

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

NINETY-EIGHTH LEGISLATIVE DAY

JUNE 25, 1975



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Doorkeeper: "All those not entitled to the House Chamber, will you please retire to the Gallery? Thank you."

Doorkeeper: "All people who are not entitled to the House Chamber, will you please retire to the Gallery? Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order and the Members please be in their seats. Good morning, how did you do it? Play golf too? We are led in prayer this morning by Monsignor Bretz from Christ the King Parish in Springfield."

Monsignor Bretz: "In view of our upcoming bicentenary celebration I would like to pray the prayer that was composed by Father John Carroll. Who in the year Seventeen Hundred and Seventy Six, accompanied to Canada a delegation composed of Benjamin Franklin, Samuel Trees and his cousin, Charles Carroll of Carrollton. This delegation was commissioned by the Continental Congress to seek the aid of Canada on behalf of the American Revolution and after the war, Father Carroll became the first Bishop of the Catholic Church, in the United States. In the same year that George Washington became our first President. Let us pray. We pray Thee, oh God of might, wisdom and justice. Through Whom authority is rightly administered and judgment decreed, assist with Thy Holy Spirit of Council and fortitude the President of the United States. That his Administration may be conducted in righteousness and be eminently useful to Thy people over whom he presides by encouraging due respect for virtue and religion, by thieful execution of the laws and justice and mercy and by restraining vice and immorality. Let the Light of Thy divine wisdom direct the deliberations of Congress and shine forth in all the proceeding and laws framed for our rule in government. So that they may tend to the preservation of peace and the promotion of national happiness, the increase of industry sobriety and useful knowledge and may perpetuate to us the blessings of equal liberty. We pray for his excellency the Governor of the State, for the Members of this Assembly and all the Judges, Magistrates and other officers who are appointed to guard our political welfare as they may enabled by Thy powerful protection to discharge the duties of their respective stations with honesty and ability. We recommend likewise to thy unbounded mercy, all our fellow citizens throughout the United States



that they may be blessed in the knowledge and sanctified in the observance of Thy most holy love. That they may be preserved in union and in that peace which this world can not give and after enjoying the blessings of this life be admitted to those which are eternal. That is how Bishop Carroll prayed for our country and its leaders two hundred years ago and that is how I pray for our country and the Members of this Assembly today. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. House Bills 1947. No....

Representative Beatty. On Nonconcurrency 284. Do you want to nonconcur on that one Representative Beatty?"

Beatty: "Well Mr. Speaker, there's only one Amendment on there and I, I haven't really seen any, I haven't had a chance to go over any...ah... anything from the Senate. We have the FEPC Amendment on, on there. As far as I know that's the only Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Well the only I reason I mentioned it is that if you're going to move to nonconcur, why we could have a voice vote if you have your doubts about it, perhaps we better wait until we have more people here."

Beatty: "Yes, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Londrigan on nonconcurrency. Senate Bill 488. Take that out. On the order of Concurrence appears House Bill 1939. Representative Deavers. 1939."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. On House Bill 1939, with the Senate Amendment on it. I'd like to make a motion that we nonconcur and have a Conference Committee ah...formed."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1939. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye'. Opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it and the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1. Any other nonconcurrency? Messages 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 the Senate has acceded in the request of the House of Representatives for a Conference Committee to consider the differences of the two Houses in regard to House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1118. Action taken by the Senate, June 24, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."



3.

A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has adopted the following preamble and Joint Resolution in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence with the House of Representatives, to wit: Senate Joint Resolution 45, adopted by the Senate June 24, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate concurred with the House in the passage of a Bill of the following titles, to wit: House Bill 2026, 2043, 2058, 2072, 2170, 2258, passed by the Senate, June 24, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate concurs with the House in the passage of a Bill of the following titles, to wit: House Bill #1109. Passed by the Senate June 17, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of the Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill #1925. Passed by the Senate, June 19, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of Bills of the following titles, to wit: House Bills #964, 981, 983, 984 and 997, 1056, 1389, 1529, 1591, 1607, 1615, 1617, 1638, 16...that's after 1615 was 1717, 1738, 1750, 1840 and 1841. Passed by the Senate June 24, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of House Amendment #1 to a Bill of the following title. Senate Bill 100. Concurred in by the Senate, June 24, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the has receded to the request of the House of Representatives for a Conference Committee to consider the differences of the two Houses in regard to House Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 881, Action taken by the Senate, June 24, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Fred Selcke: "Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has acceded to the request of the House for a Conference Committee to consider the difference of the two Houses in regard to House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 911. Action taken by the Senate, June 24, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House that the Senate has acceded to the request of the House for a Conference Committee to consider the difference between the two Houses between House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 645. Action taken by the Senate, June 24, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House that the Senate has acceded to the request of the House for a Conference Committee to consider the differences between the two Houses in regard to House Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 456. Action taken by the Senate, June 24, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House that the Senate has acceded in the request of the House for a Conference Committee to consider the difference of the two Houses in regard to House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 335. Action taken by the Senate June 24, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House that the Senate has acceded in the request of the House for a Conference Committee to consider the difference of the House. Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 56. Action taken by the Senate June 24, Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House that the Senate has acceded to the request of the House for a Conference Committee to consider the difference between the two Houses on House Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 69. Action taken by the Senate, June 24, 1975.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House that the Senate has acceded to the request of the House for a Conference Committee to consider the difference of the two Houses in regard to House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 184. Action taken by the Senate, June 24, 1975.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House that the Senate has acceded to the request of the House for a Conference Committee to consider the differences in regard to House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 298. Action taken by the Senate, June 24, 1975. Mr. Speaker,



I am directed to inform the House that the Senate has acceded in the request of the House for a Conference Committee to consider the difference between the two Houses in regard to House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 418. Action taken by the Senate June 24, 1975.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House that the Senate has acceded to the request of the House for a Conference Committee to consider the difference of the two Houses in regard to House Amdnment #1 to Senate Bill 470. Action taken by the Senate June 24, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendment #1 to a Bill of the follwoing title, House Bill 1697 and request a Committee of Conference. Action taken by the Senate, June 24, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House that the Senate has refused to recede from Amendments #1 to a Bill of the following title, House Bill 871. Action taken by the Senate, June 24, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr Speaker, I am directed to inform the House the Senate has refused to recede from Amendment #1 to House Bill 1146. Action taken by the Senate, June 24, 1975. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House, the Senate has refused to recede from Amendment #2 to House Bill 1043. Action taken by the Senate June 24, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House the Senate has refused to recede from Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 601. Action taken by the Senate, June 24, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House, the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendment to a Bill of the following title, Amendment #1 to House Bill 600. Action taken by the Senate, June 24, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House that the Senate has refused to recede from Amendment #2 to a Bill of the following title. House Bill 1518. Action taken by the Senate June 24, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House the Senate has refused to recede from Amendment #2 to House Bill 1408. Action taken by the Senate, June 24, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.



Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House the Senate has refused to recede from Amendment #1 to House Bill 1176. Action taken by the Senate June 24, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House that the Senate has refused to recede from Amendment #1 to House Bill 1949.

Action taken by the Senate, June 24, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House

that the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of a Bill of the following title, House Bill 1172 together with the following Amendments. Passed the Senate as amended,

June 24, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House the Senate has concurred with the

House in the passage of a Bill of the following title. House Bill 1274 together with the following Amendments. Passed the Senate as amended, June 24, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House, the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of a Bill of the

following title. House Bill 1289 together with the following Amendments. Passed the Senate as amended, June 24, 1975.

Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage

of a Bill with the following title. House Bill 1381, together with the following Amendments. Passed the Senate as amended

June 24, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr Speaker, I am

directed to inform the House the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of a Bill, House Bill 1443, together with

the following Amendments. Passed the Senate as amended, June 24, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr Speaker, I am directed

to inform the House the Senate has concurred with the House

with the passage of a Bill, House Bill 1453, together with the following Amendments. Passed the Senate as amended. June 24,

1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed

to inform the House the Senate has concurred with the House

with the passage of House Bill 1656, together with the following Amendments. Passed the Senate as amended, June 24, 1975.

Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform



the House, the Senate has concurred with the House with the passage of House Bill 1659, together with the following Amendment. Passed the Senate as amended, June 24, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House, the Senate has concurred with the House with the passage of House Bill 1691, together with the following Amendments. Passed the Senate as amended, June 24, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of a Bill of the following title, House Bill 1716, together with the following Amendments. Passed the Senate as amended, June 24, 1975.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House the Senate has concurred with the House with the passage of a Bill of the following title. House Bill 1722 together with the following Amendment. Passed the Senate as amended, June 24, 1975. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of House Bill 1743, together with the following Amendments. Passed the Senate as amended, June 24, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House that the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of House Bill, the following House Bills, House Bill 1769, 1790, 1828, 1848, 1849, 1911, 11... 1103, 1401, 1587, 1668, 1730, 1739, 1837, 1881, 1977, 2065, 2101, 2229, 2350, 2260, 2215, 2075 and 1968, together with the following Amendments. Passed the Senate as amended, June 24, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee Reports."

Fred Selcke: "Mr. Boyle Appropriations II, to which Senate Bill 629 and 635 were referred, reported the same back with the recommendation, with the Amendments thereto, with the recommendation that the Amendments be adopted and the Bill as amended, do pass. No further Committee Reports."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Calvo. On the order of Concurrence. House Bill 229. Representative Calvo."

Calvo: "Mr. Speaker. I would ask that the House concur in these two Amendments...ah...One of them reduces the amount that I requested in the...for the Supervisor of Assessments Office, back to what it was before however, it does add an Amendment, the second Amendments



which makes certain that those funds are not within the County General Tax Levy Fund and...ah...that is important because of the suites that were filed in the Supreme Court decision. So, I would ask that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 229."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Will the Gentleman yield a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Walsh: "This means then, that the levy is just what it was before."

Calvo: "That's right Bill, we tried to, you know, it was permissive to double it because we were having trouble with our budget for our guy, but they took it back to exactly what it was before."

Walsh: "Thank you."

Calvo: "Yeah."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 229. Representative Hart. Give the Gentleman order please. Representative Hart."

Hart: "Just so everybody will know what they're voting on, this is...ah... similar to the Bill that we voted on last week...ah...I think Representative Maragos was the Sponsor of it and it provides for a tax increase without a referendum and so...ah...if you want to vote for that fine, if you don't why at least you know what you're doing."

Speaker Redmond: "Questions? The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 229? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wish? Representative Calvo."

Calvo: "Ah...I would just like to explain my vote Mr. Speaker. We may not have enough attendance here for 89 votes, I don't know. But, what the Gentleman just said, I do not feel, although it may be, technically be true, it is not to me actually representative of what's going on. When we pass this one per cent for the sup...the Assessment officers throughout each county in Illinois, we did it and we put it in the Statutes to where it would not be part of the General County Levy. Now objections were filed by some large taxpayers and I don't know the, if I had the law suit in front of me, I could tell you who filed them and the Supreme Court said, 'Well yes, that's what the



Legislature intended to do, but they did not also amend Section 406 of the Counties Act. Now what this Amendments does, is amend Section 406 of the Counties Act to do what we tried to do before and I do not think it's really fair to say that this is any tax increase without a referendum, 'cause all we're doing is getting the same amount, exactly. Now my Bill as it was originally passed in the House would have given a permissive use...ah...increase by the Counties of the Budget of the Assessment officers. However, that was amended to go back to what it was for many years and I say that we are not voting, really on a tax increase without referendum and I ask your support of these concurrences."

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

Hart: "Well Mr. Speaker...ah...I'd just like to say that when the Legislature passed this Levy, whenever it was, they passed it without a referendum at that time and now the Gentleman is asking for...ah...for this General Assembly to again say that this tax can be imposed without a referendum Now, there is a whole lot of green lights punched there of people that aren't on the Floor of the House and I don't think it's fair to them and Mr. Speaker, if I could have your attention for just a minute. I don't think it's fair to the Members who are not here, many of whom have expressed themselves on the Floor of the House as being against tax increases without a referendum for somebody to go around and push their green lights under the conditions that prevail here today and I would urge the Members sitting in the seats near those persons whom are not here but whose green lights are punched to push them on 'present' at least so that they won't be unfairly voted for something that they've expressed themselves as being against."

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

Calvo: "Well Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that the Gentlemen he talks about, if they were here would think they were voting on a tax without a referendum but in the event it's possible that they might, I think in fairness we should take this out of the record until we do have the attendance here."

Speaker Redmond: "I think in fairness with the sparse attendance here that's it not fair to do anything except take this out of the record."



Representative Hart."

Hart: "Well, you'd have to suspend the rules to take it out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I took it upon myself to, he didn't ask me to call it and I don't think it's fair..."

Hart: "Mr. Speaker, regardless of how it gone on the board, it was called, the rules provide that unless there's leave of the House the thing can't be put on, taken out of the record after a Roll Call has started and I object to the procedure of taking it out of the record and I believe that your decision must be within the rules."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, this is concurrence, it's an unusual situation with the sparse attendance, I would do the same thing for you Representative Hart. I have called Bill after Bill and the people were not on the Floor and technically I shouldn't go back to them but I did it to accomodate the Members and I think it is perfectly all right. I was the one that put it there, this is not Third Reading, this is concurrence and that's..."

Hart: "Well, why didn't the Gentleman make a motion to nonconcur?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well...Out of the record on 229."

Hart: "Well let...let the, let the records show, Mr. Speaker, that' you're apparent disregard for the rules of the House is objected to by me and I'd like for the Journal to so state."

Speaker Redmond: "Let the Journal so state. Is there anybody else here that has concurrence that's willing to go? 284. Where is that Representative Beatty? On nonconcurrence, Senate Bill 284. Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 284 is an Act to Appropriate money to the Local Tax Study Commission and the one Amendment on it is an Amendment that was put on by Ms. Catania. The FEPC Amendment, now it's getting late in the Session and the Co-Chairman of this Commission and I've spoken with Senator Soper, we don't wish to keep this Bill kicking around and have Conference Committees. We will be fair in every way and we won't be biased towards any particular sex, we're going to employ members of both sex on the Commission. I...We don't really want to add this...I want to recede from House Amendment #1 and have the Bill sent to the Governors desk."



Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is...Representative Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I too agree with Representative Beatty. I...ah...have supported this Amendments all the way through but I understand the Senate is going to take them off and I think when they take them off and send them back over here I think we send a Message and I agree that we should recede from House Amendment #1 on House...Senate Bill 284."

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

Ryan: "Will the Sponsor yield."

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Ryan: "Is this the FEPC, Susan Catania Amendment? Well I...Susan I see is here now but she wasn't and I was going to ask you to hold it but I don't know...They're trying to take your Amendment off Susan."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't think you were listening."

Ryan: "Well who wasn't listening?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beatty, will you explain your position."

Beatty: "As I had indicated, the Senate does not want this Amendment but I'm co-chairman of this Commission and have spoken with Senator Soper the other co-chairman and even though this Amendment is not on there we're willing certainly to be fair in every way and with our employees and we're going to hire persons of both sex. We think it's late in the Session we would like the Bill sent to the Governor. We will run the Commission properly and...ah...I think this is playing around too much with words when in effect we will be fair in running this Commission and I'd like to have this to recede from the Amendment 1 and get this sent to the Governor. I don't want to spend the rest of the year in Springfield."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "I think I understood that very well, Mr. Speaker...I think you weren't listening."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan, I think maybe you're right. The Gentleman has moved to, that the House recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 284. The question is, shall the House recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 284? All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the



record. On this question there's 92 'aye', 16 'no' and the House
recedes from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 284. 276. Representative
Merlo. 726."

Merlo: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I wish to nonconcur to
Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 726. The Amendment proposes a
ten per cent decrease in operating funds for the Department of
Insurance and of course my proposal to nonconcur is based principally
on the fact that if there ever is an agency of Illinois Government
that is operating with a low budget, it's of course, the Department
of Insurance. This agency alone brings into the State of Illinois
somewhere in the area of fifty three million dollars, however, it's
expected to operate on a budget less than four million dollars. Now,
I say this, that during these times when most of these companies, and
it's a known fact, have been on a very tight basis as far as their
funds are concerned, based on the fact that the stock market has
gone down a lot of these companies do have large stock portfolios
more than ever today, we need examiners in the Department of
Insurance and so Ladies and Gentlemen I urge you support me on
the nonconcurrency."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentlemen moved that the House nonconcur in
Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 726. All in faovr indicate
by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the House
nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 726. Representative
Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to
introduce a group of guests in the Gallery. They're a group from
Lyons township from the new regular democratic organization of
Lyons Township. They're down here with Lou D'Neff, their Committeeman,
I'd like to say hello to them."

Speaker Redmond: "647. Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.
I move to concur with the Senate Amendment to House Bill 647. It
is basically a...ah...technical error. They added an 'a' in front
of an 'or' in reprinting the Senate version and it...ah...is deleting
the 'a' and putting the 'or' back in. I move for concurrence. This
is on House Bill 647 to amend..."



Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 647? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Brinkmeier 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? On this question there's 90 'ayes', no 'nays', and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to Senate Bill... House Bill 647. What do you got?...612. Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill...I move that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 612. Ah...House Bill 612 is the Social Services Planning Act which...ah...we passed several weeks ago. Senate Amendment #1 simply brings within the purview of the Act and it poses the planning requirements of the Act under the Department of Public Health, which was not included in the original Bill. You know, it was added by the Senate Sponsor at my request and I move that we do concur."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 612. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 107 'aye', no 'nay' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 612. Representative Griesheimer on 645. Do you want that? Take that out of the record. Representative Skinner, do you want the...328?"

Skinner: "Representative Brinkmeier is going to handle that."

Speaker Redmond: "527, Representative Rigney."

Rigney: "Well Mr. Speaker, House Bill 527 if you'll recall, is the New Cattle Brand Act for the State of Illinois and the Senate by Amendment reduced the fees for registration and reregistration of brand and I move for concurrence in the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 527? All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 106 'aye', no 'nay' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 527. Representative Dyer. 696."

Dyer: "Ah...ah...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House..."



I move that the House do concur with Senate Amendment #1...ah... to House Bill 696. This simply makes it clear...ah...that the ...ah...direction should be...that the motion should be under the direction of the Supervisor in the Township in purchasing care for nursing homes."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to HOUSe Bill 696. All in favor indicate by voting 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you Mr. Speaker...ah...By way of explaining my vote and since I didn't have an opportunity to ask a question, I wonder if the Sponsor might respond in explaining her vote. There was a problem that some of us noted when this Bill passed the House and we didn't raise it as an issue because of our regards for the Sponsor of the Bill and her indication that she didn't feel it was a problem. I think she knows what I'm discussing I wonder if she might, in explaining her vote indicate whether that problem's been taken care of."

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

Dyer: "Yes Mr. Lundy, I did discuss this with the Senate Sponsor and Sponsor..."

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

Dyer: "and he seemed to feel as I've indicated my answer that the... that the overall Legislation surround...into which this sitted takes care of the licensing and inspecting problem. I'm sensitive to the problem, I'm aware and I do believe it's been taken care of."

Lundy: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there are 109 'ayes', no 'nays' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 696. 583. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Ah...Thank you Mr. Speaker. I...I move that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1. Senate Amendment #1...ah...makes some revisions...ah...mostly nonsubstantial, however, it did delete one provision that was in the House Bill and that was that the...Wine manufacturer could...ah...manufacture wine on grapes



other than grown on land owned or leased by the manufacturer. There was some problem that the liquor industry felt they had, we would, were over run by other out of state wineries. So, I'm willing to accept it and this Bill for those who don't remember is the Little Old Winemakers Bill. I move that we concur in Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 9583? All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 103 'aye', 1 'nay' and the House does con...concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 583. 635. Representative J. D. Jones. Take that out of the record. 674, Representative Tipword. Tipword."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is a Bill that's been taken out of the record now, I think four times of five times this is a bill that relates solely and only to the Police, the downstate Police and Firemen Pension Fund. The purpose of this Bill is to assure that there is uniformity of Police and Fire Pensions throughout the downstate portion of Illinois. It would, we have ran into some situations in spite of the language of the present Constitution, where the benefits of current members of Police and Fire Pensions Systems are being...are loosing some of their benefits by the fact that they're requiring earlier retirement so that they can not get the full retirement that is provided under the benefits. We've also had an instance where one of the cities is even...ah...considering borrowing funds for its needs from the Police and Fire Pension...ah...Fund for the State of Illinois. I mean of their particular system. This would provide that the laws of the State of Illinois relating to these pension funds, the benefits under them, the manner in which they are handled would be uniform because it would leave it up to the members of the General Assembly to change any of the benefits of provisions of those pension funds in any way. This would guarantee some permanency to those people who are under the downstate Police and Fire Pension Fund, it relates only to the downstate areas and it relates to all, all municipalities in which



there is a Police or Firemans Pension. I would move for concurrence with the Senate Amendment who place this Bill back in position to guarantee uniformity throughout the state. Move for concurrence."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the question? The question is, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I know that the vice-chairman of the Personnel and Pensions Committee has a deep interest in this matter. On previous occasions when it was called on a motion for concurrence he either spoke against the motion or he was prepared to speak against the motion when it was taken out of the record and I know that Representative Tipsword has taken this out of the record on several occasions already. But I would submit to you Mr. Speaker, that in the absence of the vice-chairman of the Personnel and Pensions Committee the House will be deprived of a full and fair debate on this motion which would critically effect the Pension system in downstate Illinois and I would submit to you Mr. Speaker that you should provide for that full and fair debate Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Well Mr. Speaker, I would very much like to take it out but the time grows very near and I know that you would like to get something done on this Calendar and get it completed as soon as possible...ah...the Bill has been called when the Gentleman was here. It's been called when he wasn't here...ah...this Bill is not going to have a critical effect upon the Police and Fire Pensions, except that it is going to guarantee that they're going to be there in the situation under which they are...are going to continue. The only opponents to this Bill, the only opponent is the Illinois Municipal League, who would like to have the means of playing around with and bearing and using the benefits of the Police and Fire Pension Fund in the ways that they would like to do and I think it behoves all of us here in this General Assembly to assure the Policemen and Firemen in all downstate Communities that their Pensions are uniform and they know by statutory law from this General Assembly what their Pension benefits are, what they can expect and what can be done with their...their pension funds, and how they are to be handled."

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



Tipsword: "So, After all of these delays, I would now move for concurrence."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is...Representative Schlickman... Give the Gentleman order, please."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. When the 1970 Constitution Article VII was ratified by the people of the State of Illinois, there was provided, as you know, Home Rule for certain units of local government. However, it's implicit in the local government article, more particularly the Home Rule Section that the General Assembly has the responsibility for determining when there should be a limitation upon Home Rule units. Now this Bill as amended simply provides that there shall be a uniformity, a uniformity within the operations of the downstate pension plan and more particularly a uniformity of benefits. Now this in no way, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, inhibits local governmental officials with respect to the exercise of their traditional police powers. The promotion of the Health, Welfare Safety morals of the citizens they represent at the local level. I think it should be the policy, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House that there be a uniformity in the operation of downstate Pension Plan and in a uniformity in the Pension Benefits levels. Now, certainly this is important for those employees who move from one unit to another so that they can be assured that they can pick up where they left off and it ill, in sense, protect municipal officials by their operation of these funds. So, I would join with the Gentleman in encouraging and soliciting an 'aye' vote with respect to concurring to the Senate Amendment of House Bill 674 with the satisfaction that we will be performing in accordance with the intent that is contained in the local governmental article of the 1970 Constitution."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Simply stated, House Bill 674 would restrict the ability of the downstate Pension Funds to determine whether there should be increased benefits or to determine whether there should be decreased benefits. It therefore, the Bill would restrict the ability of the Pension Fund to move in two directions. The one direction which would relate to decreasing benefits is covered under the Constitution which provides that no Pension rights or benefits shall be reduced or restricted by any action



of a local Pension Fund. Therefore, the one aspect of the Bill is Constitutionally protected. Therefore, it leaves the other aspect of the Bill, which is the ability of the downstate Pension Funds to increase benefits. So today we are saying to the Pension Funds, 'No, you don't know what's good for the annuitants in your system, we know what is good and therefore we are going to restrict your ability to provide for the retirement incomes and the retirement benefits which shall be enjoyed by your people.' With all due respect to the Sponsor and he has been entirely gracious in this matter. I would request a 'no' vote on this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We have statewide retirement systems. Let's just use the Teachers Retirement as an example. Can you imagine today taking that system and tearing it up so that each of the local school districts could decide what they wanted to do and didn't want to do? It's ludicrous on it's face...ah...If we need anything in these two retirement systems, we need uniformity, we need uniformity of benefits and the /^{annuitants} of those systems and...ah...the beneficiaries of those systems need to know that those systems are...are going to be there. These two systems are probably the systems with which we ought to be most concerned and this particular Bill addresses something that should have been addressed over the five terms that I've been here and I'm pleased to see that we're where we are on this issue and I would solicit an 'aye' vote for this very significant piece of Legislation."

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

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House....ah... Once again, I would like to...ah...solicit a 'no' vote on this concurrence. I simply think that this Bill is simply another erosion of the...ah...Home Rule powers. They presently do have the protection under the Constitution and I have not...ah...personally witnessed any abuses of this privilege and I would ure a 'no' vote on this concurrence."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further questions? Representative Tipsword."



Tipword: "I'm delighted that the vice-chairman of the Pension Laws Commission...or...the Pension Committee is back and I appreciate his remarks, but I agree wholeheartedly with what Representative Hoffman has said to us just previously. That it would be a ludicrous situation to have differing Pension Systems in each one of the municipalities in the State of Illinois. I think we need this uniformity. This is not anything that is going to limit Home Rule, really, unless Home Rule has some desire to...to say to the Policemen and Firemen in their areas, 'We would like to have the control of the use of your Pension Funds, we would like to vary you Pension Benefits different than other people.' we have no, have had no difficulty on these Pension Laws and these Pension Funds in coming to the General Assembly and making those changes that are needed from time to time so that the Policemen and Firemen in downstate Illinois have a Pension Fund upon which they can rely, because they know they have Pension Benefits and look to the statutes and see what those benefits are going to be. Once we, if we do not pass this we're going to have the situation of those few Home Rule units in downstate Illinois having the opportunity to change those things all around and increase and decrease benefits, as has been said. ...ah...To use the funds and do what they will and to have a multiplicity of downstate State Police and Firemen Pension Funds and Benefits. I think for the purpose of uniformity to assure these people who are in these jobs what they have that they can look to one place, the General Assembly to provide their benefits or their changes. I would urge the Members of this body to concur with the Senate, which voted 54 to nothing in support of the Bill in this version and 2 'present'. So I believe we can follow the lead of the Senate and concur with this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 274? All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Ah, yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House...ah... in explaining my 'yes' vote, I would just like to...ah...statistically bring some of you people up to date on why this is a good piece of



Legislation and just quoting from the 1975 report of examination of the Public Employees Pension Fund, which is a very late publication by the Department of Insurance and for the benefit of you who are not familiar, there are four hundred and forty Police and Fire Funds outside of the City of Chicago. Now two hundred and sixty of these are Police Funds and a hundred and eighty are Fire and...ah...twenty seven per cent, twenty seven per cent of these have fifteen members, participants or less and fifty six per cent have twenty five participants or less. Now...ah...there is local control of these boards but I will quote right out of the Department of Insurance observations and it says, 'It is within this operational framework where the majority of the problems exist which confront this large group of deversified funds, not the least of which includes the lack of uniformity in interpreting Provisions of the Pension Code itself.' Now, due to their organizational structure there are many problems which result ⁱⁿ the division...ah...within the Department of Insurance has over the years focused a majority of its examination activities towards this...ah...four hundred and forty funds and I would say that...ah...a 'yes' vote on this would be the best thing that could happen in terms of...ah...the Insurance in conformity with the Constitution that these ...ah...benefits that they'll be receiving when they retire the participants, will not be reduced and if there is some continuity as far as the funds themselves and I would certainly encourage a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen I would like to plead with this General Assembly to take into consideration the needs of the downstate Police and Firemen. They need to know what they have in their Pension Benefits, they need to know what kind of funds they have and what kind of control and direction they have and we have one place, the General Assembly of the State of Illinois to give them that lead and only one place that they need to look to. This will not effect the...the Chicago Police or Firemen in any respect but it does effect this



multiplicity of Police and Fire Benefits that we have scattered all throughout downstate Illinois and they need this right to uniformity, they need this right to know what their benefits are going to be. They need the assurance of the State Statutes of the State of Illinois, that their benefits are going to be one thing and one thing only unless changed by this one body and not as would have...would take place if a multiplicity of four hundred and forty different municipalities were decreasing and increasing their benefits. Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes Mr. Speaker, Parliamentary Inquiry. How many votes does this take? Just 89?"

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, if we go to a Roll Call at this time I intend to request a verification so I would ask that those who are voting switches either refrain or vote the people that you voted 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "This requires 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Tipsword. The Clerk will take the record. Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes I...I would like to speak on this Bill. Once again, as I mentioned before, this Bill was brought before a Committee, it was amended, it went back to the Senate and the Senate went and took off that same Amendment. Now, again for those of you downstate, this is simply again an erosion of your Home Rule power. Now the present statute covers ...ah...the...ah...Constitution does cover that there will not be any diminishment of Pension Benefits and I...ah...If I do recall this Bill was not approved by the Pension Laws Commission and I would those...would urge those of you who are voting in favor of this to reconsider what you are doing and...ah... if there is a time that this particular area does need attention, I think it could be brought at some other date, but at the present time I don't see any need for this Bill and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "I...I'd like to ask the Gentleman that spoke last...ah...a question if the rules permit to be bent a little bit."



Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Hart: "Ah...Representative Terzich...ah...I don't understand what your objection is to it. What...What's wrong with this Bill."

Terzich: "Well the...the problem is that these funds have been...ah...operating...ah...successfully as...at the present time. There has been some mention that some people have had some benefits taken away from them but this has never been to my knowledge and...ah...it has not been approved by the Pension Laws Commission. I'm simply against taking some more Home Rule powers away...ah...that there are a substantial number of problems and I think that they should have...ah...enough authority to act independently without any further additional Legislation put upon them."

Hart: "Well, would it be possible, under this Legislation for there to be more expertise in the...in the...ah...management of the Trust Fund?"

Terzich: "Well I would think that the...ah...municipality has sufficient people that are...ah...knowledgable enough to handle the fund. I think the municipalities can do a good job."

Hart: "Who ordinarily does that in a municipality?...Some of the local Policemen or Firemen themselves?"

Terzich: "I believe that some of them may be on the board...I...really don't know who it does consist of..."

Hart: "And...and really in my area, I don't believe that many of them have any expertise about managing Pension Funds...ah...I understand your objection to it but...ah...It seems to me and I've had a lot of discussions with Mayors and people on City Councils and others about this thing...that...ah...although this would have some...ah...diminution of local control...ah...the...ah...it's possible, advantages of better management, accumulative investments and better returns on the Funds...ah...Trusts, seem to me to outweigh the objections that have been expressed by you and I understand your reservations if the Pension Laws Commission isn't for it, I understand your position that you, espouse here on the Floor of the House. But, I...I...I believe that this is a Bill that really is long overdue and...ah...with the amount of money that's accumulating now in these funds I think that we need to go to a better system of



management and I would urge the Members to adopt this concurrence Amendment."

Terzich: "Well, I would mention that all of these benefits are available all of these funds through the Department of Insurance they can avail themselves to all of these...ah...procedures, they can get the expertise from the Department of Insurance at the present time. They can definitely do that right now."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Please switch me from 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from 'no', to 'aye'.

Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I believe the switches are closed. I'd like to be recorded as 'no'."

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

Jones: "'Aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "J. D. Representative Younge, Representative Leinenweber and Representative Steele have requested to be recorded as 'aye'. Representative Brandt...Brandt 'no'. White 'no'. How many have we got Mr. Clerk? 115 'ayes' 24 'nays', 2 'present'. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I've been trying to reach your attention perhaps you didn't see my light. May I explain my vote please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Go ahead."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I am not only persuaded to vote 'aye' on this Bill because of the need for uniformity of operations in the downstate pension Police and Fire Pension Plan and the uniformity in benefits but I'm also persuaded Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, by the fact that this Bill was reported out as amended by our own Committee on Personnel and Pension by 15 to nothing. It was voted out of this House by a vote of 132 to 2. It was reported out of the Senates Pension, Personnel and Veterans Affairs Committee by a vote of 6 to nothing and was passed by the Senate by a vote of 54 to nothing and I should say Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, as I look at the Board, I am not persuaded by the fact



that all but one of the 'no' votes is from the City of Chicago and it would not be effected by the passage of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "115. Representative Madigan. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker on our count we have 15 people in the first column alone voted 'aye' and they are not in the Chamber and I request a verification of the Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd. Representative Mudd 'no'. The Gentleman has requested a verification of the Roll Call. The Clerk will verify the affirmative Roll Call. The Clerk will call the absentees."

Fred Selcke: "Arnell, Gene Barnes..."

Speaker Redmond: "Maybe the simplest way here would be to dump this Roll Call and have a new one Dump the Roll Call. All in favor vote 'aye, opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Ah...Yes, I'd like to explain my vote once again. I ...ah...would encourage everyone to join with me and vote 'yes' and I also am a Member of the Municipal Problems Commission and I've consulted with...ah...one of the vice-chairmen of that Commission, Representative Bluthardt and to the best of our knowledge I know the statement was made in the, that the Illinois Municipal League was in opposition to this. Well to the best of my knowledge, unless...ah...Representative Terzich has received some communication in the last day or two...ah...I'm completely unaware of this but I just think that a 'yes' vote is an absolute must in terms of bringing some uniformity and some common sense into these four hundred and forty different funds and I would encourage a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker...ah...Since we've dumped the Roll Call, in explaining my vote I'd like to point out to everybody that this is, is supported by the Taxpayers Federation, by the Department of Insurance, which is the one that gives direction to these...these funds, it is a Bill of the downstate Policemen and of the downstate Firemen, this is a Bill that will effect



only the downstate Firemen and Policemen and you will be serving their interests if you will concur with the action of the Senate on this Bill in keeping this kind of assurance just where it is right now. That the General Assembly is the body that they look to for changes in...in their Pension System and not to four hundred and four different communities with all kinds of different demands on their Pension Fund and upon their time. I...I thank those who are voting green and I urge more to do so."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, I was off the Floor when the switches were open for a new Roll Call. I'd like to be voted 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "It's still open Representative Griesheimer."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. In explaining my vote, I'm a member of the Pension Committee. I carried 90 per cent of the downstate Firemens Pension Bills this year along with the Pension Bills for the State Police and I'm not in favor of this Bill and I hope it doesn't pass because I think it's going to set the stage for the same type of an Amendment that Representative Ebbesen tried to put on to a couple Pension Bills this year. We're going to be in a position to levy taxes on a local level to assure that all of these Pension Funds are uniform and I tell you that it's a bad Bill and I hope you would change your minds."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The switch is open Representative Youngie if you want to vote. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 112 'aye', 26 'no' Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Verification of Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker: "The Gentleman has requested a verification of the Roll Call. Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "May we have a poll of the absentees please."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will poll the absentees."

Fred Selcke: "Gene Barnes, Caldwell, Capuzi, Catania, Collins, Darrow, Epton, Ewell, Fleck, Garmisa, Greiman, Hill, Hirschfeld, Huff, Katz, Kelly, Kent, Kucharski, Leverenz, Mann, Maragos, McAuliffe, McCourt, Palmer, Peters, Pierce, Pouncey...Pouncey 'no'. Capuzi 'aye'."



Representative Taylor...ah...Rose."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be recorded as voting 'no'."

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

Fred Selcke: "Stearney, Stubblefield, Washington, Yourell."

Speaker Redmond: "Verify the affirmative Roll Call."

Fred Selcke: "Anderson, Jane Barnes, Beaupre, Berman, Birchler,
Bluthardt..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birchler, for what reason do you
rise?"

Fred Selcke: "We're verifying the 'aye' votes Mr. Birchler.

Bluthardt, Borchers, Boyle, Bradley, Brinkmeier, Brummet,
Byers, Calvo, Campbell, Capuzi, Carroll, Chapman, Choate,
Coffey, Craig, Cunningham, Daniels, Deavers, Deuster,
DiPrima, Downs, Duff, John Dunn, Ralph Dunn, Dyer, Ebbesen,
Ewing, Fennessey, Flinn, Friedland, Friedrich, Gaines,
Geo-Karis, Getty, Giorgi, Griesheimer, Grotberg, Hanahan,
Hart, Gene Hoffman, Ron Hoffman, J. Houlihan, Hudson, Jacobs,
Jaffe, Dave Jones, Kane, Keller, Kempiners, Klosak, LaFleur,
Lauer, Leinenweber, Londrigan, Lucco, Luft, Lundy, Macdonald,
Mahar, Marovitz, Matijeovich, Mautino, McAvoy, McClain, McGrew,
McMaster, Miller, Mugalian, Mulcahey, Neff, O'Daniel, Polk,
Porter, Randolph, Rayson, Reed, Richmond, Rigney, Ryan,
Sangmeister, Satterthwaite, Schisler, Schlickman, Schneider,
Schoeberlein, Schraeder, Schuneman, Sevcik, Sharp, Simms,
Skinner, E. G. Steele, Cissy Stiehl, Stone, Telcser, Tipsword,
Totten, Tuerk, VonBoeckman, Waddell, Wall, Walsh, Washburn,
Willer, Winchester, Younge, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, I don't believe I'm recorded and I'd like
to be recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Representative
Hill. For what purpose do you rise? Record Representative
Hill as 'aye'. Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, I wanted to be recorded as 'aye' and verified
if I could. I need to go over to the Senate."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Representative



Madigan, any questions of the affirmative Roll Call?"

Madigan: "Mr. Boyle..."

Speaker Redmond: "116 is the beginning here."

Madigan: "Mr. Boyle."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Boyle on the Roll Call? Is he here?"

Take him off."

Madigan: "Mr. Campbell."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's that?"

Madigan: "Campbell."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell, is he here? Yes, he is."

Madigan: "Choate...Mr. Choate."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Choate. He's in the back they tell me.

There he is."

Madigan: "Mr. Craig."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Craig. Is he in the Chamber? How is he recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "'Aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Take him off."

Madigan: "Mr. Cunningham."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham. How's he recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "'Aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Take him off."

Madigan: "Mr. Daniels."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels. How's he recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "'Aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Take him off."

Madigan: "Mr. Deuster."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster, is he in the Chamber. How is he recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "'Aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Take him off."

Madigan: "Mr...ah...Ralph Dunn."

Speaker Redmond: "Ralph Dunn? How's he recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "'Aye'."

Madigan: "Mr. Fennessey."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Fennessey. How is he recorded?"



Fred Selcke: "'Aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Take him off."

Madigan: "Mr. Gaines."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Madigan: "Mr. Giorgi."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi, how's he recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "'Aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Take him off."

Madigan: "Ron Hoffman."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Madigan: "Mr. J. D. Jones."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones? J. D. He's here. The back of the hall."

Madigan: "Mr. Keller."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keller, is he here? How's he recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "'Aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Keller, yeah, take him off. Ralph Dunn has returned put him back on."

Madigan: "Mr. Kempiners."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Madigan: "LaFleur."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative LaFleur. Is he here? Take him off."

Madigan: "Mahar."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar's here."

Madigan: "McAvoy."

Speaker Redmond: "McAvoy is here."

Madigan: "McLean."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Madigan: "McGrew."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McGrew, is he here? How is he recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "'Aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Take him off. Representative Kent for what purpose do you rise?"

Kent: "How am I recorded Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is the Lady recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "The Lady is recorded as being 'absent'."



Kent: "Please vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the Lady 'aye'."

Madigan: "Rigney."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rigney? Here he is."

Madigan: "Sharp."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Madigan: "Skinner."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner is here. Representative LaFleur has returned put him back on, did we take Representative Cunningham off? Put him back on, he's here."

Madigan: "Telcser. Totten."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten, is he here? Yes, he's here."

Madigan: "Tuerk."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tuerk? He's here."

Madigan: "VonBoeckman."

Speaker Redmond: "VonBoeckman? How's he recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "'Aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Take him off."

Madigan: "Winchester."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Winchester? Is he here? Winchester. How's he recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "'Aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Take him off."

Madigan: "Younge."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge, is she here? How's she recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "'Aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Take her off."

Madigan: "Marovitz."

Speaker Redmond: "Who was that Marovitz? Representative Marovitz, is he here? Take him off."

Madigan: "Willer."

Speaker Redmond: "She's here. Deuster's returned, put him on. Daniels has returned, put him back on."

Madigan: "James Houlihan."

Speaker Redmond: "James Houlihan? How is he recorded?"



Fred Selcke: "Ah...The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Take him off."

Madigan: "Londrigan."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Londrigan. I saw him a minute ago. He's right next to you. Representative Stubblefield? Was Representative Stubblefield taken off?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Vote him 'aye'. Representative VonBoeckman has returned. Put him back on. Representative Giorgi, was he removed? Put him back on. Representative McCourt. For what purpose do you rise?"

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker How am I recorded?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is the Gentleman recorded? McCourt."

Fred Selcke: "McCourt? The Gentleman is recorded as being 'absent'."

McCourt: "Please record me 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Representative Rose."

Rose: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not recorded, I'd like to be recorded 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record him as 'aye'. Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not recorded and would like to be recorded as 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record him as 'aye'. Representative Calvo has requested that he be verified, he has an urgent call. Any objections? Did we take Representative Choate off? I think we did didn't we? Did we remove him?"

Fred Selcke: "No we did not remove him."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Any further questions? Representative Madigan? What's the score Mr. Clerk? No more. On this question there are 112 'ayes', 28 'nays', the Bill having received...or.. the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 674 and it has received the required Constitutional Majority of 107 votes. 705. Representative Reed."

Reed: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I move that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 705. It's a technical Amendment it dealt with the language of the Bill where referred to city Library Districts instead of Public Library Districts, which was the true intent of the Bill. I move for concurrence please."



Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 705? All in favor, vote 'aye'. Opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there are 104 'aye', no 'nay' and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 705. 707. Representative Tipword. Record Representative Tipword as 'aye' on that one. Is Giorgi in the Chambers? Representative Davis, on 731. 731. Fair Employment Practices. Representative Davis."

Davis: "Ah..... I've just been handed this. This is the Fair Employment Practices Bill. Al Jordon hasn't been down here. I don't know what he thinks about it, but its been cut the usual six percent, and I move to concur in the Senate Amendment. If the ah..... Director isn't here, the Director don't think enough of it, so I move to concur in it."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and #2 to House Bill 731. Those in favor, vote 'aye'....."

Davis: "Instead of issuing press releases, he ought to be here to talk about the cut that the Fair Employment Practices gets, but he isn't here."

Speaker Redmond: "Those in favor, vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there are 114 'ayes', no 'nay', and the House concurs in Senate Amendments #1 and #2 to House Bill 731. 735. Representative White.

White: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 737."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the House concur with Senate Amendments #1 and #2 to House Bill 731? 735. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Would the Gentleman explain the Senate Amendments?"

Speaker Redmond: "Explain the Amendments, please."

White: "Ah..... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, will you take it out of the Record for a Moment."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the Record. 741. Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Senate Amendment #1, this clears up some ambiguity in the House Amendment to House Bill 741 and



I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Any discussion? Question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 741? All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the Record. On this question,, there are 103 'aye', no 'nay' and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 741. 756. Representative Walsh. 756. Representative Stubblefield."

Stubblefield: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, these are two technical amendments that implement the administration to make the Bill administratively possible by the Secretary of State's office. Establishes a more acceptable ah.... effective date and I would move concurrence."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Gentleman has moved the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 756. The question is, shall the House concur? All in favor, vote 'aye'. Opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there are 119 'aye', no 'nay', and the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 756. Representative White."

White: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 735 is not my Bill. It was a typographical error."

Speaker Redmond: "Who has 735?"

White: "Larry DiPrima."

Speaker Redmond: "Senate Bills, Third Readings, Second Reading, rather. 241."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 241. Bill for an Act in relation to transportation of law enforcement officers by metropolitan transit authority. Second Reading of the Bill. This Bill has been read a second time and Amendment #1 was tabled. Now, got Amendment #2, Kornowicz. Amend Senate Bill 241, page 1, by deleting lines 1 and 2 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kornowicz. The question of the germaness of this Amendment has been raised, and I have consulted the transcript, and I have ruled on that previously and held that it was germane."

Kornowicz: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Ladies and Gentlemen, I move for the adoption of Amendment 2. This is actually the Peoples Amendment. It's an Amendment to fill the vacancies of the 7 Members of the Committee at the present time. There are five vacancies.... there



are five and there's two vacancies. There's one deceased and then one vacant. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think what we ought to do with regards to this Bill, of course, is to vote 'no'. But we also should take into account the history of this Bill. This was a Bill that was introduced in the Senate. It was passed by the Senate. It came to us, amending the Chicago Transit Authority Act, to simply provide, to simply provide that employees of the Cook County Sheriff's Department shall have free ride on Chicago Transit Authority vehicles. That's the way the Bill came to us. Read a first time and sent to Committee and reported out with a recommendation do pass. Previously, at Second Reading, there was an amendment offered that went from that subject matter to an entirely different, unrelated subject matter. That subject matter being the appointment of the Members of the CTA Board. Specifically providing, in that Amendment #1, that"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Point of Order, Mr. Speaker, the question is, the adoption of Amendment #2 and the Gentleman is not addressing himself to the Amendment. Would he confine his remarks to the Amendment?"

Speaker Redmond: "Confine your remarks to the Amendment."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, what I'm trying to do is inform the Body what's contained in here, because the Sponsor has not seen fit to explain to the Body what is contained in this Amendment, and I'm simply leading up to that, and I think that if this Body is going to be a deliberative Body, it's got to know what is contained in this Bill as it came to us and what has happened to the Body previously so that we have an understanding of our present posture. This Amendment, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, amends a different subject matter within the Act to provide that the Mayor of the City of Chicago, his appointments will have to be acted upon within 15 days by the Governor of the State. And that was Amendment #1, and it was defeated resoundingly by a margin 2 to 1. Now, being persistent and wanting to pursue a political objective and goal, an Amendment has come up, Amendment #2 that would provide as a sop, if you will, that the Mayor has to act



within fifteen days upon appointment by the Governor. Now Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have a great deal of respect for the Chicago Transit Authority and its responsibilities and I have great appreciation for the burden that lies upon the Mem...the Board Members of the C.T.A. and I very, very much respect and appreciate the necessity of having good competent people on that board. But I don't appreciate Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, restricting the Governor or the Mayor to only fifteen days in which to approve or disapprove and if there's no action an automatic approval. We don't require the Senate Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, by law, to act within a given time on a nonination by the Governor, we don't require anywhere in the statutes that there be a limited time. Fifteen days just isn't sufficient to go into the qualifications competency, background of individuals who are appointed to this responsible position. Now we have here in Amendment #2 a device for attempting to secure directly what they couldn't do indirectly and that was in Amendment #1. It's a sham, it's political in nature and I'm just sorry, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House that the valuable time of this House is being taken up with such a bad Amendment and I urge its defeat."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, you have ruled this as germane and I have respect for you and I feel that you're right and that shouldn't be brought up by means of argument. There's a way of bringing it up and it wasn't challenged. Now on House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 241. Long before I was in the Legislature I think long before you were, Mr. Speaker, there was a compromise arrived at, a compromise arrived at which seems to me somewhat ridiculous but it was before our time where the Governor had certain appointments to the C.T.A. and the Mayor had certain appointments and each one had to approve the appointments of the other. Well that's not exactly efficient government to me but that compromise was made and we've had to live with it. Now we find that a very important body of government a very important municipal corporation has been hampered and hamstrung in its operation by the refusal of one of the parties to approve or disapprove the nominee which is the right of the other party and let's



be frank the Mayor has made a nomination, it seems to me on the service to be very well qualified and the Governor has sat on it for no apparent good reason except about some extraneous non germane reason, the cross town expressway or some other reason that has nothing to do with the C.T.A. So I think this Amendment, this Amendment attempts to correct a ...a rather difficult situation that has arisen because one of the two parties here of the Governor has not, has not confirmed or denied appointments that are the right of the Mayor to make. Now the Amendment #1 was somewhat questionable in that it required the Mayor...the Governor to within fifteen days approve the appointment of the Mayor, otherwise it became final. Now Representative Kornowicz has taken that Amendment out and now with Amendment 2 he has solved the situation by adding equity. By having fairness to approve the Governor's appointment in fifteen days otherwise it becomes final or the Governor to appoint the Mayor's appointment...approve the Mayor's appointment in fifteen days otherwise they become final. If it were up to me, if it were up to me, I'd like each one make his appointments and not make them subject to the approval of the other but that is in the statutes, it's been there since long before we were in the Legislature and I would say this, that is in exactly that 1945 provision is not exactly provide for efficient government but at least Representative Kornowicz's Amendment addresses itself to a serious problem as there is and, and made it a...ah...and made it a provision that we could live with still giving the veto power but limiting it to fifteen days because we can't tie up and paralyze government and for that reason I'm going to support the Representative from in the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 241."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Deuster: "Ah...I'm wondering...ah...Representative Kornowicz...ah..."

The Law as it now stands does provide that both the Governor and



Mayor must approve of each others appointments. What is the rational and the reasoning for that...ah...Is it your judgment that this is to be a proforma and perfunctory matter and that no exercise of judgment or review of the qualifications is involved or do you think the purpose of the statute is so that the Governor would have an opportunity to look over the Mayors and the Mayor would have an opportunity to review the qualifications? What is your understanding of the rational for the existing statute?"

Kornowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the only, the thing that I'm very much interested is...In the, the two vacancies and the vacancies, the submission of the, one of the members of the...the committee was submitted to the Governor and...ah...there's no action's been taken. In regards to the Members of the Committee, there is three Members that's been appointed by the Governor on which they're acting, there's two Members that are appointed by the Mayor and there is two vacancies and I feel they can not operate properly unless the vacancies are approved."

Deuster: "Yes...I don't know if that answers my question but the second question is the. At what time does the time start running...ah... now is there any requirement that the, that the Governor be given a certified letter or something or when, when does the time, as the fifteen days, when does that fifteen days start running or when does the Governor first find out that the Mayor's made an appointment so he can...ah...have a study of the man's qualifications and look him over?"

Kornowicz: "After approval of the Bill. The Amendment."

Deuster: "No, that's not...that's not...I don't think that's accurate. Maybe you didn't understand my question. I'm saying suppose the Bill goes into effect and then next year the Mayor makes an appointment or somebody dies or resigns, say it's January 1st or let's say February 1st, 76 and the appointment is made. I'm saying under your proposal the Governor has fifteen days to act and I'm saying at what point, when does that fifteen days begin running? How is that provided for in your Amendment?"

Kornowicz: "It's ...in regard to the time of the appointment."



Deuster: "I didn't hear your answer."

Kornowicz: "At the time of the appointment."

Deuster: "Well Representative Schlickman just handed me the Amendment and it doesn't say at the time of the appointment. It says after the receipt of it."

Kornowicz: "Well that's the same thing isn't it?"

Deuster: "I don't think so. If the Mayor called me and said I'm appointing you to the C.T.A. Board and then a week later the Secretary types out a letter and they mail it to the Governor. This time appointed is the day, but the time the Governor hears about it is next week or whenever the U. S. Postal Service delivers the letter. So what is it? When does the time run...start running?"

Kornowicz: "After the time of the receipt."

Deuster: "The receipt. All right. Thank you Mr...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leon."

Leon: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of this House. I wish to speak to the Amendment, I am in favor of it and I'd like to remind this Body that in the past years, since 1945, there have been many men appointed by both the Mayor of Chicago and the Governor of Illinois to the C.T.A. Board. Their qualifications were never questioned by the other. They were automatically endorsed and approved by the other person and the one making the appointment. The other day on the Floor of this House when the original Amendment #1 was presented the opponents to the Amendment said what is there is there, why don't you have the Mayor be given only fifteen days to approve the appointment of the Governors appointee. Mr. Kornowicz should be applauded he took that Bill back, amended it with Amendment #2 and conformed it to the requirements and the requests of the other side of the opposition. I think this Amendment is very worthy of our consideration, it is one that will clarify a situation which is in need of clarification and I ^{heartily} endorse the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House...The question has

been stated very well by Representative Pierce. The statute



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

at the present time provides that four of the appointments to the Board of the Chicago Transit Authority shall be made by the Mayor with the approval of the Governor and that the other three appointments shall be made by the Governor with the approval of the Mayor. Unfortunately at the time of the drafting of the statute, provision was not made for a situation where one of the parties to the appointive process would decline to act either favorably or unfavorably upon the appointment of another. This Amendment attempts to cure this defect in the law and provide that in the event that one of the parties of the appointive process decides or declines to take action, why then the appointive process will operate automatically so that if he does not wish to disapprove the appointment shall be approved automatically. I think that this is a good Amendment, it is intended to facilitate the efficient and the economical operation of Government and I would suggest an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan. Do you desire to be recognized?"

Houlihan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Houlihan: "Ah...When this Amendment and now the Legislation, if it passed the House and the Senate would this refer to all future appointments?"
Speaker..."

Kornowicz: "Yes."

Houlihan: "Well in other words, the particular situation that we're dealing with that developed this concern where...ah...Mr. Soloway was nominated by the Mayor and Governor has...ah...asked him to provide some information so that he can make a responsible decision on the appropriateness of his appointment would not be effected by this Legislation. Is that correct?"

Kornowicz: "Well, I mean we're asking for the, to fill the two vacancies that are occurring at the present time. Jim you understand, I mean after all the Governors got three men that's been appointed and the Mayor is suppose to have four and according to...to the present time we have two vacancies on the board and this is what we're asking. We're not asking for anything different. We included the Mayor previously, it was, my Amendment was knocked out because I just had the



Governor and now we felt that we would satisfy all the Members in the House and we included the Mayor, in regards to Amendment 2."

Houlihan: "But in response to my question, this would re...apply only to the future appointments, is that correct?"

Kornowicz: "That's right."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you ready for the question? The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 241. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. Unable to determine. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 96 'aye', 42 'nay' and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 348."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 348. Beaupre. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Liquor Control Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. Three Committee Amendments. Committee Amendment #2 was tabled in Committee evidently, Committee Amendment #1 amends Senate Bill 348 on page 1, line 10 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House...ah... The Appropriations Committee Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 348...ah... restored the funds...ah...cut in the Senate...ah...Appropriations Committee and I move the adoption of Committee Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 348. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Committee Amendment #2 was tabled in Committee. Committee Amendment #3, amends Senate Bill 348 on page 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre."

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



Amendment #3 is a...an Amendment which I do not oppose. It is the so called, Catania Amendment...ah...and I would move its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 348. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The Amendment's lost. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 629."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 629..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kozubowski here? Take it out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. 635. Representative Barnes, take that out of the record. 683."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 683. Williams. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Department of Transportation. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment. Amends Senate Bill 683, as amended on page 7 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Well thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move for the adoption of...ah...House Committee Amendment 1."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions?"

Williams: "Ah...As I recall it was thirty five thousand for the Saline River, I don't have a copy of the Amendment but in Appropriations it seems to me that's what it did, adds thirty five thousand for the Saline..."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 683. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #2. Mr. Williams this is the one you had marked 1. It's Floor Amendment #2. Amends Senate Bill 683 as amended on page 7 by inserting between line 26 and 27 immediately preceding Section 2, the following, Kaskaskia River navigation, one hundred and twenty nine thousand and three hundred and so forth."

Williams: "The Amendment #2 is a Departmental Amendment. It does not change any dollars. It was in the budget here for three hundred and seventy-seven thousand three hundred from Bonds...ah...CDB and it was found that salaries and so forth for payment of State share



construction costs and so forth could not be taken out of bonds. So what this does is it breaks out one hundred and twenty nine thousand, three hundred to the General Revenue Fund and retains out of bonds, two hundred and forty eight thousand. The dollars are the same but...ah...the one twenty nine three hundred is out of GRF and two forty eight out of CDB. I move the adoption of Amendment #2."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, has moved the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 683. Discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Schlickman: "This Bill originally provided for an appropriation of seventy two thousand which I assume was from the General Revenue Fund?"

Williams: "Out of the...ah...I mean, as it was originally introduced?"

Schlickman: "It originally provided for seventy two thousand out of the General Revenue Fund?"

Williams: "For this project?"

Schlickman: "Well for the flooding...for the studying..."

Williams: "This is for the Kaskaskia River..."

Schlickman: "No...I'm...What I'm trying to lead up to, I'm trying to find out what this Bill now provides, or would provide with your Amendment #2 in respect to funds out of the General Revenue Fund. I'm trying to get a total."

Williams: "Ah...All right. As it came over and as you know I just got this yesterday and so I'm trying to put the thing together here. As the Bill came over here from the Senate with...ah... 8 Senate Amendments in appropriation. The amount now is...ah... twenty million, nine hundred and ninety-seven thousand three hundred for fifty-nine projects. Four million four hundred and seventy thousand was from the General Revenue."

Schlickman: "Thank you very much."

Matijevich: "Any...No further discussion? Representative Williams to close."

Williams: "I move the adoption of Amendment #2."



Matijevid: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved the adoption of Amendment #2 to House...ah...Senate Bill 683. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no' and the Amendment #2 is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Williams. Amends Senate Bill 683...ah... as amended on page 6 by striking lines 16 through 21."

Matijevid: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Williams on Floor Amendment #3."

Williams: "Amendment #3, again, is a...a Departmental Amendment agreed to by the Sponsors here or the Representatives from the Decatur area. It's in the budget for fifty thousand dollars for the City of Decatur to do a study on an alternate water supply. The amount of fifty thousand was not needed so this is actually a reduction of twenty five thousand and I move the adoption of Amendment #3."

Matijevid: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 683. There being no further dis...no discussion, all in favor say 'aye, opposed 'no'. Amendment #3 is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Matijevid: "Third Reading. With leave of the House we passed over Senate Bill 632, Representative Byers now desires that to be called. Read Senate Bill 632."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 632. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Bureau of the Budget. Second Reading of the Bill."

Matijevid: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Byers."

Byers: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. There were three Committee Amendments to this Bill."

Matijevid: "Just a minute..."

Jack O'Brien: "Three Committee Amendments. Amend...Amendment #1, amends Senate Bill 632 on page 6 line 7 and so forth."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker..."

Matijevid: "Representative Byers on Amendment #1."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, Members of the House...ah... Committee Amendment #1 is an Amendment to provide for administration of summer employment program for...ah...under employed youth in the



State of Illinois. This...ah...is a thought that it's necessary by the Federal Government and it was just signed into last week...into law by President Ford and this is going to provide seven people to administer this program for the summer. This fifty eight thousand dollars and I would move for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 632."

Matijevec: "The Gentleman from Madison has moved the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 632. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion all in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no' and Amendment #1 is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Amends Senate Bill 632 on page 7 line 27 and so forth."

Matijevec: "Representative Byers on Amendment #2."

Byers: "Amendment #2 is also a Committee Amendment that was adopted...ah...President Ford signed two weeks ago a supplemental appropriation allotting Federal Funds to improve the installation of in...of homes for low income residents and...ah...this is the anticipated share of Illinois money, two hundred and twelve thousand dollars and I would move for the adoption of Committee Amendment #2."

Matijevec: "Representative Byers has moved the adoption of Committee Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 632. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, That's Committee Amendment #3 that he just explained. Committee Amendment #2 is for two hundred and twenty-one thousand, seven hundred and thirty-six dollars for the Department of Personnel for skill placement programming evaluation of the program in development of manpower areas. I move for the adoption."

Matijevec: "Amendment #2, the Committee Amendment has been moved adoption by Representative Lechowicz. Is there any discussion? All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay', the 'ayes' have it. Committee Amendment #3."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #3, amends Senate Bill 632 by inserting after line 8 on page 10 of Section 5(a) and so forth."

Matijevec: "Now this is the one that you've already discussed, Representative Byers. Moves the adoption of Committee Amendment



#3. There being no discussion, all in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay' and Committee Amendment #3 is adopted."

Jack O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Matijevich: "No further Amendments? Third Reading. Senate Bill 751."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 751. Porter. A Bill for an Act to amend the Public Community College Act. Second Reading of the Bill."

Matijevich: "That's an error on the Calendar. That should be on Third Reading. Thank you Representative Porter. Senate Bill 1057. Is Representative Meyre on the Floor?"

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1057. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment. Amends Senate Bill Amendment..Amends Senate Bill 1057 on page 1, line...and so forth."

Porter: "Could you take that out of the record please, I don't have the Fiscal Note yet."

Matijevich: "Take Senate Bill 1057 out of the record. I understand 1250 is not being called. Is that right, Representative Shea? 1250 you want to hold for a while? All right...ah...1492."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1492. Kosinski. A Bill for an Act to amend an act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Capitol Development Board. Second Reading of the Bill. This Bill was read a Second time previously and held. Amendment #1 was tabled, Amendment #2, Kosinski. Amends Senate Bill 1492 as amended on page 1, line 27 by deleting five million one hundred and sixty nine thousand eight hundred and sixty four and inserting in lieu thereof, five million ninety three thousand, two hundred and fifty-two."

Matijevich: "Representative...ah...Kosinski on Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1492."

Kosinski: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 is merely technical. The Senate deleted seventy six thousand six hundred dollars in line items, however they neglected to delete it from the total so this corrects the total and I ask for its adoption."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2

to Senate Bill 1492. Is there any discussion? Seeing no discussion



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

all in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay', the Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1492 is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Matijevich: "Third Reading. With leave of the House, Representative Kozubowski is now back on Senate Bill 629. Read Senate Bill 629 Mr. Clerk."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 629. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission under the Office of the Governor. Second Reading of the Bill, five Committee Amendments. Amendment #1. Amends Senate Bill 629, Section 2, grants in aid and so forth."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walter Kozubowski."

Kozubowski: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 is a five thousand dollar reduction of the annual appropriation for ILEC, it's agreeable to the Department itself, the Director testified he had no opposition to the Amendment and I would move its adoption."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved the adoption of Committee Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 629. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, all in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and Committee Amendment #1 to 629 is adopted. Further Amendments."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #2. Amends Senate Bill 629 on page 1 by deleting line 3 and so forth."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kozubowski."

Kozubowski: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This was an Amendment which was offered by Representative Ryan and I would now ask that he explain the Amendment."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Ryan to explain Amendment #2."

Ryan: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2..ah...allows for the transferring of funds between the ILEC and the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Commission and I would move for the adoption of Amendment #2."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Kankakee has moved the adoption of Amendment #2 the Representative from Cook, Representative Duff, do you want to be recognized?"



Duff: "Will the Sponsor answer a question please?"

Matijevich: "Which one, Representative Kozubowski or Ryan?"

Duff: "Ryan."

Matijevich: "Representative Ryan indicates he'll yield."

Duff: "What is the Illinois Juvenile and Criminal Justice Commission?"

Ryan: "It's a new Commission that's been created by Senate Bill 32."

Duff: "Well it hasn't been created has it?"

Ryan: "Well I think it has, yes."

Duff: "Well it hasn't gone through both Houses..."

Ryan: "It's passed yes. It's passed both bodies of the General Assembly."

Duff: "And been signed by the Governor?"

Ryan: "Well I don't know at this point."

Duff: "Well I think there isn't any such Commission existing and Mr. Chariman, I would question the Amendment on that premise."

Matijevich: "Ah...The Gentleman from Christian, Representative Tipword."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker I was...ah...I wonder if I might ask a question of the Sponsor."

Matijevich: "He indicates he'll yield."

Tipword: "What is this transferring? How much for what purpose, how much is it taking out of the Law Enforcement Commission and what's left in the Law Enforcement Commission once this goes?"

Matijevich: "Proceed Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Your question is what's the...what is the transfer?"

Duff: "Yes sir.."

Ryan: "Is that right?...Well it's whatever is left after the 31st of October."

Duff: "And then everything is going to go?"

Ryan: "Right."

Duff: "The Law Enforcement Commission will be no more, so everything will then be under this...this Juvenile and Justice Commission which pretty well puts all of its efforts into one area."

Ryan: "Is that a question?"

Duff: "Is that what it does?"



Ryan: "Is that a quest...I'm not sure I..."

Duff: "Yes, sir...That was a question Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well I'm not sure what you're asking me."

Duff: "Well, I'm saying is that what you're really doing is by virtue of this you're going to...to...ah...destroy the Law Enforcement Commission and put all of its funds over into this...this...ah...Juvenile Justice Commission or whatever you call it."

Ryan: "That's the intent."

Duff: "Well I would certainly urge all of the Members of this body to...to vote against this Amendment."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Downs."

Downs: "Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Downs: "Representative Ryan, it's a little hard to hear your answers...I...ah...perhaps your microphone is not turned up very loud. Did you just state that it is the intent of your Amendment to abolish the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission after a certain date, or would you at least explain it so that we all can hear?"

Ryan: "Well certainly Representative Downs. You were in Committee when we heard this Bill and evidently you weren't listening, I'd be glad to explain it to you. This Amendment all..."

Downs: "Mr...Mr. Speaker on a point of personal privilege, I was in Committee, I heard it, I voted against it, what I want is the...."

Matijevich: "Representative Downs that is not a point of personal privilege. Proceed Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "This Amendment allows for the transfer of funds between ILEC and the Criminal and Juvenile and Justice Commission which has been created by, or will be created by Senate Bill 32. ILEC may spend funds up to October 31st, 1975 and after that date the Criminal and Juvenile Justice assumes the authority to expend all funds appropriated in this Bill."

Matijevich: "Is there any further discussion? It's been moved for the adoption of Committee Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 629. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The 'nos' have it. Five Members want a Roll Call so we'll have a Roll Call. All those in favor of Committee Amendment #2 signify by voting 'aye, those



opposed, signify by voting 'nay'. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan, to explain his vote. He likes what he sees. The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, if I interpret the statement by the Sponsor of this Amendment, he is going to eliminate the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission by institution of the transfer of this fund. Now, if you want to eliminate the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission, then I suppose you should vote for it, but it seems to me this is a very unusual approach to abolish a useful commission, and if anyone.... I'd like to point out and say a second time, this Amendment abolishes the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission. Is that what you want?"

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Bob Craig."

Craig: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would also like to oppose this Amendment because if this appropriation bill for the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission, which we're talking about here, and if Amendment Number 2 is adopted, the appropriation is expected to end, and all active ILEC funds, there's about 60 million dollars, to local governments on October 31, 1975, and these new funds will go to the cities and counties after July 1st, if the Amendment isn't approved, but if the Amendment is aimed in supporting Senate Bill 32, of which I think these people are really interested in, the Bill has already passed both Houses and signed, it would supercede the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission with a new Criminal and Juvenile Justice Commission. They don't argue with the issue of Senate Bill 32, but we do argue that the Amendment #2, this Amendment, if left on, the ILEC appropriation Bill will cause all Federal Law Enforcement dollars to local government to stop, when the Governor fails to sign the Bill which he will, and we argue that Senate Bill 32 should stand on its own merits of local government law enforcement funds should not be jeopardized and I think a lot of these areas - I know for instance, in Danville we have a new jail being built and these funds, I'm informed, would stop between now and October or whenever this new Commission is approved by the Federal government, and I urge a 'no' vote on this Amendment. I'm sure a lot of you have a lot of projects in your own local areas that will be affected if this Amendment goes on."



Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Coffey. No, he doesn't desire..... The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative LaFleur, to explain his vote."

LaFleur: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the previous two speakers have mentioned some things that I think need to be cleared up, and the relationship to the distribution of Federal funds to the Commission that exists now called ILEC. The appropriation, and I think it's a proper Amendment to the appropriation Bill to posture the appropriation in the same position that Senate Bill 32 puts upon on ILEC Commission. This is a Commission that was formed as an executive commission by Governor Ogilvie. Senate Bill 32 does not do away with ILEC. It does not change any position of the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission. It has one intention, one job only. It changes it from an executive commission to a statutory commission. Amendment #2 is a proper Amendment to an appropriation bill to put the appropriation in the proper posture to go along with Senate Bill 32. Now Senate Bill 32 went out of this House with over 100 and some votes, I think 120 votes. Now, there is no reason that if it went out with 120 votes, there shouldn't be the same number of votes on the appropriation bill, so that the new commission would be properly funded. No one is going to lose any money. There is not going to be a change. We're not doing away with the Commission. We are"

Matijevich: "Please bring your remarks to a close, Representative LaFleur;"

LaFleur: "We are only creating it as a Legislative Commission, and I would urge a 'yes' vote."

Matijevich: "From Cook, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz, to explain his vote."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to the Amendment. I believe it is a misguided effort to deal with the problem that you are dealing with directly in Senate Bill 32. In the normal course of events, that Bill will be going through and going to the Governor and I suspect it will be back here again. In the meantime, we're simply going to lose the Federal funds. They cannot obligate Federal funds on a three month basis. It is not done that way. These



are grants that will require grants for a longer period of time. If the Gentleman who sponsored the Amendment will just be patient; namely, if he lets Senate Bill 32 go to its course and if it is the will of the General Assembly that there be a new Criminal Justice Commission instead of ILEC, that will take place in due course without this Amendment. All this Amendment will do will be really to complicate all of the funding that is now going on, and all of the worthwhile projects in Danville and all of the other places in the State. It will result in the loss of Federal money, and there's really no reason for it, and I would urge patience on the part of those and let Senate Bill 32 go its normal course and in the meantime, let's have funding for ILEC as long as it is the agency in the State and I would urge the defeat of this Amendment."

Matijevich: "The Assistant Majority Leader from Cook, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to support Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 629. The debate that has preceded me relative to this Amendment is quite reminiscence of the debate which I have heard on several Bills affecting the Governor's office. Whenever there's a proposal for rearrangement of part of the Executive function, invariably we hear, 'you will lose all of your Federal funds'. Invariably we hear, 'you're going to ^{lose} that project in your district'. We heard it last night. We hear it this morning. We'll hear it tomorrow. And the day after that. You're going to lose this, you're going to lose that. The facts of the matter are very simply. Senate Bill 32 has already passed out of this House and Senate Bill 32 provides for a rearrangement and a revision of the method by which we funnel Federal anti-crime money to the local governments throughout this State. This Amendment is in complete accord with Senate Bill 32 and provides for an orderly transition from one Commission to another. It provides for four months funding for the old commission and eight months funding for the new commission. Certainly, it's a proposal of the Legislature and that's what Senate Bill 32 is, a Legislative proposal. It's finally adopted. Then there will be a need for an orderly transition. We will not be able to transform everything over night. It will have to be done



over a period of one or two or three or four months, and that's what this Amendment proposes to do, and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from MacCoupin, Representative Ken Boyle."

Boyle: "Thank you, Mr Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to the Amendment. I believe that this is a very ill-conceived Amendment, and I would point out to the distinguished Assistant Majority Leader that not only the downstate funds will stop if this Amendment is defeated, or is passed, but all planning region grants will go broke, including those in Cook County. Now if you want to stop the grants, totaling over 50 millions of dollars to your local units of governments, to your cities, to your municipalities, to for law enforcement, in downstate as well as Cook County, just vote for this Amendment. This is an ill-conceived Amendment. Technically, I don't know if.... if you can transfer to the ah.... Criminal and Juvenile Justice Commission set up under Senate Bill 32 in this manner. Senate Bill 32 should rise or fall on its own merit. We shouldn't devastate the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission in this manner and we shouldn't strike this type of blow to law enforcement, to our municipalities, and I urge a 'no' vote on the Amendment."

Matijevich: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook rise, Representative Madigan?"

Madigan: "Point of information for Representative Boyle, Mr. Speaker. In Cook County, we are practically or in effect broke right now. Thank you."

Matijevich: "His heart bleeds. Have all voted who wished? Take the Record. On this issue, there are 69 voting 'aye', 97 voting 'nay', 3 voting 'present' and Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 629 fails. Are there further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #3. Amends Senate Bill 629 on page 5 by deleting Line 10 and so forth."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kozubowski."

Kozubowski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #3 was offered by Representative Catania and it's the standard FEPC Amendment, and I would urge its adoption."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook has offered to move the adoption of



Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 629. Representative from Lake, Representative Deuster on a Point of Order."

Deuster: "Ah.... yes, Mr. Speaker, yesterday, this general subject came up and ah.... I think on the subject of germanness, it was suggested that this sort of an Amendment was not germane, and I would raise the question for the Chair as to whether this Amendment is germane."

Matijevich: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Point of Order, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Deuster's inquiry is not timely."

Matijevich: "Your point is well taken. Representative from Cook, Representative Madigan, on Amendment #3. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Ah.... I would like to inquire from the Chair at what time must the question of germanness of an Amendment be raised? We are considering an Amendment and I thought before ah.... we get into a roll call, the point of germanness may be raised?"

Matijevich: "I'll give you a break, I'll take another look at it. Hold on."

Deuster: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr Speaker, you're very fair."

Matijevich: "Mr. Deuster, in looking at the Amendment, all the language does is affirm what is already in the Statutes and it offers, as I understand it, no new subject matter that changes any existing law at all, and therefore, the Amendment is in proper order. On the Amendment, Representative Madison. From Lake, Representative Deuster, on a Point of Order."

Deuster: "Yes, the question was germanness, not whether the Amendment was in Order and it relates to an entirely different subject. It relates to the State Fair Employment Practices Commission, and it also relates to the Federal....."

Matijevich: "On that issue, the Chair rules that it is germane. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madison. The Gentleman from Cook Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I'm getting ready for ah.... Amendment down the line, which is another attempt to be politically vindictive, and a



few other things that Representative Madigan so aptly described in his remarks against the Amendment before."

Matijevich: "Amendment #3 has been offered and moved its adoption. All in favor, say 'aye'. Opposed 'nay'. All in favor, vote 'aye'. All in favor, vote 'nay'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, take the Record. On this issue, the 'ayes' are 57, the nays are 49, none answering present. Committee Amendment #3 is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #4. Amends Senate Bill 629 by inserting on page 7 after line 8 and so forth."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kozubowski, on Amendment #4."

Kozubowski: "Mr. Speaker, I believe Representative Kosinski offered that Amendment in Committee."

Matijevich: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Committee Amendment, or rather Amendment #4 is offered by me in Committee on behalf of the Department, the Illinois Law Enforcement organization. The ah.... the Amendment does three things. With Federal monies, I repeat with Federal monies, it allocates \$200,000 payable from the Federal Criminal Justice Trust Fund for the implementation of Juvenile Justice Act of 1974. From Federal monies it allocates \$96,000 payable from the Federal Criminal Justice Trust Fund for Juvenile Justice Planning Special Emphasis Grant, and from Federal Funds, it allocates \$300,000 payable from the Federal Criminal Justice Trust Fund for organized crime projects, and I move for its adoption."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved the adoption of Committee Amendment #4. Before I ask for discussion, I've been asked that anyone taking pictures please refrain. As we all know, we had about an hour and one-half sleep and someone might have one or two eyes closed, and I think rightfully so, so anyone taking pictures, please refrain. Although, Representative Dan Pierce's son took a picture of both Dan and I and from now on, nobody else. Hey Jack, where do you turn the light off? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan."



Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, would you ask the Sergeant at Arms to move all unauthorized persons off the Floor?"

Matijevich: "Mr. Sargeant-at-Arms, John, remove anybody who doesn't belong here off the Floor. The rest of us are punished. We stay. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Houlihan on Amendment #4."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, that was just a numbering problem, which I think has been ah.... explained by the Clerk to the Sponsor and then to myself, so I have no comments."

Matijevich: "Then move that Committee Amendment #4 be adopted. All in favor, say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. Committee Amendment #4 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #5. Amends Senate Bill 629 on page 3 by inserting after line 32 and so forth."

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

Kosinski: "This also is a Department amended Amendment, which I offered. It's ah.... for the Department of Law Enforcement, Illinois Bureau of Investigation Intelligence Systems Project. \$18,854 of this is from General Funds to match payable from the Federal Criminal Justice Fund, \$169,624 and I ask for its approval."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved the adoption of the Committee Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 629. Discussion? Representative from Cook, Representative Madison."

Madison: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, just a point of information. The ah.... the Amendments that are being passed out to Senate Bill 629, Mr. Speaker, are not properly numbered. The ah.... Amendment that ah.... Representative Kosinski has offered is in effect, Amendment #5, but on the Amendments that have been passed out, it is listed as Amendment #6. That is a point of information."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kozubowski."

Kozubowski: "Mr. Speaker, the last Speaker is correct. The Amendments are incorrectly numbered, to the Members as distributed. However, the Clerk's copies are correct and we have been describing those Amendments correctly."

Matijevich: "It's been moved the adoption of Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 629. All in favor, say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. Amendment #5 is adopted. Further Amendment? Representative Kozubowski."



Kozubowski: "I don't believe there are anymore Amendments at this time. However, one Representative has asked that I hold this Bill on Second and I will certainly see to his wishes."

Matijeich: "If there are no further Amendment, then this Bill at the request of the Sponsor will be held on Second Reading. Senate Bill 1496. Representative Hart. Read the Bill."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1496. A Bill for an Act making an Appropriation to the Supreme Court for the pay of certain offices in the judicial system of State Government. Second Reading of the Bill. Three Committee Amendments. Amendment #1. Amends Senate Bill 1496 on page 9 by deleting line 27 and so forth."

Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Representative Hart."

Hart: "Ah.... I'm not sure what the Order of this, is this the one that has ah..... what's the effect of it?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #1. Section 7. Excuse me, Section 8. Funds appropriated."

Hart: "You can't tell. Who offered it? Who offered it?"

Jack O'Brien: "Catania."

Hart: "O'kay, this is the FEPC Amendment. We don't have any objection to it. I move for the adoption of it."

Matijeich: "Ah.... where are we? Representative Ryan from Kankakee."

Ryan: "Well, Representative Hart, I'm not sure..... maybe the Clerk could tell us, is this the FEPC Amendment?"

Hart: "Yes, yes, it is."

Ryan: "Number 1 is."

Hart: "That's what he said. Offered by ah.... Mrs. Younge, I presume, or no Catania. It was in her Appropriations II."

Matijeich: "Representative Hart has moved the adoption of Committee Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1496. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "I just wonder if the Sponsor will yield for a question?"

Matijeich: "He indicates he will."

Deuster: "Does this Amendment have any legal significance whatsoever? Is it necessary?"

Matijeich: "Representative Hart, will you turn his microphone on."



Hart: "Well, the legal significance of it, of course, is that ah.... it would be a reaffirmation of the law, and whether or not that would have any, you know, ultimate significance,certainly any violation could be prosecuted without this Amendment. However, ah.... there is a consistent pattern having been established on these matters, and with the concurrence of Judge Gilley, Court Administrator, we have no objection to it, and it's just surplus language, I think. It won't hurt anything."

Deuster: "It won't hurt and it won't help."

Hart: "That's about the size of it."

Deuster: "Thank you."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "Parliamentary Inquiry."

Matijevich: "Proceed."

Palmer: "Mr. Speaker, the question is whether or not we're adding substantive language to this Bill. I think last night, the Speaker indicated that the substantive language such as this, specifically was added, then he would rule that it would be substantive."

Matijevich: "On that issue, the Lady from Cook, Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, I have discussed this with our Parliamentarian, Dave Epstein....."

Matijevich: "Mrs. Chapman, you don't have to speak. This is exactly the same point as Representative Deuster made and the Chair rules that it is in proper Order."

Palmer: "Well, just so I can get a precise answer to the question, because of something that happened last night, not that I care about this Bill, but we've got a lot of them coming in in this way, is it a substantive Amendment to the Bill which is then prohibited by the Constitution?"

Matijevich: "I don't think you will find anything in the Constitution that talks about substance, Representative Palmer, and this Amendment does in no way change any existing law at all. It adds nothing, as far as existing laws concerned, and you show me in the Constitution where it shows something about substance."

Palmer: "I haven't had a chance to look at it, Mr. Speaker. I'm trying to recall something that occurred last night."



Matijeich: "The Amendment is in Order. The Amendment has been moved for adoption by Representative Hart. All in favor say 'aye'. Opposed 'nay'. All in favor, vote 'aye'. Opposed, vote 'nay'. Amendment #1. Have all voted? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Clerk, take the Record. On this issue, there are 68 'ayes', 23 'nays', one answering 'present' and Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1496 is adopted. Further Amendment?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #2 offered in Appropriations II by Representative Byers amends Senate Bill 1496 on page 1, line 23, by deleting \$10,203, 000 and inserting in lieu there of \$9,944,000 and so forth."

Matijeich: "Gentleman from Franklin, Representative Hart."

Hart: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment deletes a little over one million dollars from the Budget in attempt to comply with the Governor's request that the ah.... reduced amount of money that is going to be coming out of General Revenue fund in all of these appropriations. Ah.... it's worked out with the staffs of both sides of the aisle and I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Palmer. Is that light still on from last Amendment, or do you seek recognition? The Gentleman from Franklin has moved the adoption of Amendment #2. All in favor say 'aye'. Opposed 'nay' and the 'ayes' have it. Further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #3, offered in Appropriations II by Representative Ryan, amends Senate Bill 1496 on page 1, line 14 by deleting \$25,000 and inserting in lieu thereof \$27,500."

Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1496 adds \$2500 to increase the salary of the Clerk of the Supreme Court. I understand this is a Statutory requirement and I move for the adoption."

Matijeich: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1496. Is there any discussion. If not, all in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay' and Amendment #3 is adopted. Are there any other Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4. Cunningham. Amends Senate Bill 1496



on page 1, line 21 by deleting \$5,775,000 and inserting in lieu thereof \$6,375,000 and so forth."

Matijeivich: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Representative Cunningham, on Amendment #4."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, by virtue of the prior Amendment #2, Number 4 is not in proper form, so I move at this point that it might be Tabled and we have #5 to accomplish the same purpose."

Matijeivich: "The Gentleman have leave to Table Amendment #4? Further Amendments."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #5. Cunningham. Amend Senate Bill 1496 on page 1, line 21 and so forth."

Matijeivich: "Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Number 5 is offered at the direction of the Circuit Court Administrator, Mr. Guley, and the purpose of it is to provide financing for the State's position for the entire payment of judicial salaries from the State Treasury. This House previously passed out House Bill 596 to that affect. It is the latter Bill. It is on Third Reading of the Senate and will be dismissed upon the passage of this Amendment and its inclusion in the Bill. For some reason, the Administrator said it should be deferred from the bookkeeping point of view, that the Amendment be put on this particular Bill."

Matijeivich: "The Gentleman from Lawrence has moved the adoption of Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1496. Is there discussion? All in favor, say 'aye'. Opposed 'nay' and Amendment #5 is adopted. Further amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #6. Dan Houlihan. Amend Senate Bill 1496 as amended on page 1, line 32 and so forth."

Matijeivich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #6 provides for an increase of \$1,200,000 to the Supreme Court Appropriation. This will fund the provisions of Senate Bill 985, which is passed by the House. That was the Bill that provided for an increase in the matched permissible salary level for official court reporters of this state from the present minimum of \$6,000 to a maximum of \$19,000 and I move the adoption of the Amendment."



Matijeich: "Representative Houlihan has moved the adoption of Amendment #6 to 1496. All in favor say 'aye'. Opposed 'nay'. Amendment #6 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #7. Dan Houlihan. Amends Senate Bill 1496 as amended on page 1, line 32...."

Matijeich: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "I move to Table Amendment #7."

Matijeich: "Does he have leave to Table Amendment #7? Ah.... further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Matijeich: "Third Reading. The Order of Second Reading, Senate Bill 1498. Read the Bill."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1498. A Bill for an Act making an Appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of certain agencies. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment. Amends Senate Bill 1498 on page 1, line 29 and so forth."

Matijeich: "Representative Beatty on the Floor? Can anybody handle that? Representative Lechowicz, can you handle that for Representative Beatty? Representative from Cook, Representative Mike Madigan. Committee Amendment #1. Representative Lechowicz says he will handle it."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Committee Amendment #1 increased the Commission on Women from \$20,000 to \$40,000. I move for the adoption."

Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved the adoption of Committee Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1498. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

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

Matijeich: "He indicates he will."

Schlickman: "I understood you to say ah.... that...."

Lechowicz: "From \$20,000 to \$40,000 for the Status of Women's Commission, whatever the name is."

Schlickman: "May I pursue, Mr. Speaker?"

Matijeich: "You've got the mike."

Schlickman: "Thank you, very much. What was the appropriation for this Commission last year?"

Lechowicz: "\$20,000. They had a \$10,000 deficiency, \$30,000 and they ask for \$40,000. It was in the House version that went over to the



Senate at \$40,000. All we're doing is making it the same in this Senate version that's in the House."

Schlickman: "Do you know what the additional \$20,000 is for?"

Lechowicz: "You mean the additional \$10,000?"

Schlickman: "The \$20,000 to \$40,000?"

Lechowicz: "Well, I told you they had a \$10,000 deficiency. The additional \$10,000, they supposedly want to hire a person."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Matijevid: "If everybody is as tired of this issue as I am, the Gentleman moves the adoption of Committee Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1498. All in favor, say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. Further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Matijevid: "Third..... The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Keep it on Second Reading, Mr. Speaker."

Matijevid: "The Senate Bill 1498 will be kept on Second Reading, did you say? Keep it on Second. Second Reading. Are there any others on Second Reading that desires to be called? I understand that the Minority Leader and the Speaker have had an agreement on some Bills on Consideration Postponed that they desire to be moved today, so with leave of the House, we will go to the Order of Consideration Postponed and the first Bill, House Bill 78. Representative VonBoeckman on the Floor? House Bill 941. Representative Houlihan. Is he on the Floor? Ah.... Is Representative Craig on the Floor? House Bill 1522? Ah..... House Bill 2987. Representative Shea on Consideration Postponed, I understand that there's been an agreement to have certain Bills called on Consideration Postponed and that's one of them. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not privy to any deal and I would like to know under the rules how any deal can be made with respect to Consideration of certain Bills on Consideration Postponed?"

Matijevid: "I ask leave of the House and you let me go, so....."

Walsh: "Well, you did not ask leave of the House."

Matijevid: "Yes, I did."

Walsh: "You ask leave of the House to go to Consideration Postponed. You



didn't ask leave of the House....."

Matijevich: "I asked leave of the House that certain Bills with which the Minority Leader and the Speaker have had an agreement to move and that leave was granted."

Walsh: "When was that? Tell me when you asked that leave?"

Matijevich: "When you said nothing."

Walsh: "Well, when did you ask it?"

Matijevich: "About two minutes ago, Bill."

Walsh: "You asked leave to go to Consideration Postponed, which was unnecessary. You didn't ask leave to call Bills out of Order."

Matijevich: "Well, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Perhaps I can get the Minority, the Assistant Minority Leader to relax. I'm not going to call that Bill."

Matijevich: "Ah..... Representative Walsh, I wonder if Representative Washburn is here, if you'd discuss it with him. I don't know if he's around, but ah..... that, he's in the Governor's office, I hear."

Walsh: "Well, all right. All right, we'll talk about this later. Do you have some others on here you're going to call?"

Matijevich: "No, only those four that I mentioned."



Matijeich: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Houlihan on House Bill 941. The gentleman from Cook, Representative Washington."

Washington: "Yes, let's don't deal in the closet. Let's all find out what we're going to call. What was the deal that they worked out?"

Matijeich: "I understand that there were certain appropriation Bills that they felt ah... ought to be out of here as quickly as possible."

Washington: "What were they?"

Matijeich: "House Bill 78, 941, 1522 and 2987 which Representative Shea claims he's not going to call."

Washington: "That's the sum total of the deal."

Matijeich: "It looks like there's a mark around Senate Bill 349, but I don't think that's... No, it's not circled. The ones he said were circled were the ones that they had the agreement. Ah... So, you can relax too, Representative Washington. Houlihan on 941."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House..."

Matijeich: "Read... Yes, it's on consideration, all right. 941."

J. Houlihan: "House Bill 941 is the ordinary and contingent expense for the racing board. There was some confusion in the presentation when it was originally on Third Reading that dealt with the question of Sunday racing. It had been raised as to whether the additional money and the additional dates would reflect an intent to include Sunday racing in the racing program. I've checked with the board and found that is not the case. That the additional dates are really from lengthening the season, both at the beginning and the end. And not to include Sunday's in the racing date and I would ask for a favorable roll call on House Bill 941. I will be glad to answer any questions. I think it was thoroughly explained in the original presentation. I assume everybody has mastered that material."

Matijeich: "The gentleman from Cook has moved for the passage of House Bill 941. The gentleman from Cook, Representative Washington."

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

Matijeich: "Indicates he will."

Washington: "Mr. Houlihan, as you recall, this Bill was put on postponed consideration in part because some of the members asked questions relative to the perspective practices of the racing board



and its director in so far as minority hiring was concerned. We've had several discussions with the board. We've had some with the director, but nothing has been finalized. Are you privy to any information from any of those two sources relative to what they plan to do, if anything?"

J. Houlihan: "Representative Washington, as you know, a number of the discussions that were carried on by the ah... Chairman of the Racing Board and yourself and other members that had raised those issues did not include myself. Ah... All I can tell you is that I have extended every effort and communicated both my strong feelings about the rightness of the request and a sense of ah..., shall I say disappointment, that there had not been something specific done immediately. I am under the impression that the Racing Board and its Chairman are going to and, in fact, to work with some of the amendments proposed on House, er... Senate Bill 37 that they are going to do everything in their power to try to address the situation which you and some of the other gentlemen raised on this House floor. I think you have adequately pointed out that the racing industry is ah... in a very real way, dependent on the patronage of ah... a large percentage of minorities and if they, their hiring power should reflect that and I am in agreement with the position and have done everything I could during the hearings on this Bill to communicate my strong feelings about that. I can also assure you that I will work in whatever way you would allow me to assist you in achieving that end as the Bill proceeds, both in the Senate and after the Bill is passed."

Washington: "One further question. You're just the man in the middle and you're not suspect in any way, but why is it that the board and/or the director refuse to accede to a simple request from a substantial number of us that they make a public statement to the effect that there has been discrimination, rampant if you will, in all phases of that industry throughout the entire State with specific emphasis upon the Electric Union and I think one member of this House represents them. I hope he speaks and why can't they come out and specifically delineate the problem from the consuming public and pinpoint some directions or specific programs or actions



that should be taken by the General Assembly and/or the board.

It seems to me that that is the minimal that should come out of this colloquy in this Department which centers around this Bill and I'm somewhat disturbed, frankly, that my good friend, militant, forthright, progressive, upstanding and self-righteous and beautifully sculptured intellectual young man, Tony Scariano, can't get on still over at that agency and call it like it is. And the simple truth is that my community puts hundreds of thousands of millions of dollars a month in the racing coffers each year. We get practically nothing out of it in terms of programs for our community and on the other end, the employment level which has many, many well-paying jobs. We're precluded from it from what I can see as a conspiracy between the owners of these tracks and the leaders of these various, leaders of that particular local union which is the Electrical Union. Question. Will you prevail, to the best of your good auspices, to get Mr. Scariano to make that statement which I've said or paraphrase it adequately so that the public will know that we're not spinning our / ^{wheels} and needlessly wasting the time of the members of this House for simply trying to bring to the attention to these people in the State of Illinois who are fundamentally, basically fair-minded that their money is going into a racist directed operation and which has a conspiracy to shut out minority groups? Would you address yourself to that, Mr. Scariano and if you promise me that, I'll sit down?"

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Washington, I ah... Let me respond in, on three points. One, you indicate that I am in the middle. And I do feel the way. You say there's nothing suspect. I would say that being Irish from the south side you might look into that a little bit further."

Washington: "Well, you're almost a brother."

J. Houlihan: "As far as the reasons for the lack of activity by the Racing Board, I have been given some, I would say, dodges, some explanations of their need to touch base. Their effort to work together on a joint statement. I suspect that the real reason is ah... in an adjective that you failed to use about your good friend and my good friend in that he ah... partakes in that quality



of being headstrong and I think that he is somewhat in a position of ah... not wanting to back down because of his own personal involvement in this. And I suggest that's wrong and particularly wrong when ah... we're dealing with such a fundamental issue. I would give you my assurance that I would work with you with all of my energies on that matter. As many energies we could of used last night in another matter which we all think are important. I would go further than that, that I would be more than happy as the chief sponsor of this legislation to issue with you a joint statement about our concern, our efforts and our continued efforts to have the Racing Board do something to address this problem. I think you've raised a legitimate question. One which I appraised of prior to this year and one which I ah... can assure I would treat as a fundamental and a basic issue and give you my cooperation and efforts."

Washington: "Thank you, Mr. Houlihan."

Matijeovich: "The lady from Adams, Representative Mary Lou Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to ask that House Bill 941 be taken back to Second Reading for a reduction amendment."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Chairman... Mr. Speaker..."

Matijeovich: "Well, I think you've come too late. Representative Houlihan, the gentleman from Cook."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to address that question. I realize it's not timely, but we did have some conversation, both ah... with the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee and Representative Kent and myself about a 6% reduction. But in looking over the figures in her proposed Amendment, I find it's the reduction, for example, in personal services is much larger than 6%. I also find that in our efforts in the Appropriations Committee under the direction of Representative Lechowicz and the cooperation of Representative Totten, we have reduced this Amendment by a little over 4% and I believe it's even higher in the General Revenue Fund and I would, therefore, respectfully suggest that taking it back to Second Reading would not be appropriate."

Matijeovich: "The Assistant Majority Leader from Cook, Representative Deacon Davis."



Davis: "Ah... Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I wanted to join with my colleague, Representative Hal Washington. I certainly agree with what he said in reference to the Racing Board. Now, my distinguished friend and he his my distinguished friend, ah... Tony Scariano. I don't like to talk about the past, but when he ran this last time for the State Senate, he'll tell you that I walked with him. I walked with him through all of Robbins and Robbins is a black community and knocked on every door I could and told them that Anthony Scariano was worthy of their vote. And here I think he could tell you that he got that vote. I have nothing against him, but he did promise. He promised here in my office that he would send me a letter and in that letter he would put his hand on the culprit. He'd tell us who these people that were consistently, consistently denying black people the right to meaningful jobs at the race track. Some of those people he explained to us in there, they work at one race track in the day and then they work at another one at night. And that those salaries that the salaries pay well over a hundred dollars a day. And he said in there and I asked him to give me a letter and he said he would. He said in there that they couldn't get a card and that they needed a card from the unions. Put your hand on it so we can go to the unions with you. Now, I haven't received a letter. I don't know why. But I'm waiting to receive that letter because we want to know who's responsible for it. I know one place they don't Jim Crow them. I know one place they don't deny them the right to come up to that window and put their money in there because they know they can't win. They know they can't win. They might beat a race, but they'll never beat the races and I'm so glad I learned that when I was young. Now, I'll join in with Hal. And believe me, if we have to do it, we'll join in with Hal because at this late date, if we hadn't heeded and heard the cry of the late lamented Dr. Martin Luther King, his blessed memory, freedom now. It must be freedom now because tomorrow isn't promised to us. And the race tracks if they don't want me to help them and I don't pick it. But as Hal said, I'll help him. We'll march together because this is a must, they are the most Jim Crow outfit out there



that you've ever seen. I don't know whether we have any blacks ah... selling those tickets and all, but all they can do is buy one. And I stand here and tell you this, for many years, for many many years, history will tell you that it was a black man who won more Kentucky Derby's riding a race horse than any other man in these United States and Earl Sandidge, they tell me, just equalled his record here a few years ago. We've been bought out there."

Matijevich: "You can reach to a close, now."

Davis: "Alright, but I'll bring it to a close by telling ^{you} that either we're going to have something done or we're going to ask our people to boycott the race tracks."

Matijevich: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten."

Totten: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker and members of the House. A point of order. I, I am just absolutely flabberghasted at the sponsor of this Bills' refusal of the Representative from Adams request to bring this back to Second Reading. He has continually supported ah... Amendments to bring, to reduce this budget or other budgets by 6% and his refusal ah... to bring this back ah... really, I think, is..."

Matijevich: "Representative Totten..."

Totten: "And I ask him to reconsider on his position to move that back to Second Reading."

Matijevich: "Representative Totten, I think he has already made his point and I think anything else is just a delay or... Ah... the gentleman from Cook, Representative D'Arco."

D'Arco: "Will the sponsor yield for a question?"

Matijevich: "Indicates he will."

D'Arco: "Jimmy, do you have any figures on the number of blacks that are sellers or cashier takers in some of our big racing tracks like Arlington Park or Maywood or Washington or Sportsmen?"

J. Houlihan: "Ah... John, I don't have the ah... figures on that. They may have that from a meeting that, I believe, Harold Washington had with Chairman Scariano, but let me point out that those ah... individuals are not Racing Board employees. That they are employed by the racing track. Now, I guess we could argue that ah... since the Racing Board has ah..., shall we say, life or death control over



ah... the track that they might have some valid input there, but I do not personally have those figures."

D'Arco: "Well, how many of the Board members themselves are black? Racing Board members."

J. Houlihan: "I would not want to judge just from experiences, but I don't believe any are."

D'Arco: "None are black."

Matijevich: "How many of the horses are white?"

J. Houlihan: "I don't know. What do I know."

Matijevich: "The horses I said. Representative Ewell on a point of order."

Ewell: "To my knowledge and to the best judgement of this Body, if the Chair wishes to partake in the debate, they usually get down from the Chair and I think it's an unfair advantage..."

Matijevich: "Ray, you and I discussed this little joke. Third Reading. The gentleman, the lady from Adams again, Mary Lou Kent, did you have a further ah..."

Kent: "Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would suggest to the Representative Houlihan that this was on postponed consideration. So, therefore, it shows me that it had difficulty in passing. I wonder if maybe..."

Matijevich: "Well, Representative Kent, I though you had a point of order. You've already been up on the issue so the gentleman from Cook, Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "These are the type of appropriations that really engender hostility in the black community because you want to cut off their food, but yet you let a racist activity like this get full funding and don't want to cut the appropriation down. And I want to know this is a bi-partisan if black Republicans don't like it either. And I'm saying this, I'll join with the Deacon. And I'll say this, Operation Push will join with him which they don't usually cooperate on things. What I'm saying is, unless you want to have a real conflagration out there in front of one of your race tracks, you'd better get on the ball. And I want to say this, the Governor better hurry up and appoint that person to the Racing Board Department before the morning or he'll have problems. So I'm saying is ah... that we're about tired of having all the money go out and nothing



come in. And is just not the way it's going to be happening from now on. And when you talk about cuts, you want to cut Public Aid and you want to cut all these other things that concern benefits for black people and poor people, yet the one thing that milks them, the race track, you don't want to cut. So, I don't understand the sponsor's posture because he's supposed to be one of these liberals and I've got more to put over from my conservatives on account of this from the liberals. And I can't understand that. Democrats get 95% of the black vote, but yet they won't help black folk at the race track. So, now I can't understand this. Now maybe they can't count."

Matijeich: "Representative Gaines, bring your remarks to a close."

Gaines: "Alright sir, I know you don't like to hear that, but all I'm saying is..."

Matijeich: "I don't mind."

Gaines: "You get 95% of the vote out of my area and that's going to change, too. Because we're going to go out there and let them know that you all is giving money to the race tracks and won't give none to the poor folks."

Matijeich: "The gentleman from Moultrie, Representative Stone."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, this issue was argued at great length when the Bill was first up. It's been argued today on postponed consideration. I move the previous question."

Matijeich: "The gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is shall the main question be put. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The gentleman from Cook, Representative Houlihan, to close."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Ewell had wished to address the Bill and I know he had an Amendment that was not accepted and I wonder if he might be able to speak ah... before closing the question or is that out of order? I..."

Matijeich: "Alright, he's indicated he'll be putting this out of order... in explaining his vote."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, when this ah... when this Bill was on Third Reading, there were really three questions which were raised. One was dealing with the



question that ah... Representative Deacon Davis and Representative Harold Washington as to the racetrack policies and the policies of the board in terms of any discriminatory policy. The second was raised and I tried to address it in conversations with both the board and members. Representative Klosak talked to me about Sunday racing. A third was raised as to ah... the attitude and maybe the ah... direction that Representative Scariano had taken with this ah... this board, maybe he had offended some the people in the industry and maybe ah... it had gone even deeper and he had offended some of the people here in the legislature when he had served. I have heard people say that Tony Scariano is their good friend and I can share that feeling. I must confess that I have been a little bit distraught in handling this appropriation Bill at not getting what I thought was the full cooperation of the board and its Chairman in trying to address the problem as raised by, initially, by Representative Washington. This is the appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Racing Board. I think it's foolhardy for us to hold this at this time. I have waited until the very last day to get this Bill out of the House and bring it over to the Senate. If we do not vote this Bill out, we will be in serious jeopardy of not appropriating funds for the Racing Board. I would suggest to my friends who have been working on this issue that we work together and maybe ask the Senate to take our case and deal with it in the Senate. I'd ask for a favorable roll call."

Matijevich: "The question is shall Senate Bill 941 pass. Those voting in favor vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'nay'. The gentleman from Cook, the Assistant Majority Leader, Corneal Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, I want to ah... ask my friends to join with me in voting 'present' so they'll get the message out there and I think we'll find out ah... who it is that's practicing this discrimination. I'm going to vote 'present' on this. Let's hold it up a while."

Matijevich: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "In response to that standard joke about the white and black horses, it appears to me that most of the horses out at the track are somewhat integrated. And that's what we tried to do with the



Appaloosa's, also. But ah... back to the question, I think that what we really have to do is consider the problem. We, as responsive members of the community, were aware of the problem that blacks could not sell tickets at the race tracks. They were denied, categorically discriminated against, in various other departments. They were not allowed to get racing dates. They could not do a number of other things. So we thought to do those things that were reasonable and we went to the Racing Board. The Racing Board turned around and said that it was all a union problem. That the unions had total control of every situation. I put in a Bill to abolish the ability of the race track to even negotiate with the unions because if you've got to kick the unions, you kick them, too. You've got to get a job done. Then I talked to the union people and it wasn't the union people who were jacking up everybody out there. All they wanted people to do was be a part of the membership and I can go along with that, but we get right back to the Racing Board, the racetrack owners and the people who do not want to give in and participate. The only they're going to respect, the only thing they're going to admire is when you stand up down here where it counts and there's only one place it will ever count under any circumstances and that's on the budget. And I tell all freshmen, if you've got anything to consider, you stop and remember you're power begins and ends with the budget and the dollar and that's the only place it's going to make any difference and it's the only place you're going to make a deal or ever be counted for anything. And I'm going to join and ask others to vote 'present' on this Bill."

Matijevich: "The lady from Adams, Representative Mary Lou Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To explain my vote, it seems very odd to me that of all things that is not cut is the Illinois Racing Board Fund. Ah... The sponsor said that it had already been cut 4%. This is untrue. It's been cut 2.2% from Ag. premiums. Ah... And my amendment, if it had been added, would have taken away 6.2% only. So this to me, is wrong. If we can take it out of schools and all of these things that have been proposed, it seems a sad day when we can't take it out of the Illinois Racing Board. I



urge you to vote no."

Matijeich: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Emil Jones."

Jones: "Yeh, thank you, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House. I, too, sat in on that meeting with our distinguished leader, Corneal Davis, with... ah... the Chairman of the Racing Board, Anthony Scariano. And in explaining my 'present' vote, my vote is really against the Chairman because he did not act in good faith. He could have come back and told us that he could not issue the letter, but he chose not to do anything. So, I think we should all say 'present' on this... on this appropriation and not fund this agency at this particular time because he did not act in good faith. And if he served in this House, and I was not here when he served, but if he served here, one thing I know you have going for you and that is your word. Your word to your fellow legislators. He did not keep that word so we should all say 'present' on this appropriation."

Matijeich: "The gentleman from Lake, Representative Dan Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, this appropriation doesn't go to the race tracks, it goes to the regulation of the race tracks. And if we don't have this appropriation and if the race tracks aren't regulated, the happiest people in the world are going to be the legalized, professional gamblers, who own and run the race tracks. So, all of you who are for leaning at race track regulations, who would wink your eye at the doping of horses, fixing of races, naturally, naturally, you wouldn't want the race tracks regulated. This money doesn't find its way into the pockets of the people who have tried to fix State government in Illinois who run the tracks, but it knows who would regulate the tracks. So, I think we've picked the wrong target here. The tracks don't suffer if they're not regulated. They run wild. They can do whatever they want. They'll be happy as can be. Now, I understand..."

Matijeich: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Gaines."

Pierce: "Now, I understand the vote..."

Matijeich: "Excuse me. The gentleman from Cook, Representative Gaines, what is your point of order?"



Gaines: "I want, I want to be recognized to answer this gentleman's argument. I'd like to explain my vote."

Matijevich: "Well, you have the right to explain your vote."

Gaines: "I want to be sure you saw me because a lot of times Speaker's up there don't see me. I don't have the right background."

Matijevich: "I don't know... I don't know yet that I've... How come you can say a joke and I can't? Go ahead, Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I resent being interrupted in the middle of my speech. He wasn't on a point of order. He's talked once. He can talk all he wants. As far as I'm concerned, he usually makes sense when he talks. I can understand why, why people would vote 'present' here today if the word is broken of someone on the board to them. If they're attacking a great social evil, I can see voting 'present'. But once we've made a point, and this isn't going to get 89 votes now, once we've made our point, just remember who we're punishing here. We're not punishing the race tracks owners. We're not punishing the unions that's passed down from father to sons, these jobs and sell the tickets, sell the tickets. They can still go ahead with their business. We're only punishing the people who want honest races, who want the race tracks regulated. This agency regulates the race tracks. It produces money for the State of Illinois. The reason we don't cut the appropriations is ah... because we'd be cutting, we'd be cutting those who regulate the race tracks and make sure they pay over to the State what they should pay over and don't skim off the top. But between you and me, the people who are in the legalized, professional racing and gambling business, are not the most savory people in the United States and they proved it right here in Illinois and by denying this budget, you're giving them a go-ahead and say, do whatever you want to do. Now I understand Mr. Gaines point and I understand why he's voting 'present' now and he can do, it maybe for another day or two..."

Matijevich: "Bring your remarks to a close."

Pierce: "I hope by the 30th, I was interrupted, sir. I hope by the 30th..."

Matijevich: "You have 3 minutes."

Pierce: "I hope by the 30th, we can pass some Bill regulating the race



tracks so they'll continue to desecrate the good name of Illinois government."

Matijevich: "Representative Gaines, we're ready for you."

Gaines: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. You got good eyesight. I want to say that, you know, they called slave-owners honest folks, too, before the Civil War. They called a whole lot of folks who closed their eyes to other indignities because their own particular indignity, they're watching for and I don't think that because a person is honest excuses them for denying black people an opportunity to earn a living. Because the crime rate in the black community is basically because they don't have an opportunity to any money any other way and I'm the one they're going to try to take from first. And I'd rather have them working out there at the races and I think ah... to excuse it on the basis they're honest folks, is not a good excuse. And it's the board that controls the thing. Everybody knows the board has control and if the board says, boo, everybody jumps. So I think they ought to say, boo, about black folks and let them see them jump, then."

Matijevich: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, it's a very difficult position to be in. This Bill has been put on postponed consideration. I've attempted in good faith to work out or be involved as much as the parties who where interested wanted to try to solve this problem. I have to suggest that this Bill has to be passed out. I've given to Representative Washington my firmest commitment to work with him. I realize that's not the commitment of the Chairman of that Board, but I hope he would understand that's a sincere commitment in an effort that I will do my best. I would also like to point out that there are many gentleman there that are following Representative Washington's lead that many times don't and I wonder what are the reasons for that. Is that because of the issue or some other issues and I think we really ought to move this Bill out and then get on with the business of the House."

Matijevich: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "Let us have some quick explanations ah... so... The Bill is



obviously lost."

Matijevich: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I think we are taking a very drastic step here. I concur with the sponsor and I concur with many of the speakers that have spoken on this issue. I've been deeply involved with this ever since I came to this House in 1970, but I think that we've got a two-fold thing here and I would hope that many of the people that are voting 'present' on this Bill will also consider and vote 'present' on Senate Bill 37 because I think we are dealing with a two-fold thing here and it's two pronged. We have got to make the racing industry understand that it is an industry that is benefiting from all of the residents of the State of Illinois and, therefore, all of the residents should be recipients of those benefits. No one has the divine right, a divine right, if you will, to operate in this State whether it be the Racing Board, the Racing Commission or whatever. What I am saying here and I can sympathize with the sponsor of this legislative and I was wondering apart from making my explanation of this vote, Mr. Speaker, if you would ah... give some indication whether or not this Bill and this O.C.E., as I believe, would be dead if we do not vote it out on this vote."

Matijevich: "This Bill is on postponed consideration. For the last time, if it is not passed now, it shall be declared lost and from what I can see unless there is some other way through parliamentary procedure, this Bill would be declared lost."

Barnes: "Well, I..."

Matijevich: "Is the gentleman finished? Alright, go ahead."

Barnes: "Because that was sort of a rhetorical I was trying to say.

Well, to finish my explanation of vote, I for one, I for one would not want to see any industry, especially the racing industry, running this State without any regulations whatsoever. But I do think ah... and, and the language of the straight why originally come that the Chairman of the Board put us between a rock and a hard place. He made a commitment to many of the members here to at least, at least, give an indication to an answer to part of the



problem that they have presented to him in person. He did not do that. I'm going to vote 'present'. I don't want anyone, anyone to consider that vote as a vote to kill this Bill although I know in practicality it will, but I don't want that to be interpreted in that direction. And I say to my friends here, if we are doing this to the Racing Board, if we are doing this on the O.C.E. here, when the other end of this industry come along in here and they will be on Senate Bill 37, let's let them know the same thing. That we're certainly not going to have business as usual. They're going to cut us in or they're going to cut it out. I vote 'present'."

Matijevich: "The Assistant Minority Leader, Representative William Walsh, from Cook."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentleman of the House, there isn't anyone who feels that this session will go by without an appropriation to the Racing Board. There is going to be one regardless of what we do right now. Now we may have to suspend some rules to take the Bill back to Second Reading to amend it, but to pass it out or to suggest that what we're doing now is denying the Racing Board their appropriation is pure nonsense. The Racing Board is going to have to come to terms with those of us who feel that it should be amended by reducing ah... more than it has been. And as I understand it, do what they had promised to do in that regard and to do what they had promised to do with regard to the other question, also. So why don't we either take out of the record, postpone it again, suspend whatever rules are necessary..."

Matijevich: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "...come to terms."

Matijevich: "We can't, we can't postpone it again. We can't take it out of the record."

Walsh: "Well, I don't know what rule says that you can't postpone it. Custom says that you can't, but there's no rule, Mr. Speaker."

Matijevich: "Well, there's a rule. And it has to be declared lost."

Ah... There are some parliamentary maneuvers, I'm sure."

Walsh: "Just take it from the table. There's really no problem."

Matijevich: "Right, but it has to be declared lost, Representative



because it's on its second ah... last go around. Ah... Have all voted who wished? The gentleman from Cook, Representative Mann."

Mann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, you don't have to tell them whether to use the time or not. I heard you talking last night for hours. Let him decide whether to use the time or not. Now Mr. Speaker and members of the House..."

Matijevich: "The time is on."

Mann: "I sat here and I've listened to a man that I served with in the Illinois General Assembly for six years, characterized in ways on the civil rights issue that those who served with him absolutely know are untrue. Now I think there are three reasons why people are voting 'present' on that board. There are some who feel that Tony should have issued a statement. Well I wonder, you know, what a statement would have done aside from being a little bit of tokenism. Secondly, there are those who are saying, we should bring it back for a 6% reduction. And finally, there are those who are punishing the Chairman of the Racing Board because he has done a straight, honest, forthright job of trying to bring honesty in the racing industry in Illinois. Make no mistake about it. Now, Mr. Speaker, here's what I'd like to suggest and I'd appreciate it if you'd give me a half a second here because..."

Matijevich: "That's about all you've got left."

Mann: "we are on second postponed consideration. The Governor does have on his desk a Bill giving the Fair Employment Practices Commission the power to authorize and initiate its own complaints. I'd be glad to sit down with Washington and Gene and some others and draw up a Resolution, a House Committee Resolution to investigate discrimination in the entire racing industry and let's find out where it is. I'd be happy to do that right now, but I think part of the problem..."

Matijevich: "Representative Mann, I think you ought to now bring it to a close."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I will do that. I will do that. You are enforcing a rule here which has not been universally enforced although I cannot say that you have not universally enforced it. I will conclude, I will just say, in all candor, that four years



ago, I personally introduced a Resolution and pursued it with the then Chairman of the Racing Board to try to do something about housing, health care, employment for minorities on that Racing Board. I think all of you will recall that and I worked very, very hard at it and I had the assistance then of State Representative Anthony Scariano. I don't think a meaningless statement that he's against discrimination. It would be like someone issuing a statement about dog bites man. We all know he's against it. The question is, what are we going to do in a concrete way to solve the problem. I would suggest that holding back is not the answer, but I'll gladly sit down with anybody, anytime to come up with an answer. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Matijevich: "Thank you, Representative Mann."

Mann: "And I'm sorry my good friend, Representative..."

Matijevich: "Ah... Representative Walsh, I've been shown the rule, Rule 38. A Bill can be placed on the order of postponed consideration only once. It may be called only once, thereafter, which is right now. This is the last reading and I would suggest that someone file a motion to reconsider the vote before it's on file. The ah... the gentleman... Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm just going to explain my vote and suggest perhaps that many of us are voting for one of the reasons, I'm sure, that the real three reasons that ah... Representative Mann offered were probably true and correct and many of us have picked out of those reasons and voted either 'no' or 'present'. I have another reason that I... and I don't know Representative, former Representative Scariano very well, but I did hear him characterized a while ago as a hardheaded man and sometimes a little bit hard to get to. I, in my long past, I've found sometimes to plow with a mule, you had to hit him over the head with a 2 by 4 and I suggest maybe we hit somebody over the head with a 2 by 4. Thank you."

Matijevich: "Representative Dunn, confine your remarks to the Bill, please."

Dunn: "I would suggest that we return this back to Second for the amendment for a 6% reduction. If it isn't offered, why I vote 'no'."



Matijevich: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Houlihan, did you wish to make a remark otherwise. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk take the record. On this Bill there are 72 'ayes', 13 'nays', 73 voting 'present' and this Bill having failed to receive... The gentleman from Cook, Representative Houlihan."

J. Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I'd appreciate you recognizing me."

Matijevich: "I did once and you didn't answer me."

J. Houlihan: "You recognized me to speak and respond and at that time, I did not want to respond. There's been enough rhetoric on this Bill as it is. I'd like a poll of the absentees."

Matijevich: "Mr. Clerk, poll the absentees."

Selcke: "Darrow, DiPrima, Farley, Fleck, Friedrich, Giglio, Grotberg, Hirschfeld, Gene Hoffman, Kucharski, LaFleur, Leinenweber, Leverenz, McClain, McPartlin, Merlo, Schoeberlein, Winchester."

Matijevich: "On this Bill, 72 'ayes', 13 'nays', 73 voting 'present'. This Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional majority is hereby declared lost."



Matijevich: "The Speaker and the Majority Leader have announced that tonight at six o'clock, the Minority Leader, Bud Washburn, will have some refreshments, rather food, in his office, and the Speaker will have some food in his office for the Democrats, so we have them to thank for that, and we can't break tonight. Ah.... Senate Bills, Third Readings. On Senate Bills, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 1384."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 1384."

Matijevich: "Representative Stubblefield."

Fred Selcke: "Bill for an Act to amend Section 8 of the Workmen's Compensation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Stubblefield: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have leave of the House to return this Bill to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of offering an Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Objection? Hearing none, return to the Order of Second Reading. Representative..... Mr. Clerk, will you read the Amendment."

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #1. Stubblefield. Amend Senate Bill 1584 on page 7 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stubblefield."

Stubblefield: "Mr. Speaker, this is an Amendment that was made necessary in order to bring the Amendment, or the Bill into compliance with the new Act that we passed last week. The Senate Bill that was passed last week, involving workmen's compensation. It's a technical Amendment that says substantially the same thing but brings the Bill into compliance so it will not be in conflict with the new Law. I move its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1384. All in favor, indicate by saying 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments? Any further Amendments? No further Amendments, Third Reading. On Senate Bills, on the Order of Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 1031."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 1031."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."



Fred Selcke: "Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act.
Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has asked leave to return Senate Bill 1031 to the order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Any objection? Hearing none, we'll return it to the Order of Second Reading. Read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk. Representative Hart."

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #5. Amend Senate 1031 as amended in Section 22 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to return this Bill to.... well, it's there. O'kay. Would you read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk or did you?"

Fred Selcke: "I did already."

Hart: "O'kay. This Amendment takes out the definition of hazardous refuse. There is some concern about it in whether or not it would be unduly limiting and so in order to clarify it, we're going to take the definition out. There's a House Bill very similar to this, which has passed both the House and the Senate, which contains the definition and the feeling is we'll put both Bills on the Governor's desk and let him decide which he would prefer to sign, so I would move for the adoption of House Amendment #5."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion. Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1031. All in favor, indicate by saying 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments? Any fur..... Third Reading. Senate Bills, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 986. Representative Freidland."

Freidland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I request leave to return Senate Bill 1986 to Second Reading for purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedland."

Friedland: "Thank you. This Amendment revises the privilege tax on ah.... mobile homes and I've worked in cooperation with Representative Dunn and it assures that there will not be a tax increase and I urge its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection to returning this Bill to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment? Hearing none, it is returned."



Fred Selcke: "Amendment #1. Friedland. Amends Senate Bill 986 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the explanation of the Amendment. Any discussion? Any questions? Question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor, indicate by saying 'aye'. Opposed 'nay'. Who? Representative Kane."

Kane: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Kane: "Will this put the tax in the same situation as the ah... Bill that passed the Revenue Committee?"

Friedland: "Is that measure..... Does Representative Grotberg have some input into that measure? Do you know?"

Kane: "Yes."

Friedland: "Yes."

Kane: "O'kay, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further questions? Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1986. All in favor, indicate by saying 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments? No further Amendments. Third Reading. Consideration Postponed. Let's take another crack at House Bill 783. Representative VonBoeckman. Representative VonBoeckman."

VonBoeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 783 is an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Industrial Commission for the Fiscal Year, July 1975. This Bill has two Amendments to it. One Amendment reduced the appropriation by 8%. The other Amendment introduced by Representative Calvo stipulates that none of the funds appropriated herein shall be used for the employment of medical examiners, except for the purpose of medical evaluation and rehabilitation services. I think this has been hashed around by ah..... both the Republicans and Democrats and I think if there is any additional changes to be made, they should be made in the Senate. Therefore, I ask a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "Ah..... Mr. Speaker, ah..... Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've been discussing this Bill with Representative VonBoeckman and I wasn't aware it was going to come up at this particular time, and I had an



Amendment filed, which I wanted to have offered on ah.... upon it being returned to Second Reading, but ah..... I'm very much concerned about some of the tactics of this ah.... Commission, because they're changing the procedures around. There are sixteen court reporters who work for this Commission full time. They're going to be eliminated by this ah..... provision in this ah.... Bill. And ah.... before I would agree to vote on this Bill, I would like to have the assurance of the Sponsor, and I know he will cooperate with me in every way that he can, that we will have an opportunity ah..... before the Bill goes through the Senate to discuss this matter in full with the Chairman of the Commission in terms of the elimination of some of these employees who have worked for the Commission for a long time, and so if Mr. VonBoeckman would indicate his ah.... agreement with that, then I would now ask to have my Amendment put on at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further questions? Question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor, Representative Hart."

Hart: "What? I asked a question. I wonder if he will agree to it?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative VonBoeckman, do you care to answer?"

VonBoeckman: "Well, Representative Hart, in your agreement as we discussed, I think that you should call the Director and ah.... encourage him to ah.... to keep these men employed. According to ah.... the report from the Director ah..... we are now a year behind time in ah.... settling these cases because of the reporters and therefore, he has a new system that he wants to / introduce Whether you can talk him out of that, I suggest you do that and place the Amendment in the Seante."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in response to Representative Hart's inquiry, I'll be more than happy to make sure that the Director will talk to him directly. We'll work very closely with that subject matter with Representative Hart. I would also like to point out, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that this item was fairly reviewed in the Appropriations Committee and as the Sponsor has indicated, this budget was reduced by \$331,600, much above the six percent reduction recommended. I may also point out that this reduction was made before the Governor's reduction message



to the General Assembly. It's been the purpose of the Appropriations Committee that we review every budget on the excess or unless we make the necessary cuts accordingly. I would hope that an 'aye' vote would go on House Bill 783 as amended. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I will not oppose this Bill, but I would like to point out to the Chairman of the Industrial Commission that he has a philosophy of government, a philosophy for the Industrial Commission that is foreign to our system of law. He has caused much consternation throughout the service of the people in the Industrial Commission when he puts forth these alien philosophies. I would suggest to him that he administer the law as it is and stop trying to present so called reform which will do exactly the opposite. I hope that he gets the message that we gave him the last time that it was up for a vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I'm one of those ones that hasn't been able to get a sun tan this year because we've been meeting all year, and I wonder if it would be possible if you could open the curtain so that we could have some subliminal, commune nature? There's a beautiful storm going on. Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Beatty: "Mr. VonBoeckman, is it true that this same leader of the Industrial Commission, Mr. Rosenbloom, was not able to properly handle the OSHA Program, and the Governor of the State of Illinois has decided to let the Federal Government handle this in the future, and is it also true that there's an investigation now as to the proper handling of that million, two hundred thousand dollars that was used by this Commission and that maybe the State will be assessed for improper use of this money? Are any of these things true that you know?"

VonBoeckman: "Well, not to my knowledge. If there is, I'm sure that the proper authority will bring this out, and I don't think that has anything to do with the Bill itself."



Beatty: "Well, isn't it true that ah..... that Mr. Rosenbloom intends to eliminate many of the old time employees, many civil service, some holdovers from either Republican or Democratic and put them in with new professional type people with higher wages?"

VonBoeckman: "No. He said not."

Beatty: "Isn't it true that in his administration of the Industrial Commission he has tried novel things, but he has not used any care in how he man-handles people who are civil service? He doesn't care about the employees."

VonBoeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, these questions ah.... are being put to me and I am not directly ah.... affiliated or affected by the Director of the Industrial Commission. Therefore, I really can't answer them with intelligence. I do know, I have heard scuttlebut to the fact that there have been some problems, but ah.... I imagine in any walk of life or anybody that is trying to do a job and trying to do something different will run into problems. Therefore, I can't answer....."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, briefly on the Bill. I think that it's a mistake to allow a man who is heading a Department to come in and try to instill new programs in his Department, when his history is that he cannot handle what was handled adequately by other administrators. That he has not been able to handle an OSHA problem, that the Governor has had to discontinue the use of OSHA funds and put it over to the Federal government. I think it would be much more sensible to take this back to second and amend it and keep these innovations out. Then if the Governor comes back into office in the next election, let's give this another review in 1976. If he's still here and Rosenbloom's still here, then we can consider change, but I don't see why we should give a man a chance to goof up the Department further."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stubblefield."

Stubblefield: "Just a point of information, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Stubblefield: "I think the previous speaker is perhaps in error in blaming Mr. Rosenbloom for the administration or the lack of administration of the OSHA Program. That comes under the Department of Labor, and it's not his responsibility."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Von Boeckman to close."

Von Boeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and gentlemen of the House, a lot of rhetoric has been brought into this...ah...subject and this is a House Bill. It has to go to the Senate, and according to the news media, the Senate has been hacking away at all House Bill appropriations to, therefore, I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "You ready for the question? 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? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there are 104 'ayes', ...Representative Dunn?"

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to explain my vote, if I may?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Dunn: "In the Committee hearing, with regard to this budget, there was some discussion about a large percentage of this budget having lapsed in the prior fiscal year. To the best of my knowledge, there has been no satisfactory explanation for that lapse. In view of the Sponsor's remarks, the Senate has seen fit to cut a number of appropriations. I hope the Senate takes a long, hard look at this budget, because that lapse was very significant and should be looked into. It was indicated earlier that there would be some answers provided before Third Reading about why that lapse occurred and what to do about it, and I haven't heard anything. Im going to vote for the budget, but I sure hope that ..ah..that this matter gets looked into very hard in the Senate."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Willer 'aye'. On this question there are 107 'ayes', 2 'nos'...Representative Calvo."

Calvo: "Well, the board was closed a little quickly, and I, too, am a little dissatisfied with some of the ways this administration has been operated and some of the statements the Commissioner has made recently, but we do have to have employees to operate this program for the working man, and I do wish to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "...108 'aye', 2 'nay' and the Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bills, Second Reading. House Bills, Second Reading appears House Bill 1947."



Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1947. What's the next Amendment? 45. This Bill was read a Second time yesterday and we quit on Amendment #44. Amendment #45. Schraeder. Amend House Bill 1947 on page 14 by inserting between lines 6 and 7 the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe ah.... on a Point of Order. Under Amendment #24, we have a Section 28, and I believe that ah.... I would hope the Speaker would check in the Rule and see if this Amendment is in order at this time."

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

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I was just getting ready to raise the issue. I would like to be very brief and I think we can handle this without going into any detail on that. It will solve the problem. Let me say, this Amendment was introduced for the prime purpose and no other purpose than to point out that central Illinois is in dire need of transportation through and out of the city. Our metropolitan area of 300,000, the second largest in the State of Illinois, is severely handicapped by lack of transportation facilities and I would go so far to say that the City of Chicago is also involved in this as well as the City of Springfield, because no one going from Springfield to Chicago via Peoria has any means of getting back and forth, and this has been a very crucial issue to us and we've attempted over the years to solve this, and this Amendment only was introduced to bring to your attention that it is a vital necessity that all areas in the State of Illinois have a viable transportation system and if nothing has been done other than to show that we in Central Illinois need a viable transportation system, then we have failed, and with that statement, I would like leave of the House to Table Amendment #45."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Hearing none, Amendment #45 is Tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #46. Mulcahey. Amend House Bill 1947 as amended by inserting after Section 28, as added by House Amendment #24, the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mulcahey. Representative Mulcahey. Representative McClain."



McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think Representative Stubblefield could handle this Amendment. It's a joint co-sponsorship, Mulcahey and Stubblefield."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe ah..... Amendment #46 may be technically incorrect, because it adds Section 29 and we already have a Section 29."

Speaker Redmond: "I've been advised that that can be corrected on its face, to Section 30. Representative Stubblefield, explain the Amendment."

Stubblefield: "This is an Amendment that asks for an appropriation to widen and resurface 18 miles of highway from Rockford to Duran. Route 70 goes across my district and Representative Giorgi and Simms District and onto the 35th District represented by Representatives Mulcahey and Brinkmeier and Rigney. This is one of the worst pieces of highway that I've ever traveled. The residents of Duran, in going to Rockford, rather than travel the highway, in many cases, go all the way by Freeport, which is about 50% further distance. It's just to the point where it's dangerous. Cars are damaged and ah..... the appropriation is justified and I would certainly move for the passage. I urge a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Question is on the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment, indicate by saying 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #47. Sissy Stieh. Amend House Bill 1947 as amended on page 12, by inserting between lines 30 and 31, the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #47 amends Section 21A to appropriate three million dollars or so much thereof as may be necessary to the Department of Transportation from the Road Fund for a grade separation on Highway 460 in Allerton in St. Clair County. This is an extremely serious situation. It's dangerous to the health and safety, to all of the people in Southern Illinois who are going to Missouri and for the 30,000



commuters from Belleville and St. Clair County into Missouri. This is probably the most serious situation in all of Illinois, and I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would just like to inform the House that we passed the Bill similar in nature for the Lady. It's in the Senate. We've passed the substance on the appropriation bill. I think, I don't know how many times we're going to put this three million dollars into a budget, but I think once or twice is enough. Now this is the third time, and I recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have no trouble with this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Lady has moved the adoption of the Amendment. All those in favor, vote 'aye', say 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #48. Skinner. Amend House Bill 1947 as amended by inserting after Section 24 the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if this Amendment is now technically in Order? Would you have your Parliamentarian check it out?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "I would ask that the Parliamentarian look at Amendment #41, which is adopted. We already have a Section 24.1."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would state that ah.... this Amendment is in Order. All it does is add another Section 24.1, which is not necessarily in conflict."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner, the Parliamentarian has pointed out that we will have two Sections, 24.1. Ah.... Amendment #41 appropriates \$200,000,000. Amendment #48 also has the same Section number and appropriates a hundred million. The only difference between them is the dollar amount.."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, if this Amendment were adopted, then there would be three hundred million dollars worth of bonding?"



Speaker Redmond: "That is correct."

Skinner: "May I ask leave to table this Amendment then?"

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections to table Amendment #48? Hearing none
Amendment #48 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #49. Skinner. Amends House Bill 1947 as amended
and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, House Bill 49 is something that if this House
can't buy it it means that they don't really care what Milton Pikarsky
.....is paid in the next Fiscal year. This Amendment says and I
will read the whole Amendmnet. 'None of the funds appropriated in
this Section may be paid to the Regional Transportation Authority
if the salary of its Chairman exceeds one hundred thousand dollars
per year.' Now I really don't believe anybody could vote against
this Bill in good conscience. I offer it as a token Amendment that
the General Assembly shall make some Amendment that effects the
Regional Transportation Authority this year. This is the only chance
we got going and I would ask for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Well Mr. Speaker, I was wondering...I believe this is similar
to...ah...Amendment #16 which was defeated. We had a different
individual in the Chair at that time and I raised the point that as far
as the RTA Board and the Directors who in turn make the salary on
the...ah...on the, whatever his title is, Mr. Pikarsky, that it's
in a different statute and I would think that the...Amendment #49
would be in conflict with that statute and it should be ruled out
of order."

Speaker Redmond: "In as much as there has been a...a vote on this
identical Amendment with the exception of the dollar amount...
Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I would suggest that the prior Amendment attempted to lower
the gentlemans salary and this doesn't do anything whatsoever to
limit his salary as...as far as the announced amount goes at this
point...All it says is you can't raise it from eighty two thousand
to over a hundred thousand. Now surely that would be acceptable."

Speaker Redmond: "I also agree with the objection that the...ah...the RTA



statutes, which created the RTA is the one that set forth the standards and I think we're trying to amend it by reference and I don't think that that's the appropriate way...."

Skinner: "Back to the dance floor."

Speaker Redmond: "So I'll rule...ah...that it's out of order.

Any further Amendments?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #50, Skinner. Amend House Bill 1947 as amended in Section 17 by changing four hundred and sixty four million eight hundred thousand and so forth."

Skinner: "Moving right along Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "...Representative Lechowicz..."

Skinner: "May I ask if...ah..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed with your explanation of the Amendment."

Skinner: "I think that might be appropriate."

Speaker Redmond: "It is."

Skinner: "May I ask the Speaker if...or the Parliamentarian if this Amendment were adopted would we again be at the three hundred million dollar level?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates that we would be."

Skinner: "May I ask Leave...excuse me."

Speaker Redmond: "Did you ask leave to table?"

Skinner: "No wait, I didn't, I'm not sure I understood what he said."

Speaker Redmond: "Three hundred million dollars."

Skinner: "Oh, I don't want that. I would ask leave...to table the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections to table Amendment #50? Hearing none Amendment #50 is tabled."

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #51, Leverenz. Amend House Bill 1947 as amended by inserting after Section 23 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Amendment 51 is to provide five hundred thousand dollars for resurfacing of one mile of state unmarked highway in the village of Maywood. I ask for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Any discussion. The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #51 to House Bill 1947. All in favor



...Representative McClain. McClain."

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

ah...I have to say that fif...that Amendment 51 through 66 are all what we typically call around here as special interest Legislation...ah...It's been the policy of...of the Department to again stress to, to the Membership that these Amendments are not...some of them are duplications from what are in the book, some ...ah...Some of the Amendments...ah...take monies out of the General Revenue Fund...ah...I would suggest to the Membership that it would behove us all to oppose these special interest Legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Well, I'd like to also point out Mr. Speaker on Amendment #47 which is in the Sponsors own district, he supported for three million dollars and what's fair for the goose is fair for the gander, if you're going to adopt one, adopt them all."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, then I would move for Amendments #51 through Amendment #56, do adopt on one Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you Mr. Speaker..ah..I believe I filed a motion to consider Amendments 53 through Amendments 65 on one Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "It was just given to me and that is correct."

Totten: "They are all of a similar matter, they are different roads for different roads for different districts and I think at this time in order to expedite the House, as soon as we get to Amendment 53 that I would like to move the...the motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, will you read the motion. It reads Amendment 51."

Fred Selcke: "Mr. Speaker, I move that Amendments 51 through 65 to House Bill 1947 be considered on one Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duff."

Duff: "Well Mr. Speaker at this time I would like to ask if the Chair would reconsider its ruling on House...on Amendment #40 and include it on that motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Choate."



Choate: "Repre...Representative Hart has an Amendment down there. I don't know the number of it, would you tell me whether that's included in that motion or not?"

Speaker Redmond: "Why don't you tell us the number."

Choate: "I don't know the number, the Clerk will have to tell me."

Fred Selcke: "Here's...ah...Representative Hart's Amendment is #69 so it's not included in this motion."

Choate: "Then Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of forty thousand dollars only and there's other Amendments that are included in that all inclusive and blanket motion...I...I don't know why you would take a group of big ones and let the little ones out."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "I'll amend it to include...ah...Amendment #69 and 70."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. With your permission I would like leave to have Amendment #59 tabled."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection to tabling Amendment #59? Hearing none Amendment #59 is tabled. Representative Totten...59."

Totten: "Okay, I'd like to amend my motion to include Amendments # 66, 69 and 70 in that motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I wonder if the Gentleman would...ah...include #67 also?"

Speaker Redmond: "Is that a three hundred million dollar one?"

Skinner: "No, it's just a teeny weeny one."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten, what...Amendments are included in your motion now? 51 through 65, is that?"

Fred Selcke: "51 through 65 except for 59 which was tabled and 66, 69 and 70."

Totten: "Correct."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you Mr. Speaker...ah...May I ask a question? Would this preclude any that are in the mail now that haven't gotten up here yet? I do have one in that posture."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll only include the ones that are enumerated here."

Richmond: "I say would it preclude...."

Speaker Redmond: "I would assume...I would assume that if the Amendment



lands here it will be considered in due course. Representative Dunn."

Richmond: "It will be up in just a few minutes, I'd like to have it considered."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to observe that...ah... I'm sort of surprised at the other side of the aisle for wanting to pass these Amendments in package. I thought they were objected.. objected to that as a matter of principal."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I would second Representative Tottens motion and...ah...ask for a Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "The question...the question is on the adoption of Amendment #51 through 65, excluding 59. 66, 69, 70. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' carry and the Amendments are going to be considered in one Roll Call. How you talk...State your point."

Skinner: "My point is that Amendment #69 is not printed. You can not vote on an Amendment that is not printed and distributed."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keller."

Keller: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, all I was wanting to ask and I don't think Representative Richmond got the complete answer here. He does have an Amendment that will be here to be distributed in just a few minutes. Will he have a chance to offer that?"

Speaker Redmond: "Certainly. The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The Amendments are adopted. Any further Amendments? Any further Amendments?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #67..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, We clearly asked for a Roll Call on those Amendments, we're entitled to one."

Speaker Redmond: "It came too late."

Walsh: "Oh, we did not ask too late. You know that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder."



Fred Selcke: "Amendment 67, Skinner. Amend House Bill 1947 as amended and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I wonder if it would be possible of having the courtesy of having the Amendment distributed and on the desks."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Ah...The Amendment has been lying on the Clerks table since approximately 12:30 to 1:00 this morning or this afternoon or whatever the hell day we're in. It's not printed and it's not distributed."

Speaker Redmond: "Well that's not the fault of the Clerk."

Skinner: "It's certainly not the fault of the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "67 is not distributed. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker it is distributed on this side, Cal."

Speaker Redmond: "Evidently it's been distributed Representative Skinner."
Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Since you denied the request for a Roll Call which was clearly made to you. I ask to be recorded as voting 'no' on the voice vote for Amendments 56 to 67, or whatever on earth they were."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, the Journal will so show. Representative Geo-Karis. She wants no...Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "No."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Macdonald, 'no', Deuster 'aye'. Any further Amendments? Representative Schraeder. Schraeder 'no'. Representative Choate."

Choate: "Representative Walsh mentioned only Amendments through 67, did you not want say through and including 69?"

Speaker Redmond: "69 and 70. Representative Choate."

Fred Selcke: "Ah...We included, 66, 69 and 70. We skipped 67 and 68."

Speaker Redmond: "Shea, 'no'. Any further Amendments? 67, it's Representative Skinner, do you want to be heard on 67? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Well Mr. Speaker, it would be nice if the Republicans could get the Amendments too."

Speaker Redmond: "Talk to your pages."

Skinner: "Talk to your Clerk sir. Who can't seem to even secure the House at night."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell."



Waddell: "Would you...Would you record me as 'no' please? On those Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duff."

Duff: "Well Mr. Speaker and...I would like all of those who voted against Amendment #9 to hear this. I vote 'aye', on all your reports."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further Amendments Mr. Clerk? Well he hasn't ah...Well I don't know but it's, it's...The Members are satisfied that it's been distribute so explain it."

Skinner: "If it would be possible to inject some logic into the travesty of the Legislative process that we're now watching. Amendment #67 deletes the two hundred million dollar figure in the Bill that...or the Amendment that we debated so hotly until 4:15 a.m. yesterday morning, or this morning and placed thereof, places one hundred million. There...any Bill that has numbers in it is hard to understand. Let me try two approaches for justifying why a hundred million dollars is enough. In approach number one I'd merely like to attempt to reiterate what Representative Kane said so well last night in such a calm voice that probably no one listened to him. He was absolutely right. We're talking about an extra two hundred million dollars. It's a seventy per cent Federally Funded set of projects and thirty per cent state funded projects. Now if you multiply thirty per cent times two hundred million dollars amazingly enough one arrives at a sixty million dollar figure for state, for the state share. Now, we have passed, Representative Dan Houlihan's Bill, which will take approximately ten to twelve million dollars from the road fund and divert it to Townships, Counties and Municipalities, assuming that the Governor vetoes the Bill and it takes us four to five months to override the veto as it did last year. So that would bring the real need up to approximately seventy, eighty, million dollars. Now, I'm willing to round the figure out, I guess you would say. I don't really think there's a justification for more than seven...sixty to seventy million dollars. But a hundred million dollars is a round figure that everybody ought to be



able to grasp. Now, that's one way of looking at it. The second way of looking at it is to look in that little black book with all the horrifying yellow highlight marks indicating that all the pet projects in your district that need doing so badly will not be done, can not be done, if we don't have the extra two mil...two hundred million dollars. If you look on option three and find the balance as of July 1, 1976, which is at the end of the Fiscal year for which we are appropriating money today, you will find that with option three which is with the two hundred million dollars worth of bonds, there will be a balance of one hundred and forty eight million dollars. Now, if you have a hundred and forty eight million dollars in the bank in cash when you are selling two hundred million dollars worth of bonds, wouldn't it be logical to assume that you would have forty eight million dollars in the bank if you sell one hundred million dollars worth of bonds. Half the amount requested by the Department. If one then subtracts the ten to twelve million dollars for the local road assistance program, one comes down somewhat below forty million dollars. Now the Appropriations Committee asked last Friday for a cash flow of this, of these projects. That has not been provided. A cash flow tells you what comes in and what goes out on either a month by month basis or a week by week basis or a day by day basis. We were assured by the staff of the Department of Transportation that this would be no problem. They would go back over the weekend, use some of their EDP money and come out with a computerized chart, telling us how much is needed when it comes in, howdo the projects come in in bunches, do they have to be paid out in...in large lump sums? We have yet to receive that chart and now it is either Tuesday or Wednesday, depending on which side of the International Meridian you're on...Tuesday or Thursday, whatever. What we have received is nothing more than a slightly altered version of option three which is available for everyone to look at in the black... in the back of the black book. Now I've served as a County Treasurer and during perhaps the biggest year with the biggest tax collections. Let's say thirty to thirty five million dollars flowed through the McHenry County Treasurers Office. I know that I needed a cash



balance of three hundred thousand dollars...prior to the time the property taxes came in so that I could pay all the Bills. The Department of Transportation has an eight hundred million dollar program. It would seem to me that five per cent of that total should be sufficient..."

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

Skinner: "...To Float, to...to cure any cash flow problems. As it was pointed out very vividly by the Majority Leader, in Committee. All one has to do is slow down the payments of some of the projects if you don't have the money in and after all the Federal Government is paying us off in three weeks. Now there is an alternative with the General Council of the Department of Transportation doesn't seem to under...doesn't seem to know, which is, will be familiar to all the con-con delegates that are here..."

Speaker Redmond: "Bring your remarks to a close, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "There is, I believe I have ten minutes Mr. Speaker...You have me..."

Speaker Redmond: "Nine have expired."

Skinner: "The three minute timer. There is a provision in the State Constitution that allows up to fifteen per cent in what might be called the state equivalent of tax and disipation warrants, fifteen per cent of the appropriations if you need short term money. We could create a, an instrument, a financial instrument, you could call a Federal Grant Anticipation Warrant if there are any of these short term programs. Now perhaps the best argument for voting for this Bill or voting for this Amendment..."

Speaker Redmond: "Bring your remarks to a close Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "In the facial expression of a Chief Fiscal Officer of the Department when I asked him if a hundred million dollars would be enough. He indicated it would. He said it would be tight, but they, that they could do it. There would be no diminution of the extra two hundred million dollar projects. I would ask for favorable consideration of this Amendment, which is what they need and not more than they need. It will result in allowing the Department to bond some cash flow but not a hundred million dollars worth of extra in cash flow. They need sixty million, let's give them a hundred and tell



them to go out and build those roads instead of having all the employees on the House Floor."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it the Amendment's. No...Back up. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The...The 'nos' have it, the Amendment is lost. Any further Amendments."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #68, Geo-Karis. Amends House Bill 1947 as amended by inserting after Section 17, the following..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To continue this protien Bill. Within the last two years there was a committment made in my district in Lake County, Illinois that the Lake front highway which is undertaken by the D.O.T. would be completed all the way to the end of Lake County on the North end. This Amendment appropriates the necessary sum for the purpose of the sight planning, land acquisition development, constructionLakes and Highways..."

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

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, it's my fault, I should have asked Representative Totten to include that...this Amendment in his previous motion. With leave, or we can do it with a voice vote..."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll do it on a voice vote. You don't object to the adoption, is that correct?"

McClain: "No sir..."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the adoption of Amendment #68 to House Bill 1947. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The Amendments adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #71. E. M. Barnes. Ewell-E. M. Barnes. Amends House Bill 1947 as amended on page 12 by inserting between lines 3 and 4 the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, you missed #70."

Speaker Redmond: "I didn't, the Clerk did."

Jack O'Brien: "70 was adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "I think 70 was included in that motion with Representative V



Waddell."

Lechowicz: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "I mean Representative Totten. 71, Representative Barnes or Ewell."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, I think that if the Sponsor would also include this on an oral motion we could put it on and...ah..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I would urge everybody to yell as loud as they possible can, 'no'."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, then I would just have to explain this Amendment very, very, briefly...ah..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Ewell: "Ah...What has happened is that I've been down here for just a couple of years and I noticed that everytime the D.O.T. budget comes along everybody puts in all their welfare, social improvement projects, roads and everything else to their benefit and in fact I even find that there are districts which pass out leaflets and brochures showing you that the average district is entitled to some thirteen million dollars of this D.O.T. project and in fact when they don't get their whole thirteen million they come up with a little advertisement saying that they've been shorted five million dollars. Now, I'm not here on behalf of just my district because I have a little district, three miles by four miles, I don't have many state roads and highways but this Amendment is offered on behalf of all the residents of Cook County who represent half the population of the State of Illinois. Now, I would like to see, not for myself, because I'm not selfish, but on behalf of the people of Cook, who traditionally get shorted to not have the right to participate and the right to have their people employed in accordance with the money that's being spent by the State of Illinois. Now, this Amendment, very simply would allocate twenty per cent of the total appropriation for the construction, reconstruction extension of streets within five hundred feet of the center line of any state maintained highway in counties having a population over one million. Now, I have deliberately avoided the many complex pitfalls that might befall us on this Amendment in pointing out that I'm not limiting this to interstate and I don't want to get into the



interstate state highway argument because then we have to get..."

Speaker Redmond: "Bring your remarks to a close Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "All right. I thought I had a little more time to present my Amendment though. But anyway, I don't want to get into that argument about arterial highways, feeders and connectors, so we use the term defined in the statute which says, streets, now what happens is, in the metropolitan area, because of the state roads running through you find an excessive amount of traffic that's forced on to the adjoining streets. This puts wear, tear, noise and it creates havoc and conditions for all the people who are on these adjoining streets. Now on behalf, of not just myself and the few people in my district who never benefit from these D.O.T. funds, but on behalf of all the people in Cook County whom I'd like to see not have one half of the money that they deserve, we only want a little bit and I would like to see somehow or another that when the trucks roll up here on the thirtieth day of June and all the goods start flowing back to the various parts of the State, that we in Cook County could participate and take home just a little bit to our people."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain, on Amendment 71."

McClain: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I would urge everybody to yell 'no' on this one, this is approximately ninety two million dollars for the County of Cook and I'd urge a strong 'no' yell."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #71. All in favor of the adoption indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'nos' have it, the Amendment's lost. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment 72, Simms, Giorgi. Amends House Bill 1947 as amended on page 12 by inserting after Section 20 the following, so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Well Mr. Speaker, this Amendment is offered by myself and



Representative Giorgi, to appropriate three million dollars or, that much as may be needed the Department of Transportation to redesign the Whitman interchange in the City of Rockford. This is the interchange which the State has on Route 51, it's an East West situation where you can only go one way and I would urge...ah...the adoption of the Amendment to...ah...House Bill 1947."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, again we have four Amendments coming up, 72 through 75 that are similar to the ones I included in the other motion. I believe I filed a proper motion with the Speaker to have these four Amendments, 72, 3, 4 and 5 considered in one Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Well Mr. Speaker, I only have up to Amendment #73. 74, 75 through 80 hasn't been distributed yet."

Speaker Redmond: "Read the motion Mr. Clerk."

Jack O'brien: "Mr. Speaker, I move that Amendments 72 through 75 be considered on one Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "You heard the motion. The Gentleman has moved that Amendments #72 through 75 be included on one Roll Call. State your point."

Lechowicz: "My point is that we only have through Amendment #73, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Have they been distributed? Okay we'll let the... amend the motion to 72 through 73. You heard the motion. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the question is on the adoption of Amendments #72 and 73. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendments adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #74. Richmond. Amends House Bill 1947 as amended by inserting after the end of Section 17 the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. That Amendment has not been distributed yet."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bradley."

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

I rise on a point of order sir, my point is that the Gentleman who is the main Sponsor of the, House Bill 1947, seems to me that he's done everything he possibly can to help the Members put their Bills...or...put their Amendments on the Bill the way that they want to and I would suggest or ask the Speaker to, at this time if it's at all possible, because I think we're using dilatory tactics with continuing to bring Amendments to the table as fast as they can get them there and we're adopting them as quickly as we can and I'm suggesting that it's dilatory to keep this Bill from getting to Third Reading and I wish sir that you would rule that the, whatever the last Amendment is up there will be the final Amendment to this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The last Amendment I have is number 74 and that's the sum of two million two million two hundred thousand dollars from the road fund to widen and resurface Illinois route 156 in Monroe County from Illinois Route 3 to Valmeyer. The question...We have that the question is on the adoption of that Amendment. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments? No further Amendments? Third Reading. Senate...Senate Bills Third Reading. On Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 14. Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise on a point of personel privilege if I may sir."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

McClain: "Sir, yesterday and early this morning after I was on my feet for approximately nine hours...ah...dealing with HouseBill 1947, I believe my remarks to Representative Clyde Choate, whom I respect very dearly, who served with my father and spent twenty eight years in the House, were very intemperate. I...ah..have gone to Clyde and explained that...ah...that I apologize for it, there's no excuse no matter how tired I was for those kind of remarks. I deeply apologize to Clyde and to the Membership for those very aggresive and intemperet remarks and I hope that in front of all, Clyde will accept my...ah... my very deepest apology."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Choate."



Choate: "Certainly, I ah.... accept Representative McClain's apologies.

I did personally when he walked on the Floor of the House this morning. I do publicly at this time. I realize that when you come into this session at eight o'clock in the morning to committee meetings and you work until four and five o'clock the next morning, that many times you will lose your temper and take out of context a statement that might be made to the extent to totally misinterpret it, and after we talked this morning, this is exactly what I think Representative McClain did, was misinterpret a statement and did not take the statement in its total context and I do accept his apology. At this time, though, Mr. Speaker, I would like to also raise another point of order as far as cutting off the Amendments, because it was clearly stated prior to a motion to cut off any Amendment, which I don't agree with, to start with, because you're certainly limiting the input as far as a Member of this House is concerned and your limiting his ability to have ah.... discharge his responsibilities, which he might want to do, as far as the people of his district and the State are concerned. But the real point is the fact that Representative Richmond had stated to this House that he had a couple of Amendments and that they were being drafted, that he did not want them included in that particular roll call simply because of the fact that they had not reached the Clerk's desk, and Mr. Speaker, I'm saying to you that they are now on the Clerk's desk and with all, with all good conscious, this General Assembly should give this freshman Member the opportunity of having those couple of Amendments discussed, whether they're adopted or not. There's only one instead of two, but whether its adopted or not, is totally immaterial at this point. The point is that this freshman Member who has been on the Floor of this House every second that this House is in Session attempted to do the things that a conscientious legislator would do and it should be considered."

Speaker Redmond: "The Journal will so show, and I will assure the gentleman, Representative Richmond, that I'll do everything I can to see that those Amendments are submitted to the Senate whenever the Bill receives consideration in the Senate. Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Mr. Speaker, actually you do include the first two of the three,



but your statement that as far as the numbers went was in error because I had filed it previously. Number 75 was on the Clerk's desk at that time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Downs."

Downs: "Mr. Speaker, we are on Third Reading with that Bill, and you've gone on to other business, and I hope that we can now proceed....."

Speaker Redmond: "Senate Bill 14. Representative Marovitz. Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all, I don't know how you're going to help Mr. Richmond, but I think you ought to at least get a roll call. The second thing I raise is I've got House Bill 3118 on the Order of Senate Bill, or House Bill, Second Reading and I would hope that we'd get back there."

Speaker Redmond: "O'kay, Representative Marovitz is not on the Floor, so we'll take that out of the Record and we'll return to the Order of House Bills, Second Reading. House Bill 3118."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3118. A Bill for an Act in relation to State Finance. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Mahar: "Is it not my..... my assumption that this involves expenditure of public funds. Does it not?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't think so. I think its ah..... the authority to impound, the authority to ah..... expend the public funds would be contained in the appropriation, and I think this is....."

Mahar: "Well, isn't that really the expenditure of public funds?"

Speaker Redmond: "I wouldn't think so. No. Incidentally, Mr. Clerk, at the time that we took the roll call on Mr. Totten's motion to consider those number of amendments, Mr. Neff had indicated that he wanted to vote 'no', so I don't know if the Record has been corrected, but please see that the Journal reflects that Representative Neff did request to vote 'no', and that I assured him that we would. Representative Neff."

Neff: "Mr. Speaker, I thought the tactics used on that roll call were terrible. The Amendments were never explained. I don't think there



was ten percent of the people on the Floor knew what they were voting on, and I thought at least I understood there would be a roll call on the machine instead of voice roll call, and I'm sorry that this is handled this way. I think it's real bad and Mr. Speaker, I would hope that we wouldn't do this, and I do want to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Show him as voting 'no'. 3118. Representative Shea.
Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 3118 certainly, under the provisions of Rule 31E, as pointed out by Representative Mahar, and I call your attention to that Rule, which says that all Bills providing for an expenditure of public funds shall be referred or re-referred to Committee on Appropriations before final action is taken in the House. Now this Bill certainly fits within that definition. It provides for an expenditure of public funds since the agency, Governor, or other agency may withhold or impound the public funds, so I would suggest to you under the provisions of Rule 31E, this Bill should be referred to the appropriate committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think I can raise two points in answer to that. This Bill was heard in the Committee of the Whole and moved to Second Reading and the Gentleman didn't object at that time with regards to Rule 31E, and this Bill does not provide for the expenditure of any public funds. If it's signed by the Governor, and if none of the officers, the authorizing signature officers choose to use the provisions of it, it doesn't affect an appropriation one iota."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "May I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this was the first time that the question could have been brought up. It would have been completely inappropriate in the Committee of the Whole, because we would have to address the Speaker and not the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole for a ruling on this matter, and I repeat that the Bill does effect the expenditure of money within the ah..... definition of Rule 31E and I would call the Speaker's attention to the fact that there are many Bills that do not contain appropriations, but are substantive Bills."



for appropriation bills that have been referred to the Committee on Appropriations because they provide for the expenditure of State money."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well, the Gentleman, when it was on Second Reading, Second Legislative Day, when he raised the point of why it was on the Calendar at that point, certainly could have made this objection. Now I don't think it's timely for one and even if it were timely, I don't think it's proper."

Speaker Redmond: "I've ruled, that in my judgement, it is not the expenditure of public funds and does not require to be referred to the Committee on Appropriations. Representative Shea on the Bill."

Shea: "Is it on Second..... Are there any Amendments up there?"

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments to this?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #1. D. Houlihan. Amends House Bill 3118 on page 1, line 8 by deleting 'may' and inserting in lieu thereof 'shall' and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "That is a mistake, Mr. Speaker. That is not my Amendment. That should be J. Houlihan. I think the same is true for Amendments 1 through 4."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative J. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Considering ah..... Amendment #1, it is a very simple Amendment and it directs ah..... the empoundment or whatever we want to refer to it as, as confiscation or the lack of spending of the six percent that would deal with the economic or fiscal crisis that we're involved in, to be a mandatory direction from the Legislature. This Amendment would require the Chief Executive to not spend those dollars unless they would certify that there was a need for these dollars. Our subsequent Amendments, I think, which further tighten up this Bill, and I would move for the adoption of Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I would oppose this Amendment. I think that by making it mandatory for the empoundment of the funds could raise serious



constitutional question and I oppose the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Gentleman..... Mr. Clerk, will you read the title of this Bill again?"

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3118. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to State Finance. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1....."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendment #1 has been read I take it. Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 3118. All in favor indicate.... Representative Houlihan to close."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, frequently when you have no arguments against a proper procedure or no arguments against the merits of the Bill or Amendment, you claim that it will be unconstitutional. With that in mind, I would urge an 'aye' vote on this Amendment, which really does make this Bill effective and makes it much more probable to achieve the purpose that we all intend; that is, not to over spend State revenues with our appropriations."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall the House adopt Amendment #1 to House Bill 3118. All in favor, say 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. All in favor, vote 'aye'. All opposed, vote 'no'. Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. To explain my 'aye' vote, I would like to recall to the Members of the House who were present during the Committee of the Whole, that there was some discussion of desirability of making the ah..... the initial empoundment decision mandatory. The rea..... and I don't believe there is any constitutional infirmaty in doing that. An Appropriation, after all, is only an authority from the General Assembly to obligate or expend public funds. There's no reason we cannot condition or place limitations or restrictions on that authority, and that is what we would be doing in this Bill. Now, we are not affec..... really changing the effect of the Bill by making the initial empoundment mandatory for this reason. The decertification, the release of the funds, is still within the discretion of the certifying officer, so that although the initial empoundment might be automatic by operation of law, the decertification remains discretionary with the certifying officer. I think if we are to act responsibly and we are really to show that we're



serious about meeting the fiscal crisis which has been described to us; namely, the short fall in State revenues, that an 'aye' vote would be called for on this Amendment, and I urge the Members to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there are 33 'ayes', 74 'nay' and the Amendment's lost. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #2. J. Houlihan. Amends House Bill 3118 as amended on page 1, line 9 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative J. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #2 was to ah.... go along with Amendment #1 in that the Bill currently reads that he can empound up to six percent, so that a particular certifying officer might empound or might confiscate or not spend two, three, maybe four percent on his own discretion. I think that's improper. I think what we are doing is giving him far too much latitude and I would suggest that the Legislature ought to extend itself and amend this to say that he shall empound equal to. He shall empound exactly six percent."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I oppose this Amendment. The way the Bill is drafted, it gives the appropriate certifying officer the flexibility, such as if he wants to empound say only one percent of the school fund instead of a mandatory six percent. I think that some flexibility is required, and I would oppose the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 3118. All in favor, indicate by saying 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The Amendment's lost. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #3. J. Houlihan. Amends House Bill 3118 as amended on page 1 by striking line 24 and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is another attempt to make ah.... one of the special orders of business, the Shea order of business, a little more reasonable. It seems to me



me that we ought to have the certifying officer not only certify that there's need for these funds, but also that the funds are available, because we all know that there's a need for these funds. That's why they were originally put in the budget. That's why they were originally requested. The question that remains is whether or not these funds are available, and that's the key factor, and I would ask for an 'aye' vote on this particularly good amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I oppose the Amendment. There is no way, at the time that we've appropriated the funds, we say what's available. This allows somebody some flexibility in the dispersal of the funds and I would oppose the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor, indicate by saying 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'nos' have it and the Amendment's adopted, or is lost. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #4. J. Houlihan. Amends House Bill 3118 on page 1 by deleting line 29 and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, certainly Representative Shea will go along with this Amendment. For what this Amendment does is provide that after the certifying officer indicates that he needs to spend these funds, he must come back to the General Assembly and certainly Representative Shea and many of us have been working very hard to reassert the role of the legislature, and to have it as a co-equal branch of government, and what I'm asking here is that the certifying officer must submit to the Legislature to have approved by the House and Senate the ah... particular certification to expend these funds and I would move for the adoption of Amendment #4."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well, the way I read the Amendment, it limits it to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House that need approval by the majority of votes, the Senate and the House of Representatives, and I'd oppose that Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washington."



Washington: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'm inclined to support this Amendment and I'll tell you why. Now there have been charges ever since the so called, fiscal crisis was laid before us but there's been a series of buck passing between two branches of... of the three branches of government. The charges have been that the Governor was...became aware of the crisis and passed the buck to the General Assembly and the General Assembly in its wisdom through House Bill 3118 attempts to pass the buck back to the Governor through his various code department offices, etc. The wisdom and duty of this Amendment is that the buck doesn't be passed to anybody but you have a share of responsibility and it follows from that that you have of accountability and that people who are confused about this buck passing and I probably am a little confused about it myself. It follows that people who are confused about this buck passing will know that both branches of government who are responsible for budgeting and appropriating are involved in an ongoing surveillance of this very serious and critical fiscal crisis. So I wouldn't cavalierly pass this one up because I think people are far more sophisticated in terms of states and answers than we think they are. And if you're talking about cutting back certain services, if you are cutting...talking about not or freezing employees or laying off employees, if you're talking about those things and a whole lot of people are wondering out there just who is responsible and people are going to get pretty darn tired trying to find out who's got the buck and they may get rid of all of us. So I suggest to you from a selfish point of view, from a stationary point of view and from just a down right accountability point of view, before you vote against this Amendment, think about that. Let's stop this take us to ever to chance or take us to whoever who may be out there and face up squarely to the proposition. Shouldn't we all, in light of the fact that we must deal with the crisis, shouldn't we all be involved in an ongoing close scrutiny of the whole budgetary process, revenue appropriation periodic appropriation, semi-freezing of such and so forth. I think this Bill...this Amendment has a certain cemetery, poetical beauty if I might say. Please don't rush hurriedly through it."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor of the Amendment yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Madison: "Representative Houlihan, would you explain to us mechanically how this would...ah...how this would operate."

Houlihan: "Representative Madison, I would see the procedure to be similar or...ah...very much a...the same fashion as when a Bill is vetoed. That Bill would then be delivered to the House and to the Senate. To the President and the Speaker of the House and then the House and the Senate would take some responsibility, some action on that. If they approve by a constitutional majority, that is 89 votes in the House. That this certificate, there was a need and there was a resource available they would then approve that certificate and it would be sent to the Comptroller to assign those vouchers."

Madison: "Representative Houlihan, you're ah...Your requirement in the...ah...in the Amendment that...ah...that the certification be approved by both the House, by both the House and the Senate tends to indicate an operation tantamount to a deficiency of appropriation and yet in the same token you're not requiring or at least your explanations indicate that you're not requiring that the certification go through the Appropriation Committees of both Houses. Is that...ah...is that your intent?"

Houlihan: "Ah...That's correct Representative Madison. I don't think this is tantamount to a deficiency appropriation because all we will be called upon to do is to review that certification. To evaluate in a body whether or not there are available funds and whether or not there is a need for these funds. It is not a new Bill, it's not like a deficiency appropriation or a veto. It would be sim...more similar to a Resolution."

Madison: "But unlike...ah...unlike a veto situation...ah...Representative, we would be asked to, as you indicate, we would be asked to scrutinize the situation to determine whether or not there was a need. It appears to me that that could be best, that could best be handled by the Appropriations Committees of both

the Houses and yet you suggest that what would happen is the



Senate and the House individually would act as a Committee of the Whole to determine whether or not this certification was...was adequate. Is that your intent?"

Houlihan: "That is my intent."

Madison: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan to close."

Houlihan: "Ah...Mr. Speaker. Once again the Majority Leader has been a little bit inaccurate or misleading in his interpretation or explanation of my Amendment. He would suggest that this refers only to the appropriations of the House and the Senate. I would like to correct him by pointing out that this Amendment at least line 29 on page 1, which says that, it follows the line that says, 'Such certification shall be filed with' and it deletes the Comptroller and the State Treasurer and then inserts in lieu thereof, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House... and must be re... approved by a majority of both Houses. So this certification procedure applies to all of the certifying officers. Not merely the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House. I believe that this process gives us as it was so aptly described by Representative Washington, a...a good check and balance, a more responsible position as Legislatures so that we do not give carte blanche to any of the Executive Officers in dealing with this fiscal problem. We can be partners in making a responsible decision about the finances and the way money is to be spent."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the adoption of Amendment #4. All in favor of the adoption of the Amendment indicate...vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 60 'ayes', 63 'nays', the Amendment's lost. This time we have a very distinguished visitor from the Republic of Indo China. May I present to you Governor Esknewah Asnowin. My pronunciation may not be real good here. Manwequalem from the Providence of South Sumatra the Republican of Indo-China. He's on a visitation leav...Indonesia... He's on a visitation here and his interests specifically are called Agriculture and Industry. Governor Asnowin."



Governor Asnowin: "Mr. Speaker of the House, Ladies and Gentlemen, Members of the Legislature, distinguished guests. I thank you very much. I am an Indonesian, not from Indo-China. I come along very far away. It's now ten minutes to five O'Clock in the morning, twenty-sixth of June, in my Province. Twelve hours different. I come to the United States, that's my second trip. I've been in the United States in 1955 attending Military schooling in (unintelligible), Virginia. Transportation Corp. I've been Director of Army Transportation, Deputy Director before I came in the Office as Governor in 1966, 68...sorry...tenth of January. This is my second term in the Office of Governor. I am visiting the United States to learn something from you. Now I come down to the Illinois State, that belong to you Gentlemen because you are elected by the people of the State. So before I go to my hotel. I have to pay call to you. I am Indonesian, we speak Indonesian. It is not use for me to speak English, but I'm trying to introduce myself. I've been in the Army since '45, I still in the Army now, I be retired in about one year time. I said earlier, I want to learn from you. To see what you have achieved here, since you got your independence for about two hundred years. As I know you are going to celebrate your independence. A big celebration in 1976. My problem in Province, as it is a national problem is to give our people prosperity. To give them better living, to give better food, better clothing and better housing. We don't have to boarder what happened in Indo-China or in Cambodia. As one...as one reporter asked me this morning. What do you think about Indo-China? I told him why we have to worry about Indo-China. Maybe you here worry much, but we don't. What we worry is how we have to deplore our country. How we have to get a better living, closing, better food. How we to build better roads, better communication. How to give a better education, better health and so on. That's why my trip in the United States this time is to have look, what you have in this state. As you may know already, our population is fifth in the world. First is China, second is India, third is U.S.S.R, Russia, fourth is the United States



and fifth is ours. One hundred and fifty million over that stretch, length of three thousand miles, stretched from New York to SanFrancisco consisting of thousand of Islands. I myself have the opinion that people has to live together, to love each other and to love each other. That is what God said in our belief, in the Koran. He treat people, man and women consisting of two and different race to love each other, to know each other and to help each other and besides that God said, he create the world for the people to give up to the people. It's up to the people, he said, to make the world heaven of it in the world. All on the other side to make hell for them. I think we are all of the opinion that we want to make the world heaven in the world before we come heaven in the real heaven later on. That's why my visit here is of good faith, as I know you have advanced very much than ours, you have been the (unintelligible) country for two hundred years. We have been independent for only thirty years, that may be long period for a human being but for a human, for nation, for country, thirty year is short period. So we haven't achieved much yet. I do hope that with the help of you people here, especially from the Governors side I can pick up Industry here, the coal mine, the soybeans plantation, exhibition in Champaign. Because in my Province we have oil, we have tin, we have coal, we have agriculture. So I do hope and I'll assure that I will take much what I've seen here in the United States and also in the State of Illinois. I thank you very much to give me this opportunity to be with you for a few minutes. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bill 3118. Any further Amendments? Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to repre...or to introduce to this House the Honorable Garland McAfee a Member of the City Council of Metropolis Illinois from Clyde Choate and Dick Hart and Winchesters district, sitting back by Miss Yvetta Younge's desk."

Speaker Redmond: "Further Amendments."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #5, Lundy. Amends House Bill 3118 on page 3 by inserting after line 8 the following and so forth."

Lundy: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House...ah...the substance of Amendment #5 is included in a later Amendment which Representative Shea



the Sponsor of the Bill will be offering so at this time I would move ask for leave to table Amendment 5."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? Amendment #5 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #6, Kane. Amends House Bill 3118 on page 1 line 8 and 12 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "I would move to table Amendment #6."

Speaker Redmond: "Any...The gentleman has moved to table Amendment #6. Any objection? Hearing none, Amendment #6 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #7. Kane. Amends House Bill 3118 on page 1 line 9 and 13, so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's a very simple Amendment. It increases the impoundment from 6 per cent to 8 per cent. Basically for two reasons...ah...one so that..ah... if we do run into further problems in the year we'll have more money to distribute...ah...in the last payment to...ah...Elementary and Secondary Education around the State and also I believe the Governor has said that in addition to this 6 per cent cut they're instituting a 2 per cent reserve and this would do is give him that authority and I would move the adoption of Amendment #7."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think 6 per cent is more than ample for what we're seeking to accomplish with this Bill by raising it to 8 per cent it would raise... raise or increase it one third of what we seek to impound and I would oppose the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor of this Amendment yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Schlickman: "Would this Amendment increasing from 6 to 8 per cent give some flexibility and selectivity to impoundment by the Governor?"

Kane: "To the extent that it's permissive, it would."



Schlickman: "In other words in some cases he could go less than 6 per cent and in other cases he could go up to 8 per cent and the average across the board could be 6 per cent."

Kane: "Yes."

Schlickman: "Thank you very much. I think it's a good Amendment Mr. Speaker and I join with the Sponsor in soliciting your support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would suppose that talking in behalf of any Amendment Bill is probably an act of futility. But I would like to point out...ah...and I questioned this when we had the Committee of the Whole. I think the Governor made a mistake when he talked an across the board 6 per cent increase and if you look at the arithmetic, the simple arithmetic of the matter. If we're going to achieve the amount of savings that he is advocating it would take exactly a 6 per cent cut in the budget. Now the Governor knew, just as we know that approximately 1.8 Billion dollars of that budget is in Public Aid Grants. There's no way that we're going to cut by 6 per cent those Public Aid Grants at this point in time. Especially with the...in view of the situation of our economy. I think the Governor was wrong when he stood up and proposed that we take a 6 per cent across the board cut. I think this was done to simplify what he was really getting after and I think we too are making the very same mistake and it seems to me that we shouldn't be making that mistake. All you have to do is look at the arithmetic on the income statement and you know that if we exempt 1.8 Billion dollars of our total budget from the 6 per cent cut that things just aren't going to balance out. This Amendment is a good Amendment. It's realistic, it points out the needs of the state, I th...I agree with the concept proposed by Representative Choate and I'm going to vote for the Bill but I think we have faulty figures involved when we're talking about 6 per cent because they just don't add up. We aren't going to balance the budget with a 6 per cent figure and I think this one is realistic in view of the fact that we're talking about 1.8 billion dollars going to Public Aid Grants and I would hope that we would support it."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Houlihan: "Ah...Representative Kane, on what basis are you making the Amendment up to 8 per cent? Has there been any official figures or are you taking the figures necessary for this cut from House Joint Resolution 67, which was considered in the Revenue Committee?"

Kane: "Well the Governor said that he wanted a 6 per cent cut and he also said that he was establishing a 2 per cent reserve and 6 and 2 add up to 8."

Houlihan: "Well Representative Kane, you're well aware that there has always been a policy of a 2 per cent reserve."

Kane: "I believe it was announced last week."

Houlihan: "Well I think that's inaccurate. I remember last year and the year before that..."

Kane: "There was a press release issued last week."

Houlihan: "I see, I would have assumed you would have been aware of it since you were in the Governors liaison."

Kane: "Not last week."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Will the Sponsor yield to a question please?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Maragos: "I'm sorry Doug, I was not, either I was not here when you explained it or I did not get the full impact of what your Amendment does. Does it save 2 per cent across the board or does it...ah...say that it's one eight billion of the target, no matter where it could be a larger percentage in certain areas and less in others and none at all in certain."

Kane: "No, the...the Amendment to make it a mandatory cut was defeated so this is a discretionary impoundment of up to 8 per cent."

Maragos: "Yes, I know and is that...My question is, is that across the board or is this in relation to making it a 8 per cent on



all items including Public Aid, including Education, including all the big amounts or is it just...ah...is it instead of the 6 per cent you're going to use 8 or are you going to go to a greater extent to say I'm going to take...ah...that the end result will be when they whatever you're doing, the three hundred million or whatever it is that you're trying to work..."

Kane: "It discretionary up to 8 per cent applied to all line items."

Maragos: "But do you think that by this Amendment you will achieve the purposes for which we all are trying to strive for to give him that impounding ability to come up with three hundred million or whatever the amount of target may be though, that's my question?"

Kane: "Well, by increasing the upper limit of the permissiveness it gives the Governor and the other certifi...certifying officers greater...greater flexibility."

Maragos: "Therefore, you think that by doing this you'll give him... there'll be a more accurate approach or a more constructive approach to the problem."

Kane: "Yes and hopefully we'll be able to...to ah...save more money for schools in the last payout...ah...in June of 1976."

Maragos: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Choate."

Choate: "Yes Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to support Representative Kane's Amendment, if I understand it. After listening to the debate and dialogue as far as this Amendment is concerned. But there's one very othe...very important other point that can be achieved as far as the adoption of this Amendment is concerned. I have said on numerous occasions that I hate to abdicate the responsibility of the Legislature by having this impoundment. But by the Governor coming in with all...within the last two weeks of the Session and suggesting that the financial condition of the state is in such state, such a state that he would suggest a flat 6 per cent across the board cut, I would suggest that maybe this is the only feasible manner of...left open to the Ho...to the Legislature. However, the portion of the Legislative responsibility that I sincerely hate to see abdicated is simply the priority of making cuts in the various budgets. Now, when the statement was made we all realized that



many of the budget...budget requests had already passed so consequently we were not in the position to arrange priorities in a couple of weeks, which we should do in the Legislature. If I understand the Amendment correctly, if I understand the Amendment correctly it will now give the Chief Executive the flexibility to probably bring about an arrangement of priorities as far as these cuts are concerned and achieve the cuts that he desires. Is that right Doug?"

Kane: "Yes, Representative Choate."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Choate: "Well then I subscribe to the Amendment Mr. Speaker, simply because he will have the opportunity of having ascending priorities which rightfully we should do."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

The question is, shall the main question be put? All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment. The previous question prevails. Representative Kane to close."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I urge the adoption of this Amendment. What it does is it increases the...the flexibility, it increases the amount of money that can be set aside to fund Elementary and Secondary Education around the state. I think that if you look at what will happen to particularly downstate school districts, if the school aid formula is cut across the board by any percentage amounts that we're going to need all the money that we can get in June so that we can fully fund the school aid formula. I might agree with what Representative Choate has said and that is that in the last two weeks of the session it's going to be impossible for the Legislature to make any kind of meaningful statements as to priorities in the budget. The budget was first started being put together last November by the Bureau of the Budget after the Bureau of the Budget had worked on it for three and four months. It was submitted to the Legislature on the



the first of March and we worked on it for three...three months or so setting our priorities and now when in the last two weeks we're asked to make a 6 per cent across the board cut and that's impossible to do and just as one example let me...ah...tell you what, what...ah...is being done now in the Board of Higher Education. The Board of Higher Education is trying to set priorities within the whole system of Higher Education so that they can absorb cuts and that the cuts can be absorbed in the...in the right places and that can't be done if we institute across the board and so by giving this increase flexibility I think that we can set the priorities of this state in a much better situation and I would the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #7 to House Bill 3118. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. Unable to determine. All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 75 'ayes', 64 'no' the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #8. Shea. Amends House Bill 3118 on page 2 in lines 16 by deleting 'attorney' and inserting in lieu thereof the following, 'auditor' and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment does two things on page 2 line 16 we use the word 'attorney general' for the second time and as I explained on Sunday, the word should be 'auditor' and I...I strike the word 'attorney' and insert in lieu thereof, 'auditor' and on page 3 by inserting between lines 4 and 5 the following, 'any necessary proration of periodic payments from the common school fund shall all be made in the last periodic payment for the fiscal year' and I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #8. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #9. Skinner. Amends House Bill 3118 as amended



on page 3 by deleting everything after line 7 and inserting in lieu thereof, the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "This Section prohibits any cuts from the Public Aid Code as it reads now. Any mandated...any mandated programs. The Amendment would prohibit any cuts from any mandated school program that would include State Aid Education, State Aid Special Ed, Transportation Grants. Anything that the Legislature has mandated the Governor shall not touch. Ah...I would move for adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think we've done pretty much the same thing in the Bill as it is. We've excluded the...ah...the grants under the Public Aid Code but not the operational expense and with regards to the School Code, we've required that any, any reduction in that only be made from the last periodic payment and I think one of the biggest items we have is the School Code so I would oppose the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Skinner to close."

Skinner: "Well Mr. Speaker, all the local educators haven't figured out what...ah...the Governor and the Majority Leader are trying to accomplish here. When they do then may very well take a look at this Roll Call. It's an extremely significant Amendment. It says that the Public Aid. That they mandated grants for Public Aid and for Education shall not be cut. I would ask for a Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the adoption of Amendment #9 to House Bill 3118. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 36 'ayes', 87 'no'. The Amendment's lost. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #10. Ewing. Amends House Bill 3118 as amended on page 1 by striking the last sentence of the fourth paragraph of Section and inserting in lieu thereof the following, and so forth."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I propose this Amendment to put Legislative input back into the appropriations procedure in this state government. This Bill very simply says that before any of the impounded funds can be removed that the removal of these funds will be approved by a Joint Appropriations Committee to be appointed by the Speaker of the House, the Minority Leader of the House, the President of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the Senate. This Joint Committee will scrutinize and examine the request for approval of these funds. I believe that the original Bill was defective in not allowing for Legislative input into the removal of the funds. The Legislation allows for the funds to be put in and taken out almost at will. I believe that this also helps answer some of the possible Constitutional problems under Article 8 Section 2 and I would ask for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would oppose this Amendment. I think that the author responsible for the...ah...expenditure of the funds ought to be the one that says in his opinion whether the funds are needed and available and I would oppose the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in support of this Amendment and I would like to...ah...indicate to Representative Madison that...ah...this is particularly the point that he was raising on...ah...my Amendment saying that it really should be done by the Appropriations Committee. Representative Ewing and my doubles partner have come up with the procedure. The process by which we can do this without going into a Special Session or have the entire House or Senate approve, but can have some Legislative input under this process and I would think that this would be very responsible and allow for the checks and balances that were so adequately spoken of by Representative Washington and I would urge all Members who are



interested in having the Legislature involve themselves in these decisions to resort Representative Ewings motion and Harold I think...ah...you'll find Amendment #10 much to your liking."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor of the Amendment yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Lundy: "Representative Ewing, does your Amendment permit the...ah... Representatives of the Appropriations Committee or the General Assembly to disapprove re...the release of impounded funds...ah... or to disapprove the impoundment of funds, or both?"

Ewing: "Well...ah...Representative Lundy, the...ah...joint Appropriations Committee would have to approve the payment or the release of the impounded funds, under this Amendment."

Lundy: "So they don't have simply a veto...ah...that is a power to stop the release within a specified period of time, they must actively approve the release of the funds. Is that correct?"

Ewing: "That's correct."

Lundy: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise too to support this Amendment. It seems to me that this at least adds some dignity to this Bill in that it makes an attempt to cover the Constitutional error in the Bill by requiring some Legislative input and while I will agree with the Sponsor of the Bill, the Legislature is not too flexible in approving or disapproving and coming together when the time may be necessary a Committee consisting of seven Members would certainly have that flexibility and...ah...I think it answers that objection and the very serious objection that these...ah...impoundments have no Legislative enactment after passage of this Bill. If this Bill is indeed found to be Constitutional. So I think this is a very good Amendment...ah...better than Amendment #4 and it certainly should be...should be adopted."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker...ah...and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

Would the ...ah... Sponsor of the Amendment yield to one question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Ah...Tom, I'm a little bit fuzzy in my mind just exactly how your Amendment operates because you said first that it would also stop the impoundment of funds. Is that correct? And then it didn't. I...I would you please explain your Amendment to me please."

Ewing: "No, it doesn't stop the impounded funds it stops the release of the impounded funds without approval of the Joint Appropriations Committee of the House and the Senate. It puts the Legislature back into the area of setting priorities in expenditures and seeing that this state doesn't overspend against the mandate of our Constitution."

Geo-Karis: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Amendment reminds me and this whole series reminds me of the Army recruit who once spent about two years walking through the camp looking under tables and chairs and beds and everything else and every time he'd turn something over he'd say, that isn't it. So finally he looked on the Company Commanders desk and saw a discharge and he says, there it is and I think Amendment #10 is the one because it does do what Amendment #4 attempted to do but it does it in a much neater and less cumbersome way. It involves the Legislature, it involves those Members of the Legislature who are, particular experts in this whole fiscal problem and I think it's a good Amendment and I think it...it does what we want it to do and I urge you support it."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further? Representative Ewing to close."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. I believe that this Amendment does improve this Bill. I would earnestly ask for an 'aye' vote on it. I would like to acknowledge that the thought in this Amendment was...ah...not original with me but actually originated in the testimony of the Sponsor of this Bill Representative Shea when we were in a Committee as the Whole. I liked that



testimony, I thought it was a good idea and I've placed it in this Amendment and I would ask for a Roll Call on this Amendment please."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the adoption of the Amendment.

All in favor indicate by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 87 'aye', 59 'no' and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Senate Bills Second Reading appears...ah...1057, is it?"

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1057. Meyer. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. This Bill has been read a second time previously. Senate... A Fiscal note requested was...Representative Meyer, was Amendment #1 adopted previously?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Meyer?"

Meyer: "I'd move at this time to table Amendment #1 and offer..."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? The Gentleman has moved to table Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1057. Any objections? Amendment #1 is tabled."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #2. Meyer. Amends Senate Bill 1057 on page 1 line 1 and so forth."

Meyer: "Ah...This is the same Amendment as Amendment #1. There's an additional Section and it provides for Master in Chancery. I would move the adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1057. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments."

Jack O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Senate Bills Second Reading, Senate Bill 635. Representative E. M. Barnes. 635."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 635. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of



Children and Family Services. Second Reading of the Bill.

Six Committee Amendments. Amendment #1. Amends Senate Bill 635 on page 1, line 13 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative E. M. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I believe this is the Amendment that reduced general support services by thirty six thousand two hundred. Is that correct? I would move for the adoption of Amendment #1 to...ah...Committee Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 635."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Committee Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 635. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #2. Amends Senate Bill 635 on page 7 line 20 by deleting four hundred and seventy eight thousand and inserting in lieu thereof, therefore, four hundred and thirty thousand, one hundred and twenty eight. So forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative E. M. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Amendment deletes five positions of fifteen vac...five of fifteen vacant positions at the Herrick House job centers. The reduction of fifty four thousand, three hundred and seventy two dollars. I would move for the Committee Amendment #2 to House Bill...ah...Senate Bill 635."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 635. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Committee Amendment #3. It amends Senate Bill 635 on page 12, line 27 by deleting 11 million 98 thousand eight hundred and inserting in lieu thereof, ten million four hundred and four thousand eight hundred and there's a note on here that says not adopted."

Barnes: "Right, it was not adopted in Committee."

Jack O'Brien: "Committee Amendment #4. Amends Senate Bill 635 on page



15 by deleting line 10 and inserting in lieu thereof, the following.
Section 10 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.
Committee Amendment #4 gives the Department 2 per cent transfer-
ability among the purchases of child care line items. I would move
for the adoption of Committee Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 635."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Any discussion? The question is on
the adoption of Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 635. All in favor
indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the
Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #5. Amends Senate Bill 635 on page 15,
after line 9 by inserting the following. Section 5.1 and so
forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes. "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.
Committee Amendment #5 reappropriates two hundred and fifty
thousand of...ah...unexpended funds from the treatment of
Child abuse for fiscal 1975. This is no...this is not new dollars,
there's no dollar changes. The reappropriation of existing
funds. I would move for the adoption of Committee Amendment #5
to Senate Bill 635."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Any questions? The Gentleman has
moved the adoption of Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 635. All in
favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have
it the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Committee Amendment #6. Amends Senate Bill 635 on
page 13 by deleting line 33 and inserting in lieu thereof, the
following. Section and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House,
this is the Catania Amendment this Amendment was adopted in
Committee. I would move for the adoption of Committee Amendment
#6 to Senate Bill 635."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #6



to Senate Bill 635. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7. E. M. Barnes. Amends Senate Bill 635 on page 14, line 32 by deleting one hundred and fifty one thousand two hundred and fifty and inserting in lieu thereof, one hundred and ten thousand, so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This was a dual appropriation. This reduction reduces the appropriation in Section 9 for Herrick House Children Center, Capitol Development from one fifty one thousand, two hundred and fifty to hundred and ten thousand. The projects effected by this proposal are already incorporated as...under the Capitol Development Bond Program in House Bill 289. So, therefore, this was a double appropriation so we're reducing this appropriation of General Revenue Fund by forty one thousand, two hundred and fifty dollars. I would move for the adoption of House Amendment #7 to Senate Bill 635."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Any discussion? The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #7 to Senate Bill 635. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #8, Lundy. Amends Senate Bill 635 on page 9 after line 21 by inserting the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Yes thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Amendment #8...ah...adds...ah...on line item in the amount of five thousand dollars for reimbursement to the athletic staff at the Illinois School for the Deaf. To pay them for athletic coaching services which they rendered during...the...ah...preceding fiscal year but for which they were never reimbursed and I would move the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Any questions? The gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #7. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"



Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #9, Lundy. Amends Senate Bill 635 on page

13 after line 28 by inserting the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This

Amendment would add to one additional line item under...ah...

grants and aid. It's a twenty thousand dollar line item for

Child Abuse Legal Services to allow the Department to put up

money which will be matched by the Illinois Law Enforcement

Commission to fund...ah...a new program providing legal

services for abused children to protect their rights and make

sure that when a hearing is held on the abuse charge, the

rights of the child are properly protected and I would move the

adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, these Amendments come as a total

surprise, the last three at least...ah...I wonder if Amendment

#9 has been distributed, we don't...we haven't seen it, my staff

knows nothing about it, they haven't been consulted."

Speaker Redmond: "I understand it has not been distributed so they'll

have to take it out of the record until it is. Will you be

sure that the Page distributes them. Mr. Clerk."

Jack O'Brien: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Any other Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Senate Bill 629. Representative Kozubowski.

632. Take 629 out. Has that been moved? Yeah, I guess that

has been. 683 now appears on the order of Senate Bills Third

Reading. Representative Williams. We moved it today and he

wants to bring it back. Representative Williams."

Williams: "Well thank you Mr. Speaker, I'd ask leave at this time

to take Senate Bill 683 back from Third to Second for purpose

of one Amendment that wasn't quite ready at the time we moved it

to Third."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to return it to the

Order of Second Reading? Hearing no objections, leave is granted.

Read the Amendment."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #4, Flinn. Amends Senate Bill 683 as amended

on page 11 and so forth GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Well Representative Flinn introduced this, it's an agreed Amendment. It's been shown to the Leadership on the Republican side and to the Appropriations Committee on the Democratic Side. It does have the approval by the Department. It's a project that can be done in this Fiscal year. It doesn't add anything that isn't in the budget already and I would move the adoption of Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 683."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 683. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Yes, is ther...is there a mistake on the Calendar? I... my Calendar shows...ah...that Bill is now on Second."

Speaker Redmond: "It was...it was on Second, moved to Third today and then Representaive Williams wanted it returned. The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 720."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 720. Daniels. A Bill for an Act to Amend an act to establish Appellate Courts. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the Floor?"

Jack O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 751. Has that been moved to Third? 1492. Kosinski. That was moved?...How about 1498? How about 1500. Representative Berman. That's the one you want held. Is that correct? Representative Matijevich? Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 14. We called that before, Representative Marovitz, not here. 16. Representative Calvo here? Representative Calvo. 16."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 16. A Bill for an Act to establish the Board of Trustees for Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Calvo."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Calvo."

Calvo: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill was debated pretty thoroughly on Second Reading. This Bill would establish a Board of Trustees for S.I.U. Edwardsville. which is Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville. This University was established nearly twenty years ago, the commencement of it was rather unique. In that the people there in that vicinity donated the, much of the land, in fact about three hundred thousand dollars worth. Six hundred thousand dollars worth, to commence this University. That was only the beginning of the... what happened?...that was only the beginning of the uniqueness of this University. It is a...it is commuter type university and there are no / ^{live-in} campus buildings and there are no students living on campus. The students are primarily...ah...approximately 85 per cent from two counties in Illinois. St. Clair and Madison County. There are first generation college students and which means that their parents did not have the advantage of a college education or because."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Calvo, you're not coming through for some reason. Try that one, yeah."

Calvo: "Yeah, now we're...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 16, is a Bill as I mentioned that is well debated on Second Reading and I think nearly everyone knows what it's about. Just to explain a little bit about the establishment of the University and how it came about. Approximately twenty years ago, the people of the Madison County and St. Clair County area contributed approximately six hundred thousand dollars of personnel monies to duty the, to help buy the sight and the land to establish this University. Since that time the University has grown to where it has about thirteen thousand students, 80 per cent...approximately 80 per cent of which are from two counties, St. Claire and Madison County in that immediate area and vicinity. One reason for that is there are not live-in facilities or buildings on the campus to house students. It is a commuter campus. Nearly

all of these students are first generation college students, which



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

means their parents are not college graduates, did not have the financial ability or opportunity to attend college. Approximately 65 per cent of the students have a part time or full time employment and attend classes at the University on the basis of when they are not working and in this manner are able to afford the opportunity of a college education. All of which they are very, very, very grateful for. Because of the uniqueness of this school even in its commencement, which I mentioned to you, the, the citizens of that community and that area feel that they are entitled to a separate board of trustees from Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. This school and neither is Carbondale within any of the present board of trustees system, such as a Board of Regents or a Board of Governors, but are governed by one Board of Trustees. It is felt by all the residents that a Board of Trustees for this University could better relate to the specific unique problems of this University and of the citizens of these two counties. I would very much appreciate your favorable vote in support of this Bill and Mr. Speaker with that I would just ask for a favorable vote, support of assisting me in passing this fine Bill for the citizens of this area. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Sponsor would yield to a question?"

Calvo: "Yes I will, certainly."

Richmond: "Representative Calvo. A not that...ah...the Senate Sponsor of this has been quoted as saying that he felt, they felt like a step-child at the Edwardsville Campus. Do you agree with this viewpoint?"

Calvo: "Well I'm not sure of the...ah...terminology of a step-child or a half-sister or just what we want to use. However, with 60 per cent of the combined student population in getting twenty nine or thirty per cent of the combined appropriation when we are a new University with new programs and it would look like that we would need more money than S.I.U. Carbondale. In many other ways that I could mention to you other than this. But I think there is some indication that we're something other than a full brother.



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

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Richmond: "Despite my respect and admiration for the fine House Sponsor of this Bill I...I feel inclined to rise in opposition. I don't believe that...ah...S.I.U. at Edwardsville could be looked upon as a step-child indeed, quite the contrary and I would point out a few reasons to confirm that statement. Next year, the tenth anniversary of S.I.U. Edwardsville, and in looking at what's happened in those years, we could find 77 million in completed buildings and equipment and libraries, classrooms, laboratories, student center, family housing apartments and administration building and there is nineteen million dollars presently on ongoing construction...excuse me...they are fully accredited by the North Central Agency for work through Bachelor and Masters level the Dental School has been founded and is fully accredited, the School of Business is fully accredited and under...in its undergraduate program. The Doctor of Education Degree has been approved, the Engineering Program is fully accredited for two bachelors level programs and I submit that this impressive list of accomplishments would simply indicate that S.I.U. Edwardsville has not played the role of the step-child. No evidence is shown that the S.I.U. Board favors S.I.U. at Carbondale and further, the management of bonded debt obligations should this Bill pass would cause incredible legal and administrative problems. Too much fragmentation of Higher Education government is wasteful, I do believe this would increase the cost of...ah...the administration the over...the overview of these two universities. Any action on this proposition should await the stud of Statewide Governors currently underway the Committee of Independent Citizens for the Illinois Board of Higher Education and I would further point out that Senate Bill 16 has not received study and consideration appropriate to the issues it raises and I would respectfully request your assistance in defeating this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steele."

Steele: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this...ah...Senate Bill 16. I think



that this would be a good Bill. It would be advantageous to the taxpayers of Illinois and I believe advantageous to the students who are involved in these two fine Universities. I say advantageous to the taxpayers of Illinois because for this reason. The S.I.U. University has the highest administrative costs of any school in the State of Illinois per student. The reason that it has the highest administrative cost of any University in the State of Illinois is because of the cumbersome unwieldy situation which the one Board of Trustees has in trying to keep tabs on these two divergent, dissimilar Universities which are one hundred and ten miles apart, completely different in their educational goals and needs. The one University across from St. Louis second most populous area in the State of Illinois is a metropolitan urban commuter type of campus. Seventy per cent of those students, their fathers and mothers have not been to college before. The other campus at Carbondale some hundred and ten miles away is the completely /different kind of educational institution. A campus dormitory, not so populated area. Their fine Universities, but I submit to you this. There is a million dollar a year super staff that stands between the two campuses and the Board of Trustees. This is a very unefficient, unwieldy cumbersome kind of way to administer to the educational needs of these people and I say to you that by establishing a separate Board at Edwardsville we would eliminate the super staff and save the taxpayers of this state a million dollars per year. I think that this reason alone justifies your strong support for this very fine Bill. Now there probably was a proper time at which one board could properly look after the needs of these two Universities, when the Edwardsville campus was a small satellite embryo kind of campus. But today it's a major University, it has completely separate kinds of needs and priorities from the other campus and the experience of the past two years has shown that this University just can not be operated efficiently and effectively to the best interest of the students or the best interest of the taxpayers with one board and I say to you that this is sufficient reason for the separation of the Boards. Now there are those who say, well let's study this problem, let's study it, let's study it for a while and I tell you having served on the



Higher Education Committee and having seen the results of some of these studies, I think perhaps we need a study to study those who make these studies. I say to you that the super staff, which is now costing the taxpayers of this state a million dollars per year was a result of a study. That's the result that we got. It's a cumbersome kind of structure whereby the two campus presidents do not report directly to the Board of Trustees, but there's an intermediary advisory super staff that would be eliminated and unnecessary if we could have a separate Board at Edwardsville and by saving us a million dollars per year I say this is a good reason certainly. There are others who say, that well, if it happens here perhaps it will happen at another University. I say that if there's other Universities that you can save a million dollars a year by replacing a million dollar staff with a nonsalaried, non paying Board of Trustees, perhaps that would be worthwhile but I just don't think that's true because we do have the high administrative cost here caused by a situation where you are shuttling constantly a hundred and ten miles, constantly shuttling personnel and equipment and staff backward and forward between these two campuses. It's a costly situation, I think it definitely merits your serious consideration and the support of all good fine responsible Legislature here and I certainly urge your support of this Bill. Thank you."

Bradley: "As a point of information for the Members...ah...that maybe missed the announcement earlier. The Speaker is providing some food for the Democratic side of the aisle in his office a little bit later on and Mr. Washburn is providing some dinner in his offices for the Republican side of the aisle in a very few minutes. The Gentleman from Stevenson, Mr. Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This issue was debated thoroughly on Second Reading. I move the previous question."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it



Mr. Calvo the Gentleman from Madison to close."

Calvo: "Well just briefly Mr. Speaker, I know we're all hungry to get to this food. When we talk about the bonded indebtedness obligation which one of the Gentlemen mentioned I could just say as a bond attorney that this matter's been checked out through the general council and there is no problem in this way. This is easy...can readily be taken care of. The increase cost of administration I think the last Speaker covered very ably. The fact is that because of trying to run both these schools with one Board we put in a one million dollar year cost for a super staff. This is not needed if we have our own Board of Trustees which are not paid and we could do away both Universities could do away with this cost...ah...I would respectfully ask your favorable support of this Legislation."

Bradley: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 16 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman...or the Lady from DuPage, Mrs. Dyer, to explain her vote."

Dyer: "Ah...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In explaining my 'no' vote I would just like to, with all deference to the pro speakers on this, I'd like to challenge them. There is no way that you can multiply overhead costs by two and end up with less than you started with...ah...it simply adds to the overhead administrative cost to have two separate boards. You would have to put up with two separate boards and two separate staffs and I think anyone here who's dealt in administration knows this. Secondly the Board of Governors deal with five different kinds of...of Universities, very diverse and they have handled that situation very well. Finally, we have a brand new Executive Director here on the Board of Higher Education, Mr. Ferman. One of his first jobs was to appoint a task force and assign a group over the summer to study this whole problem of governors in our Universities in Illinois. It would be very premature to pass a Bill like this before this group has a chance to recommend a good efficient way



of...of solving our whole problem of proliferation and fragmentation in Higher Education. If you want to cut the cost now for students going to Universities you will vote 'no' on this Bill and then let's get that report in the Fall and try to solve the whole problem. I do urge a 'no' vote."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Moultrie, Mr. Stone, to explain his vote."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker Ladies and Gentlemen. I believe that if we were to pass this Bill today we would be making a very, very serious mistake. The Illinois Board of Higher Education for many, many years has had a...a Committee on Governing which has made many studies of the way the units of Higher Education in the State of Illinois should be governed. As you will recall just a few years ago they divided what was once the Board of Governors of state colleges and universities into two boards, one they left as the Board of Governors, the other they called the Regency Board or the Board of Regents. They put Illinois State University and Northern Illinois University under that Board. At the time that division was made they felt that this would be the...the best and the most economical way to run the Higher Education system of State of Illinois. Now this Committee of the Illinois Board of Higher Education is an ongoing Committee. The...ah...meet occasionally and make further studies of the situation. I believe that for the good of Edwardsville, we must see to it that this Bill does not pass...Ah...As you become smaller in...in the Higher Education system you begin to loose influence and when you loose influence then you naturally will loose money. The Gentleman stated in his opening remarks that everyone in the area was in favor having a separate Board for Edwardsville...ah...either he is mistaken or the Edwardsville Intelligence in their Editorial on June 14, 1975, was mistaken, because I have the Editorial here in which they state that it is not for the best interest of the students of Edwardsville or for the people of the...ah...area of Edwardsville or for this Campus, that they have their separate Board. He sets out many reasons...ah...all of which agree with and I believe that we should defeat this Bill."



Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Lucco, to explain his vote."

Lucco: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I believe that enough facts have been brought out either to show very clearly that Edwardsville Campus, S.I.U. Campus at Edwardsville, has grown, has progressed has matured enough that it could and can and ought to be able to stand alone."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Steele, to explain his vote."

Steele: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Just to explain my vote, Ladies and Gentlemen...ah...it has been mentioned if you want to cut cost. Yes, that is what we want to do. Now, I may say to you this. I do come from this part of the state, but I assure you this, I would not support this Bill if I didn't honestly believe it was the interest of the taxpayers because it will save money and because I thought it was the interest of the students who are involved at these two Universities. That is the major and primary concern and should be the concern of all of us here. Now we don't need a study to determine that it's costly to shuttle personnel and staff and equipment a hundred and ten miles every day back and forth between campuses. We don't need a study to determine that the administrative costs have been shown to be high. Higher here than any other University of this state. We don't need a study to determine that you can save a million dollars per year by eliminating the present structure which involves this super staff and replace it with a non paying nonsalary board of trustees that can give more direct attention and keep closer touch with the needs and priorities of the students at each individual campus. I think the merits of the situation deserve your sincere support of this fine measure and I think that your vote should certainly be green on Senate Bill 16."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn, to explain his vote."

Flinn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I too rise in support of this very good Bill. About twenty years ago when S.I.U.E. first started I was a night school student at the old Rock Junior High School in East St. Louis. There were



a number of rented buildings that the S.I.U. had at that time and for a good reason in those days the Board was in Carbondale. Since that time, S.I.U.E. as we call it, Edwardsville has grown up into a full fledged University. One is primarily a commuter college and about 80 per...65 per cent of the graduates live in that area after they graduate. They work there. A great many of these students work for a living in S.I.U.E. It's a different University, different than any other University in the whole state. It does deserve and need its own board to understand its problems. It need more vocational training than it gets now and as Representative Calvo mentioned to you, out of the total...h...S.I.U. student body, 40 per cent are in Edwardsville but only 30 per cent of the money goes there, which is proof that the step child of the little sister hand me down system works there against S.I.U."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins, to explain his vote."

Collins: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Well I don't know. Looking at this Bill it's been suggested that two Boards is not the answer, well if two Boards isn't the answer maybe no Board at all is. Because we've all had our unfortunate experiences with this University and I just ask you all to remember that when the Legislature looked into the matter of a million dollar home being built at S.I.U. some years ago in Carbondale and when we asked the Board what their answer to it was they said they... didn't know it was being built and when S.I.U. was putting Federal overhead funds into various projects even to the point of retiring revenue bonds with these funds that were given for a research project the answer of the Board was, they didn't know and then when we went down to S.I.U. at Edwardsville where they built a complex on the river so they could have a Festival down there and pour taxpayers money down the drain the answer of the Board was they didn't know and then when they started banking land at S.I.U. Edwardsville, there's twenty seven hundred acres there at a commuters college and yet we found that they were building dormitories there and again the Board didn't know because they were using unappropriated funds so, I...I say that the Board has operated in the past certainly has done the job because they don't know what's going on. So either



1102

we could have no Board or support this Bill, and I think the only answer is to support this Bill, because when they try to answer the problem by creating a staff, the staff didn't know. when all the staff authorized in Edwardsville was that they build a Metro-east Exposition Center, a further waste of...ah... tax...taxpayer's dollars. So let's get rid of this costly million dollars staff and, let's give Edwardsville their own Board, and perhaps we can straighten out this mess. I doubt it, but the present system hasn't worked, maybe the new one will.

Bradley: "The Gentlemen from Randolph, Mr. Birchler, to explain his vote."

Birchler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I won't be quite as long as some of the other speakers. As an Educator, I've had the opportunity to attend both of the campuses, work with the administrators at both of the attendant centers, with the staff in many occasions. I kind of resent that statement that...ah...Edwardsville is an orphaned or stepsister to the Carbondale area. Then I come here to this Body...ah...on the Appropriations Committee. I see the president and a staff of each of those schools come in and ask for the money that they need. I personally feel that this is a bad time for us to split that Board. Make two different Boards. I think we create another problem, and I urge the people on this Floor to remember we do have a new Higher Education Board that has not had an opportunity to really make a good study, and I feel that we should not start splitting schools off from under controls of the Boards we have now and make more Boards. I urge a 'no' vote."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, to explain his vote."

Borchers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, and Acting Speaker, I'm really kind of surprised at your vote for several reasons. Now, I have been given to understand that the Carbondale-Edwards...Edwardsville...Campuses are a hundred-ten



miles apart. It just happens that the University in your area is only about fifty miles, maybe fifty-five miles from the University of Illinois. Now, let's go down to Eastern Illinois and the University of Illinois. I think it's around sixty miles or thereabouts, as I recollect. But each of them is a distinct a per...a University, they...the students have the loyalty to their University as I have to the University of Illinois, my university. I can't conceive of being a student in Edwardsville and having a loyalty to Carbondale, for example, or vice versa, I think that there is something that has not been mentioned and that is the importance of student and student loyalty. This is part of the background of our country. Whether it be Yale or Harvard or Berkley or the University of California or whatever it may be, the University of Illinois, I think this is part of college life and it is very important in the development of the student. So I think we should think from the students angle, the...ah...the loyalty of the college and the fact that your college, in Normal, is only some fifty miles away, fifty-five and Charleston is only some sixty miles and they have the right and the opportunity to be loyal to those individual colleges, to have their own football teams, their own activities and they don't have to go traveling one hundred and ten miles one way or another to do it. So I hope this is a different as...thought and a different aspect of this thing and would hope people to vote 'aye'."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman, to explain his vote."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I trust that all of the 'aye' votes on that board are here, because at the proper time I'm going to call for a verification and there are some of us here on the Floor that are aware of activities that are going on that may not totally be related to this issue and I think that's unfortunate."

Bradley: "The...the Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen, to explain his vote."



Ebbesen: "Ah...Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I too am a Member of the House Committee on Higher Education and as you all know, I attempted to, to...ah... amend Senate Bill 16 on Second Reading, to create a separate board for Northern Illinois University. I still plan to propose such type of Legislation at the appropriate time, but, it's been indicated that we have an ongoing Committee that studies everything relative to Higher Education and I would just invite your attention that...ah...perhaps, you know, I feel both studies have a, a very definite way of dragging their feet and perhaps a Bill creating a new Board really may expedite that study and for that reason I'm anxious to see what they say about the entire Higher Education system now in Illinois relative to how it's to be governed and what specifically they have to say relative to Northern and a possibility for their board and for that reason I vote 'aye'."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Perry, Mr. Ralph Dunn, to explain his vote."

Dunn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'd like to just say that if this does pass and it looks like it will, it's been on this Calendar for a long time, it's been well greased, we have such things going with it as no fault insurance and the D.O.T budget and probably the remap, you know this is a really quite a complex thing and so we'll know how everyone voted and whether they really pushed the switch, I'm going to join with my friend over here to ask for a verification. Now I might say that if we pass this then I promise you I will work with all of you who want to to have separate boards. We could have thirteen Boards of Trustees in the State of Illinois, there's no reason we shouldn't. If Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville is about the seventh or eighth in size of the different schools in the State of Illinois and they, they, if you want to have a Board, separate Board there why let's vote it that way but let's don't tie it in with some other idea that might be floating around and something that we might not ought to vote for. I urge an 'aye' vote and I certainly



am going to help with a...urge a 'no' vote, I'm sorry, I'm going to ask for a verification of the affirmative Roll Call too. Thank you."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Calvo, to explain his vote."

Calvo: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Due to the threat of a verification and the small margin by which the Bill is passing, I think it is absolutely/^{necessary}that I explain my vote. In the first place, I don't know anything about any deals, I guess that's what Mr. Dunn referred to, I...arrangements, you know, whatever you want to call it. He talks about D.O.T., I don't...I don't know what he's talking about some other Bill, I don't know anything about that. This Bill is here on its own merits and I hope it would rise...rise or fall accordingly. I would just say to you that when you talk about, as some of the speakers have in explaining their vote, about saving money by keeping one Board of Trustees, this is ridiculous. Every Board of Trustees does not have its own personel staff in the state. For instance, the University of Illinois elected a Board of Trustees does not have a personel president, an administrative staff, but this Board does, they've got a super president, two University Presidents, two Chancellors, two General Counselors and everything else and that Super President has a staff that together the salaries and expenses are a million dollars a year. There's no need for this, absolutely none, after, if...if and when you see fit to support this Bill and pass this Legislation and we have appointed non-paid Board of Trustees at S.I.U. Edwardsville, certainly they will not need this super staff any longer, the reason they say they have to have the super staff is to be able to inform them and correlate the two Universities. Well there's not any need for that correlation any more. It just isn't fair and that's why we want to pass this Bill, at least we'll save the taxpayers a million dollars a year and do a better job. Let me tell you just briefly that the most important function of a Board of Trustees in these systems is to relate to the University



the feelings of the people it serves and to relate to the people of that community, the...the Universities progress and what it does and what it needs and what programs it needs..."

Bradley: "Would the Gentleman bring his remarks to a close."

Calvo: "Yes sir, I certainly will. And this is why it is necessary to have this Bill. That's been overlooked. The function of the Trustees is to serve the University and to take the Community message to it and message from the University back to the Community and that's the most important reason...vote 'aye'."

Bradley: "...The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, for what purpose do you rise sir?"

Barnes: "I would simply like to know how long is two minutes? Now this has been going on consistently, it's not just today, the Gentleman from, from down in Southern Illinois get up here on a two minute explanation of vote and talk fifteen minutes yet and still when I or some other Member get up for explanation of vote, we're cut off at two minutes, now if two minutes is two minutes as far as I'm concerned and if we are going to have two minutes, one of us is going to have it, all 177 will. If we're going to be allowed fifteen minutes fine, I can live with that, but let's all be governed by the same rules."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Richmond to explain his vote."

Richmond: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We observed on Second Reading what could very well happen should this Bill pass. All of the Universities at...would be seeking this same action or a great number of them might and we know that this could lead to a Pandora's Box. Now, I know most of you came in her...came to this decision with your minds made up and I want to speak to those that might be voting green on this issue without giving it much thought or without having a great deal of interest in it. I'm here as a freshman, it's true, I ...I've asked for very few things, I'm deeply interested in this issue, I have helped a great number of you on various issues that were of interest to you and on that basis, I ask you to give me



your consideration and vote red."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I think we could avoid a verification here by getting some more green votes. It disturbs me that Members of the Higher Education and Members of the Appropriation Committee are voting red on this when they've just gone through a 90 day work out on the fact that Higher Education is the second biggest government in the State of Illinois and if we don't start chipping away at it and reducing it down to local government in some kind of perspective they have the strongest lobby, they have...it makes...Langhorne Bond's two hundred dollar thing look like nothing by comparison, we devote this kind of time, I think there isn't a stu...a campus in the State of Illinois that couldn't be run locally in the long run come out better for the taxpayer and student than under the existing various systems we have and the quickest way to avoid a verification is jump off your high horse on Higher Education and come down with the people and vote green."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Fulton Mr. Schisler, to explain his vote."

Schisler: "Mr...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House... ah...If they're going to verify could I have leave to be verified now because I have to leave a few minutes."

Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections the Gentleman will be verified. The...Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis, to explain her vote."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In all due respect to the Board of Higher Education I can tell you in the last five years it has done a deplorable job and if that's any evidence what's going on, at S.I.U., I certainly urge all the green votes to go for this Bill because Edwardsville and...ah...Southern Illinois at Carbondale are too far away from each other really to...know each other compatibly."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd, to explain his vote."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I've...ah...looked at



this proposition very carefully, it's not an area that I'm very familiar with and it took me a long time to express my position on this, but I think as outlined by the previous speakers on this subject, Education is one of the largest...ah...propositions that we do have to look at and I would offer for the consideration of the Members of this Body, that when we have different Boards of Trustees trying to achieve a good balance, progressive education for the people of the State of Illinois and can compete as boards in different colleges, I think that this creates an atmosphere the one board can learn from another and can only better the education of this state."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Mrs. Dyer, I thought you explained your vote once, I could be wrong but..."

Dyer: "I was rising on a point of personnel privilege, in response to Mr. Grot...Representative Grotbersg remarks...ah...expressing surprise ath...ah...the...ah...people on the Higher Education Committee voting red on this issue. I'd like to give him some facts and figures to respond. The operating budget for the Board of Trus...of Regents is four hundred and nineteen, one hundred thousand dollars in 1976..."

Bradley: "Pardon me Mrs. Dyer, the Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, on a point of order."

Borchers: "I want to remind the Speaker that Mrs. Dyers name was not mentioned and therefore I don't think she has a right to..."

Bradley: "She is a spokesman though for your side of the aisle on the Higher Education so proceed Mrs. Dyer."

Dyer: "Ah...Thank you...ah...bringing out the point that every time you create another Board you increase overhead expense. The... ah...budget for '76 for the Board of Governors is five hundred and fifty one thousand two hundred dollars. These are administrative costs for these boards. Trustees of Southern Illinois University for the two campuses..."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook Mr. Porter."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, that's not a point of personel privilege, she's arguing the Bill. She's already spoken on it."



Bradley: "I think your point's well taken. Mrs. Dyer on a point of personel privilege, I think was your point, is that not true?"

Dyer: "That is correct, the reason..."

Bradley: "State that...state that point."

Dyer: "All right, I'd like to state the point. Ah...Representative Grotberg implied that there was no rational basis for...ah...leaders on Higher Education Committee to vote 'no', on this Bill, I was trying to demonstrate that on pure statistics it is the reasonable vote here is a 'no' vote..."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 95 'aye', 58 'nos' and 8 voting 'present'. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "I renew my motion for a verification."

Bradley; "The Gentleman requests a verification. Mr. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Calvo."

Calvo: "Mr. Speaker, I request a poll of the absentees."

Bradley: "We'll poll the absentees."

Fred Selcke: "Berman, Darrow, Downs, Hirschfeld, Emil Jones, LaFleur, Lechowicz, McGrew, Miller, Rayson, Sharp, Shea, Totten, VanDuyne, Washington, Mr. Speaker."

Bradley: "Mr. Lechowicz wants to be recorded as voting 'no'. Call the affirmative Roll sir. Mr....for what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Miller arise?"

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

Bradley: "The affirmative Roll, Mr. Clerk. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Due to the fact that people are moving for...ah...dinner, I think it's important that we make an announcement one to either stay here or if you're not here to come back if you're on the affirmative Roll, otherwise we're going to spend so much time with people going in and out it's going to be..."

Bradley: "I think your point's well taken if the Members would be in their seats and those who are in within ear shot return to the Chambers because we are on verification and the Clerk will call the affirmative Roll."



Fred Selcke: "Anderson..."

Bradley: "Mr. Washington wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'."

Fred Selcke: "Washington, 'aye'. Arnell, Gene Barnes, Jane Barnes, Beatty, Borchers, Boyle, Brandt, Brinkmeier, Brummet, Calvo, Campbell, Capparelli, Capuzi, Carroll, Collins, Craig, D'Arco, Davis, DiPrima, Duff, John Dunn, Ebbesen, Epton, Caldwell 'aye'..."

Bradley: "Caldwell 'aye'."

Fred Selcke: "Fary, Fennessey, Fleck, Flinn, Friedland, Gaines, Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Getty, Giglio, Giorgi, Grotberg, Hanahan, Dan Houlihan, Huff, Jacobs, Dave Jones, Kelly, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Kucharski, Laurino, Leinenweber, Kornowicz, Leon, Londrigan, Lucco, MacDonald, Madigan, Madison, Mahar, Maragos, Marovitz, Matijevich, McAuliffe, McAvoy, McClain, McLendon, McPartlin, Merlo, Meyer, Molloy, Mudd, Mugalian, Mulcahey, Nardulli, Neff, O'Daniel, Patrick, Pierce, Polk, Porter, Pouncey, Reed, Rigney, Schisler, Schoeberlein, Simms, Stearney, E. G. Steele, Cissy Stiehl, Stubblefield, Taylor, Telcser, Terzich, Tipsword, Wall, Washington, White, Williams, Younge, Yourell."

Bradley: "Questions on the affirmative Roll sir? For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff arise?"

Duff: "Just to make a request of the persons that are asking for the verification Mr. Speaker. There are a lot of people, as we all know, eating now, running back and forth on the Floor. So if somebody asks to be verified would you accept that as the procedure so the people can get there, get on there an be verified and continue on?"

Bradley: "That's been the policy sir, that they ask leave."

Duff: "Thank you."

Bradley: "Mr. Schisler has been verified. Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Ah...Anderson?"

Bradley: "In the center aisle sir."

Hoffman: "Okay...ah...Beatty."

Bradley: "Beatty? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."



Hoffman: "Brandt."

Bradley: "Brandt? Hows...The Gentleman in the Chambers? How is he recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "Aye."

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Hoffman: "Capuzi."

Bradley: "Capuzi, how is the Gentleman recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "'aye'."

Bradley: "Is he in the Chambers? Take him off the Roll."

Hoffman: "Craig."

Bradley: "He's here."

Hoffman: "Davis."

Bradley: "He's in his chair."

Hoffman: "John Dunn."

Bradley: "John Dunn. Is the Gentleman in the Chambers? He's back there someplace. Where are you John? I don't see him. How is he recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "Aye."

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Hoffman: "Epton."

Bradley: "Epton? How is he recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "'aye'."

Bradley: "Take him off."

Hoffman: "Fary."

Bradley: "He's in his chair."

Hoffman: "Garmisa."

Bradley: "Garmisa is in his...chair next to him. Put Mr. Capuzi back on the Roll."

Hoffman: "Getty."

Bradley: "Getty is in his Chair and Mr. Beatty is back. Put him on, back on the Roll."

Hoffman: "Giorgi."

Bradley: "Mr. Giorgi? His' right here sir."

Hoffman: "D. Houlihan."

Bradley: "D. Houlihan. He's right here with Mr. Giorgi."

Hoffman: "Okay, Jacobs."



Bradley: "Is Mr. Jacobs in the Chambers? How is he recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "'aye'."

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Hoffman: "Laurino."

Bradley: "Mr. Laurino's in his Chair."

Hoffman: "Thank you. Londrigan."

Bradley: "Mr. Londrigan. Is he in the Chambers? Mr. Londrigan? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "Ah...The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'yes'."

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll and put Mr. Brandt back on."

Hoffman: "Madison."

Bradley: "Madison? Mr. McMaster. You're not voting sir? You want to change yours from 'no' to 'aye'. Mr. McMaster goes from 'no' to 'aye', Mr. Madison. Mr. Madison in the Chambers? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "Ah...Mr Madison is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll and Mr. Londrigan is in the Chambers and put him back on. He's standing right here."

Hoffman: "Maragos."

Bradley: "Maragos. Was the Gentleman in the Chambers? How is he recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "Maragos is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Hoffman: "Marovitz."

Bradley: "Mr. Marovitz? He's right here sir."

Hoffman: "Okay, I see Matijevich. McAuliffe."

Bradley: "McAuliffe is right here sir. Mrs. Macdonald with leave would like to be recorded, she's standing right here. Verified."

Hoffman: "Good. McClain."

Bradley: "Mr. McClain. He's sitting down on the Floor here. Stand up, would you Mike."

Hoffman: "Is that from exhaustion? Okay. Mugalian."

Bradley: "Mugalian? Is the Gentleman in the Chambers? How is he recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "'Aye'."

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Hoffman: "Pierce."

Bradley: "Mr. Maragos has returned to the Chambers sir. Mr. Pierce. Put



Mr. Maragos back on the Roll and Mr. Pierce, is he in the Chambers? How is he recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as votin 'aye'."

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Hoffman: "Polk."

Bradley: "Mr. Polk. Mr. Polk in the Chambers? How is he recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "'Aye'."

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll and Mr. Leinenweber is going up the aisle and he wants to be recorded as 'aye'...or he wants to be verified. Mr. Polk is off the Roll then."

Hoffman: "Patrick."

Bradley: "Mr. Patrick. There he is. He's back there."

Hoffman: "Stubblefield."

Bradley: "Stubblefield, how is the Gentleman recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "'Aye'."

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Hoffman: "Tipsword."

Bradley: "He's in his chair."

Hoffman: "White."

Bradley: "White, is White in the Chambers?" How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "'Aye'."

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Hoffman: "Younge."

Bradley: "Just a minute now. Mr. Schraeder would like to be recorded as 'aye'. The question...ah...Any further questions?"

Hoffman: "Yes..ah..Hanahan."

Bradley: "Just a minute sir, could you...All right. Mr. Madison has returned to the Chambers and we'll put him back on. Mr. Stubblefield, put him back on as 'yes'. Now I don't know that John Dunn was taken off. Was John Dunn taken off? All right. We put John Dunn back on. Wa...ah...Wall. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, I've never seen this happen since I've been in the House and in this particular way and I think since this is an unusual situation before this is closed down. The Chair should



send someone to the...the...the Democrat and the Republican...ah...
headquarters, so to speak and tell the people there that...."

Bradley: "They can hear us Mr. Borchers, they can hear us."

Borchers: "Well I think a reasonable time should be given for them to
get back."

Bradley: "We...We announced that sir. Mr. Hanahan you are recorded
as voting 'aye', sir. No sir. Mr. Hanahan has not been taken
off. Is there further questions?"

Hoffman: "Yes. Ah...Wall."

Bradley: "Mr. Wall in the Chambers? How is he recorded."

Fred Selcke: "'Aye'."

Bradley: "Take him off."

Hoffman: "Younge, did I ask..."

Bradley: "Mrs. Younge was verified before she left, with your approval
I thought sir."

Hoffman: "Okay fine, all right. McMasters."

Bradley: "Tom McMasters got on standing got on standing right here
as an 'aye' vote, changed from 'no' to 'aye' sir."

Hoffman: "He's not here."

Bradley: "All right is Mr. McMasters in the Chambers? How is he recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Bradley: "Take him off."

Hoffman: "Matijevich."

Bradley: "Matijevich? How is he recorded/"

Fred Selcke: "The..."

Bradley: "No I did not verify Matijevich."

Fred Selcke: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Hoffman: "I did not verify him before....Oh...here he is."

Bradley: "Here he is, put him back on."

Hoffman: "O'Daniel."

Bradley: "O'Daniel's in his seat."

Hoffman: "Stearney. Representative Stearney, is he here."

Bradley: "Stearney, he's right here sir."

Hoffman: "Okay. That's it...That's the..."

Bradley: "That the Poll sir? Mr. McMasters is back, put him back on the ✓"



Roll.

Fred Selke: "No, he changed his vote."

Bradley: "Kornowicz, are you recorded sir? "Kornowicz? I don't think you were taken off the roll, sir. No, you weren't taken off." What's the purpose of the Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Sharp arise?"

Sharp: "Yes, I'd like to be recorded voting 'aye'."

Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'."

Fred Selcke: "Sharp, 'aye'."

Bradley: "That...ah...Anymore questions sir?"

Hoffman: "I have no more request of the Affirmative."

Bradley: "Let's have a count Mr...."

Fred Selcke: "Okay...3, 4, 93...93 'ayes', 58 'nays'."

Bradley: "On this question there are 93 'ayes', 58 'no's', and this Bill...the Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Byers: "How am I recorded?"

Bradley: "How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "The Gentleman's recorded as being present."

Byers: "Change that to 'aye'."

Bradley: "Record him as 'aye'." "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers arise?"

Borchers: "Ah...How am I recorded?"

Bradley: "How's he recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Borchers: "Well, come to think about it, I believe I'll just stay right there."

Bradley: "On this question there are 94 'ayes', 58 'nos', 8 voting present. This Bill having received the Constitutional majority is hereby declared passed." "Senate Bill 37. What purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski arise?"

Kosinski: "I...having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the motion by which Senate Bill 37 has been...ah... that Senate Bill...state your motion again."

Kosinski: "Having voted on the prevailing side, I move that...ah... the vote by which Senate Bill 16 has been passed, be reconsidered."



Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to...let me state...The Gentleman moves that by...ah...the vote by which Senate Bill 16 passed be reconsidered?" The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Calvo."

Calvo: "Mr. Speaker, I lie...I move that that motion lie upon the table."

Bradley: "He moves that those...that motion lie upon the table. All in favor of the motion say 'aye'...'aye'...opposed 'no' The motion prevails. Senate Bill 37."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 37. A Bill for an Act to the State of Illinois, Horse Racing Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "Take it out of the record at the request of the Sponsor." Senate Bill 296. Mr. Kornowicz? Out of the record. Senate Bill 345. Mr. Taylor?"

Fred Selcke: Senate Bill 345. Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense for the Pollution and Control Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have leave of the House to have Senate Bill 345 returned to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment?"

Bradley: "The Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, return the Bill to Second Reading."

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #2, Ryan. Amend Senate Bill 345, page 1, line 11, and so forth."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan, on the Amendment." The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #2 is an agreed Amendment. It's according to what the Governor has stated, the six percent cut, and that's all that it does, is cut fifty thousand dollars out of the Appropriation for the Pollution-Control Board."

Bradley: "Does the Gentleman from Kankakee..?"

Ryan: "Yeah, that's right Mr...ah...Speaker. You caught me here with my mouth full, and I...ah...and I apologize for that. That's



an Agreement Amendment."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 3450. All in favor will say 'aye'. Opposed will say 'no'. The Motion..... The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #3. Ryan. Amends Senate Bill 3450, page 1, line 11 and so forth."

Bradley: "Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan, on Amendment #3."

Ryan: "I will yield to the Gentleman from Cook for the explanation."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor, on an explanation of Amendment #3."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I don't even have a copy of Amendment #3. Will the Clerk read Amendment #3?"

Bradley: "Clerk will read Amendment #3."

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #3. Amend Senate Bill 3450, page 1, line 11, by deleting \$179,630 and inserting in lieu thereof \$274,700 on page 1, line 13 by deleting \$18,800 and inserting in lieu thereof \$18,400. Page 1, line 14 by deleting \$14,200 and inserting in lieu thereof \$13,500. On page 1, line 15, by deleting \$120,730 and inserting in lieu thereof \$110,700. Page 1, line 16 by deleting \$20,000 and inserting in lieu thereof \$18,800. Page 1, line 17 by deleting \$14,500 and inserting in lieu thereof \$12,000. Page 1, line 18 by deleting \$57,500 and inserting in lieu thereof \$14,000...er..\$40,000."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, that's a reduction Amendment. We move for the adoption."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipword on the Amendment."

Tipword: "Is this the one that takes out the \$50,000? If so, what happened to the other one?"

Bradley: "Mr. Taylor, do you wish to reply? Mr. Taylor, there was a question from Mr. Tipword."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, maybe Amendment #2 should be read, because it might be that I had the wrong Amendment in the first place and it might be that we have to Table Amendment #2 and adopt Amendment #3."

Bradley: "Two is tabled, 3 is adopted."

Taylor: "Take it out of the Record for the moment, will you please?"

Bradley: "Take it out of the Record. Senate Bill 379. Now we're leaving



that Bill on Second Reading. House Bill 379."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 379. Bill for an Act to amend the School Code and the Capital Development Board Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McPartlin."

McPartlin: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 379 amends the School Code and the Capital Development Board Act. It requires the Illinois Office of Education to develop and operate a service center for the deaf and blind individuals. It creates an Advisory Board for services for the deaf and blind individuals. It provides that the Capital Development Board cooperate and lend assistance in development of specifications and site locations for a deaf/blind service center. I would ask for the support of the House on this Bill."

Bradley: "Discussion? If not, the question is shall Senate Bill 379 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wished? Bradley 'aye'. Have all voted who wished. The Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there are 103 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received a constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 4452. Mr. Rayson wants to be recorded as voting 'aye', on 379. Senate Bill 452. Mr. Capparelli. Take it out of the Record. Senate Bill 461. Mr. Sevcik, Mr. Clerk."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 461. An Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Illinois Legislative Investigation Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sevcik."

Sevcik: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 461 is the fiscal 76 appropriation for the Illinois Legislative Investigating Commission, totaling \$617,000 and I ask for your favorable support."

Bradley: "Discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 461 pass? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Yes, I would like to ask the Sponsor whether or not this appropriation has been reduced by six percent?"

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sevcik."

Sevcik: "No."



Barnes: "Why not?"

Sevcik: "It was the way it was passed out of Committee."

Barnes: "Don't you think since we are bringing all appropriations of these types back to Second Reading to reduce them by 6%, that this should be keeping in line with what we've been doing here consistently?"

Sevcik: "All appropriations weren't taken back for six percent?"

Barnes: "I believe in the last few days, everyone that has come up that has not been the sponsor that held that and brought them back for Second Reading for that purpose."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we had an Agreement here earlier this week, sometime, I don't know what it was with the Sponsors of some of these Bills. One was the other racing Bill. One was the Pollution Control Board and I can't recall now what the other one was. Two Democrat sponsors and one Republican Sponsor. Today, the two Democrat sponsors backed out of the deal and the Republican sponsor said if they don't why should we, so I think that's why we are at this stage. We've got an Amendment for this Bill and it's entirely up to the Sponsor if he wants to take it back."

Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Well, thank you, but I'm sure, and in deference to my learned friend, the Minority spokesman on the Appropriations Committee, I'm sure that the Sponsor of this Bill could have answered my questions himself that he's ably equipped to do so, but I would suggest to the sponsor of the Bill and to my learned friend, the Minority spokesman of the Appropriations Committee, it has been... he has been leader on that Committee that has insisted that all appropriations be reduced by six percent, including all Commissions. Now, what I am saying is be consistent in your efforts here. I have insisted that the appropriations that come before Appropriations II has been acted accordingly. Now what we're doing here is treating this in a preferential situation. Now, if that's the position of the Sponsor, and that's the position of the Republican party, fine. I've got no problem with that. But let's say that that's the position."



Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kanakee, Mr. Ryan, on a Point of Order."

Ryan: "Point of Order. On what occasion does Representative Barnes rise here? Is he talking to the Bill, to the Amendment, or what's his problem?"

Bradley: "I think he's concluded his remarks. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of ah....."

Bradley: "Mr. Simms, would you..... pardon me, just a moment. What's your point, Sir?"

Barnes: "I believe according to the rules, each Member here has ten minutes to address a Bill."

Bradley: "I thought you had concluded, Sir."

Barnes: "Now, when I asked the Sponsor of this Bill a question, the Gentleman from Kanakee interceded, and I didn't say anything. That's his prerogative and that's your prerogative of being the Speaker, but now he's going to raise a point of Order while I am questioning the Sponsor and addressing a Bill? Now what kind of rules are those, and if it is a rule, I'd like for you to tell me or the Gentleman from Kankakee to tell me what rule it is."

Bradley: "Are you concluded, Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "I have not concluded."

Bradley: "Well, what's your Point, Sir."

Barnes: "My point is, why am I being cut off and cut in on?"

Bradley: "Go ahead and continue, Sir. You're not cut off."

Barnes: "I ask the Sponsor of the Bill a question....."

Bradley: "Mr. Sevcik, do you wish to respond to the question?"

Sevcik: "I answered his question. He asked me if it has been reduced by six percent. I said 'no'."

Barnes: "And I ask you the question, Mr. Sponsor, whether or not you consider holding this Bill and returning it to second reading for the purpose of an Amendment."

Sevcik: "And I said 'no'."

Barnes: "Well, fine. My address to the Bill then, Mr. Speaker, is as I put forth, being consistent is something that we should be here. Now we've got special considerations and special dispensations around here for special people, well that's fine, let's say that. I think



it's being inconsistent.. It's being inconsistent with the Sponsor of this Bill, and Members of the Minority Party on the Appropriations Committee. Not the question, the reduction of a six percent cut on this Bill, and I would suggest to the Members in the House to vote accordingly."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sevcik, to close. I'm sorry, Mr. Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Bill and the Appropriation. The Legislative Investigating Commission only investigates those items which this Legislature or this House of Representative specifically directs them to investigate, so the appropriations are in line with what this Assembly has directed and for these reasons, I think this appropriation Bill should be left in its proper form, at the proper level because that money will only be spent if the Legislature mandates further additional investigation, so I think Representative Sevcik is correct and this Bill should be passed in its present form."

Bradley: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sevcik, to close."

Sevcik: "Mr Speaker, I was going to reiterate the same remarks made by Representative Simms. It is the mandate of the General Assembly for us to investigate various problems and try to make recommendations to this General Assembly, and the more Resolutions that are introduced and passed, we have to put on additional staff and ah.... court reporters and everything that goes on in the investigation, so I ask for your favorable support for Senate Bill 461 which passed out of the Senate Appropriations Committee and the House Appropriations Committee and passed the Senate 49 to 1. I ask for your favorable support."

Bradley: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 461 pass? All those in favor, will signify by voting 'aye'. Opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart, to explain his vote."

Hart: "I just had one observation, Mr. Speaker. If we're going to get out of here by June 30, we've got to quit debating these Bills on their merits."



Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there are 123 'ayes', 8 'nos', 5 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Merlo 'aye'. Senate Bill 471."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 471....."

Bradley: "Take it out of the Record. 478. Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 478. A Bill for an Act providing for the ordinary and contingent expenses of State Fair Agency. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 478 is the Bill ah... for the State Fair Agency and ah... it had two Amendments on it, that we approved, that were put on in the Committee. The Amendments are on, and I wish for a favorable vote. Briefly speaking, it's the ah... it makes the appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the State Fair Agency for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1975. I respectfully ask for your favorable consideration."

Bradley: "Discussion? If none, the question is, shall Senate Bill 478 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'. Opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there are 116 'ayes', 1 'no', 9 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. J. D. Jones 'aye'. Senate Bill 484."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 484. An Act providing for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Mines and Minerals. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "Ah... thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill provides for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Mines and Minerals. It was ah... the Amendment was placed on the House, ah.... at Representative Boyle's request. It was reduced ah.... by Committee Amendment six percent and I would ask for the favorable support of this Bill."



Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Palmer."

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

Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Palmer: "With the reduction, is there an increase over 75 appropriations, and if so, how much?"

Hart: "Well, there wouldn't be, except for the ah... money that's in there for land reclamation. The ah.... Amendment, the reduction Amendment took six percent out of the Bill. I think it was about \$114,000 and it would have brought it down ah.... two or under to 1975 FY Bill. However, ah.... since we passed House Bill 1277 in the waiting moments of the 78th General Assembly, which requires hearings and ah.... various procedures involving strip mining, there was some \$45,000 added into this Bill by House Amendment #3, which ah.... brought over the ah.... FY 75."

Palmer: "That's good enough. Thank you."

Bradley: "Further discussion? If none, wish to close, Sir?"

Hart: "No."

Bradley: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 484 pass. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there 135 'ayes', 1 'no', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 510."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 510. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Labor. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is the ah.... appropriation for the Department of Labor for the fiscal year. This Bill was thoroughly discussed on Second as you recall. We went through practically every category of the budget. The reducable item from the original budget's submission, would only be a total of \$3,718,000 and more than six percent was cut from that by virtue of the fact that the Senate's deletion of the Department's relations was sustained by the House yesterday, so no six percent is required here. I know of no other opposition. I ask for your support."



Bradley: "Further discussion? If none, the question is shall Senate Bill 510 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question, 136 'ayes', 5 'nos', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 556."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 556. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Public Health. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is the Appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Public Health. This Appropriation was reduced by an excess of six percent. Reduced in agreement with the...both Approp...with the Appropriation Committee and with the Department, itself, who came in with the reduced Amendments. I would move for the passage of Senate Bill 556."

Bradley: "Questions? If none, the question is shall Senate Bill 556 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. On this question, 148 'ayes', no 'nos', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 598."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 598. A Bill for an Act to Amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill which provides two things. It provides for the...ah...ah... regulation of buses by the Interstate Commerce Commission...er...by the Department of Transportation, the shipping of responsibility, and also provides...contains a confidentiality provision with regard to... ah...accident reports. The confidentiality provision is a transfer of responsibility from...ah...the Inters...the Illinois Commerce Commission to...ah...DOT and...ah...I can represent to the members that reports are no more or no less confidential before then they were before the Bill was adopted. The reports are confidential to the Agency but they may be obtained directly from the initial investigating officer whether



it be a County Sheriff's Deputy, State Police or Local Police.

I urge a favorable Roll Call."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bar...I'm sorry. Further discussion? If none, the question is shall Senate Bill 598 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Bradley 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there are 137 'ayes', 3 'nays', 6 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. We'd like...we'll ple...we'll move back to...on Second Reading appears Senate Bill 345, and Mr. Taylor having voted on the prevailing side by which Senate Amendment was...#2 was adopted, he now moves to reconsider. Has he made the motion. All in favor say 'aye', no...those opposed say 'no', the 'ayes' have it, the Bill is now reconsidered. Now, the Gentleman moves to Table Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 345. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', by saying 'aye', those opposed by saying 'no', the Amendment is Tabled. Further Amendment's."

Fred Selcke: Amendment #3, Campbell. Amend Senate Bill 345, page 1, and so forth. Campbell, I guess it is."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Campbell, on Amendment #3."

Campbell: "Ah...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House...ah... I apologize to the Sponsor. I was eating some of that chicken and so forth when he had the other one, and that Amendment was supposed to have been Tabled, but nevertheless...ah...my good friend, Jimmy Taylor, this is gonna ah...this is in line with the six percent reduction...ah...that was requested by the Governor, agreed to by both sides of the aisle and I'd appreciate your favorable support."

Bradley: "Mr. Ryan, did you seek recognition on the Amendment?"

Ryan: "I was just going to say that the reason for the confusion earlier was that it was Campbell's Amendment, and how my name got on I'm not sure."

Bradley: "The question is, on Amendment #3, all those in favor will signify by saying 'aye',...I'm Mr....I'm sorry Mr. Barnes. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."



JUN 25 1975

165.

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I had a question of the Sponsor of the Amendment."

Bradley: "He indicates he'll yield, sir."

Barnes: "Well, my question...ah...to the Sponsor of the Amendment. Are you familiar with the...ah...Pollutions Control Board's Budget this year, and to what extent? And that's just not rhetorical, because I'm going to ask you some questions about it, that's the reason I ask you?"

Campbell: "You talking about the Sponsor of the Amendment or the Sponsor of the Bill?"

Bradley: "I think we're on the...."

Barnes: "We're on the Amendment."

Campbell: "I've briefly looked at the Pollution-Control Boards Budget while it was in the Appropriations Committee."

Barnes: "Well, my next question is..."

Bradley: "Mr. Barnes, I think you should confine your questions to the Amendment at..."

Barnes: "Ah...the reason I ask that question Mr. Speaker, I asked him if he was familiar with the budget because I was going to ask him some questions on the budget...on the Amendment. Yes, the Amendment will be reducing the budget, and I think that that is in line with...ah...the...ah...issue that's involved in the Amendment."

Campbell: "Yes, if you had asked that question before Gene, it reduces the budget by fifty thousand, one hundred dollars, or six point six percent of the total budget."

Barnes: "Right. Then my next question is this. The budget itself Mr. Sponsor, the budget itself was only increased by three percent. Are you familiar with that?"

Campbell: "Yes."

Barnes: "Well, what are you...what you're doing then, in fact, is not just merely reducing this budget by some six percent of the current fiscal year, but you are, in fact, reducing it three percent below the...ah...fiscal year '75 appropriated level. Is that correct?"

Campbell: "The Governor requested all line items."

Barnes: "No, no. That's not the question I asked you. I asked you



are you reducing it by three percent, under its current budget appropriation?"

Campbell: "No."

Barnes: "Well, it was only...it was only the appropriation request, Mr. Sponsor, was only three percent above its current level.

Will your Amendment reduce it by six percent?"

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Ryan: "Well, maybe I can be helpful, I'm not sure, I'll try to be. I'm not sure that we have figured the percentages on these Gene... ah...I mean...I don't know what the fixation is on six percent."

Barnes: "Well, the problem is, and the reason I asked the first question is because I didn't want to get out and seem like I was trying to embarrass anyone. I have the budget in front of me, and the budget was only to raise the request of the current budget. It's only three percent over last year. They had one vacant member of the Board. It's a five man Board. They increased the budget by only three percent which, in fact, encompassed the vacancy that they had. Now this Amendment is reducing it by six percent, and by Statute this Board is required to have five members. That's the point that I'm getting at."

Campbell: "That's...that's a good point, but this Amendment also, if six point six percent whereas Amendment #2 was eight point eight percent. So this is putting a little bit more money back in."

Barnes: "I agree with that, but...and,...ah...I hope that I'm not getting rhetorical here going into dialogue."

Bradley: "I...I think you are in...into a dialogue, sir. Why don't you address the Amendment Sir?"

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

Bradley: "The Gentleman is not Out of Order, if he wants to address himself to the Bill. Mr. Barnes on the Bill. I mean on the Amendment Sir."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The Pollution-Control Board by Statute is required to have five Board members, a administrative assistant, and I, believe, a secretary. For the current



fiscal year, they had one vacancy. In the request for the 1976 fiscal appropriation, they requested a three percent increase, which would bring them in line with filling that vacancy. That vacancy was filled. The increase in this budget merely brings them in line with the money necessary for filling the vacancy that is required by statute. If we reduced this budget by six percent as in this Amendment that's now being offered, we will, in fact, reduce the amount of money available to the Pollution Control Board from their current, their current fiscal appropriation by three percent. Now I just want to make that clear. If that's what the General Assembly wishes to do, they are going contrary to their statutory obligation, and I think that should be pointed out."

Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor, on the Amendment."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I think that I have a little light to shed on this Amendment. As you know, this Bill has been called up a number of times, 5 or 6 times, I have continued to take it out of the Record. I made a statement on this floor that I would not call the Bill until I got the answers from the Director of the Pollution Control Board. The Director of the Pollution Control Board was here at my seat yesterday evening at six o'clock. He told me that if the Governor so wishes that they could live with the cuts that was being made and I so move, Mr. Speaker."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Keller."

Keller: "Well, I didn't want to speak to the Amendment, but I wanted to ask the Sponsor of the Bill a question."

Bradley: "Well, we're not on that point of order."

Keller: "Well, I wanted him to hold it on Second Reading before he moved it, because I may have another Amendment to offer. That's what I wanted to ask him before you move this to Third."

Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of Amendment #3, that's Senate Bill 345. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'. The opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?" The..... Mr. Taylor, do you wish to hold this on Second Reading or do you want it to go to Third Reading? Third Reading. Mr. Keller."



Keller: "Yes, I wanted to ask the Sponsor of the Bill. I've watched this calendar rather closely....."

Bradley: "You're out of Order, Sir."

Keller: "I want to ask him on the Bill."

Bradley: "You're out of order, Mr. Keller. We're not on the Bill. We're going to nonconcurrences. On Page 15, appears Senate Bill 208. Mr. Barnes would like to be recorded as voting 'no' on Amendment #3. The Journal will so show. Third Reading. Senate.... On the Order of Nonconcurrences, Consideration Postponed is Senate Bill 208. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, previously the Senate moved to nonconcur with House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 208. In response, I moved to recede from House Amendment #1. It was not the sense of this House that we recede, so at this time, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I should like to move that the House do not recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 208 and request that a Conference Committee be reported."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to nonrecede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 208 and asks for a Conference Committee. All those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will say 'aye'. Those opposed will say 'no'. The Gentleman's Motion prevails. On the Nonconcurrences appears Senate Bill 512. Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I move that the House recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 512."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the House shall recede from Senate Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 512. On the Motion, the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "What does that Amendment do?"

Bradley: "Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane on ah..... Further discussion? What was the Motion again, Sir? All right, the House.... the Gentleman's Motion..... the question is shall the House recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 512? All those in favor say 'aye'. Opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Vote 'aye'. I'm sorry. Those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Final action. Have all voted who wished? On this question, there are Take the Record. On this question, there are 132 'ayes'



6 'nay', none voting 'present' and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment, or does recede, I'm sorry, to Senate Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 512. On the Order of Concurrences appears House Bill 2876. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 2876."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that we nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2876. All those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will say 'aye'. Opposed will say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman's Motion prevails. On Nonconcurrences appears Senate Bill 488. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker, I would move that we recede from House Amendment #1 and #2 on Senate Bill 488. The Amendment cuts \$40,000 from the Appropriation and the Governor says that we must have six percent off of this. The Agency agreed with the \$40,000. They cannot afford both the \$40,000 and six percent, so they asked to put back on the \$40,000 so they could take the six percent cut, and I would move that we recede from these two Amendments."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that we recede from Amendments.... the House does recede from Amendments #1 and #2 to Senate Bill 488. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there are 110 'ayes', 16 'nos', 14 voting 'present' and the House does nonconcur in Senate Bill 488, but does recede in Amendments #1 and #2 to Senate Bill 488. Mr. Bluthardt on a Motion."

Bluthardt: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur in House Bill 2065. Senate Amendments 1 and 2, not that I'm opposed to the Amendments, but they overlook adopting Amendment #3, which is a clarified Amendment and I move to nonconcur."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment.... it's on the Supplemental Calendar. House Bill 2065. The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1 and #2. All those in favor of nonconcurring, say 'aye'. Opposed will say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Gentleman's Motion prevails. Mrs. Catania on 3086. You have a Motion?"



Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I believe that Representative..... This is on Postponed Consideration, and Representative Griesheimer was the Committee Member handling the Bill."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer, now where are we on the Bill?"

Griesheimer: "This Bill is on Consideration Postponed. Committee Bill 3086."

Bradley: "What page, Sir?"

Griesheimer: "I'm told it is on page 8. It's the last Consideration Postponed on ah..... page 8."

Bradley: "3086. Yes, Sir, what's your Motion, Sir?"

Griesheimer: "Well, it's on Consideration Postponed and it comes up for Consideration again at this time. It's been considered once and placed on Consideration Postponed. We're raising it at this time for additional consideration. Final consideration."

Bradley: "House Bill, Consideration Postponed. It's on Third Reading. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer, on House Bill 3086."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill was commonly known as the follow through program Bill, was initially introduced in the House by Representative Catania and at the same time, she introduced the appropriation Bill for the follow through program. Through manner of means which we cannot describe at the present time, the House passed the appropriation Bill and that appropriation Bill is presently pending in the Senate. I think that the passage of the appropriation Bill is pantomont to the approval of the basic Bill itself, but because of the problems we found ourselves in about a month ago, the basic bill was not passed and it had to be sent back to Committee where it became a Committee Bill. Now this is an excellent Bill, which provides special follow through programs for the head start students in five major areas of the State of Illinois. It's presently being conducted in the Waukegan area, where we had extensive subcommittee meetings last summer, to study the outcome of their program. Without any doubt, this is providing an invaluable assist to those children who might not otherwise be able to even get through out school system. From a monetary standpoint is extremely important to the State



because the students who do qualify for this follow through program are undoubtedly the type of students who will continue their education and will definitely not be the type of people who will be on our public aid rolls in years to come. We physically watched these students while they were in the process of their classes. They are learning by a unique system of parent involvement. The class provides that the student's parents actually come into the school and take part in the teaching process, so that we're not only educating the students, we're also educating the parents. As I said, the appropriation bill has already been approved by the House. It is in the Senate. The program is unquestionably a fine program. I would point out that the need for this program is predicated upon the Federal Government's failure to completely fund this program for the next fiscal year. At the present time, we do not know what the status of this program is in the Federal Government, but we have to take this Action because if the Federal Government does fail to fund it, all of our programs in the State of Illinois would fail. This is an extremely good program. I believe that I could answer questions or Mrs. Catania could answer questions on this. I would urge the ah..... adoption and passage of this Bill."

Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

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

Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Totten: "Is it my understanding from your remarks that this was a program started by the Federal Government, that they have now abandoned and we have to pick up the entire cost?"

Griesheimer: "No, that's not correct. Ah... the Federal Government did initiate the program, but it has not been abandoned by the Federal Government. Ah..... we're in a position where the Federal Government has given some indication that they may cut back on funds. If they cut back on funds, we cannot keep our program going, because we do need some funds from the Federal Government. What we are doing is coming in with an appropriation in a substantive bill to continue this program in the State of Illinois in the instance the Federal Government should either partially cut back their program or modify



it in some manner."

Totten: "Was this entirely Federal funds in the prior fiscal year."

Griesheimer: "Technically, the program was completely Federally funded, but I would point out that in the Waukegan area, where we have one of the most censored programs, ah.... that they school does participate by providing the school building, by providing school facilities and what we're really paying for are the teachers and the academic hardware."

Totten: "How much money is contained in the Appropriation Bill?"

Griesheimer: "\$500,000."

Totten: "\$500,000."

Griesheimer: "That's correct. The original.... I would point out that there was a much higher price tag on this originally, but it was substantially reduced. I believe it was reduced in the House."

Totten: "O'kay, thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Bradley: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman."

Berman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Berman: "Ronnie, as I.... who's the Sponsor?"

Bradley: "Griesheimer, Sir. Mr. Griesheimer."

Berman: "As I understand.... as I read the Bill, I believe that ah.... the only schools that would be eligible for this money are the schools that are already doing the program. Is that correct?"

Griesheimer: "As I understand the Bill as written, it is to continue the program as presently initiated and the program is going on at the present time. Ah.... the biggest program, of course, is in Chicago. Then there's a program going on in Mounds, Waukegan and East St. Louis and we would try to keep these pilot programs going. I would have to state that ultimately, if this proves to be the success as we anticipate it will be over the long haul, that this will probably be one of the most sound investments we could have to develop students in this economic classification throughout the State of Illinois, because everyone of these students that are education will not be on public aid rolls in the years to come."

Berman: "Well, I don't take issue with your last comment, but the thing that bothers me is that by the language of the Bill, a school



district that wanted to expand this program or use this money in schools, individual schools, that are not now having it, I don't think would be able to do so. Now that's my interpretation and that's what causes me some additional problems with this Bill."

Griesheimer: "Well, if I may, I think I can respond to that by this explanation. Ah..... we would very definitely like to offer this to more schools, but as you know because of the fiscal situation the State finds itself in, it would be certainly unsound judgement to just issue a blanket statement that all schools could go into this. We could not afford it this year, so what we're trying to do is maintain the potential in the pilot project areas of this educational program, so if and when the time comes in a year or two to come, and I think it will come, when we can afford this, it can be offered to the other schools. At the present time, if we discontinued this program, either by the Federal government discontinuing it or the State refusing to pick up any portion that the Federal Government failed to fund, we'd just be dropping the entire program and as a practical matter, I don't think it could be reinitiated very quickly in the State of Illinois."

Berman: "Well, addressing myself to the Bill. Number 1, I don't think the Senate is looking very favorably on your appropriation bill. Number 2, \$500,000 ah..... is either not going to be needed because Federal Government will continue the program, or if the Federal Government doesn't continue the program, \$500,000 isn't going to help. Ah..... I think in addition the thing that bothers me is that we're only addressing part of a total problem, and that is that follow through is nice and is productive but there are other programs such as the Child Parent Guidance Centers that are also good. Some of the Headstart Programs are also good, and I think that we ought to take a look at the whole picture instead of piecemeal and partial funding instead of just going ahead in this approach. I'm going to vote 'present' on this Bill."

Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. D'Arco."

D'Arco: "Ronnie, can I ask you a question? Ronnie, how do you answer that objection that \$500,000 is not enough?"



Griesheimer: "Well, at this point in time, I don't think anyone can say conclusively what this program would cost, if the Federal Government completely cut it back, and I think what we're trying to do is to take a realistic approach to what we can afford, what we can hold as a contingency fund here, if you will, for the Federal Government cutting back on money for this program. If I were to come before this House and say what we really need is three or four million dollars. There's no question the State could not afford that. We're just trying to take a realistic figure to perpetuate an extremely effectual program."

D'Arco: "Mr. Speaker, may I address myself to the Bill, Sir "

Bradley: "You certainly may, Sir."

D'Arco: "I agree with Mr. Griesheimer that ah.... the reason he is asking for \$500,000 is because he knows that anything over and above that would be an unrealistic figures and very difficult to appropriate in this General Assembly. I visited the school in Waukegan and I visited the school in Chicago and it is really an amazing thing to watch these kids get the individual attention that they got because of the reduction in the class sizes due to this program. The parents were marvelous. The teachers were marvelous and the kids were really learning, and that's very important. It is a pilot program and hopefully this is the future, the way education will go in the future and I would really seek your support of this Bill. Thank you."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I too would like to join in supporting this legislation and I do think that generally it is better to light one candle and curse the darkness and it's better to take a little step forward even though you might not be able to go the whole road. What this Bill really does is it gives the State of Illinois standby authority and it just gives authority to continue a program that happened to be initiated by the Federal Government but widely recognized as an outstanding program for the development of our young people here in Illinois, and I think since the appropriation is over there, whether the appropriation is enough or small or big or whatever the size might be, that's something else. But nonetheless this legislation simply gives our State of Illinois the standby



authority and it might be comparable, the other evening, the legislation we passed authorizing the ah.... the Department of Transportation ah.... to have the authority to apply for and receive Federal grants with respect to the railroad abandonment. We want our State of Illinois to be prepared to take action ah.... when we think that action is necessary. I would urge the support of this Bill so that our State can be ready to carry on if that necessity arises. I urge an 'aye' vote on this."

Bradley: "Gentleman from Moultrie, Mr. Stone."

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

Bradley: "Mr. Gentleman moves the previous question. The question.... shall the main question be put. All those in favor, will say 'aye'. Opposed will say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer, to close."

Griesheimer: "Just very briefly, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is an extremely effectual program, which could have long-term economic benefits for our State. I think it's proven itself without a doubt. Mr. D'Arco and I and Mrs. Catania and Mr. Polk have all seen this program in operation. It's an amazing thing to see students who would otherwise probably be slow learners, finding themselves, not only progressing, but progressing very well. I think we should take advantage of this program by keeping this contingency open so we can support this program should the Federal Government back off. The comments that Mr. Deuster made about moving this program onto the Senate, I think it is only fair, this is the substantive bill that this House has already approved the appropriation for this Bill and it would make good sense, good practical sense to have this Bill over at the Senate at the same time. I urge its passage."

Bradley: "The question is, shall House Bill 3086 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed by voting 'no'. The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis, to explain his vote."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, \$500,000 is not anything when it helps children and when we can help roads we can afford to help children, so I urge an 'aye' vote. It's a very good program."



Bradley: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, to explain his vote."

Polk: "Very briefly, Sir, as Chairman of that Subcommittee last year, it has pointed out one thing. Representatives Schneider, Griesheimer, D'Arco, those who were there heard the testimony and all feel this is a great program, and I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there are 112 'ayes', 5 'nays', 10 voting 'present' and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Greiman 'aye'. On the Supplemental Calendar appears House Bill 1911. Mr. Tuerk, on a Motion on..... On concurrences, appears 1911. Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 1911 is the Bill which authorized the County to enter into a franchise agreement for cable television. Many of you perhaps remember this is a Bill that has been pending for a year or so. Mr. Al Green helped us work out all the details of this Bill and its in Order that is agreeable to everyone. Senate Amendment #1 merely exempts the authority being granted to ah.... license or franchise telephone companies be subject to jurisdiction of Illinois Commerce Commission or the SPC and Senate Amendment #2 merely provides when an area that annexes to a municipality, the the license, tax or franchise would become part of that municipality. I would ah.... move to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and #2 to House Bill 1911."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. D. L. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ah..... the Bill that Representative Tuerk is referring to, House Bill 1911, is on the Supplemental Calendar, on the Order of Concurrences that we have just received. There's some three pages of Bills here on the Order of Concurrence and quite frankly, we haven't had the opportunity here to examine the file, and what I would ask is of the Sponsor and I would ask the Speaker also to consider that we not move to this Order of business on the supplemental calendar until we've had an opportunity to examine these files."

Bradley: "We'll take it out of the Record for right now. The Order of Senate Bills, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 1250."



Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 1250. An Act to redistrict the State of Illinois and the Congressional District in repeal of certain acts therein named. Second Reading of the Bill. One Committee Amendment. Amends Senate Bill 1250, on page 6, by deleting lines 21 through 34 and so forth."

Bradley: "What purpose does the Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms, arise?"

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, prior to the consideration of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1250, in accordance with the rules, I have filed a motion on the Clerk's desk, which does take precedence before the consideration of Amendment #1."

Bradley: "What page is your Motion on?"

Simms: "It's listed on the Calendar under Motions. Page 9, Mr. Speaker."

Bradley: "We'll go to Motions then. Senate Bill. Motion regarding Senate Bill 1250. Mr. Simms."

Simms: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a very simple Motion. It strikes the enacting clause. I think this is the time when each Member of the House has the opportunity to make a decision on this Bill. I think pretty near everybody in the General Assembly in this Chamber has made a decision in principle perhaps concerning the merits or the demerits of this particular piece of legislation, and to save the time of the House, of Representatives to go through the long, deliberate process of many Amendments that have been filed, I have filed this Motion which will strike the enacting clause to Senate Bill 1250. I would urge that there be an affirmative 'yes' vote for this very important motion."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea, on the Motion."

Shea: "Needless to say, I oppose very strongly the Gentleman's Motion and would urge a 'no' vote."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, on the Motion."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as a Co-sponsor of....."

Shea: "Is this debatable or is he closing or what?"



Bradley: "Well, the two Gentlemen were Co-sponsors of the....."

Walsh: "How did his mike happen to be left on, Mr. Speaker, when he had finished speaking?"

Bradley: "Mr. Walsh, did you want to speak on....."

Walsh: "Mr. Simms may close and ah..... I'll explain my vote."

Bradley: "O'kay, fine. Mr. Simms, to close. What purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington, arise?"

Washington: "I rise on a parliamentary inquiry."

Bradley: "State your point."

Washington: "I may have been off the Floor, but I'm a little confused as to the procedure. Is it proper to attack a Bill in this method, in this collateral method, which apparently supercedes the amending process as the Order of business. I just don't know. On what is this rule..... why are you permitting this Motion?"

Bradley: "Mr. Simms, what rule did you base your request to go from the....."

Simms: "Rule 63 ah..... 63a precedence of motion to lay on the Table a motion to strike the enacting clause if a Bill has precedence over a Motion to amend and if carried its equivalence to the objection of the Bill."

Bradley: "Gentleman's Motion is in order. Do you wish to close? I think that's where we were. Mr. Simms, do you want to close? If not, the question is, on the Gentleman's Motion to strike the enacting clause on Senate Bill 1250. All those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion will vote 'aye' and those opposed will vote 'no' and the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, is recognized to explain his vote."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there can't be anyone here that doesn't know what we're about, and for those of you who feel that this Motion is cruel and inhuman, may I suggest to you that it has been done before in this session twice and has been done before in this Legislature, many, many times. The Sponsor of the Bill has been around and has talked to people about 'beat me on the Bill, don't beat me on a technicality'. Well I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that this isn't a technicality. This is a legitimate action that is being used and in my opinion, the only way that we can beat the Bill, and the Bill



richly deserves being beaten, because the Sponsor of the Bill knows very well that there are steps that must be taken and for those of you who are going along with them because they want to stay with good old Jerry, their Majority Leader, and believe me, no one has a higher opinion of him than I do, let me tell you people that what you're doing is, you're assisting him, you're assisting him in passing this Bill and you're assisting him in remapping for all of the evils that it contains, you're assisting him, because all he needs you for those of you who are dedicated and have pledged yourself to vote against the Bill, all he needs you for is to vote 'no' on this Motion. And that's all he wants you for. The next crucial step is Amendment #1 and he's got plenty of people over on this side who for, whatever reason, are pledged to vote for Amendment #1. He will use them for that purpose and they are pledged too, presumably, to beat the Bill. But what they're doing when they vote for that, and when you vote for this, is you're helping him pass his Bill. He doesn't care what you do when the Bill is at passage stage. You can vote whatever you want, because he's got an altogether new group of people to pass the Bill, so I submit to you that if you do not vote 'yes' on this Motion, and I also remind you that the Gentleman did vote 'yes' on a Motion earlier this session to do exactly this thing, because he's a professional. He knows. He voted 'yes' on a Motion to strike the enacting clause. If you do not vote 'yes' on this Motion, then you are voting 'yes' on remap, no matter what you've said, and no matter how you vote on subsequent votes on this issue. Let me remind you of that and you live with yourself on that issue and I urge you to vote 'yes'."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rayson, to explain his vote."

Rayson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I want to explain my vote. Ah...."

I can't ah.... out do the previous speaker, except that I recall not too many weeks ago, we had a similar motion. He was the Gentleman who supported the Amendment to make a bad Bill infinitely worse, and at that time, I warned him, as did some other people, that this was at this time, establishing very dark precedences in this Legislative process. Some of you, some of the wise counsel voting green suggested this is a terrible weak legislative motion requiring the weakest of



all votes, the majority vote of those voting that would kill a Bill, and that the thought was that this would be reconsidered in the Rules and I haven't seen any reconsideration of this, and yes, I want to follow the premonitions of the Gentleman. I want to say that this would rue the day of many and I at that time suggested many of you would rue the day, so I'm going to vote 'no' on this Motion and be consistent in this point of view, even though I think the remap is abominable."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff, to explain his vote."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've never voted to strike a Bill from the enacting clause from the enacting clause ever before and I didn't vote on it for the Gentleman from Cook who just spoke either because I thought his Bill should have a chance to be heard on the merits, because it was an issue that could require profound /^{debate} before this House. I would point out to that Gentleman and others that his hard feelings about not having won that Motion, when I supported his position can't very easily be carried back to his constituents and his old friend, Abner Mikva, when this Bill passes, because we're not going to debate this Bill on the merits. There should be no question in anybody's mind that this map has become the most important politically significant measure supported by its sponsor and its sponsor's sponsor. This is a measure that we are trying to kill simply because I have never seen such adroit, careful, enduring, political machinations surrounding one Bill in my life. This Bill that we're trying to strike the enacting clause is dripping with compromise, is dripping with ah... maneuvering and parliamentary procedures that we will see. If you think that you can stop this Bill without supporting this Motion, I would suggest to you that you're wrong. There are people in this House who are going to vote for that Amendment #1, which is going to pick up some votes from people on your side of the aisle, because they will not be able to carry it back on their districts, and the Bill is going to come out of this House. Representative Rayson, I sympathize with the difficulties in which you stated your position. I supported you then. This is not to allow a Bill to be heard on its merits. This is pure politics and you know it, Sir. You want this Bill dead,



join with us."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, to explain his vote."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I feel I should explain my first vote to strike the enacting clause in 13 years. I've never done it before, because I've always felt that a Sponsor who thought enough of a Bill to introduce it, deserved a hearing at the passage stage. And I'm not suggesting in any way that Representative Shea as an individual does not believe fully in what he is doing here. It was based on a philosophy that a Bill deserves consideration only from a standpoint of equity, but Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there's no equity in this Bill. This Bill was conceived in an atmosphere and in absence of equity. It's designed to eliminate one of the fine sitting members in the United States Congress. A good Democrat to bat, if you will. An excellent Legislator, who has fought hard and fought an upward hill battle in a Republican District to gain election to the United States Congress. The People in that District feel very, very, strongly about this matter. The People in the District that he formerly represented feel very strongly about it. His friends feel strongly about it. The People on the issue that he's champion through the years feel strongly about it, and Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we cannot have a reapportionment bill whose sole aim is the elimination of one individual from the Congress. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill, if passed, and signed will do violence to the Democratic party. It will split it apart. The feeling is tremendous. In the City and in the suburbs across the State, in this Nation, there's tremendous resentment about a Bill that was conceived in vindictiveness, and there's many Members in this House, who off the record will tell you it was a bad idea. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm taking exception to a long standing position in not voting on an Amendment on a Motion to strike an enacting clause of a Bill....."

Bradley: "Mr. Mann. Mr. Mann, will you bring your remarks to a close Sir?"

Mann: "Because I think this Bill does not have merit. It is not worthy of the importance of congressional redistrict and remapping. When we establish one man, one vote, when we talked about fair contiguous



districts. We weren't talking about this. Let's not cast it all aside. Let's come up with a fair map for everybody. Both parties. All incumbents,--and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Bradley: "Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Fredrich, to explain his vote, and we're using the two minute timer."

Fredrich: "Mr. Speaker, even if I thought the previous speaker was correct, that this would really drive a wedge into the Democrat party, I still would be voting to strike the enacting clause. I don't care what kind of map you come up and how many Amendments you put on it, I'm still going to vote against this Bill, because I don't believe in reapportioning the State of Illinois for congressional purposes every fifteen minutes. Conceivably in this decade, we could have had three or four reapportionments for Congress. I think it's wrong, I think we should wait until the new census and reapportion it the way it has always been done."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder, to explain his vote."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is a typical situation where a certain group of Democratic leaders want to control the Democratic party in the State of Illinois. On the last reapportionment of the State Legislature, an obvious attempt was done to do the same thing and they got the job done. Unfortunately, I didn't lose the election, and / may or may not be happy with that situation, but they put our legislative district in another Republican area and they murdered us. Let me say the consequences of that and as history has shown, Joe Mudd and I were elected to the Legislature. They were wrong about that one. They did it in a very serious vein. Now they're doing the same thing with the congressional districts. We had a lousy congressional district, I have to admit, but when the Democratic Party was our leader came up with a map that makes it even more seriously against our party, then they have only one thing to say and that they're trying to take care of their own in particular interest rather than the interest of Central Illinois where I come from. The 18th Congressional District is more severely Republican than ever before, and if the Chicago organization can justify that to me, I'd like to ^{have them} do it to me publically, because they cannot justify



it, and that's why I'm requesting a strike from the enacting clause."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, to explain his vote."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, probably there's nothing more basic with respect to a Legislative Body than the Constitutional responsibility that's given to us with regard to reapportionment. Reapportionment not only to itself, the Legislative Body, the State Legislative Body, but also to the Congressional Body. Constitution requires, and the Supreme Court has caused it to be implemented, that to be reapportionment after every census. The Supreme Court has not changed the rules with regard to congressional reapportionment. It has caused to be changed the rules with regard to legislative reapportionment. The one man, one person principle is to be strictly adhered to with regard to congressional reapportionment but not as to legislative reapportionment. State Legislative reapportionment. And I think it's interesting, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that now that the Democrats have secured control of the Legislature, they haven't directed their attention to the Supreme Court Decision of the United States with respect to the change in Rules as far as Legislative, State Legislative reapportionment, to insure geographic integrity. I see in this, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, not only a distortion of priorities, but an opportunity on the part of certain persons within the Majority party to engage in political opportunity, and I find it so repulsive that I am willing, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, to take this extraordinary step in voting for a Motion to strike the enacting clause."

Bradley: "Would you bring your remarks to a close, Sir?"

Schlickman: "And I think it's interesting, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in conclusion, that the fourth legislative district, its membership, Republican and Democratic, is united in this Motion. This Motion to strike the enacting clause, and I think it's in Order and I would trust, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that the one congressional district that is most vitally affected by this Bill, Senate Bill 1250, are in unison, and I would hope that the Membership of this



House would look to the Membership of the Fourth Legislative District as its guide and to vote 'aye' in the passage of this Motion, the adoption of this Motion and to strike the enacting clause."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lundy, to explain his vote."

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have heard Members on this Floor tonight tell me and argue that they will not vote to strike the enacting clause of this Bill as a matter of principle. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there is no principle involved here. The Motion to strike the enacting clause is part of the rules of the House. It has been used twice this Session. The second time it was used, the Sponsor of this Bill voted for it, so it's not a matter of principle. It's in the House rules. It's a legitimate, parliamentary procedure. If you disagree with it, you should vote to change it when we consider our rules or any Member could have moved on his own to change the rules. That has not been done. So the Motion to strike the enacting clause is there. It is a legitimate parliamentary means to avoid considering an issue on the merits, and why is it appropriate here? I'll tell you why, because this Bill is poisoning the Legislative atmosphere. This Bill is poisoning the political atmosphere in this State. In short, there are no merits to this Bill and it ought not to be debated on the merits because it has no merits. It is a sheer political power play and it is an attempt by one segment of one party to extend its control throughout the State and I urge my friends who are voting 'no' to vote 'present' and I urge my friends who are voting 'present' on principle, to vote 'aye'."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg, to explain his vote."

Grotberg: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to explain this exceptional vote. I did it once before and got caught in the cross wind, but there's no cross wind here. I look at the Bill and Amendment #1. The County Chairman of Kane County has asked several of us to try to get Kane back together. It's in two districts. You will find Amendment #1 does just that. It puts Kane in three districts. What a perfect delight. And if you look further down the stream, you will find that the 15th Congressional District, on another Amendment, has a nice county removed from it



and three more townships from the top of DeKalb. It's this kind of thing, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that drives me into desperation of voting for the striking of the enacting clause, rather than become a party to such gerrymandering. I have invested interest in the 15th Congressional District, as do several Members on this side of the aisle. God knows how many are back in the Districts. At this point in time, I would just as soon fight it out with my friends and neighbors as to who's going to represent the 15th and leave it the way it is. At least some of the voters know who their congressman is now, and who their representative is now, and I just cannot become a party to any further kicking around of the voters in this confusing times that we're in today. I urge everyone who's on the yellow switch or on the red switch, for God's sake, get your head on straight and kill this thing before it has little ones."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell, to explain his vote."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm going to be very brief. This was was discussed quite thoroughly in the Executive Committee and it came out of that Committee, as you all know, on a straight party line vote, but I would like to remind the Republican Party that this is the second time since 1971 that they have scooted their responsibility, their legislative responsibility, to redistrict the State into proper congressional districts. We've heard about political opportunists, and I would like to call your attention to what happened in one session of the General Assembly back, I believe, in 1971, when there was a so-called vehicle floating around this House that was going to go to the Senate and to come back with certain Amendments and full debate so that we could do what the ah..... Constitution says is our responsibility. Now that vehicle never did go anywhere, but into a Federal court where three judges with the help of two leaders from the Republican side, Representative Hyde and then Speaker Blair, who absolutely told falsehoods in front of that Federal panel that.....that absolutely told falsehood in front of that Federal panel....."

Bradley: "Mr. Yourell, just a moment, please, Sir. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlicman, arise?"



Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Gentleman who has just concluded his remarks, I assume temporarily, I believe is going beyond this Motion, number 1. Number 2, he has mentioned the names of two former Members of this House, one of whom happens to be a Congressman, and he has accused them, as I heard him, he has accused them as being liars, and I very deeply, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, resent on the Floor of this House, that Gentleman making that statement without their being here to defend themselves. He's expressing an opinion and I think, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, he ought to be reprimanded for that very intemperate comment on his part."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell, to conclude his remarks."

Yourell: "Thank you for your reprimand, Mr. Schlickman, but the Record clearly shows and if you had taken the time to read that Record, that that record clearly shows that what I've said is true. Now I understand that's a very sharp edge and apparently has cut you where it hurts the most, and I remind you, Mr. Schlickman, that political opportunism, as you call it, works both ways and on both sides of this aisle. Examine the Record and you'll see that there's plenty of proof to substantiate what I've said. Thank you."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms, to explain his vote."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote and asking for some more green votes on that Board, we're going to do ourselves a big favor if we're not going to have reapportionment to save the time of the House and vote 'yes'. That way, you're not going to be hear Saturday, Sunday and Monday, because of other things that the time of the House is taken up considering Amendments and also the debate of this legislation, and especially I ask those Republicans and I urge them to think about their own party. Perhaps they may not have done it this session so far, but think about your own party and the responsibility you have to the party and of your political philosophy. Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time, I would like ah... to ask for a verification if that becomes necessary and be recognized for that purpose."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Grundy, the Minority Leader, Mr. Washburn."



Washburn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to explain my vote in support of this Motion, because I think the very fact that this Bill is before us is an insult to the people of our State. Now the only reason that would compel the drawing of a new map prior to the census of 1980 is a massive shift in the population concentrations throughout Illinois, and no such population shifts have occurred. And this Bill is an affront to the voters of our State. The selection of delegates to a national nominating convention and personal vendeta is against certain congressmen are not hardly reasons of sufficient moments to warrant consideration of this proposal, and I would ask, Ladies and Gentlemen, for some more green lights, so that we can send Senate Bill 1250 to the grave yard, where it belongs and save a lot of time."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz, to explain his vote."

Katz: "Ah..... Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it has been my pleasure for eleven years to represent the people of the first district of Illinois, but I will never represent them on an issue about which they feel so strongly as I do here tonight. This district with a distinguished congressman, elected by a large number of the citizenry a young man known nationally as one of our most promising leaders, is now about to lose a congressman, not through the will of the voters of the 11th Congressional District, but through the diabolical plotting to draw a district that would eliminate from this Nation's congress one of the most distinguished young men of the History of the United States, in my opinion, and the voters of my district, Mr. Speaker, feel so strongly about this issue. Now with regard to the question of the Rules, I wish that the Rules had had time to be considered, and there is a Rule changed that will deal with the problem of striking the enacting clause, but Rules work both ways. If it is changed, it must be changed so that it applies both ways. They cannot be discriminatorily applied so that they only are useful in the hands of some, but not in the hands of all, and I will join with the distinguished leaders of my party and the distinguished leaders of the Minority, to eliminate this device or to put certain restrictions on this device, but so long as it is in our Rules, it ought to be applied fairly and evenly and in this perhaps



I may disagree with the distinguished Gentleman from Tinley Park."

Bradley: "Will the Gentleman bring his remarks to a close, please?"

Katz: And so...I bring my remarks to a close only by saying that that light that I'm about to touch is the light from the hearts from all the people in the First District, I vote 'yes.'"

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Londrigan, to explain his vote."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker, I've rarely seen such hypocrisy as we have in some of our speeches tonight. I don't say anyone shouldn't vote the convictions of their District. This is a political issue. Why call it otherwise? We have a duty here which we have never performed for this General Assembly to have our Congressional Districts. The one we have now, was Bob Blair's and a couple judges. We have never performed our duty. When the Republican's were in charge, they redistricted all the rest of the state, but not the Congressional District, and we now have that obligation. I find it very hard to see how any Democrat cannot say that we are going to get a better shake than we have now. We've got a Republican map. This is bigger than any one Congressional District and any one Congressman. Our District doesn't have a chance of winning. Don't you care about our District and all the rest of the Districts downstate. Well you stick by your's, but this is better than one District. This is for the people and the party, and I'm going to stand up here and vote for any District which will be better than what I have now, and which will be better for the Democratic Party than I've got now, and I don't, personally, see how any Democrat can help but vote 'no.'"

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Palmer, to explain his vote."

Palmer: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's been only a few years ago, two or three years ago, that the Court drew these lines that they are drawn now, and as a result of these lines being drawn the way they are, there have been both Rep... a majority of Republican and a majority of Democrats. But I should like to draw your attention to the South end of Cook County, which does not have an identity of interest with the City of Chicago, and a third district. We should like to leave it like it is now, where



we have a fair chance to win, a sporting chance, if you please, to win. Now the name of this game here is rudely, mathematics, where the line should be drawn. I think we should leave it like it is. Let the people get accustomed to the districts that they live in, so that they can be participants, knowledgeable participants, in this process of federal government, and let us elect our own people while we do have a fair chance. We don't want one man or one party ruling this state. We like to have the people have their say on it. Let's leave it like it is, and let's vote green to strike this enacting clause."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, to explain his vote."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. A very close friend of mine told me about two years ago that I would probably never make it as a politician, because I wasn't ruthless enough. After I've seen what is going on this Session, I'm inclined to believe that the gentleman maybe was true. Well, let me say this. Number one, this map is one of the most ridiculous maps that I have ever seen in my life. I think the...the...the beginning of this map...ah...was misguided and it has caused us to be involved in probably one of the worse games of political prostitution that I've ever seen, and I will not support this map, first and foremost because this map was designed to punish, as it relates to the Tenth District, to reward, as it relates to the Sixth District, but more than that to protect, as it relates to the Second and Eighth Districts. The Districts where the Black Community for the first time in a long time, has a chance to elect their own representation. For that reason, I cannot support this map. But beyond that, Mr. Speaker, one of the previous speakers indicated that some people had said that they would not vote to strike the enacting clause, because it was a matter of principle with them. Well for me, it's a matter of principle. Now you can speak about whether or not this Bill has merit, but as far as I am concerned, the integrity that I have to represent for myself, the ability that I have to have to sleep nights, and to be comfortable with myself. I said a long time ago that the Motion to strike the



enacting clause was a astardly rule as far as I was concerned, and my integrity is on the line as it relates to that Rule. I cannot support it. If this map passes, so be it, it will pass, not with my support, because I don't like the map, I don't think it gives true representation to the Black Community in Chicago, but Gentlemen, Representative Lundy, with all due respect, I don't like the Motion to strike. I cannot support it now. I never will support it, and I don't give a damn what Bill is before us, with or without merit, the Motion to strike, it appears to me, does not give the Sponsor of a Bill his day in court, and I don't care if the Bill has merit... does not have merit....his constituent's to represent his district, and he should have his day in court, and for that reason I cannot support this Motion to strike."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Boyle, to explain his vote."

Boyle: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. At the present time I have a green vote up there. Yes, I was dissatisfied because of the way that this map was put together. Yes, I felt like I was chagrined because I had no input. I don't like maps drawn in the backrooms anymore than anybody on the Floor of this House, but I'm a Democrat, and I'm a Democrat first, and the Democratic Party put me here, and I'm going to tell you fellow Democrats over here, as echoed by by seatmate, Jim Londrigan. Under the present remap, the Twentieth Congressional District where Macoupin County is in the vast majority of my district is located is a Republican District. We have, absolutely, no chance to elect a Democrat in that district. Anything is better than nothing. Anything is better than nothing. Of course, this is a partisan issue. Of course, this is a political issue. There's no use in trying to fool anybody. I've offered Amendments to try and take the Twentieth Republican Congressional District and make it a Twentieth Democratic Congressional District, but I can't get these Amendments on, I won't even get a shot if the enacting clause is struck, and I don't have any deals with Jerry Shea. I don't know whether Jerry Shea is going to vote for or against my Amendments, but I'll tell you this, Jim Londrigan and Ken Boyle are going to try and make the Twentieth District a Democratic District and we're not going to participate in



Republican Politics, and I change my vote to 'no'."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins, to explain his vote."

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

When we heard this abomination in the Executive Committee, we were treated to a long parade of bright young Democratic ladies from the City of Chicago who came in and...and...per...to persuade us to vote for this map. And, I must say, that at least they were honest. They told us they wanted a Democratic map and said so and that...and that is their function, and I respect them for that. But I don't respect the charge that has come up again today on the Floor of this House, and was raised in Committee that day by a Chicago alderman, a former Congressman, and...ah...a individual who hopes to be Congressman again, because this map draws a district just for him, and he had the nerve to make the charge that was repeated here today, that somehow Republican leaders went into a Federal Court and fixed a federal panel of judges to come up with a Republican map. Well, this is balderdash, it's slander, it's libel, it's criminal, and beneath any member of this House to make such a charge. Now let's look at this thing for what it is. It's a gerrymander and that's all it is and that's understandable. Gerrymander means...when the Majority Party draws districts to favor them and to punish the Minority. At least I can understand that. But this is also a map drawn in vengeance. This is a map to punish those that don't toe the party line, and that I find very hard to understand. No Republican should vote for this map. No fair thinking Democrat should vote for this map. This is an insult to every citizen in the State of Illinois, and the only way to give this the proper treatment, the treatment that it richly deserves, is to vote yes on this Motion to strike the enacting clause."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijeich, to explain his vote."

Matijeich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Romie Palmer said that the court drew up this map, and I've heard a lot sa...of talk about principle. The principle is whether we believe in separation of powers. Whether we believe that the Legislature has the responsibility...the responsibility to draw up the map. I've heard some talk about the input. The input that they may or may not ha...have had on this map. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I talked a little bit



last night about my memory, and I don't need much of a memory to talk about what happened with the Congressional Remap a few years ago, because everyone that was here at that time knows that a Bill... a Bill sailed out in a matter of seconds, and there was nobody, nobody on the Floor of the House that had any input, and we were told then that it was a vehicle, and that it was going to come back. It never did come back...never came back. We in the Legislature never did have our day...we didn't have our input, but what is happening this time. This time this Bill had a full committee hearing of three hours...three hours in the full committee where anybody, anybody in the House could have walked into that committee room with an Amendment. Every single Legislator on the Floor of this House had the ability to place an Amendment on that Bill, and here it is on Second Reading where 177 House members have a voice, a voice in Congressional Remap. This isn't a three member court panel that is going to tell every single citizen of the State of Illinois who can represent them in Congress, but we the members of the General Assembly have that responsibility, not responsibility, we've got the duty to do it."

Bradley: "Will the Gentleman bring his remarks to a close?"

Matijevich: "Now Ladies and Gentlemen. There has been a lot of input.

In my own Congressional District, we...ah...every member of my Congressional District knows deep down that this is a better...district both for Republicans and Democrats. They know that. Not one of them could stand on the Floor of this House and say no, they couldn't do it, and I say to them that they would be contributing to the defeat of a good district for the people of Lake and McHenry County if they support a motion to kill a Bill by striking the enacting clause. Everybody, let's not shirk away from what is your Legislative responsibility and duty, and vote no on this motion to strike."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines, to explain his vote."

Gaines: "I wish to say that when I was a small boy, we had the strongest Black political organization in the history of this country. The present Democrat Organization now is no exception. William L. Dawson was the adlerman, and my father, Harry C. Gaines was the president of



of the organization, and I was trained by them in politics, and I'm quite sure that Congressman Dawson, his spirit, is depressed, to see the Democratic Party draw a map that precludes such outstanding Black Democrats as Senator Chew, Alderman Sayer, and Alderman Frost, from becoming congressmen, because it takes them out of a district that their community is in, and puts them in a district where they can't go up. Yet, the Democratic Party gets ninety-five percent of the Black vote. I'd like to have a district where Charley Chew could go to the Congress, so I could run for the Senate. I can't do that in this district. I'd like to have an opportunity to see some of my good Democratic friends go to Congress. They can't do it under this map. I'd like to have an opportunity to see some of my good suburban Republican friends go to Congress. They can't do it under this map. So as a Black man, my representation is restricted, and as a Republican, my representation is restricted. That's why I am voting, and using this parliamentary tool, which is a legitimate parliamentary tool, they used it when my Dad was down here, so it's a long history of good tools, so therefore, I'm sorry that my good friend, Brother Madison can't join me, but I am voting in the best interest of the City of Chicago for growth, and that is why I am voting 'aye'.

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter, to explain his vote."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House, my-colleague from the First District, across the aisle there said he speaks for all of the people of...ah...our First District. I think that his vote does. It's not...ah...because we in the First District have such a deep admiration for the ille...ideology of our present congressman, but he did win his election fair and square. The people selected him. We don't think they will again. But Jerry, we appreciate your thinking of us there, but really we'd rather do it ourselves. I vote 'aye'."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian, to explain his



vote."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just very briefly I would like to talk about two things. There are some people who are voting 'no' on the premise, on the argument that this bill, on Second Reading, can be made a better bill. Now, if you just think about what that means; we're only talking about a map. So if you're going to make the 24th District a better Democratic district, you're going to make the 23rd a poorer Democratic district. If you're going to help one person, you're going to hurt another one. Those people that are voting on the theory that by going through the amendment process they're going to come up with better legislation, I think are deluding themselves. What we're really involved in is a power play; and I think those of us that have even been here for two and a half years or only a half a year should know that in this play, power is very important; and it's our purpose, I hope, to eliminate the influence of power for its own sake, because power does not result in good. Not only does power corrupt absolutely, but it has never been a force for good; and I suggest that . . . that . . . that we should not talk in terms of amendments. Now, there are some who voting 'present', and some have said they are voting 'present' as a matter of principle or as a matter of conscious. Now, that so-called abominable tactic of striking the enacting clause was directed against my very dear friend and seat-mate, Leland Rayson, but we, ladies and gentlemen, have legitimized that tactic. It is an accepted parliamentary tactic in this House; and if you think that by voting 'present' you are making any kind of a vote at all or that you're representing your constituents in any way at all, you're being mistaken. The issue is on this amendment and on this Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Madison, Mr. Steele, to explain his vote."

Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this motion. I think this motion is clearly in the best interest of the people. To consider remap at this time only serves to create confusion in the eyes of the voters. It only serves to create the disruption and distrust in our governmental process.



I submit that there are no accurate population figures available today by which a constitutional remap could be considered, could be enacted that would be held . . . upheld in the court. It's been five years since we've had an accurate census here in the State of Illinois; and I submit to you that there are no figures available which could accurately reflect the shift in population and create a remap that would be held as constitutional. We have little enough time left in this session to enact bills that will benefit the people; and I say let's enact laws that will not confuse the voters, that will not be unconstitutional, that will not disrupt government and that will benefit the people; and for that reason, let's support this motion, and let's put several more green lights up there on the board."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The . . . Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. There are 82 'ayes', 80 'nays' . . . The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, would you poll the absentees, and then verify the affirmative vote, please?"

Speaker Bradley: "Poll the absentees, sir. The gentleman from Dupage, Mr. Schneider, for what purpose do you arise?"

Schneider: "At the appropriate time, if necessary, I'd like to verify the negative Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "You'll have that opportunity, sir. Call the absentees, Mr. Clerk."

Jack O'Brien: "Byers. Downs. Holewinski. Jim Houlihan. Stearney."

Speaker Bradley: "Call the affirmative Roll, sir. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, could the members please be in their seat?"

Speaker Bradley: "Would the members, please, be in their seats; and those not entitled to the floor, please, leave; and let's clear the aisle? Poll the affirmative Roll, sir."

Jack O'Brien: "Anderson. Arnell. Bluthardt. Borchers. Campbell. Carroll. Catania. Coffey. Collins. Cunningham. Daniels. Deavers. Deuster. Duff. Ralph Dunn. Ebbessen. Epton. Ewing. Fleck. Friedland. Friedrich. Gaines. Geo-Karis. Greiman. Griesheimer. Grotberg.



Gene Hoffman. Ron Hoffman. Hudson. Jaffe. J. D. Jones. Kane.
 Katz. Kempiners. Kent. Klosak. Kucharski. LaFleur. Lauer.
 Leinenweber. Lundy. Macdonald. Mahar. Mann. McAuliffe. McCourt.
 McMaster. Meyer. Miller. Malloy. Mugalian. Neff. Palmer.
 Peters. Pierce. Polk. Porter. Randolph. Reed. Rigney. Rose.
 Ryan. Satterthwaite. Schlickman. Schneider. Schoeberlein.
 Schraeder. Schuneman. Sevcik."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Might I ask you again, sir, if you would have the gentlemen and ladies sit in their seats. We can't see."

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, sir, would everybody, please, be in their seats; and would we clear the aisle; and we will stop with the verification until that's done. The members will be in their seats; and then those people not entitled to the floor, would they please remove themselves? Would the members, please, be in their seats. Mr. Greiman, Mr. Hoffman, Mr. Gaines, Mr. Barnes, Emil Jones, Mr. Collins, Mr. Simms, so we can proceed. Mr. Jaffe, Mr. Giorgi, would you please be in your seats. It's impossible for the gentleman to verify to see who's here and who's not. Proceed, sir."

Jack O'Brien: "Sharp. Simms. Skinner. E. G. Steele. C. M. Stiehl. Telcser. Totten. Tuerk. Waddell. Walsh. Washburn. Willer, and Winchester."

Speaker Bradley: "Questions on the affirmative Roll? Mr. Shea, please."

Shea: "Is Miss Catania on the floor?"

Speaker Bradley: "Miss Catania on the floor, is she in the Chambers? Would she stand up, please, I can't see her. Here she comes."

Shea: "Mr. Coffey?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Coffey? He's in his seat."

Shea: "Mr. Deavers?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Deavers is in his chair."

Shea: "Ralph Dunn?"

Speaker Bradley: "Ralph Dunn? There he is, he's in the back of the Chambers."

Shea: "Mr. Epton?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Epton is in this chair."



Shea: "Mr. Fleck, I see him. Mr. Griesheimer, I see him. R. K. Hoffman?"

Speaker Bradley: "There he is, sir, in the chair."

Shea: "Mr. Lauer?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Lauer, sir?"

Shea: "Yes."

Speaker Bradley: "That's . . . a facsimile, but I don't believe that that's Mr. Lauer in Mr. Lauer's chair. Is the gentleman on the floor? How is he recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Shea: "Miss Macdonald, is she in her seat, sir?"

Speaker Bradley: "She's back at Mr. Walsh's chair, I believe, sir."

Shea: "Mr. Meyer? I see him there. Mr. Miller?"

Speaker Bradley: "He's there, sir."

Shea: "Mr. Malloy?"

Speaker Bradley: "He's there, sir."

Shea: "Mr. Rose?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Rose is in his chair."

Shea: "Mr. Sevcik?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Sevcik is in his chair."

Shea: "Mr. . . ."

Speaker Bradley: "Just a minute, sir. Would those people in the aisle, would you please clear the aisle and sit down; I can't see those people back there for verification at all . . . of the affirmative, sir."

Shea: "Mr. Telcser?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Telcser is in the aisle."

Shea: "Mr. Borchers?"

Speaker Bradley: "He's in his chair."

Shea: "Is Mr. Cunningham on the floor? I see him there."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Cunningham is in his chair."

Shea: "Mr. Ebbessen?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Ebbessen is down and in with the Press box."

Shea: "Mr. Ewing on the floor?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Ewing is in his chair."

Shea: "Mr. Greiman?"



Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Greiman is in the aisle . . . or . . . he's here."

Shea: "Mr. Grotberg?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Grotberg is in his chair."

Shea: "Mr. Jaffe?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Jaffe is in his chair."

Shea: Mr. Daniels?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Daniels is in the back rear of the Chambers, sir."

Shea: "Mr. Kucharski on the floor?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Kucharski is in his seat."

Shea: "Mr. McAuliffe?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. McAuliffe is in his chair."

Shea: "Mr. Peters?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Peters is in his chair."

Shea: "Mr. Pierce?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Pierce is in his chair."

Shea: "Mr. Schlickman?"

Speaker Bradley: "He's in his chair."

Shea: "You . . . you're standing up. Mr. Tuerk?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Tuerk is in his chair."

Shea: "Miss Willer?"

Speaker Bradley: "She's in her chair."

Shea: "I have no further questions."

Speaker Bradley: "On this question . . . for what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, arise, Jimmy?"

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like not to bore the . . . ah . . . members with a lot of rhetoric. I think everybody has said how deeply they feel about these issues. All I can tell everybody is there's a lot of politics, there's a lot of personalities, a lot of individuals who are intertwined in this particular map; and this is the worst vote to cast on those personalities. This is the one where we deal with the process, so I vote 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the gentleman as voting 'no'. The gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers. Mr. Byers."

Byers: "Mr. . . . Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, this is a difficult vote for me to cast. I feel that . . . ah . . . the



Democratic Party has always helped in . . . ah . . . electing Democratic candidates. I'm . . . ah . . . always run on the Democratic ticket and am proud of the principles and traditions of the Democratic party. I'm not quite sure this is the right for a remap or not, but, nevertheless, I do feel that striking the enacting clause is not the proper way to go about it . . . not . . . ah . . . sure the right . . . ah . . . proper vote that I'm going to make will be the right one. But . . . ah . . . nevertheless, in the interest of the Democratic party and of our Majority Leader, Gerry Shea, I'm going to vote 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the gentleman as voting 'no'. For what purpose does the gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, arise?"

Kane: "How am I recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Kane; "Keep me that way."

Speaker Bradley: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? On the question now we have 81 'ayes', 82 'nays'; and we recognize the gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms."

Simms: "Well, I'd like to ask for a verification of the negative vote."

Speaker Bradley: "I think there was one already been requested. Which one would like to take it? Mr. . . . ah . . . I think the gentleman, Mr. Simms, had the motion. Let's let Mr. Simms verify, would you call the negative Roll, sir?"

Jack O'Brien: "E. M. Barnes. Beatty."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Duff, I think I know what you're going to request, and I would ask, respectfully, that the members be in their seats and those people that are not entitled to the floor, please, remove themselves; and we're going to wait until that happens. It's a very important piece of business here this evening. We want to be as fair to one side as the other. Let's be in our seats and clear those aisles; and would the Pages, I think this time, we can even have the Pages come up and sit down unless it's absolutely necessary that you be out on the floor. Mr. Greiman, would you please . . . in all fairness to the other side . . . well, they ask that everybody be in their seat on our side; and even though you're helping them . . . ah . . . get over and stand next to Mr. Schneider. Proceed, sir."



Jack O'Brien: "Berman. Birchler. Boyle. Bradley. Brandt. Brinkmeier. Brummet. Byers. Caldwell. Calvo. Capparelli. Capuzi. Chapman. Craig. D'Arco. Darrow. Davis. DiPrima. John Dunn. Ewell. Farley. Fary. Fennessey."

Speaker Bradley: ". . . man from Winnebago, Mr. Simms, what purpose . . ."

Simms: "Well, I would like to renew the plea that the Majority Leader asked earlier. We can't see with so many people milling on the other side of the aisle."

Speaker Bradley: "I think your point . . . I think your point is well taken. Mr. Kosinski, Mr. Madison, Mr. Emil Jones, they can't see past you, sir, would you please sit down? Would you like Mr. Schneider to sit down and . . . well, there . . . there . . . on that side they're objecting to the people standing up. Could we get our . . . please be in our seats. Proceed, sir."

Jack O'Brien: "Flinn. Garmisa. Getty. Giglio. Giorgi. Hanahan. Hill. Dan Houlihan. Jim Houlihan. Huff. Jacobs. Emil Jones. Kelly. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Laurino. Lechowicz. Kornowicz. Leon. Leverenz. Londrigan. Lucco. Luft. Madigan. Maragos. Marovitz. Matijevich. Mautino. McClain. McGrew. McLendon. McPartlin. Merlo. Mudd. Mulcahey. Nardulli. O'Daniel. Patrick. Pouncey. Rayson. Sangmeister."

Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rayson, arise? Mr. Rayson? Turn him on, sir."

Rayson: "Ah . . . In the explanation of votes, my name was mentioned and I'd like to rise to a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Bradley: "State your point, sir. Proceed, on your point."

Rayson: "First I've had chance to ruminate over my vote, and in these . . . ah . . . reflections I . . . ah . . . would like to recall to the membership that . . . ah . . . I went to Rochester and . . . ah . . . moved to Oak Park, Illinois and went to law school. At that time, I was a Republican. For those on the Republican side that don't believe it, I always keep telling them I'm a constitutional conservative; but in law school among many people I met, including the, his excellency, the Governor, who was a student there and a bright fellow; but that was the year when Governor Adlai Stevenson



. . . ah . . . was a professor and I got to know him well, and Senator Paul Douglas; and I became a Democrat because these gentlemen exemplified to me the highest, the highest in politics; and Adlai Stevenson the II, the Stevenson with unbowing integrity, said many things. One, 'I'd rather be right than President'. He also said at the 1952 convention, 'Where we have erred let there be no mistake, where we have wronged the public trust let there be no doubt, for confession and candor are good for the political soul', and I felt that this is the viability of the great Democratic Party; and because of that I was a devout Democrat, a precinct captain, a field Hessian and willing to suggest that this is the way to go to make this country a little better off than it might be otherwise. But through the years I became disenchanted and, unfortunately, the kind of politics that we have in Chicago suggest that if you're a loyal man and a good family man, that's about all you need to go high in this Democratic machine; and I suggest that there's too many problems in the world. From the genocide that in large part many elements of the ge . . . Democratic party helped to foster, to all sorts of rampant maladies in this country suggest that we need more than that as a criterion for your being a Democrat. We need the Democratic Party to really be the the party of the Stevenson's and the Douglas'. Somehow I see it faltering along the road and somehow I see nothing good, you know, in the immediate horizon as to this quality, integrity that the kind of viable party we need in this great country deserves; and I might say to my Republican friends, everything I say goes a fortiori, that's one thing we learned in law school, too. So in light of this . . . in light of the vote being so close and, 'yes' I'm not very happy about the motion to strike the enacting clause in any set and form; but it's here, it's part of a legislative process; and I think this vote is so close that I'm changing my vote from 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the gentleman as voting 'aye'. The gentleman from Dupage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Now, would you re . . . recount for me just quickly, I've lost track since Rayson changed?"

Speaker Bradley: "Just a minute, we'll get it from the Clerk."



Schneider: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The count is 82 'ayes', and 81 'nays'. The gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, if you think that I haven't gone through agonizing moments. Hey, ladies and gentleman, you haven't said or found out how I'm going to vote, so you'd better keep those 'ho has' down. I've served, as you know, three terms, and I don't think anyone in this Assembly that knows me at all or even a little bit, knows that I do anything without serious consideration. I dare say this is probably one of the most agonizing times I've had. But let me tell you how I feel and how I felt the last few days. A number of people in the Democratic side of the aisle, including some of the Leadership, have come to me and said, 'can't you help us?', and I said, I don't see how I can help you because you haven't helped the downstate area. That same thing persisted until today. It persisted up until a little while ago when I made my speech; and believe me I made it from the way I feel. I still feel the same way I do. I have some very dear friends on both sides of the aisle, and I happen to think that the ones I've sat next to for these three terms mean a lot to me; and I don't turn a deaf ear to their wisdom, because I know I have made some votes that may not have been the best, but at least they've been the vote as I partly represented the people in my district in the State of Illinois, and I might add, first and foremost, the Democratic Party who elected me to office three terms, this is one of the most agonizing things that I've done; and the Republicans are gonna' go off in awe and laugh and say a lot of things; but in my lifetime, I don't think one of you will, even after I do what I am about to do, are going to be able to say to me, or to anyone else, that I have layed down my principles. As you know, I have been going up and down the aisles on this . . . ah . . . verification hoping to get some votes to save my position. In your hand there have been people in my leadership and my dear friends in my leadership who have come to me and said this is wrong. Well, perhaps it is wrong, and I am willing at this particular point and time to do one thing, and I hope after I do this thing on the next vote, if there is another vote or two votes



or three votes that my dear friends don't come to me and say, 'This you should do because it is the right thing'. Having listened to my friends on both sides of the aisle, and since this apparently has become a strict party-line affair, I am going to consider the wishes of my party and perhaps I can go back to my people in my district and say, 'I didn't follow your wishes but I think in the long run it is your wish'; and with that all I can say is I will vote 'no' on this issue and will continue to support the idea that this remap is wrong because it does not fairly represent the 18th Congressional District nor the people I represent; but since this is a party-line vote, I will not desert my party in the face of the wisdom of my many friends in the party."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the gentleman as voting 'no'. On this question there are 81 'ayes', 82 'nos' . . . you want to continue with the verification? Oh, I wasn't sure. The gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Well, Mr. Speaker and members of the House, normally . . . ah . . . the vote should have been explained some time ago, but . . . ah . . . with leave of the House, I'd like to take 30 seconds and explain my vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed, sir."

Brinkmeier: "Well, very briefly, I don't like this remap at all. I think it's vindictive; I don't think it's fair to the downstaters, but I want to explain my vote simply by saying this, number 1, I don't like . . . I don't like the motion to strike after the enacting clause. Number 2, and number 2, I made a commitment to oppose this proposal, and I'm going to stay with it whether I like it or not; I'm going to stay red."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Lauer is back, put him on the Roll; continue with the verification of the negative votes. Proceed with the . . . ah . . . Simms, Mr. Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, now what is the count?"

Speaker Bradley: "We have not finished here . . . unofficially, it's 82-82; and we think where we are right now is we're calling the . . . ah . . . negative Roll; and the Clerk will proceed and I . . . I know



we're going to get the same request that those people . . . ah . . .
remove themselves, please be in their seats, go ahead and continue
with the Roll Call of the negative vote, sir."

Jack O'Brien: "Schisler. Schraeder. Sch . . ."

Speaker Bradley: "O.K., now, in all fairness, would we please be in our
seats. All right would you like to have Mr. Schneider, Jaffe and
. . . are those gentlemen bothering you, Mr. Simms? All right, con-
tinue, please."

Jack O'Brien: "Shea . . ."

Speaker Bradley: "Mrs. Geo-Karis on a point of order."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, it would
be very much appreciated if you would sit down so the rest of us could
see what's going on."

Speaker Bradley: "Your point is well taken, we've requested that time and
time again. The sooner we sit and are in our chairs, the Clerk will
get this particular procedure over with. Continue, sir."

Jack O'Brien: "Shea. Stone. Stubblefield . . . er. Terzich. Tipsword.
VanDuynes. VonBoeckman . . . ington. White. Williams. Younge.
Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Questions of the negative vote? Mr. Simms."

Simms: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, I'm going to yield to Mr. Schlickman on the
verification."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Schlickman, question?"

Schlickman: "Mrs. Chapman?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mrs. Chapman's in the aisle."

Schlickman: "Mr. Darrow?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Darrow is in his chair."

Schlickman: "Mr. Fennessey?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Fennessey is in his chair."

Schlickman: "Mr. Hanahan?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Hanahan is in the rear of the Chambers."

Schlickman: "Mr. Hill?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Hill is in his chair."

Schlickman: "Mr. Laurino?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Laurino is in his chair."



Schlickman: "Mr. Lucco?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Lucco is in his chair."

Schlickman: "Mr. Schisler?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Schisler? He's over here in the . . . lobbying."

Schlickman: "Mr. Taylor?"

Speaker Bradley: "He's in his . . . no, Mr. Taylor? He's in his chair."

Schlickman: "Mr. White?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. White is right here."

Schlickman: "Mr. Capuzi?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Capuzi is in his seat."

Schlickman: "Calvo?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Calvo is in his chair."

Schlickman: "Mr. Byers?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Byers is in his chair."

Schlickman: "Mr. Tipsword?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Tipsword's in his chair."

Schlickman: "Mr. Craig?"

Speaker Bradley: "Craig is in his chair."

Schlickman: "Mr. Giorgi?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Giorgi is . . ."

Schlickman: "In the balcony."

Speaker Bradley: ". . . in the balcony."

Schlickman: "Mr. . . . Mr. VonBoeckman?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. VonBoeckman is in his chair."

Schlickman: "Mr. Flinn?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Flinn's in his chair."

Schlickman: "Mr. Emil Jones?"

Speaker Bradley: "Emil Jones? Mr. Jones? There he is over in the aisle."

Schlickman: "Mr. Marovitz?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Marovitz is in his chair."

Schlickman: "Mr. Matijevich?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Matijevich? He's in the aisle."

Schlickman: "Mr. McGrew?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. McGrew? Mr. McGrew in the Chambers? How is the gentleman recorded?"



Jack O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Schlickman: "Mr. O'Daniel?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. O'Daniel is in his chair."

Schlickman: "Mr. Patrick?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Patrick? Mr. Patrick is in his chair."

Schlickman: "Mr. Giglio?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Giglio is in his chair."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Speaker will come out if you persist and we'll go
get him."

Schlickman: "I'm sure he'd want to be verified."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. McGrew is back in the Chamber and put him back on the
Roll as voting 'no'. For what purpose does the gentleman from McHenry,
Mr. Hanahan, arise?"

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, why are all these people here on the floor?"

Speaker Bradley: "Your point is well taken. Will . . ."

Hanahan: "Would the Doorkeeper please remove these people . . ."

Speaker Bradley: ". . . those people not entitled to the floor please . . ."

Hanahan: ". . . I'm sick and tired of people who are not Representatives
completely taking up the space in this House."

Speaker Bradley: ". . . Your point is well taken. Would those people not
entitled to the floor, please, remove themselves from the floor; and
the Doorkeeper will see that that takes place."

Schlickman: "Was Mr. Speaker . . . ah . . . verified?"

Speaker Bradley: "This does not apply to Senators, of course. Here's the
Speaker, sir. Further questions, sir?"

Schlickman: "Mr. Ewell?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Ewell is in his chair."

Schlickman: "Mr. Daniel Houlihan."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Daniel Houlihan is in the chair next to Mr. Shea."

Schlickman: "Is he in his own chair?"

Speaker Bradley: "No, sir, he's standing next to Mr. Shea. Further ques-
tions, sir? Further questions?"

Schlickman: "Mr. DiPrima?"



Speaker Bradley: "He's in his chair."

Schlickman: "Mr. Farley?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Farley's in his chair."

Schlickman: "Mr. Huff?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Huff, he's on . . . in your aisle, sir."

Schlickman: "Does that qualify when you're in the other side of the aisle?"

Speaker Bradley: "Well, I think in this case it's going to qualify."

Schlickman: "I thought the rules require that you be in your chair?"

Speaker Bradley: "Well, . . . ah . . . we've never persisted with that, sir,
in the Chambers, further questions?"

Schlickman: "Mr. Leon?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Leon is in his chair."

Schlickman: "Mr. Maragos?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Maragos is in his chair."

Schlickman: "Mr. Mudd?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Mudd is in his chair."

Schlickman: "Mr. Nardulli?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Nardulli is in his chair."

Schlickman: "Mr. McLendon?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. McLendon is in the aisle. Further questions, sir?"

Schlickman: "No thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "On this question there are 82 'ayes', 82 'nays' . . .

for what purpose does the gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart, arise?"

Hart: "Ah . . . Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I've listened to all the debate about this . . . ah . . . bill itself, I've listened to all the arguments on the floor and off of the floor about the need and a necessity for changing the map that . . . ah . . . we have lived . . . we have lived with since the last decennial census. I've received a lot of communication from the people in my district, including all of my county chairmen, one of them or two of them have been around here; but all of them have asked me and sent petitions to the representatives in the 59th District to oppose the remap seeing no necessity for it. My congressman, Paul Simon, came down here and testified against the remap and said that it wasn't . . . ah . . . shouldn't be supported. I've seen nothing or heard nothing to make



me believe that the package of this bill would improve government in Illinois or government in Washington, D. C. I . . . I have talked to people in my district about this and asked them, 'do they see any need for changing the map'; and universally without exception they have said that, 'we don't see any point in it, we like it the way it is'. I think it would be confusing to change and for this reason in the interest of good government and to keep this matter from going any further, I would like to be cast as voting green."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the gentleman as 'aye'; the gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Richmond."

Richmond: "Mr. Speaker, and ladies and gentlemen of the House, for the exact same reasons, although it applies to the 58th District rather than the 59th, and it applies to the county chairmen from that district, I also wish to be voted 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich, do you wish recognition, sir? The gentleman from Dupage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Ah . . . At the appropriate time after you've announced the Roll Call would you please recognize me?"

Speaker Bradley: ". . . question there are 84 'ayes', 82 'nays'; and this motion prevails. The gentleman from Dupage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Mr. Speaker and members having voted on the prevailing side on which the motion to Senate Bill 1250 was adopted, I move that we reconsider the question."

Speaker Bradley: "The gentleman having . . . moves to having voted on the prevailing side on which this motion was adopted . . . ah . . . votes to . . . moves to reconsider. Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "I move that motion lie on the table."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Jaffe moves that that motion lie upon the table. All those in favor of the motion to lie on the table say 'aye', oppose say 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the motion is tabled. On the order of Concurrences appears House Bill 765. Mr. . . . Mr. John Dunn."



Dunn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker...ah...the board isn't posted, is this Third Reading?"

Bradley: "Concurrences sir, on your House Bill. 765."

Dunn: "Oh, pardon me. I recommend we concur in the Senate Amen... Amendment, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 765. There were a couple provisions about this Bill that seems controversial. The Amendment deletes those provisions and as the Bill now stands no one that I know of objects to it. I urge your favorable vote."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This is final action. The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn, to explain his vote. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 95 'ayes', no 'nayes', none voting 'present' this Bill...and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 765. Mrs. Geo-Karis, 'aye'. House Bill 777. Mr. Londrigan on..."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. All this Senate Amendment does is put an effective date on of January 1, 1976. All parties agreeing, I move to concur. "

Speaker Redmond: "The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 777? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Final action. The House will come to order. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 98 'aye', no 'nay' and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 777. 816. Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I move that the House not concur in Senate Amendment..."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 816. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House nonconcur in Senate



Amendment #1 to House Bill 816. 826. Representative R. K. Hoffman. R. K. Hoffman, 826. Concurrence. Ron Hoffman? Take it out of the record. 827. Out of the record also. House Bill 836. Representative Luft. Out of the record. House Bill 854. Representative Luft out of the record. House Bill 85...898. Representative Fennessey...898. Representative Fennessey."

Fennessey: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. There are three Senate Amendments applied to House Bill 898. Senate Amendment #1...ah...just enacts the Home Rule Amendment. This act does not apply to any Home Rule unit. Amendment #3...ah...it just specifies that appointees to the Board shall be...geographically represented and they all, will all not come from one section of the state and the Amendment, third Amendment, Amendment #4 is a severability clause. If one part of it's declared unconstitutional, it will not effect the rest of the Act. I move for the adoption of these Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "First of all Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the question. There are three Amendments here and I think they should be voted on separately..."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll take them that way."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed we had a flood."

Schlickman: "I should like to address myself to Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Schlickman: "To House Bill 898. This Bill creates the agricultural areas, conservation and protection Act. It's a Bill that was caused to be introduced by the Illinois Agricultural Association. A group, Mr. Speaker...Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Schlickman: "The Illinois Agricultural Association Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, is a very progressive group and it's concern for two things in the State of Illinois. One thing that it's concerned about is the conservation of prime agricultural land



and I would hope Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, when I talk about preservation of prime, agricultural land, I would have the attention of every Member of this House because Illinois, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House is the greatest state in the union because it exports more agricultural products and industrial products than any other state and the economy of this state is dependent upon our agriculture and our agriculture is dependent upon land. Prime agricultural land and this Bill directs itself to the preservation and conservation of prime agricultural land and it also concerns itself, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to the preservation of open space. Now for those of you who are not agriculturally minded, I would hope that the preservation of open space would concern you. Now I very much resent, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that the Senate would offer and have adopted an Amendment that would exempt from the coverage of this Act, suburban Cook County. Cook County being the only Home Rule County in this state. I want prime agricultural land and I want open space in suburban Cook preserved. I don't want the land in suburban Cook, the unincorporated land to be subject to the whim and caprice of the Cook County zoning Board of Appeals. The administrator of which has been indicted and convicted, who took money for his own exchanges. I want the land in suburban Cook, preserved and I don't want Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, politicians who will take money for land changes to be controlling how that unincorporated land, that prime agricultural land, that open space will be misused and mis...abused because of the money passing hands. I very much resent this Amendment that would exempt suburban Cook from its application and I urge this body to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 that would give to unincorporated Cook, to the wheelers and dealers, those public officials who would take money, would take money in their abuse and their violation of their trust to the people and I urge a 'no' vote on the motion to concur with Senate Amendment #1."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Fennessey."

Fennessey: "Well Mr. Speaker as the Gentleman said, this Bill is directed towards conserving agricultural land and open space and I certainly..."

Speaker Redmond: "He's closing...he's closing."

Fennessey: "Would like to concur in this Amendment. I move to concur in the Amendment. There's not very much Agricultural land..."

Speaker Redmond: "You can stand a few better manners Mr. Skinner. Proceed."

Skinner: "Perhaps you could stand a little better eyesight up there too Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Skinner: "I thought that everybody on this Floor had a right to ask the Sponsor questions..."

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, but I don't think it's good manners to be butting in everytime somebody's talking. I will call upon you in your time...Proceed."

Skinner: "I would suggest sir, that my time is before his time. There was no question asked of him by the previous speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Skinner: "I wonder if the Sponsor would yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Skinner: "Why are you exempting Home Rule Units?"

Speaker Redmond: "Fennessey. Representative Fennessey."

Fennessey: "It's only exempts Cook County. There's very little farm land in Cook County."

Skinner: "Well, I would like to suggest that there may be other counties who become Home Rule Counties and those are likely to be in the fastest growing counties in the terr...in the state and I wonder if that is a well founded assumption. Ah... does the Illinois Agriculture Association approve of that Amendment?"

Fennessey: "Yes. The Illinois Agricultural Association concurs in this Amendment."

Skinner: "Then they're nuts."

Speaker Redmond: "They aren't the only one. Representative Deuster."



Speaker Redmond: "You said it...Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "I wonder if the Sponsor would yield to a question on the question, I guess is following in this vien...ah...I've, everytime I go to a metting of the Farm Bureau people, they've got a tremendous Cook County Farm Bureau. They...They've got all kinds of farmers up there and...and my district borders on Cook County and I have some Home Rule Units in my district and I can't conceive for the life of me why...ah...you want to take out part of Lake County as well. Ah...What...What is, what is the further thinking on this? This is prepostrous, because it's not just Cook County we're talking about, we're talking about any...ah...county in the State of Illinois that might tomorrow decide to become a Home Rule Unit and certainly if we're interested and I had a Bill on this subject too. I think it's a very good Bill but I would like to...ah...have further explanation on why you want it to just apply to part of the state."

Fennessey: "Well Home Rule units have the power at the present time. They can establish a system such as this if they so desire, Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Have any...My next question? Have any of them done it?"

Fennessey: "No."

Deuster: "Why not?"

Fennessey: "Well I couldn't answer that this is the first time it's ever been attempted in the State of Illinois."

Deuster: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stone."

Stone: "I didn't desire recognition...ah..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "Well thank you Mr. Speaker. Let me say that the Cook County Zoning Map does not, to my knowledge, contain a zoning classification of agriculture. But we do have in Cook County a lot of agricultural areas. Lamont Township, Orlan Township, Brenan Township, Thorton and Boom and then up in the Northern part in the Northwestern Townships of Cook County there's still an awful lot of farming. So then I would say to you that Amendment #1 certainly would be suspect and that there's no reason why you should exclude or include a great



part of the str...State and then exclude Cook County. I think probably it has to do with the zoning of the...ah...the zoning ordinance of Cook County. I think, I know that the farmers have, that I know, have puzzled over this thing a long time and that farming is a nonconforming use and it means simply that if, many of them although would like to keep farming, they can perhaps if a hot developer comes along can sell that land for a lot more, but they, they, I don't believe it should be the policy of Cook County to encourage...ah...the residential or commercial industrial development over agricultural use. There's plenty of people who I know are farmers who've done it all their lives and would like to keep doing it. I think it's a bad Amendment and I think it should be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rigney."

Rigney: "Well Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We seem to be agreed upon a couple of things concerning this Bill. First of all everyone agrees it's an excellent Bill and an excellent concept. The second thing that I think that I would have to agree with you on and that is I would prefer to see Cook County in it too. But let's keep one thing in mind. This is the evening of June 25, we are in the dying hours of this Session. Those of us in the hundred and one downstate counties definitely want this Bill. It's an excellent Bill, it deserves to be adopted by this General Assembly at this stage of the game I don't think we can afford to fuss over this subject any longer. I think it's time that we concur in the Senate Amendment whether we find it distasteful or not and for that reason I definitely solicit an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Parliamentary Inquiry. Are we on Amendment #1 or 1, 3 and 4 all together.?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Fennessey moved to concur in 1, 3 and 4. Representative Schlickman requested division. It was the intention of the Chair to divide it so that we vote on one and then we'll vote separately on three and four."

Hoffman: "All right, then his Amendment #1 the technical Amendment and



Amendment #2 the one that we're really discussin' right now?"

Speaker Redmond: "I think #1 is the one that is..."

Fennessey: "The Home Rule Unit....Amendment #1 is the Home Rule Unit."

Hoffman: "All right, fine, thank you. According to the Digest I thought it was reversed."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The Gentleman has moved to adopt Amendment #1 to Sen...To House Bill 898. All in favor indicate by ... Representative Palmer."

Palmer: "Vote..."

Speaker Redmond: "What did you say? Representative Palmer?"

Palmer: "Yes, if we can have a Roll Call vote on it."

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, well we would have to have. The Gentleman has moved the...that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 898. All in favor indicate by voting 'aye'. Opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this question there are 99...100 'aye', 39 'nay' The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 898. The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 3 and 4 to House Bill 898? All in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. I guess we're a little ahead of ourselves here. The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 3 and 4 to House Bill 898? All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 105 'ayes' 6 'nay' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #3 and 4 to House Bill 898.."

Shea: "On the Order of Concurrences appears House Bill 959. The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn : "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I recommend that we concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 959. This Amendment merely adds blind and disabled persons to the group comprising Senior Citizens, who will be allowed under this Bill to camp free at state parks. I urge your favorable vote."

Shea: "The question is, shall the House concur with Senate Amendment

#1 to House Bill 959. On the question, all in favor will vote 'aye'

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



those opposed will vote 'nay'. It takes 89 votes, this is final action. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 107 'ayes' 2 'nays' no Members voting 'present' Senate Amendments #1 to House Bill 959 is adopted and...er...the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 959. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell. The Gentleman from Co...er...Macoupin, Mr. Boyle. Would somebody shut their lights off. They're flashing. On the Order of Concurrences appears House Bill 985. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz on the Floor? On the Order of Concurrences appears House Bill 1048. Mr. E. M. Barnes, is he on the Floor? Mr. Katz I called 985, if you're ready we'll proceed with it. All right take that out of the record at the Sponsors request. Now we're on 1048. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes. Turn Mr. Barnes on please."

Barnes: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 and 2 I believe it is, is that correct?"

Shea: "Sir all the Calendar shows is Senate Amendment #1."

Barnes: "#1. Move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 1048. It's a reduction Amendment and, 6 per cent. I would agree to it."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves for the concurrence in Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 1048. On the question all those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Takes 89 votes, this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 117 'ayes', 1 'nay', 2 Members voting 'present' the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1048. Mr. Gaines votes 'aye'. On the order of /^{House} Bills on the Concurrence Calendar appears House Bill 603. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move that the House do concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 603. It justifies in the particular time limit that..ah..the councils have to keep their films and it's an Amendment that



they requested to be put on which I promised to be put on.
 Represen...Senator Daugherty did it."

Shea: "Ladies and Gentlemen the red light is on, they're taking
 some pictures from the balcony."

Maragos: "I'll read it to you....I'll read it to you just a minute,
 on this question....I'll."

Shea: "He's going to read it."

Maragos: "The Amendment provides that an issuer registered a transfer
 of a security upon endorsement by a corporation, in the individual
 fiduciary at whose name the security is registered is not bound
 to inquire with the endorser of any authority of an endorsing
 officer. In other words this bill....Now you want to know what
 it does? Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is a
 technical Amendment which has been put on the Bill for the reason
 to show that in the event when a stock transfers the transfer
 agent does not have to look behind their signatures to find
 out if they're authorized and it's a good Amendment it expedites
 the stocks and their transfers and I move for its adoption. Concur
 rather in the Amendment."

Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman moves for
 the adoption of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bil 603....All those
 in favor of concurrence will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote
 'nay'. This is final action and requires 89 votes. Have all
 voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr.
 Clerk. Geo-Karis from someplace in the back votes 'aye'.
 On this question there are 120 'ayes', 2 'nays' 5 Members voting
 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to
 House Bill 603. On the order of Concurrences appears House
 Bill 1244. The Lady from Cook, Ms. Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I move that the House
 concur with Seante Amendments #1 and 2 to House bill 1244. really
 ...ah...neither Amendment hurts the Bill and...ah...tends to, in
 the view of the Senate anyway, I presume to clarify...ah...it requires
 that a parent is not liable for a child 18 years or older if it
 can be determined that this minor has in fact established a consistent



pattern of independent living arrangements prior to the application for assistance. I move the adoption of the two Amendments."

Shea: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Senate Amendments #1 and #2 to House Bill 1244. On the question the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill that I've analyzed rather carefully I think and I was concerned about the Senate Amendment and I would like to say this...ah..Under present law, I guess the law is that a husband is liable for the support of his wife and."

Chapman: "And the wife for the support of her husband."

Deuster: "Under certain circumstances."

Chapman: "If he's in need of such support."

Deuster: "Yes, if in need....This Bill was designed to further equalize it so the...the husband's responsible for his wife without any reservations and the wife is also responsible for the husband without any reservations. Then along comes the Senate and as I understand it they said that...ah...a husband and wife, a husband is responsible to support his wife only if she's in need or is likely to become a public charge and so they have equalized things but I should certainly think as the Sponsor of this Legislation you'd be interested in not concurring because we wind up with a...with a law which says the husband is generally not responsible to support his wife and vice versa unless you can go to court and establish there's need and I think we ought to have the basic presumption that a spouse ought to support a spouse."

Chapman: "Mr....Mr. Deuster I think the point you're missing is that this is an Amendment to the Illinois Public Aid Code and what it does is, is speak for the basis of public aid eligibility when a husband is liable for the support of his wife and when a wife is liable for the support of her husband. Now we know that if either and in fact if either the husband can support the wife or the wife can support the husband, they're not going to get any Public Aid and so this is what the Senate Amendment specifically



JUN 25 1975

219.

states. That the law re...as you know there's a Family Necessities Act and we know that the Public Aid...ah...is not going to declare anyone eligible if either spouse can...ah...support the other spouse and...and Ladies and Gentlemen let me read you the exact wording so that Mr. Deuster doesn't lead you astray. This is what the Senate Amendment makes the Bill say and this is only for the purposes of Public Aid eligibility...ah...A husband is liable for the support of his wife and a wife for the support of her husband if either is in need of such support and is or is likely to become a public charge. I...I ask for your support for this very simple and clarifying Amendment."

Shea: "On the question, all those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 116 'ayes', 6 'nays' 9 Members voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1244. Was that 1 and 2? Ms. Chapman was that 1 and 2 you explained and moved for concurrence in? Turn Ms. Chapman on."

Chapman: "Yes sir, I moved for the adoption of Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill...."

Shea: "I thought you did but I wanted to be sure. That the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1244. On the ...On the Order of House Bills Third Reading, or on Concurrence appears House Bill 626. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell on the Amendment."

Yourell: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House...ah...Senate Amendment #1 is an Amendment that provides that this is not a limit on a County which is a Home Rule Unit and I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 626."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 626. On the question all those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 112 'ayes' 1 'nay' 1 'present' House Bill 6...and the Hou... and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 626. House Bill 1303. The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Grotberg: "Thank you Mr. Speaker...ah...I was wondering on a point of inquiry whether there's any indication of the adjournment time for tonight..."

Shea: "No sir, we're going to try to get through the Concurrences. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to nonconcur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4 to House Bill 1303."

Giorgi: "You heard the Gentlemen's motion? Any discussion? All in agreement signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and we do not concur to House Bill 3213...1303. House Bill... Concurrence on House Bill 1313. Representative Sharp."

Sharp: "Yes Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1313. House Bill 1313 gives the Department of Transportation...ah...in cooperation with Municipal Corporate Authority or County Authority the right to receive and expend Federal Funds for the construction and improvement of public roads not on the Federal Aid System and the Amendment...ah...specifically states...ah...that the Funds would be used on a non-federal system. I move that we concur."

Giorgi: "Is there any discussion? Representative Sharp moves that we concur to House...to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1313. All in favor...Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Dunn: "From the synopsis I really can't tell. Is this a significant powerful change or is this technical? If it's significant please explain what it really means."

Giorgi: "Representative Sharp."

Sharp: "The Amendment is...is nothing that makes a great change...ah...it's just further outlawing of the Sections under the Highway Safety Act for which these funds could be spent and this is an authorization to expend Federal Funds that are available for this type of project and we need the authorization before we can spend the funds."

Dunn: "Thank you."

Giorgi: "Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Mr. Speaker if the Sponsor would yield for a question."



Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Holewinski: "Representative Sharp, will this, will the Senate Amendment allow a municipality to unor...enter into an agreement with the Federal Government and by-pass the state in terms of developing..."

Sharp: "No...No that's what the Amendment is for to make sure that can't happen."

Holewinski: "Thank you."

Giorgi: "Any further discussion? Representative Sharp moves that the House concurs in Senate Amendment...What Amendments were they? Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1313. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk? On this question there are 121 'ayes', 1 'nay' 6 voting 'present' and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1313. House Bill 1328. Schoeberlein is not here. House Bill 1375. Representative Porter."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Shea had a question about that. Is he on the Floor now?"

Giorgi: "He's off the Floor take it out of the record."

Porter: "Do you want me to take it out of the record?"

Giorgi: "Take it out of the record. The next one is Shea's, we'll take it out of the record. Representative McPartlin on...McPartlin's not on the Floor either. Go back to the two Concurrences on House Bill 2868. Is that a concurrence? Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr Speaker. Listed on the Calendar this evening is House Bill 2868 and 69 and that's in error. Both of those we moved not to concur on a couple days ago and they should be off the Calendar."

Giorgi: "Off the Calendar...Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, also Senate Bill 184 should not be on the Calendar. That's on page 14, the last listing under concurrences."

Jack O'Brien: "On page 14 on the Calendar, there's several mistakes. Under Concurrence. House Bill 2706 and 2708 should not be there, Friedland. House Bill 2768, Craig's is on in error and three Senate Bills. Senate Bill 56, Keller, Senate Bill 69, Sharp and Senate Bill 184, Ebbesen today in error."

Giorgi: "Page 12. Griesheimer, House Bill 645. On page 12."



Griesheimer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I would move to concur with the Senate on this particular Bill. I would point out that the Amendment in the Senate merely corrected the typographical error in the original snowmobile Bill in the penalty section. It referred to the wrong section in the basic act and they corrected that and I would move to concur."

Giorgi: "Is there any discussion? Representative Griesheimer moves to concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 645. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. On Concurrence. Jack...Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 130 'aye', no 'nays', 3 voting 'present' and the House concurs with Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 645. Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to make an announcement please."

Giorgi: "Continue."

Lucco: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'd like to remind the Members of Committee of Higher Education of the breakfast scheduled tomorrow morning at 8 a.m. at the State House Inn. Members of the Higher Education Committee."

Giorgi: "Representative Downs."

Downs: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There will be a meeting tomorrow morning of the special sub-committee of the House Executive and Human Resources Committee with regard to implementation of the alcoholic treatment act and that meeting will be in the Rathskeller. That's the Members of the Executive and Human Resources Committee who are Members of that sub-Committee. 9 O'Clock tomorrow morning in the Rathskeller."

Giorgi: "Representative Skinner on 2822, Concurrence. He doesn't want it called. Representative Fennessey."

Fennessey: "I'd like to announce ...ah... that the Elections Committee will meet at 9 O'Clock tomorrow morning in 1229A)."

Giorgi: "Room 122 (a). What time? 9 O'Clock. Representative VonBoeckman are you asking leave to go to motions on something you say you have agreed with the possibility of even the other side of the aisle? Is there any objection to go to Senate Bill 1156 on the motion of Representative VonBoeckman. Mr. Clerk read Senate Bill 156."



JUN 25 1975

223.

O'Brien: "Ah...Motion to discharge Committee on Town...County and Townships and place on the Calendar on the order of Senate Bills Second Reading."

Giorgi: "Mr. VonBoeckman, on the Motion please."

VonBoeckman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. This Bill was scheduled to be heard...ah...one week and...ah...the Committee didn't get to it, and it was omitted from the Calendar the following week, and I did testify before the Committee on...on the Bill, although it wasn't posted, and...ah...the Chairman of the Committee, Representative Yourell, and the Minority Leader, Representative McMaster's ...ah...concurred, and the Committee concurred in the Bill, so therefore I'd like to discharge the Committee."

Giorgi: ""Mr. Mugalian on the question."

Mugalian: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, I don't think you were speaking into the microphone, and I...ah... could hardly hear the last speaker. Have we just gone to the order of Motions?"

Giorgi: "Yes Sir, I have leave of the House to do that Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Alright, I wonder if any more people in the House realized that. Ah, is this Senate Bill 1156?"

Giorgi: "1156, that's correct Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "As I understand it, this Bill would increase the requirements ...ah...for competitive bidding for special districts, is that correct? Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question...we...will the Sponsor yield?"

Giorgi: "Representative VonBoeckman?"

VonBoeckman: "I'll yield to a question."

Giorgi: "He asked you a question, I believe."

VonBoeckman: "Well, he was cut off and I didn't hear him."

Giorgi: "Mr. Mugalian. Put Mr. Mugalian on."

Mugalian: "Do I understand that this Bill increases the amount which would require competitive bid...bidding for special districts?"

VonBoeckman: "No, it originally was introduced as \$4,000.00 but was amended in the Senate and brought to come into line with all of the rest...rest of the bidding in, in local municipalities, and therefore the special districts were not covered, and so the Amendment made it in line to \$2500.00."



Mugalian: "Well, Mr. Sponsor, are you saying there is presently no law covering special districts as to what's required of competitive bidding?"

VonBoeckman: "According to my information, no."

Mugalian: "So, that this Bill would for the first time, permit the waiving of competitive bidding, and set the ceiling...ah...Floor at \$2500.00. Is that correct?"

VonBoeckman: "That's correct."

Mugalian: "Thank you."

Giorgi: "Representative Rigney."

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

Giorgi: "Continue."

Rigney: "Ah...are you sure that there are no limits now. I was under the impression that the present limit was \$1500.00."

VonBoeckman: "Well...ah,ah...again, maybe you're right, but to my information...ah...they didn't say whether there was or not, but...ah...the \$2500.00 was amended to bring into conformity with the rest of the Statutes."

Giorgi: "Are you through, Mr. VonBoeckman?"

VonBoeckman: "If there are no other questions, I'd like to have support..."

Giorgi: "There...there are more people ...Mr. McMasters."

McMaster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I was deferred to the Chairman of the Committee at first, and then after he talks, I would be very happy to."

Yourell: "Thank you Mr. Chair...Mr. Speaker and Members of the House...ah.. Representative VonBoeckman is right in the genesis of this Legislation. Ah...he did come before the Committee and presented his legislation along with witnesses and...ah...the Senate Amendment which reduced the amount from \$4,000.00 for competitive bidding was reduced to \$2500.00. This is more or less in line with other units of local government...Ah...it's my understanding that Representative Giglio had a Bill, I don't know what happened to that in the Senate that would raise the competitive bidding mark ...ah...to conform the municipalities to \$25.00.00. It is my understanding that the Chicago Board of Education is \$1500.00 and townships...ah...were \$2500.00, and I had a Bill that would lower them to twenty...\$1500.00,



and now that's back up to \$2500.00. So I think it's good legislation and covers competitive bidding for special districts as well as we require for other units of local government, and I forget the vote by which the Committee allowed this Bill to come out, but it was a substantial margin, both Republican and Democrat members voting in the affirmative."

Giorgi: "Representative McMaster's, I think Mr. Schlickman first."

McMaster: "I would like to, perhaps, direct my question to Mr. Yourell, if I may?"

Giorgi: "McMaster's, just a moment. Mr. Schlickman raises a point of order."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, within the Rules, you have the authority to go from one order of business to the other order of business, but when you go to an order of business, you are to pick up on numerical basis, and more specifically pick up where you left off previously, and I inquire of the Chair, which Motion did you last consider prior to the consideration of this Motion?"

Giorgi: "I was ⁿ/_on the Podium, but I did ask, specifically leave of the House to go to Motions, and specifically to go to Senate Bill 1157, 6, and I asked if there were any objections, and there were no objections, and I went to the Motion, and I think...ah..."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I think, what you said was, may I have leave to go to the order of Motions, which was something you didn't have to ask, because you have that authority under the Rules. Mr. Speaker, I did not, and I have been standing here, I did not hear you make specific reference to a particular Bill, as to seeking leave, and I would suggest ..."

Giorgi: "I specifically said Mr. VonBoeckman wants us to consider Senate Bill 1156. Did anyone hear me say that?"

Schlickman: "Then I defer to the Ma....."

McMaster: "Ah...again, I wanted to ask Representative Yourell something. I don't see Bus right now. Are you still there Bus? He's coming. He's coming"

Giorgi: "Yourell?"

McMaster: Ah...Chairman Yourell, you mentioned...ah...the Bill that you have that sets the bidding requirements for townships, board of auditors, from \$2500.00 down to \$1500.00, and I know that at the



time we talked about Frank Giglio's Bills that we were going to level everything out at \$2500.00. May I ask, was that Bill of your's tabled in the Senate or?"

Yourell: "Ah...ah...honestly, I don't know, but I told the Senate Sponsor to make them in conformity with other units of local government."

McMaster: "Well, I wish you would check on it...ah...Bus, because this was our agreement I know. I...."

Yourell: "Ah...Tom, if it doesn't come out that way, I'll table the Bill."

McMaster: "This I respect you Bus, I know you will. Ah...I have nothing against this Senate Bill 1156 coming out, I know that we tried... I think this accidently happened didn't it Bus that we didn't get it reported out of Committee, our Committee made a mistake, and for that reason, I'm willing to see the Committee discharge, as I am sure the Chairman of the Committee is, and let your Bill be heard on the Floor, Jim. I urge a yes vote on this Motion to discharge."

Giorgi: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Schlickman: "Did the Committee on Counties and Townships post a Notice with respect to a hearing on Senate Bill 1156, and was there a hearing?"

VonBoeckman: "Ah...yes, Gene, there was a...the Notice was posted in one week as I stated, and the work load was so great they didn't get to it. The following week, I appeared before the Committee and the Committee Clerk was in error in not posting it, and the Committee heard it anyway, and there was no decending vote in the Motion to Discharge Committee."

Schlickman: "I'm sorry, you said there was no dissenting vote in what?"

VonBoeckman: "There was no / dissenting vote in the Committee to allow me to file a Motion to discharge Committee, because this was the only way we could get it out."

Schlickman: "Did your Committee vote on this action?"

VonBoeckman: "Representative Yourell, had stated that they had did, that they had voted on it to concur."

Schlickman: "I accept that."



Giorgi: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Gene...Gene, maybe I can clear this up for ya. The Bill was posted in the proper fashion on the Call, and then the Sponsor didn't show up, and inadvertently all the, all those Bills that were not heard during the Committee meeting of that week, was supposed to be postponed, but the Committee Clerk, inadvertently left that postponed Bill off the Call. This Bill did receive a full hearing in the Committee; the witnesses were there, and the same treatment that was accorded all other legislation was accorded this."

Giorgi: "Representative Deavers, do you want to discuss this Bill or Alright, any further discussion? The Gentleman is motioning that Senate Bill 1156 be discharged from Committee and be placed on the order of the Calendar, Senate Bill's Second Reading, First Legislative Day. This will take 107 votes. All in favor signify by voting 'aye, those opposed by voting 'no. Representative Schlickman?"

Schlickman: "May I suggest to accomplish the end that you're seeking, that it be Second Legislative Day. Tomorrow this Bill will have to be read, a read for a third time, or it'll die."

Giorgi: "Well, I'm reading the Motion as it is presented to me."

Schlickman: "Well, I think somebody better move to have...ah...leave to amend this thing...."

Giorgi: "Would you like to amend your Motion to Second Legislative Day, Mr. VonBoeckman?"

VonBoeckman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move that..."

Giorgi: "Renew the Motion to the Second Legislative Day, Second Reading, Senate Bills. Take the... Have all voted who wished? Take the..."

Schlickman: "Is this with the understanding that tomorrow...oh, never mind, thank you."

Giorgi: "Take the Record. Mr. Ebbesen for what reason do you rise? On this Motion there are 121 votes, 120 'ayes', 3 'nays', 2 voting 'present' and the Gentleman's Motion is successful. So Senate Bill 1156 will appear on the Calendar, Second Reading Second Legislative Day. The Speaker has asked me to go to Third Readings. Take the Record, take the Record. Mr. Ebbesen?"



Ebbesen: "Ah...Yes...Mr. Speaker, you know I also had that request as long as we're on motions and are waiting three weeks and have the same...exactly the same situation and if we don't do that now, I don't know when we're going to get back and we've been waiting three weeks. The first time we've been on motions. Senate Bill 725 is a...filed by Representative Neff and...ah...all of the difficulties have been cleared up with this with both sides of the aisle and all who voted negative in the Committee. Could we hear that Bill now?"

Giorgi: "All right we'll go to the motions...On Senate Bill 725. The Clerk will read the motion."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 725. Pursuant to temporary House Rule 32. I move Senate Bill 725 be taken from the Speakers Table and be placed on the Calendar on the order of Second Day...Second Reading, Second Legislative Day."

Giorgi: "Representative Neff on the Motion."

Neff: "Ah...Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.. Senate Bill 725 was heard in Cities and Villages and I filed this motion with the consent and the encouragement of the...ah...the Committee, the House Committee. There was a misunderstanding on this. This is no reflection on the Committee and I might say this this is the first time since I've been here that I've ever filed a motion to discharge a Committee and I did this at the request of the...Representative Taylor, the Chairman and the Minority Spokesman, JoeEbbesen and...What this Bill does....I might... explain it too, it simply insures where a municipality has zoning powers one and a half miles outside of a city boundary and...and effects counties that have no zoning. Also it exempts and...ah...Home Rules...ah... Counties. We'll have an Amendment on it that exempts those and all this says on it is in any zoning board in the city where they do not have zoning one member of the zoning board of appeals and the zoning board commission would come from the incor...unincorporated areas where they do have jurisdiction over them...I...as I say again, I think the Committee of Cities and Villages is all in favor of this and I know Representative Taylor will speak on it if necessary."

Giorgi: "Representative Schlickman."



Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to direct myself, my attention to the merits of the Bill because that would be out of order and I, if on Third Reading if it reaches that far, I will concern myself with that, so if you call to the Members attention, the Membership of the House that we have an entirely different situation from this Bill and the Bill that we previously voted upon. On the Bill that we previously voted upon, it was represented that there was a hearing and it was only through inadvertancy that the matter was not reported out of Committee with the recommendation do pass. So here Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we have a Bill which was heard in the Cities and Villages Committee and there was a motion of do not pass and that motion did prevail by a vote of 8 to 5 and I think Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, on the eve, on the eve of all Bills originating in the Senate being reported out of this House or passed by this House tomorrow, that this is a bad, bad time for a Bill of this nature, one that was defeated in Committee, where there was a hearing be brought to the Floor of the House on the Order of Second Reading and Mr. Speaker, I will object, I will oppose this Amendment...ah...motion and I will object to any suspension of the rules with respect to it."

Giorgi: "Representative Taylor and then Representative Ebbesen. Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise in favor of this motion, simply because Representative Neff did come to the Committee and he did make what I think was a good explanation but there was a few questions that was not cleared up and after giving answers to what most problem was and why they need this piece of Legislation, I rise to support it and I hope that this House will grant him that approval to put this House Bill on Second Reading."

Giorgi: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Thank you. Yes, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to Representative Schlickman, what Representative Taylor has just indicated, we had a full hearing, there was a misunderstanding, it did fail, or we concurred on a do not pass, but there were misunderstandings and I want you to know that the Minority Spokesman, all

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



those who voted in opposition of this Legislation, I contacted personally and explained to them what our misunderstanding was, they withdrew their objections and I'm sure that they'll support this on the House Floor and I encourage your favorable vote."

Giorgi: "Representative Lauer."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, Point of Parliamentary...ah...Parliamentary Inquiry please."

Giorgi: "Go ahead."

Lauer: "I find on the Supplemental Calendar #1, House Bill 1947, which is the D.O.T. Bill and entrees were made into...into the Journal this morning that must...leaves an hour for the House to have been in but nonetheless, we were here."

Giorgi: "Mr. Lauer, could you hold that till we get...till we complete the action on the motion for Senate Bill 725. Okay Mr. Neff to close...or Mr. Mahar on Senate Bill 725."

Mahar: "Thank you Mr. Speaker...I...I rise to support the motion to discharge. There definitely was a misunderstanding and I was one of those who voted against this Bill in Committee and I...It was certainly a misunderstanding and...as Representative Ebbesen and Chairman Taylor stated, all those who voted against it now realize it was a mistake and I urge a discharge."

Giorgi: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Mr. Chairman, I just have one question. I'll hurry along. We've heard two people refer to a misunderstanding but no one told us what that misunderstanding is and...that's not a very legitimate way of stating why a Bill was...ah...reported do not pass and then they give a vague misunderstanding and it irregular at this stage of the game, I think, to be voting Bills out of Committee that received a do not pass. What was the misunderstanding."

Giorgi: "Mr. Ebbesen, would you explain that please."

Ebbesen: "The misunderstanding stemmed from what counties it had effect on and...ah...those that had zoning did not have zoning and the likes of this..you know, with a Bill that was thoroughly heard and we became very, very, confused and I would like Mr. Neff to close and let's have a Roll Call."

Giorgi: "Mr...Mr. John Dunn."



Dunn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think the misunderstanding...ah...came up this way. It...ah... if you live in a city this Bill would provide that a person living outside the city and in the county could sit on your zone commission and participate in zoning decisions within the city even though that person had no interest whatsoever in when it took place in the city. After that discussion we then got into the fact that this applies only to areas where there is no county zoning and there are very few of those and Mr. Neff represented that there would be no problems. So I think that's...that's how the confusion came about and how it got cleared up."

Giorgi: "Representative Neff to close please. Let's hurry it up."

Neff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I think this is pretty well explained the...the questions on this, again I want to explain to Mr. Schlickman during the several years that I've been down here that this is the first time that I've ever filed a discharge to Committee and I certainly wouldn't have done it outside of a request of the Committee and as far at this late hour, the motion has been filed and laying on the Calendar for approximately three weeks. It certainly isn't my fault that...ah...it came up this late date and it certainly isn't the Speakers fault, it's just a case of getting to it."

Giorgi: "The question is on the motion by Representative Neff on Senate Bill 725. To take from the Speakers Table and place on the Calendar on the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading. It takes 89 votes. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. I am told it takes 89 votes Mr. Pierce. Just to take from the Speakers Table, not to take...discharge from Committee...Just from the Speakers Table. Inquiry by Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Speaker please...Or would the Clerk please read the motion?"

Jack O'Brien: "Pursuant to Temporary Rule, 33. I move that Senate Bill 725 be taken from the Speakers Table and be placed on the Calendar on the order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day."

Schlickman: "Second Reading is typed in?"



Jack O'Brien: "Second Reading."

Schlickman: "Is typed in?"

Jack O'Brien: "Yes sir."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Giorgi: "Take the...Has...Has everyone voted who wished? Take the record. Yes sir Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "I want to explain my vote."

Giorgi: "Be my guest."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, it was mentioned, and Members of the House, it was mentioned that there was a misunderstanding. I still don't know what that misunderstanding is. But the statement was made that there was some misunderstanding and...as to the Rule that people in unincorporated would have when serving on a zoning commission or...on a zoning. There is nothing in this Bill that would restrict the activities of a person in an unincorporated area with respect to zoning within the incorporated areas. Now I can't speak to the merits of the Bill but there will be ample discussion about that later if this thing advances. But there wasn't any misunderstanding and I should like to suggest that this Commis...this Committee Cities and Villages ought to have a better understanding of zoning law before they vote on Bills of this measure."

Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there are 120 'ayes', 4 'nays', 3 voting 'present' and the motion having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Mr. Beaupre on a...Mr. Beaupre on your motion."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker on Senate Bill 657...ah...This is a Senate Bill Sponsored by Senator Daley...ah...that we had to get the old discussion about on the Floor a few days ago...ah...I understand that the...the Revenue Subcommittee Chaired by Repre...By Senator Carroll, hasn't had time to read our statewide Tax Commission Bill and that they indicate that they may not have time to read it. I think until Senator Carroll gets time to take a look at that Bill and to carefully scrutinize it that I'd like to take this motion out of the record."

Shea: "You wish to table it sir?"

Beaupre: "No I'd like to take it out of the record."

Shea: "You...you just want...You want to leave it on the calendar?"



Beaupre: "Yes"

Shea: "All right, fine. On the order of House Bills Third Reading...
Mr. Lauer."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker...ah...The temporary Speaker that immediately
preceded you deferred my inquiry. I'm referring to the Calendar
Supplemental #1...."

Shea: "We're not calling anything on the Supplemental on Concurrences
tonight."

Lauer: "Ah..."

Shea: "Do you have a nonconcurrency?"

Lauer: "No, It's an inquiry please."

Shea: "Yes sir."

Lauer: "On Supplemental #1 I find House Bill 1947."

Shea: "Yes sir, it's on Third Reading."

Lauer: "How...How Mr. Speaker, does this arrive on Third Reading
when...ah...there were a couple of notations made into
the Journal this morning and I think one of them was your own,
stating time and date that...ah...this Bill would arrive on
Third Reading on this Calendar, on the same Legislative Day
after you, yourself did allocate a time and the date..."

Shea: "Mr. Lauer, you and I may agree but we're bound by the
Rules and that Bill was read a Second time on Tuesday,
June 24. Are you worried about it getting called tonight
sir?"

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not worried about it getting called
tonight. I am worried...worried about it getting called
at all."

Shea: "Well, I can understand your concern and I might share it
with you but it won't get called tonight. On the order of
Concurrences. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, we were on the Order of Motions."

Shea: "Motions. All right Mr. Madigan, go ahead. We're
skipping around."

Madigan: "On the order of Motions Mr. Speaker, appears two Motions
filed by myself relative to Senate Bills 1484 and 1485 and at
this time I would like those motions and pursuant to those motions



JUN 25 1975

234.

I would defer to the Chairman of the Judiciary II Committee, Mr. Katz."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz on a motion, but prior to that Mr. Washington, I see you. Mr. Katz on the motion but prior to that Mr. Washington has a Parliamentary we're on the Order of Motions Senate Bills 1484 and 1485 by Mr. Madigan. He deferred to Mr. Katz and Mr. Washington on Parliamentary Procedure. Turn Mr. Washington on please."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker before you sat there and called the last Bill on motions 725. Now how did you skip 1056 and such and so forth?"

Shea: "I just did it I guess."

Washington: "Well, you have no right to do that without leave of the House and the next motion is 1056 Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "Well Mr. Taylor said that he didn't want his."

Washington: "I didn't hear him say it. Who'd he say it to?"

Shea: "He told me, he came up here and mentioned it to me."

Washington. Well that's not the way we do business here. Mr. Taylor should get on that mike and say he passes and the next Gentleman... Mr. VonBoeckman should do the same...Mr. Simms should do the same, then Mr. Madigan."

Shea: "Well, I...I...Well can I direct your attention to the Calendar you're talking about sir? Mr. Taylor doesn't want his called. Mr. VonBoeckmans has been called and...."

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

Shea: "Can I finish please sir?"

Washington: "Well let me finish what I'm saying."

Shea: "No sir, I'd like to finish and I'd like to remind you sir that sometime tonight Senate Bill 1250, that motion by Mr. Simms and Walsh was called. Just remember that."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, I'm simply asking you to follow the rules of the House. Now Mr. Taylor, if he wanted to have his motion bypassed should have said so on the Floor of the House.."

Shea: "Well he...he said it to me and I took it out of the record Sir... I've always, when I've been in the Chair, when a Gentleman or Lady of this House has asked me to bypass one of their Bills, I have always done that. Now back to Mr. Katz on 1484. Mr. Porter."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Porter: "Ah... Preceding your tenure in the Chair there, I think you started off, or the preceding Speaker started off at 725 and I wonder why we couldn't have taken the preceding motions from the top as we normally do..."

Shea: "Sir, when I arrived in the Chair, we were on Mr. Beaupre's Motion on Senate Bill 657."

Porter: "Would you go back to the beginning of the list after we hear the next one then?"

Shea: "Sir, If I continue on the list I'll go down and perhaps I'd like to go back and we'll see if we can get there for you sir."

Porter: "All right."

Shea: "Now back to Mr. Dat...Mr. Katz who has been deferred to by Mr. Madigan, on 1484 and 1485."

Katz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Madigan's motion I believe relates to Senate Bill 1484. That's a Bill that came before the Judiciary Committee. It was heard the last night that we had hearings in Judiciary Committee. It was not able to pass out in the form that existed and we have a Rule in Judiciary Committee that Amendments do have to be in form before we will pass a Bill out. We've had no further meetings and Mr. Madigan would like to move... ah...Senate Bill 1484 out to Second Reading so that he might have an opportunity to put the Bill into shapr. We have no other meetings scheduled of Judiciary II and as Chairman of Judiciary II I have no objection to the allowance of Mr. Madigan's motion so that he has a chance to present the Bill in the form that he wants."

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

Madigan: "Yes. And he would like that Mr. Chairman. In view of the lateness, Mr. Speaker, of the hour to be on the Second Legislative Day..."

Shea: "The Gentleman asks leave to amend the petition on its face to read second...Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Is there objection? Hearing none. Leave is granted. Now Mr. Madigan on a motion and we go to Mr. Duff."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker I move for the adoption of the motion."

Shea: "Would you care to explain what the Bills are sir."



JUN 25 1975

236.

Madigan: "The...ah...The Bills relate to the...ah...penalty for the use of a handgun and also for the...ah...failure to register a handgun under the registration act and they prescribe a maximum minimum penalty and there were several objections in the Committee and it's our intent that when the Bills are place on the Order, in the event they're placed on the order of Second Reading, to draft Amendments which would be acceptable to the majority of the Judiciary Committee."

Shea: "On the question, on Mr. Madigan's motion to discharge the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Will the Sponsor yield a question? I would in the absence of the Minority Spokesman and as a Member of the Committee, I'd like to relate to the problem."

Shea: "Proceed sir."

Duff: "Ah...Representative Madigan, the Senate Sponsor indicated to us subsequent to that day when there might have been some misunderstanding in the Committee. Representative Madigan do I have you because I want to ask you a question?"

Shea: "Proceed Sir, he'll yield."

Duff: "The Senate Sponsor indicated to us that there was some misunderstanding as to the real intent of the Bill and it was our understanding from him that the confusion that arose is that the two Bills refer to minimum sentences not mandatory sentences and it was the general feeling of the Committee that if...if we had known it was a minimum sentences we would have passed the Bills out and if there is no intention to amend to mandatory, Mr. Speaker, I would be in full support of the motion."

Shea: "Representative Houlihan for the answer."

Houlihan: "Thank you. That is correct Mr. Duff. That is what the intention will be if the Bill, if we are successful and we will amend the Bill to reflect what was the Senate Sponsors original intention and I might point out that the Amendment that was drafted that changed that vote a misunderstanding between the House Sponsor and the Senate Sponsor and I hear correctly describing what happened that night and you're correctly anticipating what will happen on Second Reading."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Duff: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would...In the absence of the Minority Spokesman but as one of the Members of the Committee, I would support the motion strongly."

Shea: "Is there any further discussion? Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman's got a motion. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: Mr. Speaker...ah...Point of Parliamentary Inquiry, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "Pardon me Sir."

Madison: "Point of Parliamentary Inquiry."

Shea: Please proceed sir."

Madison: "How many votes does a motion to discharge take?"

Shea: "89."

Madison: "How many votes does a motion to take from the Speaker's table take?"

Shea: "107."

Madison: "In light of the fact that..both of these Bills failed in Committee as I understand it, would you explain to me the difference between the motion to discharge and a motion to take from the Speakers Table?"

Shea: "Yes sir. A motion to discharge has to be filed before a Committee before a Committee Report is filed, once a Committee Report is filed and read into the record, it then lies upon the Speakers Table and takes 107 votes."

Madison: "Are you telling me Mr. Speaker, that the simple difference between getting a Bill out of Committee by 89 votes or 107 votes notwithstanding the action of the Committee is a technical point in terms of when you filed the motion?"

Shea: "My Parliamentarian tells me I may be wrong so I'm going to check. My Parliamentarian here and I, I think said the same thing but in different words. It takes 89 to discharge a Committee it takes 89 to take from the Table after....the Speakers Table after a Committee reports it back. You have 48 hours to do that in. After that it's finally tabled and takes 107 sir."

Madison: "Thank you."

Shea: "Is there any further discussion? Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rayson."



Rayson: "Well Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask Representative Madigan or Representative Houlihan the following. My recollection there was a proposal in Committee to...ah...make certain provisions of 24-1 of the Criminal Code on the deadly weapon relating to misdemeanors is the one which the fifteen day jail sentence would be applied and then there's some talk about getting to the Senate as original proposal. Am I correct in saying that theses...ah...sh...provisions of jail on offenses committed applied to misdemeanor Sections and not the felony sections?"

Shea: "Is there any further discussion?"

Rayson: "Well ask the question Mr. Speaker, to Representative Houlihan I believe."

Shea: "Well then...ah...Mr. Houlihan do you care to answer it?"

Houlihan: "Yes."

Shea: "Turn Mr. Houlihan on."

Houlihan: "His answer is, in answer to his question is yes."

Rayson: "Well just speaking briefly to the motion. If the people want to get this out and get in on the Floor and here's our last opportunity to try to do something. Now I don't mind mandatory jail sentence of some sort for people who use guns but if we're going to just mess around with misdemeanor stuff we're going to run into situations where the guy is really charged with a felony, you know, can get out on parole or whatever, never see a damn jail, the poor guy who may not register his gun has got fifteen or thirty days, whatever you put on the Amendment in jail. This doesn't seem like good gun control to me."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan moves on Senate Bill 1484 to place on the Calendar on the Order of Second Reading Second Day. Now Mr. Madison raises another point."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "Yes sir."

Madison: "My understanding of the rules is that a motion to discharge is only in order when the Committee has not acted relative to a do not pass motion. If the Committee has acted relative to a



do not pass motion my interpretation of the Rules is that a motion to discharge is not in order but a motion to take from the Speakers table, which requires 107 votes."

Shea: "I have just had another Parliamentary lesson by my friend Mr. Katz and you are very correct and if you'd notice I've put the question. 1484 takes 89 votes and it's my opinion that 1485 is going to take 107."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I think you still misunderstand me. What I'm suggesting is that the motion on 1484 is improper because it is a motion to discharge. The Committee, as I understand it, considered this Bill and made a do not pass recommendation. If I understand the rules at that point, a motion to discharge is not in order but the motion must be to take from the Speakers table."

Shea: "Sir, 1484, from at least what I gain from Mr. Katz is still in the Committee. Is that right Mr. Katz?"

Katz: "There was never a do not pass motion on 1484...ah...There was a do pass that failed but there was not a do not pass and so that Bill has never had the do not pass motion that the distinguished Gentleman from Cook has just referred to."

Madison: "Am I to understand then Mr...the...Mr. Speaker, that a do pass motion that fails does not have the same effect as a do not pass motion unless the Roll Call is reversed?"

Shea: "Yes sir. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman with a Parliamentary Inquiry."

Schlickman: "My Parliamentary Inquiry Mr. Speaker and thank you very much for recognizing me. Do I understand that if this Bill is discharged that at Second Reading there will not negatively speaking, be an Amendment offered?"

Shea: "I don't have any idea about Amendments, I'm just informed by Mr. Houlihan there will be Amendments."

Schlickman: "Well Mr. Speaker and Members of the...I guess I have to explain my vote...huh?"

Shea: "I think you best do that."

Schlickman: "Thank you.."

Shea: "All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'."



Shea 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 115 'aye', Kempiners 'aye'. Did you want to explain your vote sir? I'm sorry I was distracted."

Schlickman: "It's obviously too late, thank you."

Shea: "115 'ayes', 20 'nay', 2 'present' and Senate Bill 1484 will be taken from the Committee and placed on the order of Second Reading Second Day. Now on the Order of Senate Bill 1485. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, moves to take Senate Bill 1485 from the Table and place on the Calendar on the Order of Second Reading, Second Day. All those in favor will vote 'aye', all those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay' and on the question the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington."

Washington: "Yes, I didn't hear the Chairman of Judiciary II before in his rational for discharging his Committee on this Bill. I wish he would respond to this question. Am I led to believe that we did not reverse the Roll Call on a do pass motion on this Bill?"

Shea: "Sir that has...this Bill's on the table, takes 107 votes to get it off."

Washington: "The...The Bill we're dealing with now? Is that what you're saying?"

Shea: "Yes sir."

Washington: "Well then I'm...I'm in opposition to the taking from the Table and I'll tell you why. This Bill is similar to the one which you've mistakingly, Members of the House, took from the Judiciary II Committee and placed on the Calendar. This Bill had a thorough discussion as did the one previous to it. The Committee had a quarrel. It was voted down after thorough debate the reason why it was voted down is because the Committee felt it was unconscionable, unconscionable do you hear, to put someone in jail for fifteen days for having failed to file or refile. That was the /^{thrust} of the thing to refile his gun registration figure. Ah...gun registration application..."

Shea: "Mr. Mr. Washington. I'm going to ask my other Parliamentarian Mr. Katz to come up here because we again disagree on something and I want to get it straightened out. I don't think Mr. Madison



going to tell me I'm wrong that it takes 107."

Madison: "Well while you have Mr. Katz up there ask him if he's sure he's right. We did reverse the Roll Call on the previous Bill."

Shea: "All right, this one is reported out of Committee do not pass and within two days or 48 hours there's a motion to discharge. Now I want to look and see where I am and when I...Mr. Madison, to tell me about the rules again."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I am not about to tell you about the rules, I'm about to tell you where the confusion rose in my mind relative to Senate Bill 1484. If you look at the Digest Mr. Speaker, the Digest indicates that on June 11 a motion was filed to take from the Table. If you look at the Calendar, the Calendar says the motion to file... a motion to file to discharge Committee. Now one of these is wrong, I would assume that the Digest is wrong."

Shea: "That's what I'm informed by the Clerk sir."

Madison: "And I would just suggest that whoever's responsible for printing these Digests would at least make them as correct as possible. Maybe Representative Hanra...Hanahan is right. Maybe we need a Union printer but it certainly creates confusion in the minds of the Members when there is not unanim...unity of agreement as it relates...as between the Calendar and the Digest and that was the problem."

Shea: "Thank you sir. We go back to why this only takes 89 and I read from Rule 33(c). If is a...If a Bill has been reported out of Committee do not pass or do not pass as amended it shall lay on the Speakers Table for two Legislative Days. If no written motion to take the Bills from the Table is made within those two days and supported by an affirmative vote of 89 Members the Bill shall be considered as finally tabled and stricken. Upon a motion to take a Bill from the Speakers Table filed during those two days and adopted by an affirmative vote of 89 Members the Bill shall be placed on the Calendar on the Order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day. This subsection may be suspended only by an affirmative vote of 107 Members. So in the opinion of the Chair it takes 89 votes to carry this motion. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan has moved on Senate Bill 1485 now on this, the question the Gentleman



from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1485 had two, I emphasize two thorough hearings by Judiciary II Committee and I call to the attention of the Membership that the reason that a majority of this Committee, of those present and voting, voting that this Bill be not, be not recommended out do pass, but recommended do not pass, is that a person who inadvertently does not apply for a gun owners registration card will be mandatorily, manditorily sent to jail for fifteen days. Now if, through that inadvertency you want a person sent to jail for fifteen days, even for failing to get a gun owners identification card. Even though a person convicted of a second offense for illegal possession of a firearms is not subject to mandatory imprisonment then vote for it. But I would hope Mr. Speaker and Members of the House that the good sound wisdom of Judiciary II Committee, two hearings would be concurred in and that you would register a 'no' vote on this motion."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In the Committee I was one of those who spoke as the Gentleman from Cook just said and I was wrong and the reason I was wrong is because the Senate Sponsor was not able to be in town, his wife was delivering a child that night and there was a confusion that arose in the presentation of the Bill. I would point out to the Members that the confusion that arose in the Committee should not be repeated here on the Floor of the House. These Bills do not have a mandatory punishment in them, they have a minimum sentence in them and there's a clear distinction in the unified code of corrections on that problem. When you set a minimum sentence, you don't deny the possibility of probation, you don't deny the possibility of conditional discharge or you don't deny the possibilities of weekend imprisonment and all the other possible decisions that a court can make...ah...I think the Bill..."

Shea: "Ah...Mr...Mr. Duff, you're not on the motion, you're on the



Bill sir."

Duff: "All right, well I'm just pointing out that the confusion that was made in the Committee should not be repeated on the House Floor. We made a mistake in Committee, these are good Bills, at least enough to warrant the consideration on the House Floor and I am supporting the motion."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank...Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would like to speak just for the motion to discharge and not to the Bill itself insofar as those two questions can be separated. This Bill which apparently is a simple Bill based on the synopsis, presumably had a full hearing in the Sa...in the Senate Committee and then presume we had a full hearing in the Senate, then it comes over to the House and has two hearing in the Senate Judiciary II Committee. The House Judiciary Committee and now we are asked to discharge the Committee and apparently the basis for that is that the Bill which is such a simple Bill is going to be amended again. Now I can't understand how a Bill could come over from the Senate and then come over to the House and still not be in shape and be such a simple Bill which apparently is a...either a thirty day minimum or a thirty day mandatory sentence. I don't think that this kind of history justifies the unprecedented motion or rather...the extraordinary motion of a motion to discharge and I suggest we vote 'no' on this motion."

Shea: "Is there any further discussion. The Gentleman from Perry... Excuse me Mr. Dunn. Now Mr. Schlickman you spoke twice..."

Schlickman: "Point of personal privilege."

Shea: "All right at the end of the discussion I'll get back to you sir. The Gentleman from Perry Mr. Dunn, on the question."

Dunn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House...I...I don't know all the merits of Senate..ah...Senate Bill 480...1485 but I can see where it was defeated in Judiciary II, I know it concerns gun owners and gun registration and I...I think a Bill that got beat in Judiciary Committee by a vote of whatever it was 7 to 8 or whatever it was, must be a bad Bill. Because I thought they let out nearly all their Bills and I urge that we don't let this out of



Committee and let him take it back in to next year. Thank you."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, are we allowed to ask questions on the Bill so that we may be in a position to properly desire how to vote on the motion?"

Shea: "No sir, you can ask questions on the motion."

Madison: "Thank you Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "I think if you phrase your question on the motion right, it would probably get answered."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not as adjure at the English Language as you are and I don't think I could do that."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McAuliffe on the motion."

McAuliffe: "I move the previous question."

Shea: "The question is shall the main question be put? All those in favor will say 'aye', all those opposed will say 'nay', in the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan to close."

Houlihan: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion. I think this is an important Bill which should come before the Membership in this Session of the General Assembly. There was distinctly some confusion that existed in a hearing before the Judiciary II Committee. One of the reasons for that confusion was that we are amending not just the Criminal Code but another Section referring to the Uniform Code of Corrections. Quite frankly I was in part responsible for that confusion because I misunderstood what the intent of the Senate Sponsor was and that intent was not to eliminate the right of probation to someone who would be convicted. Now let me emphasize because there's been a misimpression here. No one can be convicted under this Section of the Criminal Statutes simply for inadvertence. This is...no one can be convicted for any criminal case, simply because of inadvertence. It must be a knowful, willfull violation of the criminal Statutes this is an important Bill and I urge your support..."

Shea: "Mr. Houlihan...Mr. Houlihan. Mr. Madison is raising a point of order."



Madison: "Well if the Gentleman has closed I think it's a mute point but he was speaking on the Bill and not the motion."

Shea: "Your point sir, is well taken. Before we close, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman on a point of Personal privilege. What is your point sir?"

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. The Gentleman from Cook, that part that is denominated as the North shore suggested there was some confusion in the Committee. I consider that to be a rebuke or a contradiction of what I said. It was stated specifically by the Sponsor of the Bill..."

Shea: "Are you talking about Mr. Houlihan sir."

Schlickman: "No sir, he's not from the North shore. It was stated specifically by the Sponsor of this Bill that the intention of the Bill was mandatory imprisonment and they had an Amendment prepared...prepared and ready to offer and he's indicated.."

Shea: "Sir are speaking about...Point...personal privilege or the Bill."

Schlickman: "I'm speaking about personal privilege. I made..."

Shea: "I don't think that's a point of personal privilege sir."

Schlickman: "Well I suggest to the Membership that if they want mandatory imprisonment...."

Shea: "Sir, I don't think that's a point of personal privilege."

Schlickman: "I think I made the point."

Shea: "The question is shall this Bill be discharged? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian to explain his vote."

Mugalian: "I just want to explain, thank you Mr. Speaker, that I think I'm going to ask for a verification if this...has 89 green lights and there are only about 110 people here."

Shea: "All, Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The... Mr. Duff to explain his vote."

Duff: "Well Mr. Speaker, I didn't say anything that would have given the Gentleman a right to point of personal privilege...."

Shea: "Sir, you're to explain your vote."

Duff: "I am explaining my vote. Anybody that says this Bill calls for a mandatory penalty doesn't know what the hell the Bill says. How's that for a point of privilege Gene."



Shea: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Sangmeister to explain his vote."

Sangmeister: "Well Mr. Speaker, I don't know if I want to get involved in this hassle or not, but I supported the motion on the previous Bill because I think it is a good Bill. But I think we do have to be concerned, even if it isn't mandatory, I don't think that we should have a Bill whereby the Judge is in the position of... sure he can grant probation but if he doesn't grant probation then his other...and he does want to sentence somebody under this that he's going to have to give him fifteen days. I think that is a little strong for the violation of the Firearms Identification Act and I would request a 'no' vote."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 80 'ayes' 49 'nays' 10 Members voting 'present' the Gentlemans motion to discharge fails. I have a motion from Ms. Dyer here and it reads pursuant to temporary rule 64 and having voted on the prevailing side I move to reconsider the vote by which House ... the House concurred with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 696. The Lady from DuPage, Ms. Dyer."

Dyer: "Yes. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In reading the fine print in the way the Senate Amendment did end. Ah...I see that it put...it puts Cook County back into the Bill which was not intended upon, the majority did not wish. I would therefore move not to concur with the Senate Amendment to House Bill 696."

Shea: "The Lady...The Lady moves to reconsider the vote by which the House did concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 696. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. It takes 89 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this there are 94 'ayes', 2 'nays', 7 Members voting 'present' and the motion to reconsider is adopted. Now the Lady moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 696. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to 696. On the order of motions, Mr. Tipsword, is he



here or has he left? I've got about three or four motions and then we'll be as they say, we'll be gone."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker this...this...ah...motion is a very simple one, it's to suspend temporary rule 58 B and provides that, this is on the explanation of votes and would provide that through the 15th of July of 1975, this year, that from now until the 15th of July that we would suspend the rule on the explanation of votes and provide that only the Sponsor of a measure or the mover of an issue would be permitted to explain their vote or any Member to whom they might yield that privilege. For the purpose of hopefully speeding up what we're doing here on the Floor of the House, just in these last two or three days of the Session. I would move that this motion be adopted."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves to adopt a motion to suspend Rule 58 B on a temporary basis until the end of the Session allowing the mover of mo...the movers of a Bill to close and also to explain his vote or to any person he so yields. All those in favor will vote 'aye' and those opposed will vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Lake Mr. Deuster to explain his vote."

Deuster: "Well Mr. Speaker, I would suggest, I don't think anybody has any way of knowing what they're voting on...ah...as been suggested that the right that's so fundamental to every Member here to explain his vote and by which many, many, many bad pieces of Legislation are defeated and many good pieces of Legislation are passed, the whole principal of shedding light on something. Right now is a perfect example. I'm sure there are a lot of Members sitting around here watching the greens and the reds, they don't have the foggiest idea what it is. I'm usually in that case, but to suspend the right to explain your vote, strips away a fundamental right that all of us enjoy and it's really stripping away the right to know what in the world we're voting on and we've gone very, very well with these rules and we are getting down to the end. I think we're all working hard, the Speaker has done a wonderful job of keeping us at the grindstone and moving us along and if this sudden juncture to strip away the right to explain a vote I think would be a terrible mistake and unnecessary and I urge a 'no' vote."



Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this there are 41 'ayes' 48 'nays' 2 Members voting 'present' and the Gentleman's motion is lost. On the order of motions appears...or On the Speakers Table, I guess, I promised two people I'd call something. Mr. Schraeder where is your item of business?"

Schraeder: "It's on the...motion on House Resolution #4...400."

Shea: "On the Speakers Table appears House Resolution 400. Mr. Schraeder. Mr. Schraeder moves for leave to have a meeting of consideration of the Resolution and on that, Mr. Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is a very simple Resolution. Very conclusive in what it does and I would ask for leave for the necessary votes to consider it at the present time. It's in regard to ..."

Shea: "Mr. Schraeder, perhaps we'll have the Clerk read the Resolution."

Jack O'Brien: "House Resolution 400. Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Seventy-Ninth General Assembly of the State of Illinois that Rule 56 of the Temporary Rules of the House be amended to read as follows: 56. Radios, television and photographs. In meetings of the whold House T.V. cameras may be operated from the rear Balcony only. Cameras and radio equipment may also be operated to cover the operations of the House."

Shea: "Mr. Schraeder, Mr. Schraeder. Would you turn Mr. Schraeder on. Sir would you pull this out of the record temporarily, the Parliamentarian has raised a point and I'd like you to discuss it with him. Take that out of the record temporarily. Now Mr. Schisler has a motion, would you turn Mr. Schisler on and we'll see where we're at with him."

Schisler: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I ask leave that the provisions of Rule 41 be suspended so that House Resolution 398 may be immediately considered and adopted by the House and I ask leave for the attendance Roll Call to be used for this suspension. I've discussed this with Mr...."

Shea: "The Gentleman asks leave for the attendance Roll Call to be used for the suspension of the Rules for the immediate consideration of the Resolution. Have you discussed this with the Leadership on both sides Mr. Schisler?"



Schisler: "Yes, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "And who did you discuss it with?"

Schisler: "Representative Washburn and Representative Walsh and with the spokesman on the Agricultural Committee, Mr. Rigney."

Shea: "All right. Mr. Washburn to...do you remember Mr. Schisler discussing with you sir, House Resolution 398, which relates to an investigation by the House Agricultural Committee on the Grain Inspection Service in Illinois and the discount rate system used in the purchase of grain? All right the Gentleman asks leave to use the Attendance Roll Call for the immediate consideration of said Resolution. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection leave is granted. Now Mr. Schisler on Resolution 398."

Schisler: "I move for the adoption of the Resolution."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of House Resolution 398. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay' on the question. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 110 'ayes', 1 'nay' and House Resolution 398 is passed and please mark Mr. Shea 'aye'. Messages 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 concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of a Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bill #342, together with Amendments. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 25, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Shea: "Committee Reports."

Jack O'Brien: "Mr. Schneider from the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education to which House Bill 740, 1067, 1125, 1603, 1604, 1723, 1772, 1854, 1855, 1856, 1857, 1863, 1980, 2017, 2023, 2025, 2111 2603, 2604 and 2890 were referred. Reports the same back in pursuant to Rule 30...23 D, the Bill was ordered tabled. Mr. Taylor from the Committee on Cities and Villages to which House Bills 694, 769, 770, 873, 1268, 2068, 2069, 2070 and 2810 were referred. Reports the same back in pursuant to Rule 23 D, the Bills were ordered tabled. Mr. Matijevich from the Committee on Executive to which House Resolution 169, House Joint Resolution C.A. 14, House Joint



Resolution 33 were referred. Reports the same back pursuant to Rule 23 D, the Resolutions were ordered tabled."

Shea: "All right, we have two quick pieces of business. On the order of House Bills, Third Read...or Second Reading, appears House Bill 3122. Read the Bill."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3122. A Bill for an Act creating a Medical Dental School Admissions Study Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Shea: "Any Amendment from the Floor?"

Jack O'Brien: "None."

Shea: "Third Reading. Now back to Mr. Porter."

Porter: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, on the Order of motions. I would move to take from the table and place on the Calendar under the order of Senate Bills Second Reading, First Legislative Day, Senate Bill 266. This is identical to H.B. House Bill 3094 and...ah...That's the...a Committee Bill that is identical to the Senate Bill that came over and I think through some inadvertency Senate Bill was first placed on the Study Calendar and then tabled and...ah...instead a House Bill was drafted. It seems to me that it makes only good sense if we go ahead with the same Bill that is the Senate Bill so that it might have a chance of passing before the time limits expire."

Shea: "Would you rephrase your motion sir. What is it, 296?"

Porter: "296. Move to take from the table and place on the Calendar on the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Second Legislative Day."

Shea: "The Gentleman makes a motion to take Senate Bill 296 from the Calendar....266, I'm sorry. Take Senate Bill 266 from...Does the Gentleman have leave to make that Second Reading, Second Legislative Day? Hearing no objection I'll amend the motion on the face. The Gentleman moves to take the Bill from the table and place it on the Calendar on the order of Senate Bills on Second Reading, Second Legislative day and asks leave to use the Attendance Roll Call. Is there objections? Hearing none. So ordered. Now on the order of Mr. Terzich, that took care of your problem? Any announcements, meetings, anything else? The Gentleman from Grundy, the Minority Leader."



JUN 25 1975

251.

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

I now move that the House does adjourn until 10:00 A.M. tomorrow morning."

Shea: "The Gentlemans motion is to adjourn until 10:00 A.M. All in favor will say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the House stands adjourned."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES