?"



Luft: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3109 deletes the prohibition against any Member on the State Board of Education being gainfully employed in the field of education and it also provides that on January 1, 1976, two Members will be added to that Board and these Members shall be certified public school teachers. That's all.

Yeow, I'm ready."

Bradley: "Ah.... the Gentleman.... The question is, shall House Bill 3109 pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye'. The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "I would like to ask the Sponsor a question, if I may."

Bradley: "You certainly may, Sir."

Borchers: "How many teachers are there on the Board at present? How do the ah....."

Luft: "There are none."

Borchers: "Are there no.... there are no..... 17, there are no teachers on the Board at the present."

Luft: "Ah..... I consider the ah.... law to be extremely discriminatory. It provides that no one, no one gainfully employed in the field of education shall be on the State Board of Education."

Borchers: "I see. All right, thank you."

Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, in answering the question put by the distinguished Gentleman from Macon, I think it should be pointed out that of the present Members of the Board, that at least four of them have previously been public school teachers. In other words, it is not .... it is accurate to say that none of them are presently teachers, but there is certainly adequate input from teachers in that four of the Members of the Board have previously been teachers. It was not with any desire to discriminate against teachers that the last General Assembly put this provision in. The State Board of Education is set up to represent the public. It was felt that the input or the public that in so far as they needed experts, that they should retain those experts who have expertise in Education, and they have done that. I believe that the attempt to have a public school system governed by citizens rather than by people who are experts is a



salutary thing. It was not done hastily. It was done deliberately here in the last session of the General Assembly, because it is a public school system. It is determining policy. Our school boards have always been public boards and not boards dominated by experts. They can retain the experts if they want to. I believe that we deliberately did that. There is plenty of teacher input in the fact that four of the present Members have been Members of the teaching profession in the past, and I would urge that we stick by the decision that was made previously in structuring the Board the way that we did."

Bradley: "Mr. Luft, do you wish to close, Sir?"

Luft: "Yes, Sir. The only thing that I would like to say, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House is here in my hand, I hold a list of 28 regulatory, licensing and policy making agencies in the State of Illinois. Not one prohibits a Member of that profession from being on the Board. I would also like to point out that in the Illinois Association of School Boards who are the big critics of this Bill, in their last publication, they say that the State Board of Education has not found a common ground from which they can launch a collective attack on the goals and the problems of our educational system. They suggest, now remember, they are the critics, they suggest that efforts from local school personnel and people who are gainfully employed in education today, not yesterday, have some input. I would ask for an affirmative roll call from the Members."

Bradley: "The question is, shall House 3109 pass? All in favor, will signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Brinkmeier, to explain his vote."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the previous speaker mentioned that the school board is to represent the public. Well, I submit to you it's more than that. They're suppose to be representing those youngsters that are going to school. And I think that prohibiting these teachers from serving, I'm talking about active teachers, from serving on that Board, we are certainly not doing those youngsters any good. I think also, not too long ago, we voted overwhelmingly in this House to allow 18 year olds to be elected



to serve on school boards. At the same time, when it may be a pending school. I feel if we are going to do this, we certainly should have some teacher with expertise on that School Board and I urge a green light."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Moultrie, Mr. Stone, to explain his vote."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I do not believe that this Bill deserves your a.... yes vote. I think it is a bad Bill and we should defeat it. The State Board of Education was just appointed within the last two years. I think, and under the circumstances, they are doing a very good job, and we should give them another year or two to find out if they are doing an excellent job. Now, it seems to me that the place of the school teacher is.... is in the classroom teaching. They should not be in control of the Boards that, that ah.... run the education system for the State of Illinois."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain, to explain his vote."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House, if you recall when we first constructed the State Board of of Education last year, I had an amendment on the Bill which did basically the same thing Representative Luft is doing now which struck the provision for teachers even to be considered as Members of the Board. We adopted the Amendment. However, the Senate receded from that Amendment and in difference to Representative Chapman, we read the Bill to go out as it is now. I think that what we've done is we've segregated the teachers to be second class citizens. We've also said to the Governor and the Senate, we don't believe you're able to judge ah.... which people are the best of the Members of the State Board of Education. I think this is a fair and most equitable and I'd urge favorable votes on this Bill."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners, to explain his vote. Before you do that, Sir, we have the drivers license up here of Mr. Harold Ray. He was sitting in the Speaker's Gallery. He can pick it up in the Speaker's office. He might want to drive home. Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are votes up there, and I just want to say I don't like part of this Bill, and that is the



mandate that any particular occupation serve on the Board of Education but I do like the second half that eliminates the prohibition. I don't think any particular occupation ought to be prohibited from serving on the School Board. So with those mixed feelings I am going to vote 'yes'."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 109 'ayes' 22 'no's' 4 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. Before proceeding with House Bills on Third Reading...Before proceeding with House Bills on Third Reading, we'll go to agreed Resolutions for House Resolution 393. The Gentleman from Cook, the majority leader, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker would you ask the Clerk to read the Resolution please?"

Bradley: "Will the Clerk read the Resolution?"

Jack O'Brien: "House Resolution 393."

Bradley: "Could we have some order please, this is an important Resolution."

Jack O'Brien: "Whereas Arthur and Sandra met at a political rally as one might expect and soon afterwards on June 22, 1960 they were joined in Holy Wedlock and whereas Arthur with the support of his loving wife, Sandra, has been elected four times to this House of Representatives and is one of the best liked, most highly respected and hardest working Members of this House and whereas, Arthur is Chairman of the House Democratic Conference and the School Problems Commission and Vice-Chairman of the Elementary and Secondary Education Committee and a Member of several other Legislative Committees and Commissions and whereas, Sandra is a Member of the Arch Council and whereas, Arthur and Sandra have enjoyed the privilege of being honored as benabreath and whereas, Arthur and Sandra have born two children, Adam and Marcy, and on June 22, 1975 they will celebrate their fifteenth Wedding Anniversary and whereas Sandra has stood by Arthur through these many campaigns and years that Arthur has devoted to this House, his numerous other Civic Activities and to the People of the State of Illinois, bearing his long absences



and untiring efforts on behalf of others, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives, of the Thirty-ninth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that we extend our sincere congratulations to Representative and Mrs. Arthur L. Berman, on the occasion of their Crystal Wedding Anniversary and be it further resolved that a suitable copy of this preamble and Resolution be presented to Representative and Mrs. Arthur L. Berman as a token of our affection and esteem of this House."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "I move for the adop..."

Bradley: "Mr...I...It was brought to our attention the clap...the response was for Mrs....and not Arthur."

Shea: "For Sandra, we'll get Art later."

Bradley: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I move for the adoption of this Amendment and I believe that all the Members of the House be made co-Sponsors of this Resolution."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of House Resolution 393, all those in favor will say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Resolution is adopted. Back to House Bills, Third Reading. Appears...For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan arise?"

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker for a reluctant announcement."

Bradley: "Proceed with the reluctant announcement."

Houlihan: "II...I've found that those shoes that Adeline mentioned were in her car, are mine. She's indicated that I can not get those shoes back until I make mention of it on the House Floor. So I want to tell you folks that...ah...Adeline was one of the best umpires we've ever played baseball with and that the shoes were there after the baseball game and no other time."

Bradley: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "In that case Mr. Speaker, I think it would be appropriate if Adeline sang both for Representative Berman and his wife and for Jim Houlihan, I love you truly."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills, Third Reading. Does anyone want to... Representative Sangmeister."



Sangmeister: "Mr. Speaker, just arising for a point of inquiry, we're

spending considerable time on House Bills and I presume that when we move them out of here there's going to be some action on them over in the Senate. Has there been any communication, from you as Speaker as to whether these Bills are just going to be passed over there and die, in other words, are we spending our time profitably, that's really my question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I did have communications with the leaderships and they said that it would depend on the content of the Bills.

The important ones would be considered, some that they felt that might stand additional study that they might not...so."

Sangmeister: "Well, then I suggest that we only pass the important ones, all right?"

Speaker Redmond: "That's all we've been doing. 3110."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3110. A Bill for an Act in relation to late payment provisions in the residential leins. Third reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ron Hoffman? Take it out of the Record. Representative Merlo."

Merlo: "Mr. Speaker. I wonder if I could handle this Bill. It was originally my Bill, it was amended at the request of the Illinois Real Estate Board and the Amendment that will change the Bill was introduced of course, represented by Ron Hoffman.. Do I have leave?"

Speaker Redmond: "With leave, Representative Merlo, will handle 3110. Any objections? Hearing none. Proceed."

Merlo: "Ah...Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Under the provision of Executive Committee Bill 3110 any residential lease that provides a payment penalty charge for the late payment of rent, can not charge more than five dollars if the payments were five days late and ten dollars if the payment exceeds ten days and the reason for this of course was, it was brought to may attention that there are some operators of buildings that have charged excessive or else outrageous penalty charges. Some as high as twenty-five dollars for five days late and fifty dollars for ten days late. The Bill was changed at the request of the approval of the Illinois Real Estate Board and it also conforms with the new liberalized lease of the

Chicago Real Estate Board and Landlord's Association for favorable consideration of



Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The question is shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye' opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted...? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 104 'ayes' 7 'nay' the Bill having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed. 3111."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3111. A Bill for an Act to amend the Metro-east exhibition performing Norths authority Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge. Incidentally, she was the catcher in todays game."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Just the part about you being the catcher?"

Younge: "The Bill 3111."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. 3112."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3112. A Bill for an Act to amend the Southwest Regional Port District Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge."

Younge: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is the subsetive part of...ah...House Bill 2800. It was House Bill 2801 and it would give the Southwest Port Authorities the responsibility of building Industrial Parks and to subsidise the interest rates between two and three per cent on revenue bonds and to issue general obligation bonds at a varying rate not to exceed nine and a half per cent and I ask for your favorable consideration of this Bill and move its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any question? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House...I...I don't see where it requires that there be a referendum in connection with the issuance of these bonds, to issue a...to build an Industrial or build Industrial Parks and I wonder Mr. Speaker if Government belongs in the business of financing private industry, because that's what this amounts to. It seems to me that when you do that for one section of the state then what you do is put other sections of the state at a disadvantage. I don't see why we should subsidize





industry in the Southwest Regional Port District area and not subsidize them through the balance of the state. So I would suggest to you that this is not an appropriate Bill, it's not a good Bill and it should be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mara...Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Maragos: "Representative Younger, isn't these bonds eventually paid back to the stockholders and aren't they...ah...for the development of private industry which would bring more revenue and income to that area?"

Younger: "Yes, the...ah...the bond...the revenue bonds would be paid back through the...ah...establishment of industries, industrial firms or factories, it would be paid back through the retirement of the...the bond. To answer the issue in reference to the referendum, certainly it's the bond issue or general obligation bond it would be by public referendum and the subject matter of that bond would be made available to the public so it isn't as the speaker, Mr. Walsh tried to indicate. It would be no disclosure of what the subject matter of the bond..."

Maragos: "Well that...do you anticipate my second question. In other words, these would be revenue bonds and not job obligation bonds."

Younger: "Ah...they will be both. But if they are obl...general obligation bonds they would be by referendum. As you know a revenue bond does not have to carry a referendum."

Maragos: "All right...you have that safeguarded then for general obligation bonds to which Mr. Walsh eluded to. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, may I speak to the point. I would like to support this...ah...this...ah...particular Bill, because, again we've...it's an area where it's needed further development and the port district as we are the biggest indus...exporting state in the nation it would behoove us to support any effort in this commercial enterprise which would bring more money for our state and therefore I ask for your support and for an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing. Representative Ewing...would you turn Representative Ewing's mike on?"



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

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Ewing: "If in...ah...these bonds are default...ah...who stands behind them, Representative?"

Young: "The...ah...Port Districts would stand behind...ah...the...ah... revenue bonds and the general obligation bonds. The full face in credit in the State of Illinois is not involved here. These are not state bonds. These are special district or municipality bonds of the Port District. So...the...so the...ah...full face of credit is not involved here, if that is the intent of your question."

Ewing: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak to this...ah...Bill. I... I would support this measure. I believe that we need to encourage industrial growth in this state and I believe that any person who purchases these bonds would be aware of the support and who would be standing behind them and they would be taking their own chances so I would say that so long as the State of Illinois is not putting full faith and credit behind these bonds that we should support this measure. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is...shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye' opposed vote 'no'. Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, he will."

Leverenz: "The question is does this have anything to do with or add to the total amount of money that would be made available to the Port District with...ah...Bill 1996 in which loans to the amount of one million nine hundred thousand dollars were made?"

Young: "It has something to do with that Bill 1996 from the standpoint that this is the part of the industrial park development that has to do with the triple A and double A industrial firms actually putting the buildings on the...ah...the industrial park sight. You'll remember that the subject matter of 1996 was the improvements and sight improvements and land improvements for the industrial park. Through...through this Bill, Committee Bill 3112, the Southwest Port District would have the mechanism to locate the triple A businesses in the park. So it has to do with that phase of the



industrial park development."

Leverenz: "Well, I wonder exactly then how much we are going to totally allow the Port District to have and to work with and...ah...I think that this is over and beyond what we had in mind...to the Bill."

Young: "...Well it's a very...Appropriation requested here is only authority to build the industrial park and the authority to...to ah...subsidize the funds and change the bond...the interest...the interest rate to not to exceed nine...nine, nine...nine and a half per cent. It's got nothing to do with additional revenue authorization."

Leverenz: "Ah...Mr. Speaker to the Bill I just believe that...ah...we ended up doing it, both with 1996 and with this Committee Bill we'll... I have no idea where the whole thing is going to go and I, my personal opinion is to vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker I would hope that...they would instruct the doorkeeper to only have the authorized personel on the floor. We... we've just received a memorandum dealing with the Bill as far as it will be pending in Committee tomorrow and the man who dropped off this information is not authorized on the floor and he's got a very contrary position. The way he handles himself and the material that he's distributing. Now I think it should be quite clear that if he has authorization that's one thing but if he doesn't he should be removed from the floor. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is shall the main question be put? All in favor vote 'aye', say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it the lady... Representative Young to close."

Young: "I ask for your favorable support in reference to this matter."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 97 'aye', 17 'no'. This Bill having received the Constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lucco, for what purpose do you rise?"



Lucco: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have leave to change my vote on 3108 from 'nay' to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Hearing none, leave is granted. 3113...Representative Lechowicz."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3113. Lechowicz. A Bill for an Act making Appropriations Comptroller to pay for legal services in relation to certain Federal Tax matters. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House I'd like to have 3113 and 3114 heard together as a package."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none, will you read 3114, Mr. Clerk?"

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3114. A Bill for an Act making Appropriation Comptroller in relation to certain Federal Employment Tax assessments. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

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

House Bill 3113 appropriates the fraction of sixteen thousand to the Comptroller to pay for legal services rendered to the state in relation to Federal Unemployment Tax matters. 3114 is an appropriation of one hundred and seventy five thousand to the Comptroller for the payment of the states adjusted assessment for Federal Employment Taxes for the years 1971 and 1972. I'd like to point out the fact that both of these Bills are really in...a tremendous savings to the taxpayers of Illinois because the original assessment to Illinois by the Federal Government was over a million dollars. I strongly recommend an 'aye' vote. Total cost of approximately one hundred and ninety one thousand dollars."

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker I don't have a copy of the Bill, all I'd like to ask is that, does the name the lawyers that are paid in this Bill, Ted? And how much is the highest amount to the lawyer named?"

Lechowicz: "Ah...Zeke.."

Giorgi: "I...don't....I really...really don't have a copy of the Bill. I'm curious.....Members....rewarding."



Lechowicz: "The Bills were distributed some three days ago. It doesn't mention the name of the law firm but I do have it here. And may I point out that the original assessment by the Federal Government was over a million dollars and I pro...and this is the first time that I've seen a settlement of this nature for this dollar amount."

Giorgi: "Is this the one the Attorney General refused to...ah...to work for the State of Illinois on, or is this the..."

Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, I don't know."

Giorgi: "And you don't know the name of the law firm..."

Lechowicz: "But, I'll tell you this, this is for the purpose of the Members of the General Assembly who paid employees out of their ten thousand dollar allotment and in turn the Federal Government assessed the state, back taxes of over a million dollars and the settlement is for one hundred and seventy five thousand. So Zeke if you want to vote 'no' go right ahead."

Giorgi: "Well, don't threaten me, I'll vote any way I like you know. I'm not...your invitation."

Lechowicz: "Well, I'm not threatening you, I'm just telling you the true facts."

Giorgi: "In fact I'll vote 'no' before you even call a Roll Call."

Lechowicz: "Fine. I hope it doesn't pass."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi, Representative Giorgi, I was advised that your son-in-law is one of the lawyers. The question is shall these Bills pass."

Giorgi: "You explained it better."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sangmeister."

Sangmeister: "Representative Lechowicz. I don't quite understand why we should be done by the Federal Government if...you know...if our employees which we paid out of that ten thousand dollars had withholding...ah...and paid the with...This is for employees that did not pay anything to the Federal Government?"

Lechowicz: "We didn't have withholding at the time of the problem."

Sangmeister: "Yea, I know we didn't have it but many of the employees, I'm sure paid their own...withheld their own taxes. Now these are these for the employees who did not?"



Lechowicz: "No sir."

Sangmeister: "Well then what is...I don't understand then why the indebtedness."

Lechowicz: "Let me...ah...see if I can find a copy of the letter from the law firm."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The question that arose here was that in certain contractual obligations where the state paid contractors. It was the feeling of the Department of Revenue that they were not contractual employees but in effect they were employees of the state and the state should have been withholding income tax like they do for normal employees. In lieu...light of what the Internal Revenue Service has discussed with the Comptroller, the Comptroller is starting with the next fiscal year to withhold the equivalent of income tax payments from certain contractual employees and paying them to the Federal Government. This settlement in effect says that in many instances before it was the determination of the Department of Revenue or the Internal Revenue Service that the state should have been withholding. They treat the state like any other employer and you know yourself that when an employer neglects or fails to withhold tax from an employee their liable for the tax plus penalties that are astronomical. The Comptroller was able to settle this case at this dollar amount and instead of a potential liability of many hundreds of million dollars."

Sangmeister: "Okay. Well then it's got to largely be for penalties because I presume most of our employees paid to the Federal Government their share so largely this is..."

Shea: "Well these were not employees. They were contractual employees..."

Sangmeister: "No penalties."

Shea: "This was a settlement where...ah...it was their deter...I don't know if you want to call it penalties or whatever else you can but I think we're getting a dickens of a good deal and I commend the Comptroller."

Sangmeister: "The Comptroller says we ought to pay this, is that right? It's his Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Will the gentleman yield for one question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Tipsword: "Ted the on...the thing that really interests me about...especially House Bill 31113 is did the Comptroller employ some attorney other than the Attorney General, after what we had a year ago now?"

Lechowicz: "Yes sir, he did. And for the work that they did...I...I commend them. They have a break down as far as the total dollar amount, the hours that they spent on it, complete justification for the sixteen thousand....."

Tipsword: "....me Ted, but I..."

Lechowicz: "I got it in a letter and I got it from the Comptroller because I asked him for the breakdown. I'm sorry I don't have it on my desk here, but if you want to take it out of the record for five minutes, I'll go to my office and get it."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall this Bill...these Bills pass? Those in favor vote 'aye' opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On these questins 108 'ayes' 3 'no' and the Bills having received the Costitutional are hereby declared passed. 3115."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3115. A Bill for an Act in relation to residential mortgages and the foreclosure of such mortgages. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leon."

Leon: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. May I have House Bill 3116 considered with this, as they are a package."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Leave is granted."

Leon: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill... Oh. I'm sorry."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3116. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to judgements. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leon. Representative Leon."

Leon: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. These two Bills are Bills that I worked out...ah...with the consumers and the Banks and Savings and Loan group. They provide for a bearance on late payments of mortgage charges, the second Bill relates to



accelerating the exemption period on abandoned buildings to thirty days. I believe they are good Bills and I'd appreciate support of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "I really wanted to rise to a point of order. I know our synopsis doesn't go this far and I wonder if I could inquire from the Chair whether we're going to have a synopsis for this...ah... last week so that we might know what Committee votes were and have some kind of a description of the Bill in front of us. I...perhaps you'd know what the...the printing plans are. Will we have...ah... another synopsis? Or a digest or something?"

Speaker Redmond: "The digest will be here tomorrow at noon they say."

Deuster: "Thank you Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question please?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Maragos: "Representative Leon. Could you please inform me what the definition of an abandoned building is so that pretty David Dempsey can lock in?"

Leon: "Yes. An abandoned building is one in which the mortgagee has ascertained has been abandoned by the occupant after making an inspection according to the Bill and making an intensive investigation as to whether the whereabouts of the person who was formerly in occupancy has gone to and when being unable to find him they will then be permitted to go to court and ask for an accelerated period to thirty days in which redemption can be made on a building that has been abandoned."

Maragos: "My question is, is it after the thirty days of the return date or is it thirty days after the return day they still have to make a search. In other words they may have to give them...try to find them and then they..the party may be in default. Does he have the initial thirty days for an affidavit of non residence or...what?"

Leon: "It's after the decree. They get the decree and then they go into court with an affidavit stating that the building is abandoned and the whereabouts of the occupant or the mortgagee can not be found."

Maragos: "Thank you."





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

Frederich: "Will the Sponsor yield a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes."

Frederich: "What is the provision with regard to the forbearance on payments?"

Leon: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear you Dwight."

Frederich: "What is the provision on the first Bill with regard to delinquency?"

Leon: "Ah...the Bill provides that when a mortgager becomes delinquent, he misses a payment. The mortgagee will send him a notice advising him of that fact. He then has an option of curing that deficiency after consulting with the bank in one of three ways. The first ninety days he can miss three months payments before any legal action will be taken against him. Prior to that time he can go into the bank and he can exercise one of three options. The first option is to pay the late payment or the delinquent payment...ah...with the proper interest. The second is to amortize it over the life of the mortgage by increasing the monthly payments and the last one is where he can add nine months, I mean, I'm sorry, three months at the end of the mortgage. The first provision is self explanatory, the second provision he may exercise once in eighteen months and the last provision he can exercise only once each five years. Not more than that."

Frederich: "Ah...you're...I think I understood that. You say he can do it once every eighteen months?"

Leon: "On the amortization on the monthly installments. Once... not more than once in eighteen months."

Frederich: "Well, in other words every...he can be three payments... every eighteen months?"

Leon: "No, it could be...it could be that way but it would usually work out to about two years."

Frederich: "Every three years he can miss three payments?"

Leon: "No. He has to make all his payments. But he could be late, he could be late. Not more than once each eighteen months."

Frederich: "But if he's late ninety days he puts it back on amortizing again."



JUN 22 1975

170.

Leon: "Ah...he can...I don't think the Bill provides he can amortize it again. I'd have to read that section Dwight. Ah...the savings and loan league thought that was a reasonable length of time and a reasonable...ah..."

Frederich: "Well, I say it's reasonable if he does it once, if he does it once every eighteen months it's not reasonable."

Leon: "I agree."

Frederich: "What's the provision for notice?"

Leon: "Sir?"

Frederich: "What is the provision for notice?"

Leon: "Ah...at the end of..."

Frederich: "No. I mean what method of notice does a person have to be given."

Leon: "At the...when he is delinquent the bank will send him a notice."

Frederich: "Just First Class Mail?"

Leon: "Yea. And then he..they send a self mailer card and they suggest in that card he can exercise one of these three options or suggest that he come into the office to discuss it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Ah...ah...Thank you Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The previous question. The question is shall the main question be put?"

All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

Representative Leon to close."

Leon: "I...I believe the Bills were explained very well on Second Reading with the Amendments that were offered and I would appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall these Bills pass? Those in favor vote 'aye' opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "I would like to have had asked a question of the Sponsor and if he'd explain to me the...What happened if the case HUD? Ah...The ownership reverts back to HUD and it's a government. What has that got to do with it?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan, 'aye'. The Clerk will take the record and on this question there's 104 'aye', 14 'nays'



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Representative Peters 'no', Borchers 'aye', Duff 'aye'. The Bills having received the Constitutional majority are hereby declared passed. 1...3117."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3117."

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

Representative Richmond?"

Richmond: "I just wanted to be added to the 'aye' Roll Call, if possible please."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the gentleman as 'aye' on 3115 and 3116."

Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker...ah...this is a Committee and Revenue Bill and I would like Mr. Skinner who...ah...whose Bill this replaces earlier speak on it. But I think there's an understanding that this may be moved back to Second for a special consideration I believe. Will you...Mr. Skinner please."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker...ah...I would be happy to...what I intend to do is bring it back to Second Reading or at least ask permission to but the Sponsor of the Amendment is not here at this time so I guess we ought to pull it out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record. House Bills...I made a mistake a little bit earlier when I announced we'd be in at...there's no...I find that last Wednesday or Thursday we adopted a Joint to be in...have a Joint Session at 11 O'Clock tomorrow with the Senate so we'll have to be in at 10:30. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "You...You said that awfully quietly, could you repeat it again?"

Speaker Redmond: "I say. Last Wednesday or Thursday, both the House and the Senate adopted a Joint Resolution for a com....a Joint Session between the House and the Senate for 11 O'Clock Monday."

Skinner: "What was the number of that Resolution?"

Speaker Redmond: "Ah...I don't....Representative Matijevec."

Matijevec: "Mr. Speaker I think that..."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker...I was asking a question."

Matijevec: "I think that was for the purpose the astronaut Sernan was going to give some of the moon rocks to the Governor. The Governors



going to accept...or take off six per cent of it I guess, and return it back to him."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, I have a little concern about Representative Skinner not moving this Bill forward..ah...or backward as it might be, to Second Reading, because the Sponsor of the Amendment is not on the floor and I can appreciate his attempt to...ah..to...ah... be concerned about that and to accomodate the Sponsor. The problem is that this is the measure which has been dealt with by the Revenue Committee and...ah...the Court Committee prior to that for two and a half years...ah...this is Sunday, if it doesn't go back to Second Reading today, according to my calculations, there's no chance of it getting out of the House until at least Tuesday, which doesn't give the Senate much of a chance to...to...ah...to take action on it. It's a very important measure, it may be the kind of measure that we ought to consider a special order of business on and ...ah...I wonder if we might just temporarily take that out of the record and decide what course of action we're going to take and see if we can't move it tonight"

Speaker Redmond: "It's out of the record. House Bills Second Reading appears House Bill 802. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I'm still searching for the number of that Resolution we passed..."

Speaker Redmond: "So are we and we'll tell you, but it's been adopted, I can tell you that."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 802. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Capitol Development Board for permanent improvement for various state agencies. Second reading of the Bill...It's been read a Second time previously."

Speaker Redmond: "...Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I believe we are on the Amendment to it and could the Clerk tell us what Amendments have been adopted?"

Jack O'Brien: "1, 2 and 3 were adopted, #4...was adopted, we're now on #5."

Leverenz: "Amendment...yes, Amendment #5 that's where I was asked to hold this Bill up until we found out exactly what we were going to do with it."



Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #5. Younge. Amends House Bill 802 on page 9, by inserting between line 13 and 14 the following. Section 9.1. So forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Yes. I...We'll ask if the...ah...Sponsor of the Amendment is going to take the Amendment out or table the Amendment as we discussed last week."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge, are you the Sponsor?"

Younge: "Yes. I...I wish to table..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi, will you sit down."

Younge: "Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Amendment #5 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #6. J. Houlihan. Amends House Bill 802 as amended on page 3 in Section 4 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative J. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I might ask the Clerk, I believe there's an Amendment, Amendment #9 which is...ah...filed which is in you..."

Jack O'Brien: "Your next Amendment is 10."

Houlihan: "Correction. Amendment #10. It's similar to correct some technical errors in Amendment #6. I'd like to move at this point to table Amendment #6."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections to tabling Amendment #6? Hearing none, Amendment #6 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #7. Londrigan. Amends House Bill 802 on page 3, line 15 by deleting and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker, I ask to table this Amendment #7, savor Amendment #9."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Tabling Amendment #7? Amendment #7 is tabled. Are there any further Amendment?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #8. Londrigan. Amends House Bill 802 as amended on page 3 in Section 4 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Londrigan."

Londrigan: "My copy here show 9, is 8 the correct number on it?"



Jack O'Brien: "You have 9 also. Amendment 8 to Section 4 on the line beginning six million five hundred thousand deleting such figures inserting in lieu thereof, seventy nine million and on page 4 by deleting line..."

Londrigan: "Table #8."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman asks leave to table Amendment #8. Any objection? Hearing none Amendment #8 is tabled."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #9. Londrigan. Amends House Bill 802 as amended in Section 4 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In this Amendment we're speaking to increase the appropriation to seventy five million dollars for the construction of state office buildings here in the capitol city. We have a like Bill up for Chicago later. In the capitol city of Springfield we spend over four million dollars a month on rental alone. The longer we delay it will be another half million dollars in added construction costs each month. Also, because of the numerous buildings the administration costs is very high in loss of being able to have all of the facility under one roof. We have for many, many years been planning, planning, and now the capitol development board wants to start digging now. They want to finally build these buildings now. This money is the money for the first building, which you have read about also to start the plans for the second building and for the additional parking space needed in the vicinity. This meets with all of the support from the city, both on the state and city level. Even those who are renting the buildings here in Springfield realize that we need this increased state office building and we ask your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The gentleman...Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House...ah... This would increase the Spre...Springfield office complex to seventy five...seventy five million dollars. This would be seventy one million dollars for the completion of phase one and approximately four million dollars to begin phase two. In the Bill we have two million five hundred dollars, five hundred thousand recommended for



the Springfield project by the Appropriations Committee, which received the project through 1976. The remainder would be in the Fiscal 77 Appropriation and beyond the expenditures at the present time. Let me also point out that phase two can not be justified at this time because in light of the expected move by the military and naval, leaving three floors of the Armory vacant plus the new computer facility freeing space in the state office building where finance is presently located, phase two requires re-evaluation at a later time, period and if you want to approve the Governors accelerated building program then vote 'aye' on this Amendment. All I'm stating that is seventy five million dollars and I recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #9 to House Bill 802. All those in favor vote 'aye' opposed vote 'no' Have all voted who wish? Representative Jones."

Jones: "I think we ought to consider what this vote means, because the plan for the construction of a million square feet of office space that has been proven by the studies and the needs as it's been mentioned the state is paying almost five million dollars a year in rent, in seventy one locations around the city and this is to consolidate the government...or the government activities in a central location and the proposed first building is on the south side of the present state office building and the plans are underway for this construction and that it...is an investment on behalf of the state to provide its own office space as has been decided....many years in talking about it planning and studying and now here is a chance for action and the funding needs to be provided and I think it is to the advantage of the state of Illinois to provide these facilities and for the benefit of the state government. I urge your consideration for an 'aye' vote on this proposal."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Londrigan."

Londrigan: "I weigh my closing on the last article but I wish to point out that this accelerated bond program that you're talking about is the same as when you built your home when you're first married. You go out and it's a good investment for you to build your own home and to mortgage it. The same way with these state buildings,



we're spending over four million dollars a year in rental, you can see that this is a good investment for us. Not only will we have this savings when we are the land owner but when we have these buildings and offices all over the city of Springfield, in as many as five different locations to a Department, you can see the cost saving it's going to be to build under one roof. Now this is the time for us to build. The Governor's constantly change, one after another and the bonds program and the buildings program are delayed, we haven't built a...really a new big building since Straton was the Governor, in three terms. Now we have an administration that is ready to go and is eager to go and I would ask your support in getting this building finally off the ground."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Frederich."

Frederich: "Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that's quite accurate. In 1953 the state office building was built to consolidate all the state offices so we wouldn't have to be paying rent. Since then they've built on the the Centennial Building, they've built the Attorney Generals Building, they've built the Secretary of States Building, they've built the Highway Department Building and now we're going to build a building to consolidate all things to pay rent. If this doesn't prove anything else, it proves how state government is growing by leaps and bounds and if you build this building it won't be five years until you're building a building so we won't be paying rent. Maybe this is time to stop it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative J. Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you Mr Speaker, to explain my vote, I'd just like to point out that...ah...if I'm expected to be a party to tightening the belt with the state funds, I certainly don't want to go home and face my constituents and have to tell them that when we're trying to cut two hundred million dollars out of the state budget, I've been a party to appropriate seventy five million for a new office building that will be populated by new state employees and I just...ah...can't face my folks back home with a green light on this one. So I urge red lights all the way around."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.





This...this...this is absolutely unnecessary and...and not needed. and to spend this kind of money to....to go ahead and build another state office building is ridiculous. We're...we're now in a financial crisis and...ah...there's no need for this Bill...for this Amendment to go on this Bill at all and I would...I would encourage a 'no' vote here."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker. Is it too late to ask a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "No."

Mann: "I'm a little confused here...my...my leaders...ah...seem to be slightly split here. I...I...ah...does this money come out of...ah... out of the current...ah...budget?"

Londrigan: "Program."

Mann: "This comes out of a bond program. What would the service cost for this be? Anyone enlighten me with regard to the service cost? I feel like an echo. Not of choice...yes..."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 61 'aye' ...Representative Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Take the record."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's..."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker...I'll ask for, now for a verification of the Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there's 61 'aye' and 65 'no'. The gentleman has requested a verification of the affirmative Roll Call. Mr. Clerk, will you verify the affirmative Roll Call? Representative Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Poll the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "Poll the absentees first."

Jack O'Brien: "Arnell, E. M. Barnes, Brandt, Byers, Calvo, Capparelli, Collins, Craig, Dyer, Epton, Ewell, Fennessey, Giglio, Greisheimer, Grotberg, Hirschfeld, Gene Hoffman, Dan Houlihan, Jaffe, Keller, Klosak, Kosinski, LaFleur, Lauer, Laurino, Madison, Marovitz, McAuliffe, McAvoy, McGrew, Miller, Nardulli, Pierce, Polk, Rayson, Reed, Rose, Schlickman, Stearney, Telcser, Terzich, Tuerk, Wall."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan. Vote D. L. Houlihan 'aye'."



Representative Giglio, 'aye'. Representative Giorgi, 'aye'.

What's the score now, Mr. Clerk? Representative Deavers?

How does he desire to vote? Record the gentleman as 'aye'. Representative Mahar. How is he recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "He desires to change it to 'aye'. Proceed with the verification of the affirmative Roll Call. What's the score now, Mr. Clerk? 67 'aye' 64 'nay' and the motion carries. The Amendments adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #10. J. Houlihan. Amends House Bill 802 as amended in section 4 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a similar Amendment and...in that it provides for the funds for construction of a, and purchase of land, planning and relocation of related costs for...ah...acquisition of a state office building in Chicago. Presently the state is leasing office space in the Loop area alone in...Loop area and Cook County included at a cost of more than seven million dollars per year...and...a great deal of that is in the loop itself, there is one, one million one hundred and sixty seven thousand square feet of land leased in the loop. This space accounts for 5.3 million of the states seven million per year burden on the general revenue and the purpose of the new state office building in the loop, will be to...ah...create 1.2 million to 1.6 million square feet an area, four to five times larger than the present owned facility which is in my mind, I think many of the people in the Chicago area, is totally outdated. I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duff."

Duff: "Well Mr. Speaker. This is a good example of the confusion that this session is going through. You know the Governor came in and told us just a few weeks ago...ah...that...ah...he had been wrong in March and that we were in a Fiscal crisis...and...ah...in the Loop right now if you really want that state office building, I think there's at least two that are totally vacant and bankrupt he could probably buy cheap. The simple fact of the matter is...we need a new..a new



JUN 22 1975

179.

state of Illinois building in the Loop, probably, someday, just like I probably need a new car, but I can't afford it, so I'm not going to buy it this year and the state of Illinois can't afford a new state office building in the Loop this year. That's a seventy five million dollar project we're talking about. I really can't understand how the Governor of Illinois can ask us for a joint session, come in here and tell us we're broke and then for one of his principal Representatives in the General Assembly to stand up and say we want to spend some money, it's ludicrous, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think we ought to defeat this Amendment and tell the Governor we agree with his, his new illumination."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative D. L. Houlihan."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Houlihan: "Jim, could you tell us where the new state office building is going to be constructed in the city of Chicago?"

Houlihan: "Representative Houlihan as I understand it, there are four or five locations which have been recommended to the Capitol Development Board and I believe that they're all pending...ah... based upon what the planning design and the funds available would be and I think...and the CDB has not made an ultimate determination and part of it rests with what funds will be made available."

Houlihan: "Who selected the sights which are under consideration?"

Houlihan: "The sights were presented to the CDB on...ah...I think open bid, they advertised and asked for recommendations...ah... of sights...ah...for the new loop complex and I believe that there were...ah...was maybe a commission which recommended those sights to the Capitol Development Board."

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

Houlihan: "Ah...Mr...Mr. Chairman...er...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is not a seventy three million dollar bond issue for construction as Representative Duff had indicated... but...ah...rather a twenty one million. I might point out to him that...ah...it is the estimation of the Capitol Development Board that this would actually in the long run, save the state funds



we are currently renting a great deal of space in the Chicago Loop area and this cost would be...ah...is..is..is great to the state and if the state would save money in constructing a Loop central office location and would be able to pay for the bonds out of the savings of this...ah...this move and I would urge an 'aye' vote on...thes Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 10 to House Bill 802. Those in favor. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question? Could you tell me where this office building is suppose to be located in Chicago?"

Houlihan: "Representative Lechowicz, Representative Houlihan has just asked me that question."

Lechowicz: "Yea...But I didn't get the answer."

Houlihan: "I indicated to him that it was my opinion that there were about four or five sights which were now being recommended to the Capitol Development Board and that a final determination had not been made on those sights."

Lechowicz: "Where are the four or five sights and what's the approximate cost of these sights? Do you have any idea?"

Houlihan: "The approximate cost, I think, of all the sights within the twenty one million dollar appropriation. The sights, as I recall, the...I don't have the listing here but one was in the south Loop, one was in the north Loop, one was, I think...ah...on eht west and then I think one was...ah...southwest."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Jim would you be so kind and give me a listing of the sights and who the owners of the property are and the approximate dollar amount?"

Houlihan: "I would certainly be happy to provide you with that list and that information."

Greiman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Madigan: "Representative Houlihan...ah...would the...ah...CDB consider a sight on the east end of the Loop?"



Houlihan: "Ah...Mike...ah..only if there was an airport in the lake where it could be located."

Madigan: "Inbetween the airport and the shore?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman.:

Greiman: "Ah...Will the Sponsor yield for a...ah...question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes."

Greiman: "Representative Houlihan. What's the...ah...per square foot cost that we're now paying in the...ah...in the Loop area?"

Houlihan: "I...I know from certain agencies that I've reviewed in the Appropriations Committee that the...the cost varies according to what buildings there are..."

Greiman: "What would be the average? Do you have any concept on an average?"

Houlihan: "Well I have...ah...I don't have it broken down in that fashion Representative Greiman, I have what is leased in the Cook County area which would be more than in the Loop. There is eight hundred and sixty eight thousand square feet leased in the Loop area alone, I don't know what the per foot average is..."

Greiman: "Well, then we have no ide...we have no per square foot... ah...concept?"

Houlihan: "No...That is available in general services."

Greiman: "What would the...what would be the...the per square foot rental...or not rental...cost to the state after, if we were owners rather than tenants? In other words, what would be the savings? What would be the estimated projected per square foot cost?"

Houlihan: "Representative Greiman, I have here the analysis of the break point cost between the construction of the new facility and the leased facility."

Greiman: "Is that based on an annual situation of cost?"

Houlihan: "That's right, and...ah..."

Greiman: "It's the maintenance and the amortization of that and all the expenses that we might have as an owner, which we may or may not have now as the tenants?"

Houlihan: "That's correct and ...ah...if I could read you a summary in area one, which is the Loop area it was found that the break point would be arrived at the following of the twenty sixth year,



from this point on it has been assumed that only the normal remodeling and...would be assoc...associated with the owned space whereas the leased space would continue at its normal rate. From the twenty sixth year through the thirty seventh year in an owned space it is found that the cost involves around...involves amounts to around four million five hundred and five thous...thousand, seven hundred and fifteen dollars or an average of three hundred and seventy five thousand four hundred and seventy six dollars per year for the twelve years beyond amourization. Whereas in the leased facility for area on, it would total eleven million dollars forty six thousand eight hundred and one for the twelve year period.."

Greiman: "Well, I...you know, I have only so much I can take in at one moment. As I understand that analysis which you just told me, the first six years it will cost us more in...in actual dollars that we have to spend, the first six years, then there's a break even point for the sixth year to the twenty fifth year or the twentieth year and then ther's a decreasing...ah...declining cost. Is that? So there is...in the first six years it would cost more to be an owner than to be a renter, is that what I understand you to say?"

Houlihan: "I believe that's correct, of course we're not talking about general revenue funds, we're talking about bonded funds."

Greiman: "Well, but, you know, that comes from someplace, I suppose. Ah...and it does, nobody's going to leave it to the state in...in their will so it's raised from the people. Okay, thank you."

Houlihan: "Well, it's raised...it's raised over a period of time, Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "I understand, so it's to be paid out somehow by the people."

Houlihan: "But it's not paid out over a six year period, that's what I'm saying."

Greiman: "No, I'm just saying the first six years there is an increase in the...in the actual out of pocket...ah...for the taxpayers, that's all I..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Leverenz: "Can you help me understand the rational behind the...ah...ah.."



Amendments? In Amendment #1 we took out the Appropriation and left 2.5 and 4., four million rather for...ah...the planning and design cost in this, now we're putting the whole thing back in there or twenty one million of it. Once they take it out and now they put it back in, what's..."

Houlihan: "That's right Ted, the feeling was...ah...by the members of the Capitol Development Board that the total figure ought to be in there so that they could procede with the planning, the land acquisition and the relocation cost so that they would be involved with the total project at one point and that those funds were necessary to proceed with the project."

Leverenz: "On the Amendment, I understand the cost to do that was in there in the first place, I don't know the rational for the cost here. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Cook yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He says he will."

Taylor: "Representative Jimmy Houlihan, do you think that these forms could possibly be used for the Governors Action Office?"

Houlihan: "No Representative Taylor, there was...ah...originally a proposal to have regional offices out in the neighborhood which could fund community services and programs in the state making the state services closer to the neighborhoods, but because of the financial situation, those plans were dropped and we're proceeding only with the downtown offices and this would only be for office space of ...ah...what is currently being used and so the answer to your question is no."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Peters: "Ah...Excuse me. Representative Houlihan, are, the Amendment calls for an appropriation of twenty one million dollars are there estimates as to what the...ah...final total cost of this proposed state building might be? A hundred and sixteen million did someone say?"

Houlihan: "I don't believe that's accurate, I think somebody's offering



some intuitive advice."

Peters: "Do you have any idea at all, Representative Houlihan?"

Houlihan: I'm not sure Representative Peters, I'm..it's, it's in the ballpark of ninety six million dollars on total completion, I believe."

Peters: "Nine...ninety six million dollars? The Amendment does appropriate twenty one million for the planning, plan specifications and land acquisition...ah...relocation and related costs, can I assume by that, if someone came up with a figure of twenty one million dollars, that some initial study had been made as to where in fact this building, if ever erected, would be located?"

Houlihan: "That's correct Representative Peters. As I have mentioned to Representative Houlihan there are, I think now, some four or five sights locations pending and all of them fall within the appropriated funds so the board would be able to determine from among those four or five that have been recommended."

Peters: "Yea. One of the things, Representative Houlihan that does perturb me a bit about this is that we did have a Bill in which would have expended the power of the state to grant leases for ten years and if that in fact had passed, I think it's over in the Senate now, with a compromise at for, but we don't know what they're going to do with it in the Senate. In fact we'd end up having that building and we'd have an awful lot of leases that we'd have to end up re-negotiating or getting out of, if this building again was ever constructed."

Houlihan: "Well, Representative Peters, I'm sure that...ah..if that Legislation passes and this Legislation passes that the general service department would coordinate both the leases and the construction schedule with the Capitol Development Board so that they could phase in the Department that was moving into the new office building."

Peters: "If I may just speak to the Amendment Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Peters: "I...I take it that there is a sigh of some relief in ans...in reply to the question of asking where the building in fact might be elect...erected. You did indicate that it would not be on the east end of the Loop on which end of course is located our city hall





and court building and I'm sure those people are not ready to give that up, yet of at any rate...ah...I would think though, Representative Houlihan that at this time agreeing with the comments made by, I believe Representative Greiman, that at some point this money is going to have to be returned or paid out of general revenue by the state and I am not sure whether the appropriation of this money at this time, in view of the problem that we have, is proper and I think this is something everyone has to make their own decision about but...ah... and I'm not suggesting to anyone to vote one way or another but I for one am going to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Catania: "Representative Houlihan, as the Sponsor of this Amendment you will be, I'm sure in a very influential position if this Amendment is adopted and I would like to ask if you would be willing to strongly suggest to the Capitol Development Board that they locate this building or buildings at the intersection of 39th and Cottage Grove Avenue. If this Amendment is adopted, since with maximum development of our Mass Transit Systey, that's only ten minutes from downtown and we have lots of vacant space there and there's a high rise development with twenty story buildings right across the street, so it could even be a high rise building."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn."

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

Catania: "...Mr. Speaker, I was awaiting a response to my question."

Speaker Redmond: "I didn't think that really was a question."

Catania: "Well it really is, because we really are needing development at that intersection. Mr. Speaker."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is shall the main question be put? All those in favor say 'aye' opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Houlihan, close a second time."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I would close merely by asking for a favorable vote on Amendment #10."



Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #10 to House Bill 802. All in favor vote 'aye' opposed vote 'no'. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is and let's not kid ourselves a part of the Governors accelerated bond program, we're getting it in bits and pieces and I'm convinced that the reason we're getting it in bits and pieces is that the Mayor of Chicago would rather negotiate on that basis then take the whole thing. There's no excuse for doing this at this time and everybody here knows it. Twenty one million dollars in additional bond authorization for the purpose of acquiring land for a new Loop office building is inexcusable and at this time when the state is looking for revenue, trying to figure out ways to save money and getting into something like this. When you vote for this, you are pushing your button for a tax increase and you know it. Now to the question of why the...the state renting facilities in the Loop, I suggest to you that maybe if this recession continues there's will be a lot more to choose from in the Loop. One thing we don't need is additional office space in the Loop. There is plenty of it available now and what you're doing in building a building like this is you're taking business property off the tax rolls and I would suggest maybe to some of those people that are so vitally interested in the future that what they're voting for is a tax exempt...real estate tax exempt project where they will be replacing property that's on the tax rolls. So I would urge that you vote 'no' on this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff."

Huff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and in explaining my vote, I just want to say that never has so much been asked for by those who are...are so unwilling to say so little about why they need it. In answer to...ah...in buttressing what Mr...Representative Walsh said, I don't understand why the state needs twenty million dollar bond...bonding power to create a state building when I don't know if everyone's aware of this general services in...ah...last September, signed a lease at 910 South Michigan to expend fifty million dollars to house...two...ah...state agencies in the south end



the Loop. I'm wondering if this might be the sight that they might plan to acquire with the additional twenty one million."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of this House. We've heard earlier as I mentioned before about four and a half hours this afternoon talking about how we could save money at the rate of maybe six per cent reduction here in Illinois. Then, after we got through doing that we put the stamp of approval on thirty five million dollars for...ah... books to private education, seventy five million dollars for a state office building here in Springfield, twenty one million dollars now being proposed for a Loop office building up in the Loop, the City of Chicago which totals a hundred and thirty one million dollar in my book. I'm going to suggest that if we keep on saving money at this rate, we're going to be broke before we might have a chance to find out whether we're broke or not. Certainly we're going to be broke, perhaps before we get out of this present session, hopefully by June 30th. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, I...This does involve ninety six million dollars and therefore...ah...I was trying to get your attention to...ah... ask a question or two. I think it's important enough that you'd allow me to...ah...ask a question or two at this stage."

Speaker Redmond: "Explain your vote, I guess that will do it."

Mann: "Well Mr. Speaker, you know this...you can't explain your vote on a matter that's been kept more secret than the Pentagon Papers, I mean I...I don't know whether we have a...a study here to justify this or what site, or whether their going to build it in the Lake or Navy Pier or in the Indian Village...I...I...I just have no idea where...where this is going and I wanted to ask Mr. Houlihan, perhaps he'd take it out of the record until he could ask the Capitol Development Board who their going to bail out. I mean I just...I...I...I don't know."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, if I may be recognized on a point of order, ...ah...this is the third time in less than 48 hours when you were in the chair when I have been cut off, when I was rising to speak on



a point which I thought was important to the people of the 22nd District. Now the problems of the 22nd District may be different from the problems of the District that you represent but they are just as important to us as your districts problems are to you. Now I'm voting 'present' because I did not get an answer to the question I asked Representative Houlihan and I would like an answer to that question."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "To reply to Representative Manns question. There is four million dollars on this Bill presently for sight acqu...sight studies and ...ah...construction rehability work that's to be completed. Now what this Amendment does is ask an addit...raising that from four million to twenty one million dollars for the acquisition of land and the possibility of constructing a building. I think this is a bit premature personally because the fact that we the General Assembly did not approve the accelerated building program. I thought it was premature on the other Amendment and I'm just voting 'no'."

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

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, briefly to...ah...explain my vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Hurry up...hurry up...hurry up. We're probably going to be here till 9 O'Clock, but go ahead."

Houlihan: "Well, Mr...."

Speaker Redmond: "Go ahead, go ahead."

Houlihan: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I believe this Amendment is important to the City of Chicago, I believe it's Legislation which is appropriate. One of the things that this will do is that it will permit the State of Illinois to release large holdings of leased facilities. These facilities are currently being paid out of the general revenue fund and I believe that this will be economically sound. In response to Representative Catanias question. I would...ah...urge that the state develop land in every district but I believe that the decision will be made by a professional board and it will be made on the best interest of the entire metropolitan area and although I would give them a recommendation, I believe that their decision would



be based on the entire metropolitan area, not just one district.

So I...I couldn't give you a commitment on that and I'd ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there's 54 'aye' 62 'no'. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is the gentleman recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Skinner: "Well, having heard that argument...ah...last year on RTA, I vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman votes 'no'. 54 'aye' 62 'nay' and the Amendment...63 'nay'. The Amendment is lost. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #11. Mudd. Amends House Bill 802 on page 6 by adding after line 14, the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Chairman, this...this Amendment was recommended to me by the Capitol Development Board to resolve a problem on a grant to a High School, within my district...ah...there...they were...This High School itself is one of the most progressive High School Districts in the state. They actually drafted the guidelines by which we control our purchasing act in regard to the in house student and the health and safety portion of our...our grant and application system...and rather than...they've got a difficulty in one portion of the purchasing act with...and it's recommended it be handled this way so if there's any...if there's any legal questions involved later that...ah... it will be answered by this type of an Amendment. So, I would ask your favorable vote and would ask for, answer any questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #11 to House Bill 802, all in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #12. Flinn. Amends House Bill 802 as amended in Section 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, I move to table Amendment #12 to House Bill 802."

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



Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 835. Representative Luft, do you want to call 835?"

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 835 was read a Second time previousley, we were on Amendment #11."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the Sponsor of Amendment 11? Representative VanDuyne. Oh...Amendment #11."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #11. Ryan. Amends House Bill 835 as amended on page 1, line 13 by deleting one hundred and seven thousand five hundred inserting in lieu thereof, ninety three thousand one hundred and twenty, and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #11 is an additional forty thousand six hundred dollars it makes no changes in the grants made and it is strictly out of operations and I would move for the adoption of Amendment #11."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative VanDuyne."

VanDuyne: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House...ah...I just go back to my initial statement, I plead...ah...for...ah...the...ah...the defeat of these Amendments, we decided a long time ago that we would go along in our Committee with the six per cent impoundment, we decided we would...ah...we would pass these appropriations through our Committee as they were presented to us and so therefor I...I... I plead for a negative vote on this Amendment."

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

Ryan: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If you will analyze the budget of House Bill 835 you'll find that the travel the contractual services, are all way out of line. The travel has been excessive in 19...in Fiscal Year 75, the Members of the Illinois Fire Commission have been to Stillwater, Oklahoma... Washington, D. C. Minneapolis, Minnesota, Los Angelus, California. Memphis Tennessee, Nashville Tennessee. South Bend, Indiana. to the tune of about four grand. Now these...these Commissioners don't travel alone, they've been to...they travel in...in threes and fours and fives...with...with secretaries and three and four commissioners.



and there isn't any other Commission that does this. There isn't another Commission in the State of Illinois that abuses the travel as this Commission does, so I think this cut is justified and I would ask for an 'aye' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #11 to House Bill 835. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Could we have the question repeated? I believe that Amendment #11 has already been adopted. Am I wrong?"

Speaker Redmond: "I've been advised that 11 is the one we're considering now. Mr. Clerk. According to the Clerk, we're on 11."

Satterthwaite: "This is Amendment 11 to House Bill 835?"

Speaker Redmond: "That's what the Clerk advises me."

Satterthwaite: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 53 'ayes', 61 'no'. The Amendment is lost. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #12. Ryan. Amends House Bill 835 as amended on page one line 13, so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If you couldn't live with the last one, I'm sure you can live with this one. This is a sixteen thousand fifty dollar reduction and it again does not change grants and aids. It reduces operations and operations only and there's a vacancy in that office, it occurred to me, it has not been filled for fourteen thousand three hundred and eighty dollars. Now, certainly there isn't anything wrong with this Amendment and I know of no opposition to this Amendment and I would move for the adoption,"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative VanDuyne."

VanDuyne: "Mr. Speaker, I won't belabor the point, but for the forementioned reasons I oppose this Amendment also and I ask for a negative vote."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates...that's Representative Ryan...He indicates he will."



Leverenz: "What is the total amount of the cut that you're trying to initiate here?"

Ryan: "Sixteen thousand fifty dollars and it is one job that entails ...ah...that was vacated in May for personnel reasons, fourteen thousand three hundred and eighty dollars in personnel services, nine hundred and seventy dollars in retirement and seven hundred in Social Security for a total of sixteen thousand fifty dollars."

Leverenz: "To the Amendment, that is an important position. I know the entire budget and I saw some of the other cuts that were asked of and I don't believe anybody has traveled in multiples of four and five and secretaries and the like. I ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #12 to House Bill 835. Those in favor...didn't he close?"

Ryan: "No I haven't closed yet, I'd like to do that."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, close."

Ryan: "Well, Representative Leverenz, any time you'd like to see the...ah.. the investigation that's been done on this and the travel vouchers and so forth, I'd be glad to show them to you. I didn't stand on this Floor and tell these people that they've traveled in fours and fives to tell a lie. I told the truth about this and that's exactly what it is and if you want to question that, I'd be glad to show it to you. I have it right here and I can show you the travel vouchers and they weren't easy to get I might add. Now this whole operation with the Fire Commission stinks and should be investigated and I think there's been some attempts to have it investigated and so this...this Amendment is not out of order and I would move for the adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #12 to House Bill 835. All in favor vote 'aye' and those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative VanDuyne."

VanDuyne: "Mr. Speaker, I submit to you in explaining my vote that this Amendment should be defeated. Now, he's talking about taking one of the positions out of this budget and I will just submit to all the Members of this body that for personnel vindictiveness I sometimes think that Representative Ryan is just kidding around only he speaks so convincingly that some of the people misconstrue what he's saying..."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Ryan to explain





his vote."

Ryan: "Well Representative VanDuyne, I resent that in the implication that you've put in to this Amendment on my feelings and...ah...I'm very sincere about this Amendment, it is an Amendment that's certainly not out of line and you show me a Commission of this state that can't afford a sixteen thousand fifty dollar cut and I'll eat your hat. This...this Commission can afford this cut and deserves this cut and I...and I submit to you Representative VanDuyne that if you'll look at the..at the entire Bill and the budget that this...that this Commission has and the operation, you'll find that there are several things here that certainly wouldn't be in..in good taste as far as you were concerned. I'm certain of that and so I honestly feel that this Amendment should be put on and I would request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 68 'aye' 73 'no' and the Amendment is lost. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #13. Chapman. Amends House Bill 835 on page 1 by deleting line 29 and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman. Is she here? Representative Davis."

Davis: "Representative Chapman had to go to the train I understand and this is a usual Amendment...ah...ah...which inserts the no funds in the Act may be expended in violation of any promulgated recommendation of the Illinois Fair Employment Practice Commission. This is the Amendment she wanted to offer and...ah...either we're going to take it out of the record or give a chance to offer it. I will move the adoption of the Amendment because the is the usual Amendment that goes on these things and I don't think in view of the fact that... Well I'm going to oppose...unless she'd get a chance, if you want to give the lady a chance, she isn't here unless...I'll put it in I'll move the adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative VanDuyne."

VanDuyne: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House...ah...I think that these Amendments really are very, very unnecessary. It's been mentioned many many times and it's already a part of the law and I say that it's



a personal front to the people who are running these agencies and who the Appropriations are for...ah...it eludes or at least infers that they are not going to support the law and I, I just think it's completely unnecessary and I'm sick and tired of monkeying around with them every time we...this Amendment everytime we're conferred with some kind of an appropriations and I still.ah.believe in giving the chance and so...so I just ask for your 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adop...the adoption of Amendment #13 to House Bill 835. Those in favor of the adoption... Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "I want to take an opportunity of personal privilege to answer Mr. VanDuynes. Now only four per cent of the entire state personnel are black males and I don't think that it's being facetious or suprecious to put this Amendment on all these Bills because these departments and commissions have proven that they don't intend to follow the law unless you keep right on their behinds."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I've listened to Representative VanDuynes make the...ah...allegations he has two periodically about this Amendment, now I serve on the other Appropriations Committee and I've never seen one agency, one Commission, or any other individual speaking for these groups oppose this Amendment. I think it's very important that we support it. I think Representative Gaines commented to the point, minority groups and discrimination has to be done statutorily in many cases because we appear not to be willing to do it in any other fashion. So, I think it's an easy Amendment to adopt, nobodys offended by it, I think it's a statement of our position as a state and I would endorse an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to speak against the Amendment, but I'm getting a little bit tired of being here all weekend, religously and some of the people have these Amendments, can't even appear to defend their own Amendment. If they aren't here they ought to have the Amendments killed just...by the fact their not interested."

Speaker Redmond: "Rep...Representative Mudd."



Mudd: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, I...ah...I think that we've debated this Amendment on numerous Bills and I would move for the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall the main question be put? All in favor say 'aye' opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment is the usual Amendment to most of these agency Bills. I don't understand why...why there's objection to it. The distinguished lady had to leave, she's been here, she had to leave and go to the station, suppose to take some of her family. But I simply will move that this Amendment be approved, accepted so on. I think it's the usual Amendment, it's been put on all the other Bills."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #13 to House Bill 835. All in favor vote 'aye' opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who...have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Am I on? Am I on? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 77 'aye', 29 'no' the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative McLain do you desire 1947 called?"

McLain: "No sir, I've informed your parliamentarian. No thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "1948? Representative Mann. 3100? Representative McLendon, 3101, do you want that called? On the order of House Bills Third Reading appears House Bill 3062. Representative Berman."

Berman: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to bring House Bill 3062 back to the order of Second Reading for the purpose of Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none return to the order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."

Berman: "I departed while Representative Huff."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff."

Huff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First of all I'd like to express my gratitude to the Sponsor for so graciously bringing this Bill back to Second Reading so I could have go with this Amendment. This Amendment is very simple on its face and hopefully very



effective in its effect...ah...all it does is to say that with regards to insurance rates that there shall be no variance in the rate charge on any given insurance described in this article, based upon geographic division with the municipalities with populations over five hundred thousand. I move for the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #13 to House Bill 3062. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no' the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments."

Jack O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I have two points. One is announcement, but on this Order of Third Reading. I have discussed with Mr. Skinner and we'd like leave to put House Bill 3117 back on Second Reading so it can be in the same posture that 3119 is for consideration tomorrow on Second Reading which I Which...at which time Mr. McMaster has some Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Hearing none be returned to the order of Second Reading...3117."

Maragos: "Put it to Second Reading and leave it there. I would also like to make an announcement and to be posted in tomorrows Calendar that the Revenue Committee's going to have a special meeting on 8 a.m. on Tuesday morning, June 24 in room 118. So please post it on the Calendar and have leave of the house to read it."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the subject matter Representative."

Maragos: "The subject matter is to discuss the Revenue impact of 3118 which we considered to day on Second Reading and to have the Bureau of the Budget the Comptrollers Office and the Department of Revenue give us the base by which they have had their objections on Revenue losses to be anticipated for the coming year."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further announcements? Representative Lechowicz?"

Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. For the purpose of announcement. Appropriations I will meet tomorrow morning at 8:00 to consider the following Bills. Senate Bill 477, which is the appropriations for the General Services Department. Senate Bill 478, The State Fair. Senate Bill 554 to CBB. Senate Bill 632, BOB. Senate Bill 8...I'm sorry



683, Waterways. Senate Bill 860, Economic and Fiscal Commission. Senate Bill 958, State Fair Transferability. Senate Bill 149do, 1492, CDB transfer. Also we have a special Committee Bill which would create the Illinois Medical and Dental Schools Admission Study Commission which was similar to House Bill 414 and House Joint Resolution 55. Thank you Mr. Speaker. That's 8 o'clock tomorrow morning room 114."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. On the Supplemental Calendar #1 to today's...ah...session indicates that the Bill 3118 which was we heard as a Committee of the Whole, was on, is on Second Reading First Legislative Day and I don't quite understand that, perhaps the Speaker can advise...ah...me as to...or...or the House as to how it could be this way. We just heard it this afternoon and the Supplemental Calendar indicates it's on Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "It's been reported out at least to the requirements because when the Committee reports to the Clerk, then it can be put on Second Reading, First Legislative Day."

Palmer: "Did...was the Bill reported out of the Committee as a Whole? Do Pass? Or was it recommended..."

Speaker Redmond: "When it arrives it automatically is reported out."

Palmer: "Sir?"

Speaker Redmond: "I said, when the Committee of the Whole arises it already is reported out, there's no other report. On to Second Reading."

Palmer: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "That showed that Bill on Second Reading, First Legislative Day. Could you explain to me why that was done? done?"

Speaker Redmond: "I just explained to Representative Palmer."

Walsh: "Would you mind doing it again, I was talking to a friend."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, when the Committee of the Whole arises that's all the business as far as the Committee of the Whole is concerned and the Bill was then returned...put on the order of Second Reading."

Walsh: "First Legislative Day...But normally there is a day in between that and we've had this discussion before. There was one time if you'll



recall and it may have been with this Bill as well as with others that it was introduced and on Second Reading, First Legislative Day, on the same day."

Speaker Redmond: "That didn't happen with this Bill, this is perfectly in order, Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Perhaps not on this Bill but..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "According...the question is one as to the applicability of temporary Rule 23...ah...B...which reads if no Bill or resolution shall be reported without a recommendation. The report shall show both the numerical vote and Roll Call vote on the Bill or Resolution ..."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't believe that's what you're talking about, the Committee of the Whole. That's when the regular session."

Palmer: "Well, that...that's the thrust of my inquiry."

Speaker Redmond: "There's never a Roll Call in the Committee of the Whole."

Palmer: "All right....fine....thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further, Representative Barnes?"

Barnes: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker, the Appropriations Committee Division II will meet tomorrow morning at 8 a.m. on the House Floor to consider four Bills. Senate Bill 555, Department of Public Aid. Senate Bill 629, Illinois Law Enforcement Commission. Senate Bill 635 the Department of Children and Family Services and Senat Bill 510, the Department of Labor. 8 a.m., House Floor, tomorrow morning."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "The Republican Members of the Appropriations I Committee will meet in 618 at 7:30 a.m."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I move the House do now adjourn until 10:30 a.m. tomorrow morning."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the House adjourn until 10:30 tomorrow morning. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no' the 'ayes' have it, the motion carries. Stand adjourned until 10:30 tomorrow morning."



June 22, 1975

Page 1.

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
1	1:00	Redmond	Calls House to Order
		O'Brien	Prayer
		Redmond	Roll Call
	1:01	County Superintendent--	Presents Lucco with Jacket
		Redmond	
	1:02	Borchers	
2		Geo-Karis	
	1:05	Redmond	
		Redmond	Joint Resolutions, Constitutional Amendments, Third Reading
		O'Brien	House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment # 10.
	1:08	Redmond	Out of the record
3		O'Brien	House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #12
		Redmond	
4	1:12	Shea	Take House Resolution 393 out of the record, Representative McGrew is excused.
5		O'Brien	House Resolution 394
	1:14	Redmond	Committee On Assignment of Bills
		Redmond	House Joint Resolution 40
	1:15	Hart	House Joint Resolution 40
6	1:16	Redmond	House Joint Resolution, Adepted
		Hart	Joint Rule
		Redmond	
	1:18	Palmer)	Question?
		)	
7		Hart )	
		Tipsword	
		Redmond	
8	1:20	Katz	
		Hart	
		Redmond	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
	1:21	Frederich	
9	1:23	Redmond	House Joint Resolution #40, Adopted
	1:25	O'Brien	Message from the Senate
		Redmond	House Joint Resolution #5, Concurrence
		Grotberg	House Joint Resolution #5, Senate Amendment #1
10		Redmond	House
	1:27	Schraeder)	
		Grotberg )	
		Redmond )	House Concurs
	1:28	Redmond	Non-Concurrence
11		DiPrima )	Refuses to recede
		Schraeder)	
		DiPrima	"Home Rule"
		Redmond	
	1:30	Walsh	
		Redmond	
12		Lechowicz)	
		Schraeder)	
	1:31	Redmond	
	1:32	Duester	
		Redmond	
		DiPrima	
13		Redmond	
		Hoffman	
		Redmond	
	1:33	Walsh	
		Redmond	
		Matijevich	
	1:34	Redmond	House refuses to recede
		Londrigan	Senate Bill 57 House Amendment #1-refuse to recede



June 22, 1975

Page 3.

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
14	1:35	Redmond	House refuses
		Jones	House refuses, Senate Bill 211, House Amendment #1
		Redmond	House Refuses
		Kornowicz	Senate Bill 295, House Amendment #1
		Redmond	House refuses to recede
		Matijeovich	Senate Bill 419, House Amendment #1
	1:36	Redmond	House refuses to recede
15		Richmond	Senate Bill 444, House Amendment #1
	1:37	Redmond	House recedes
		Willer	
		Geo-Karis	
		Redmond	
	1:39	Willer	Senate Bill 454, House Amendment #1
		Redmond	House Recede
16		Washington	Senate Bill 432, House Amendment #1
	1:40	Redmond	House refuses to recede
		Walsh	Senate Bill 638, House Amendment #2
		Redmond	House refuse to recede
		Walsh	Senate Bill 640, House Amendment #2
		Redmond	House refuses to recede
		Rigney	Senate Bill 682-House Amendments # 1, 2, 3.
		Redmond	Refuse
17		Willer	Senate Bill 642, House Amendment #1
		Shea ) ) Willer)	Refuse?
	1:42	Redmond	House refuses to recede
		Campbell	Senate Bill 944, House Amendment #1
	1:43	Redmond	House refuses to recede
		Campbell	Senate Bill 945, House Amendment #1

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
	1:44	Redmond	House refuses
18		Redmond	House Bills; second reading
		Mautino	House Bill 1176, Senate Amendment #1
19	1:47	Redmond	Non-concur
		Chapman	House Bill 1697, Senate Amendment #1
	1:48	Redmond	House Non-concur
		McClain	House Bill 1949, Senate Amendment #1
		Redmond	House Non-concur
20		Redmond	
	1:50	Yourell	House Bill 1683-Senate Amendment #1
		Redmond	
		Palmer	Yield?
		Redmond	
	1:51	Peters	Yield?
21	1:52	Redmond	House concurs
		Rigney	House Bill 2788-Senate Amendment #1
	1:54	Redmond	House Concurs
		Walsh	
		Redmond	
22	1:56	O'Brien	House Bill 835-Second reading-Committee Amendments 1,2,3, and 5. Tabled Committee Amendment #4.
		Redmond	
	1:57	VanDuyne	
		Redmond	
		Mudd	
23		Redmond	
	1:59	Van Duyne	
		Redmond	
		Van Duyne	
24		Redmond	
	2:00	Catania	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
		Redmond	Amendment #4 lost
		Catania	
25	2:01	Bradley	
		Redmond	
		Duester	
		Redmond	
	2:03	Catania	
		Redmond	
		Frederich	"Nutty" Amendment
26		Redmond	Turn the Chair to Matijevich
		O'Brien	Amendment #6
	2:05	Barnes, E.	
		Redmond	
		Ryan )	Yield?
		)	
27	2:07	Barnes)	
		Redmond	
		Van Duyne	
		Redmond	
28	2:08	Barnes, E.	To close
	2:10	Redmond	
		Ryan	
		Redmond	
29		Leverenz )	Yield?
		)	
	2:11	Barnes, E.M.)	
		Redmond	
	2:12	Van Duyne	
30		Redmond	
	2:13	Peters	
		Redmond	
		Birchler	
		Redmond	

June 22, 1975

Page 6.

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
	2:14	Barnes	
31		Redmond	Amendment #6
32	2:17	Ryan	
		Redmond	Amendment adopted
		O'Brien	Amendment #7
		Ryan	Leave to table Amendments 7, 8, 9 and 10
	2:18	Redmond	Leave
		O'Brien	Amendment #11
		Redmond	
		Shea	House Bill 3118-dissolve into committee as a whole
	2:19	Redmond	
		Matijevich	
33		Houlihan, J.	Possible to consider House Joint Resolution 67?
	2:20	Matijevich	
34	2:21	Bradley	
		Washburn	
		Matijevich	
	2:22	Walsh ) Matijevich)	"We can discuss Houlihan's"
35		Berman	
	2:25	Matijevich	
36	2:27	Houlihan, J.	House Joint Resolution 67
		Matijevich	"It's waiting to be introduced"
		Peters	
		Matijevich	
37	2:28	Duff	
	2:29	Matijevich	"Get on with business"
		Lundy	"Reads rule" (Rule 18)
38		Matijevich	

June 22, 1975

Page 7.

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
	2:30	Lundy	Not objecting to the "Committee-as-a Whole"
		Matijevich	
		Schraeder	
		Matijevich	
	2:31	Houlihan, J.	
39		Matijevich	
	2:32	Shea	House Bill 3118
41	2:40	Washburn)	
		Shea )	Discussion
50	3:05	Lechowicz	
51		Matijevich	
		Washburn	
	3:06	Caldwell	"Excellent Acting"
		Matijevich	
52		Lundy)	
		Shea )	Discussion
	3:08	Shea )	
56	3:17	Matijevich	
		Duester)	
		Shea )	Discussion
58		Matijevich	
59	3:23	Lechowicz	Responds to Duester
60	3:26	Shea	"Specific Manner"
	3:28	Duester	
		Matijevich	
61	3:29	Lechowicz)	
		Duester )	
62		Matijevich	
	3:30	Schraeder)	Question?
		Shea )	Discussion
64	3:35	Matijevich	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
64	3:35	Shea Schraeder Matijevich	Like to answer
66	3:39	Ryan ) Shea ) Matijevich)	Question?
67	3:40	Lechowicz Ryan ) Shea ) Matijevich)	Point of order
69	3:45	Houlihan, J. Ryan Matijevich Lechowicz Matijevich Houlihan, J. Matijevich	Point of inaccuracy
70	3:46	Lechowicz Shea Ryan Matijevich	Point of Personal Priviledge Shed some light "Have not completed my question"
	3:47	Shea	
	3:48	Ryan Matijevich	"Address myself to the Bill"
71		Washington) Matijevich) Tipsword) Shea )	Yield? Discussion
75	3:57	Matijevich	
76		Anderson) Shea )	Will sponsor yield?

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
	3:59	Matijevich	
		Houlihan, J.	Question?
		Shea	Discussion
81	4:10	Houlihan, J.	Speaks for the Bill, don't intend it to be a compreciative passing of the buck
		Shea	
	4:11	Bradley	Moves Committee of the Whole does arise.
82	4:12	Matijevich	Chair will state the motion
	4:13	Shea	Might I ask one question?
Matijevich		Matijevich	
		Lechowicz	Anyone here from Administration?
		Matijevich)	
		Palmer )	
83	4:14	Matijevich	Bradley, will you hold that motion?
		Palmer	
	4:15	Bradley	"I'll hold the motion."
84		Matijevich	Thank you
		Mahar)	
		Shea )	
	4:16	Matijevich	May we have order?
		Shea	Continues
85	4:18	Matijevich	
		Beaupre	Two Questions
	4:20	Shea	Discussion
	4:24	Matijevich	
87	4:25	Matijevich)	Bureau of the Budget question
		Shea )	
88		Cunningham	
		Mann	
		Cunningham	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
	4:27	Matijevich	
		Cunningham)	Question?
		Shea )	
	4:28	Matijevich	
		Cunningham)	Two more questions
		Shea )	
90	4:29	Matijevich)	
		Palmer )	Discussion
	4:30	Shea	
92		Matijevich	
	4:33	Lechowicz)	
		Palmer )	Discussion
		Shea )	
	4:35	Shea )	
94		Matijevich	
	4:38	Lechowicz	Point of order
		Matijevich	
	4:39	Shea	Tax increase not necessary
		Matijevich	Happy to be opposed to it
		Palmer	
95		Matijevich	
		Geo-Karis	Point of order
		Matijevich	You're next
	4:40	Leonard Schaeffer	Director of the Budget
96		Matijevich	
		Schaeffer	
97	4:45	Waddell,	
		Matijevich	Proceed
		Schaeffer	
98		Matijevich	
99		Geo-Karis	
		Schaeffer	Discussion



June 22, 1975

Page 11.

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
101		Matijevich	
		Kane	Point of order
		Matijevich	Point well taken
		Lechowicz)	Will the witness respond?
		Schaeffer)	
102		Matijevich	
103		Giorgi	"Questions are irrelevant."
		Matijevich	
		Lechowicz	
		Matijevich	Anything further?
		Schaeffer)	
		Lechowicz)	Discussion
106		Matijevich	
		Giorgi	
		Matijevich	
		Shea	"Revenue estimates"
		Matijevich	
		Hill	"Agree with last gentleman"
107		Matijevich	
		Katz	
		Matijevich	
		Giorgi	
		Matijevich	
		Huff	"Growing sense of frustration"
		Matijevich	
		Lechowicz)	
		Schaeffer)	Discussion
113		Matijevich	
		Schraeder	
		Matijevich	

June 22, 1975

Page 12.

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
		Lechowicz	
		Schaeffer	Discussion
115		Matijevich	
117		Matijevich	
		Houlihan, J.	"Suggest Lechowicz out of order"
		Matijevich	
		Shea	
118		Matijevich	
		Giorgi	
		Matijevich	
		Barnes, E.M.	
		Matijevich	
		Barnes, E.M.	
119		Matijevich	
		Washington	"Make motion we now arise as a Committee of the Whole"
		Matijevich	Committee does now arise
120		Maragos	Point of order
		Matijevich	
		Hill	
		Matijevich	House Bills, third reading
		O'Brien	House Bill 3006, third reading
		Matijevich	
		Younge	Take out
	5:28	Matijevich	House Bills, third reading
121		Matijevich	
		Terzich	House Bill 3094, back to second
		Matijevich	Amendment #1 adopted, third reading
	5:30	O'Brien	House Bill 3097, third reading
122		Dunn, J.	
		Matijevich	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
	5:33	Neff	Favor
123		Matijevich	
		Tuerk	Yield?
	5:34	Dunn, J.	
124		Matijevich	
	5:36	Garmisa	
125		Matijevich	
	5:38	Duester	
		Matijevich	
126	5:40	Schraeder	
		Dunn, J.	
		Matijevich	
		Maragos	
		Matijevich	
127		Dunn, J.	To close
		Matijevich	House Bill 3097, Passed
		O'Brien	House Bill 3102, third reading
		Matijevich	
	5:42	Caldwell	
		Matijevich	
	5:43	MacDonald	
128		Matijevich	
		Katz	Oppose
129		Matijevich	
	5:45	Tipsword	Oppose
130		Matijevich	
	5:47	Geo-Karis	
		Matijevich	
		Schneider	Support
131		Caldwell	To close
	5:52	Shea	Support

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
		Matijevich	
		Gaines	
133		Matijevich	
	5:54	MacDonald	
		Matijevich	
	5:55	Borchers	Against
134	5:56	Matijevich	House Bill 3102, Passed
		O'Brien	House Bill 3106, third reading
	5:57	Berman	
135	6:00	Matijevich	House Bill 3106, Passed
		O'Brien	
		Matijevich	
	6:01	Beaupre	
136		Matijevich	
	6:04	Geo-Karis)	Question
	6:05	Beaupre )	
137	6:07	Hanahan)	Question
		Beaupre)	Discussion
139	6:12	Hanahan	On the Bill
		Duester)	
		Beaupre)	Discussion
142	6:17	Ebessen	Move previous question
		Matijevich	
		Beaupre	
143	6:19	Matijevich	Shall House Bill 3107 pass?
	6:20	Gaines	Explain vote
		Matijevich	
		VanDuyne	
		Matijevich	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
		Brinkmeier	
144		Hudson	Looks better
	6:21	Matijevich	House Bill 3107, passed
		Bradley (in Chair)	House Bill 3108, third reading
	6:22	O'Brien	
		Barnes, J.	
		Bradley	
	6:23	Schneider	
145		Bradley	
	6:25	Geo-Karis	
		Bradley	
		Dunn, J.	Will Sponsor yield?
146	6:27	Barnes, J.	
		Bradley	
		Brinkmeier	Moves the previous question
		Barnes, J.	To close
		Bradley	
	6:28	Schneider	To explain vote--against
147		Bradley	
		Ryan	To explain vote--favor
		Bradley	
	6:29	Borchers	Against
		Bradley	
	6:30	Mudd	Explain vote--favor
		Bradley	
		Hudson	Explain vote--Oppose
148		Bradley	
	6:32	Deavers	Change light to green
		Bradley	
	6:33	Schneider	Verification
		Bradley	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
		Barnes, J.	Poll the absentees
		O'Brien	Polling the absentees
		Bradley	
149	6:35	O'Brien	Calling the affirmative roll call
		Bradley	
		Sangmeister	Vote me no
	6:36	Willer	Vote me no
	6:37	O'Brien	Continues with affirmative roll call
		Bradley	
	6:39	Schoberlein	Vote me Aye
		O'Brien	Continues
150	6:43	Bradley	
		Walsh	Record me Aye
		Bradley	
		Schneider	Questions affirmative roll call
		Bradley	
		Matijevich	
		Bradley	
	6:45	Giorgi	
		Bradley	
151		Merlo	Vote me Aye
		Schneider	Questions affirmative roll call
		Dunn, R.	Change me to Aye
153		Bradley	House Bill 3108, passed
	6:50	O'Brien	House Bill 3109, third reading
		Bradley	
		Luft	
		Bradley	"Order"
154		Luft	
		Bradley	
		Borchers)	Question

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
		Luft)	
		Bradley	
		Katz	
155		Bradley	
		Luft	To close
		Bradley	Shall House Bill 3109 pass?
		Brinkmeier	Explain vote--For
156		Bradley	
		Stone	Against
		Bradley	
		McClain	Explain vote--For
		Bradley	
		Kempiners	Explain vote--For
157		Bradley	House Bill 3109, passed
		Shea	House Resolution 393
		O'Brien	
158		Shea )	Move-fer-adeption
		)	
		Bradley)	
		Maragos	Moves for adoption
		Houlihan, J.	"My shoes are in Geo-Karis' car"
		Bradley	
		Matijevich	
		Redmond	House Bills, third reading
		Sangmeister	Point of inquiry
159		Redmond	
		Sangmeister	
		Redmond	House Bill 3110
		O'Brien	House Bill 3110, third reading
		Redmond	Take it out of the record
		Merlo	Will handle House Bill 3110
		Redmond	Leave granted

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
160		Merlo	Explains Executive Committee Bill 3110-Sponsor
		Redmond	House Bill 3110, passed
		O'Brien	House Bill 3111, thrid reading
		Redmond	
		Younge	Take out of the record
		Redmond	Take out of the record
		Younge	Take out of therecord
		Redmond	House Bill 3112
		O'Brien	House Bill 3112, third reading
		Redmond	
		Younge	House Bill 3112, explains the bill-Sponscr
		Redmond	
161		Walsh	Not a good bill
		Redmond	
		Maragos	Question
		Redmond	Yields
		Maragos	Question put
		Younge	Response and discussion
		Maragos	
		Younge	House Bill 3112
		Maragos	Speak to the point
		Redmond	
162		Ewing	Question
		Redmond	She'll yield
		Ewing	Question put
		Younge	Discussion
		Ewing	Speaks to the Bill
		Redmond	
		Leverenz	Question
		Redmond	Yields



<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>SPEAKER</u>	<u>INFORMATION</u>
163		Leverenz	Question put
		Younger	Response and discussion
		Leverenz	
		Younger	
		Leverenz	Speaks to the Bill-votes no
		Redmond	
		Lechowicz	
		Redmond	
		Winchester	House Bill 3112, moves previous question
		Redmond	
164		Younger	To close
		Redmond	House Bill 3112 passed
		Lucco	Leave to change vote
		Redmond	Leave granted, House Bill 3113
		O'Brien	House Bill 3113, third reading
		Redmond	
		Lechowicz	Leave to hear House Bills 3113 and 3114 together
		Redmond	Leave granted
		O'Brien	House Bill 3114, third reading
		Lechowicz	Explains House Bills 3113 and 3114 Sponsor
		Redmond	
		Giorgi	
		Lechowicz	
		Giorgi	
165		Lechowicz	
		Giorgi	
		Lechowicz	House Bills 3113 and 3114, discussi
		Giorgi	
		Lechowicz	
	Giorgi		

PAGE.      TIME

SPEAKER

INFORMATION

166

Lechowicz

Giorgi

Lechowicz

Redmond

Giorgi

Redmond

Sangmeister

Lechowicz

Sangmeister

Lechowicz

Sangmeister

Lechowicz

Redmond

Shea

Sangmeister

Shea

Lechowicz

"No penalties"

Shea

Sangmeister

Lechowicz

"It's his bill"

167

Redmond

Tipsword

Redmond

Tipsword

Lechowicz

Tipsword

Lechowicz

Redmond

Vote, House Bills 3113 and 3114  
Passed

O'Brien

House Bill 3115, third reading

Redmond

Leon

Leave to hear House bill 3116 too