

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

NINETY-NINTH LEGISLATIVE DAY

JUNE 26, 1975



Doorkeeper: "All those not entitled to the floor, will you please return to the gallery? All those not entitled to the floor, will you please retire to the gallery? All those not entitled to the floor, will you please retire to the gallery?"

Bradley: "The House will be in order. This morning we will be led in prayer by Father Kosak, pastor of Little Flower Church here in Springfield."

Father Kosak: "Call for a moment of silence in memory of James Bud Krause, who died last night. Eternal rest grant unto him, Oh Lord, and let perpetual light shine upon him, may his soul and the souls of all the faithful departed, through the mercy of God rest in peace. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen. Almighty and eternal God, acknowledging your supreme dominion over all creation, we, your creatures, humbly ask your blessing for ourselves, for our community, and for our beloved country. From the depth of your bountiful providence, we beg for the world of man, that most precious and coveted of all gifts, peace. Not if the world gives peace, but the peace promised to us by your Son, our Lord Jesus Christ. May your spirit bless and guide the political processes of our city, state and country and bless those who aspire to share in the exercise of your divine authority. May we all strive for justice, equality and charity toward our fellow man. We ask this through our Lord, Jesus Christ, your Son, who lives and reigns with you in the Holy Spirit, one God, forever and ever. Amen."

Bradley: "Roll Call for attendance. Messages from the Senate."

Jack O'Brien: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurs with the House in the adoption of House Amendment #1 and the Bill of the following title, Senate Bill 663. I am further directed



to inform the House that the Senate refused to concur with the House in the adoption of Amendment #2. Action taken by the Senate, June 25, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurs with the House in the adoption of Amendment #4 to.....Senate Bill 637. I am further directed to inform the House that the Senate refused to concur with the House in the adoption of Amendment #2. Action taken by the Senate, June 25, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representative that the Senate concurs with the House in the adoption of the House Amendment #2 and 9 of the Senate Bill 468. I am further directed to inform the House the Senate refused to concur in the adoption of Amendment #3. Action taken by the Senate, June 25, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurs with the House in the adoption of the House Amendments #1,2,3 and 4 to Senate Bill 433. I am further directed to inform the House that the Senate refused to concur with the House in their adoption of Amendment #5. Action taken by the Senate, June 25, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurs with the House in the adoption of House Amendment #2 to the Bill of the following title, Senate Bill 1048. Action taken by the Senate June 25, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurs with House in the adoption of House Amendment #1 to the Bills of the following title, Senate Bill 1049. I am further



directed to inform the House that the Senate has refused to concur with House in the adoption of Amendment #2. Action taken by the Senate June 25, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurs with the House in their adoption of House Amendments #1 and 2 to the Bill of the following title, Senate Bill 1311. Concurred in by the Senate June 25, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurs with the House in the adoption of the House Amendment #1 in the Bill of the following title. Senate Bill 701. Concurred in by the Senate June 25, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurs with the House in the adoption of House Amendment #1, 2, 3 and 5 of the Bill of the following title, Senate Bill 805. Concurred in by the Senate June 25, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede from the Amendments #1 and 2 of the Bill of the following title, House Bill 2238 and requests that conference committee action taken by the Senate June 25, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate refused to recede from Amendment #1 and 2 from the Bill of the following title. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurs with the House in the passage of Bills of the following title, House Bills 662, 664, 121, 138, 141, 169, 236, 237, 284, 300 and 330 passed by the Senate June 25, 1975. Kenneth Wright.



Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurs with the House in the passage of Bills of the following title to wit House Bills 990, 2561, 2693, 2721, 2815, 2837, 2972, 2988, 3023, 3035, 3049, 3051, 3070, 3071, 3077, 3087. Passed by the Senate June 25, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurs with the House in the passage of Bills of the following title to with, House Bills 596 and 697 passed by the Senate June 25, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of the following amendments, Amendment #1,2,3,4,5 and 6 of the Bill of the following title, Senate Bill 32. Action taken by the Senate June 25, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of Amendment #1 to the House of Representatives Bill of the following title, Senate Bill 472. Action taken by the Senate June 25, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of Amendment #1 to the House of Representatives to the Bill of the following title, Senate Bill 476. Action taken by the Senate June 25, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of Amendment #2 of the House of Representatives to the Bill of the following title,



Senate Bill 507. Action taken by the Senate June 25, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of Amendments #2 and 3 of the House of Representatives to the Bill of the following title, Senate Bill 517. Action taken by the Senate June 25, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate refused to concur with the House in the adoption of Amendment #2 in the House of Representatives to the Bill of the following title, Senate Bill 658. Action taken by the Senate June 25, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate refused to concur with the House in the adoption of Amendments #1, 2 and 4 of the House of Representatives to the Bill of the following title, Senate Bill 661. Action taken by the Senate June 25, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate refused to concur with the House in the adoption of Amendment #1 of the House of Representatives to the Bill of the following title, Senate Bill 666. Action taken by the Senate June 25, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the passage of the Amendment #1 of the House of Representatives to the Bill of the following title, Senate Bill 989. Action taken by the Senate June 25, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate refused



to concur with the House in the adoption of Amendment #1 of the House of Representatives to the Bill of the following title, Senate Bill 1497. Action taken by the Senate June 25, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of the Bill of the following title, to with, House Bill 114, House Bill 119, House Bill 146, House Bill 278, House Bill 345, House Bill 3005, House Bill 2617, House Bill 2692, House Bill 2804, House Bill 2826, House Bill 3105, House Bill 3057, House Bill 3047, House Bill 738, House Bill 743, House Bill 1149, House Bill 1588, House Bill 942, House Bill 1506, House Bill 1079 together with amendments passed by the Senate as amended June 25, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Bradley: "Resolutions."

Jack O'Brien: "House Resolution 405, Kelly. House Resolution 413, Richmond. House Resolution 414, Terzich. House Resolution 415, Kelly. House Resolution 416, Polk. Senate Joint Resolution 43, Marovitz. Senate Joint Resolution 44, Giorgi."

Bradley: "The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, on the agreed resolutions."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Resolution 405 by Kelly commends Mr. Willie Ward, municipal clerk of the Village of Robbins and all the municipal clerks throughout Illinois for their contribution to local government. House Resolution 413, Richmond, we join the state as well as southern Illinois in congratulating Congressman Paul Simon and Lieutenant-Governor Neil Hartigan for their...uh...successful culmination of unceasing and tireless work to boost the economic health of the southern region and the state. House Resolution 414, Terzich, we memorialize Congress to take such action as may be necessary to effect the immediate release of Mrs.



Connelly...uh...who is within Communist control prison in Lea. House Resolution 415, Kelly, commends Mr. and Mrs. Howard Allen of Hazelcrest for 50 years of marriage. House Resolution 416, Polk, we commend Sergeant-Major John Hirsten on his 30 years of dedicated service to our country. Senate Joint Resolution 43 by Marovitz, we...uh... extend the date of the report of the Spanish Speaking People's Study Commission to October 15, 1975. Senate Joint Resolution, Giorgi, we...uh...extend the reporting date of the Joint Committee on Unemployment, Administration of the Unemployment Compensation Act to October 30, 1975. Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the agreed resolutions."

Bradley: "The gentleman moves the adoption of the agreed resolutions. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the resolutions are adopted. If there are any members here who have anything on concurrences that they wish to move to non-concurred so that we can send it back to the Senate. Non-concurrences. No. Evidently we don't have any. Concurrences. On the calendar appears House Bill 328. Mr. Skinner and Mr. Brinkmeier on concurrences 328."

Brinkmeier: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I would move to concur with the Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 328."

Bradley: "Pardon me, sir. Go ahead."

Brinkmeier: "This amendment is...uh...actually House Bill 3027 which we have passed out of here and what it does, it grants the salary increase to the...uh...ESR people. This amendment was put on in the Senate prior to the other action, so actually it may be superfluous and in no way is it going to affect the Bill, and I would hate to lose the Bill, which, the Bill itself simply changes the name of the ESR person to regional superintendent and I do move for concurrence."

Bradley: "The gentlemen moves to concur, that the House does. concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 328. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by



voting 'no' and this is final action. Sponsor Brinkmeier. Have all voted who wish? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't know what the Senate Amendment #1 did."

Bradley: "Mr. Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Yes, Ted. That is the salary increase for the ESR people. That was added on in the Senate prior to the time that they took action on 3027. So it's actually superfluous but unless we concur we will lose the change of the name, that's really what this Bill does and that's what we all want, I am sure."

Lechowicz: "Thank you."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 96 'ayes', 3 'nays', none voting present and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 328. 464. Mr. Cunningham. On the calendar appears House Bill 464."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Chairman and members of the House, the amendment made by the Senate to this Bill is neither momentous nor fatal, it just changes very slightly the rules in regards to the Office of Education prescribing the regulations for determining whether or not a bona fide effort is made to secure employment. Accordingly, we move for concurrence."

Bradley: "The gentleman moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 464. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lundy to explain his vote."

Lundy: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a good amendment. I would hope the members would support it. It remedies a problem which... uh... a number of people trained for teaching have experienced. Thank you."



Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 103 'ayes', 1 'nay', 1 voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 464. Mr. Taylor, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I wish all of the Sponsor would explain these amendments, these concurrence. You know the Governor's Action Office is still on the loose and I have some indication that they might be trying to ease it through so I don't want that to happen. Would you do that for me, please?"

Bradley: "We will request that they do that."

Taylor: "Thank you very much."

Bradley: "House Bill 635. Is Mr. Jones on the floor. Mr. Giorgi, do you wish to concur on House Bill 707? We will hold that at the request of the Sponsor. On the calendar appears House Bill 826, Ron Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The first thing I would clarify is that this does not have a GOHR Amendment on here, Representative Taylor. There are two amendments on here that I would ask the House to concur in. Amendment #1, put on in the Senate, changes...uh...the word 'charged to' and inserted 'paid by' and I would move for its concurrence on Senate Amendment #1. Senate Amendment #2 changes slightly the...uh...process by which the notification of interest charged to an account would be transmitted to them. The original Bill indicated that the information as to the total amount charged would be...uh...transmitted to that person and we have indicated on there...uh...as a substitute that the seller holder shall annually be informed of their right to have such information. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 and 2."

Shea: "The gentleman moves to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2. Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the House concur with Senate



Amendments #1 and #2, this is final action and requires 89 votes. All in favor vote 'aye' those opposed vote 'nay'.
Have all voted who wish?Mr. McPartlin, did you say you wanted to verify this?"

McPartlin: "Not really."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Take the Roll Call, Mr. Clerk. On these questions there are 103 'ayes' no 'nays' two members voting 'present' and the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2, to House Bill 826. On the order of concurrences.....appears House Bill 827."

Hoffman: "...you Mr. Speaker, ...House Bill 827 is addressing itself to the same subject matter, it does not contain a GOHR Amendment, it changes the language that the lender shall inform...annually...ah...to the buyer the right to obtain su...information for income tax purposes and I would move for concurrence on Senate Amendment #1, to Senate Bill 827."

Shea: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 827. On the question, the Gentleman from Lake,.....er.....the Gentleman from McHenry Mr. ..S.. Skinner."

Skinner: "Yea,....the remap didn't pass, I'm not from Lake yet. Mr. Speaker, would the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Shea: "With that last remark....you and Hoffman may not get a whack....Do you want to take the Bill out of the record and go back and talk to him.....take it out of the record...Mr.On the order of concurrences appears House Bill 1103, Mr. Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move to concur in Senate Amendments 1.....s...can we take them together? I'll explain them all....ah...but I would move to concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 to House Bill 1103."

Shea: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels raises a question. Turn Mr. Daniels on."



Daniels: "It's just thatcould we have a division of the question, Mr. Speaker?"

Shea: "The Gentleman asks for you to take them one at a time. Is there one particular one that you want to talk about, Mr. Daniels?"

Daniels: "No, I just want to have him cover them carefully so that"

Shea: "He is going through them one at a time....Do you object to his voting on them all at once?"

Daniels: "Well, why doesn't he go through them and then we'llI can make a decision."

Holewinski: "Amendment #1....ah....was a...a technical Amendment, really, we put it onah...at the request of the staff members of the Senate Committee it did things like we had deposits and premiums we put in 'and/or'...ah...it also made the Attorney General the enforcement officer for the Act. The only other thing this Amendment did was....ah... where we referred to applications, it specified 'written' applications....an.....and that is the total extent of Am....Amendment #1. Amendment #2...took out credit unions from the scope of the Act. They....it was felt that...ah.. that credit unions were not significantly in the mortgage market/^{as of}yet and therefore this would be a burden upon them and the Senate adopted a...an Amendment withdrawing credit unions.....ah....Amendment #3 simply changed the ...ah.... officer to whom the reports are made from the Commissioner of Real Estate to the Director of the Department of Financial Institutions... And...ah...Amendment #4 was just a.... an Amendment that was put in by Senator Carroll to guarantee the confidentiality of the reports and that no materials really referring to individuals would be reported and that was our intent. Amendment #6 is really the onlyto my mind...the only significant....that is the one that withdrew the requirement of ...ah...disclosing deposits....ah. there was resistance to this in the Senate...ah...and...ah



and the Senate put this Amendment onI would move to concur.....in all Amendments."

Shea: "Well, it seems that the only Amendment that might cause some consternation is Amendment #..."

Holewinski: "would be 6."

Shea: "Amendment #6. So why don't we take and divide the question as Mr. Daniels said and adopt Amendments #1, 2, 3 and 4 on one Roll Call and then we'll run 6. The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #'s 1, 2, 3, and 4 to House Bill 1103, all those in favor will vote 'aye' those opposed will vote 'nay' and on that questionno.. don't open the voting yet...please, Mr. Clerk....On that question, the Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I realize that we are on concurrence but actually what we're doing here is passing or defeating a Bill. Now, I don't know how much you've been around banks and building and loans lately but I can tell you they're up to their ears in reports. Every day some government agency a"

Shea: "Mr. Friedrich, could I disturb you for one minute sir? We split the question.....Amendments 1, 2, 3, and 4 are technical. I specif.....I specifically kept....."

Friedrich: "Alright.....allright...thank you."

Shea: "I specifically kept 6, the controversial one out, and that one too could send the Bill to a conference committee. Sir..."

Friedrich: "Alright."

Shea: "On the question, shall the House concur in Amendments #'s 1, 2, 3, and 4 to this House Bill, 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 106 'ayes', 4 'nays' and 2 Members voting 'present' and the House does concur with the Senate in Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, and 4 to House Bill 1103. The next question is, shall the House concur in Senate



Amendment 6 to House Bill 1103 and on that question the Gentleman from M.....Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, again what...if we concur here in this Amendment, what we're doing in effect of course is passing this Bill. Now, let me remind you again thatevery business is beset...anymore with filling out forms. Unbelievable requests andr....requirements by the law and by regulations of the various agencies and here is another one which will take the time and add more expense to these agencies but worse than that here is information which in the Act says it is confidential but I would remind you that the ...the circuit breakers were also confidential but 260,000 letters werea list with 260,000 names on it was made just because someone who ran the computer was told to release it. Now, most of these institutions are on computer and all you have to have is one guy who...who can be paid 15 bucks to turn on the computer and out comes a list of this information which should be confidential. I'm telling you that we're in a computer age and anytime your list.....name or the information about you is on a computer it's / ^{liable} to be put out by someone.....So...I...I...would ask you to vote 'no' on this and in the finality kill this Bill."

Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Shea: "He indicates he will, Sir."

Daniels: "Representative Holewinski, as I understand it...your original Bill required the filing of mortgage loans or statements, mortgage loans by zip code areas, now, would you again tell me what '6' does to the original Bill?"

Holewinski: "The original Bill required disclosure of deposits andah...and mortgages and...of various types, conventional, FHA, ...ah...the entire gamut in the home mortgage market.....ah.....Amendment #6 takes out the requirement



that deposits be disclosed....so that the Bill now will.... require the disclosure of those various categories of ah...of mortgages....and so what an institution ...we'll be doing is disclosing publicly where it's.....where they're making loans..... Now, the information that will be provided really will be.....will allow...ah...those interested in the community and government to take a look at whether our cities are truly being disinvested..."

Daniels: "So in other words all...all that you've done to the Bill by '6' is take out the deposit...."

Holewinski: "...that disclosing...the deposit, but you still have to disclose the mortgages by zip code area...."

Daniels: "By zip code and census track...."

Holewinski: "By census track...yea....."

Daniels: "OK, thank you."

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

Holewinski: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In reference to the comments made by one of the prior speakers I would just like to say, if you take a look at the Bill you'll see that we've got adequate protections in the Bill....ah....in terms of ...of protecting the individual of the confidentiality of individual information. The only thing it requires is a report to be filed with the Department of Financial Institutions ...ah...designating what types of mortgages are being.....given out. I think that...ah...this....this is a very prominent topic, I'm sure we're all familiar with it and I would ask for a favorable vote on Amendment #6."

Shea: "The question is, shall this....shall the House concur in Senate Amendment.....on the question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Craig.....er....from Vermilion, Mr. Craig....is he on the floor?...The question is, shall the House concur in Amendment #6 to Senate Amendment #6 to House Bill 1103. All



those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay', this is final action and takes 89 votes. Your light was on Mr. Craig.....Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to explain my vote ...ah...ah...this is a Bill that means a lot to.....to the cities....it means a lot to a lot of people who put a lot of hard work into it. When....When the.... the Senate felt very strongly about the requirement of disclosing deposits and removed....that....that requirement. It doesn't make the Bill any stronger it....it...delineates what ...what potentially was a problem....ah....a problem that I intend to work on in the future. I think that ...ah ...that we best serve people who are interested in this issue ...ah...by concurring in this Amendment and passing the Bill out of here rather than ...than sending it into a Conference Committee at this late date...ah....and taking a chance at losing more....more than we really have gained by the Bill....and I would ask for an affirmative vote."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 40 'ayes', 49 'nays', 10 members voting 'present' and the House does not concur with Senate Amendmentwith Senate Amendment #6 to House Bill 1103. On that Mr. Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Mr. Speaker, can I have a poll of the absentees on that?"

Shea: "I've already announced the Roll Call, Sir. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I....I thought the Gentleman ...ah.. was in the process of trying to get your attention...I.... don't want to challenge your ruling here...ah..."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Mann, if you....ah...were sitting up here and saw the number of red lights and the number of green lights and looked at the attendance it....you...you could have spent two hours talking about it and couldn't have accom-



plished what I think the Gentleman wanted to accomplish.

Do you want to make a motion, Mr. Holewinski, to non-concur?"

Holewinski: "Mr. Speaker, I mo....I move that we non-concur on Amendment #6, to House Bill 1103...."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves that the House do non-concur on Amendment #6 to House Bill 1103, all those in favor say 'aye' those opposed 'nay', the 'ayes' have, the House non-concurs in Amendment #6 to House Bill 1103. On the order of House Bills on concurrence there appears House Bill 1172, the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Just one second, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "Turn Mr. Schneider on, will you?"

Schneider: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I was just checking the Amendments from the Senate..ah....on 1132 it's the OCE for EPA....ah...the Senate has reduced the budget further ...ah...by House...by Senate Amendment #2 by \$393,000...ah...Amendment #1 removes a reference to the Federal Government...ah...I would ask.....ah...and Amendment #3 changes the language on lines 28 to 35 by indicating thatah....for planning, financing and construction of municipal sewage treatment works pursuant to the provision so.....I would move, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House that the House do concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 for the budget of the agency."

Shea: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1, #2, and #3 to House Bill 1172. This is the operating budget for the EPA and this is final action. On the question, is there any discussion? Is there any discussion on the question? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay', and this is final action. Shea 'aye',Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On these questions there are 109 'ayes', 1 'nay', 10 Members voting 'present', and the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1, #2, and #3 to House Bill 1172. In the order of concurrences appears House



Bill 1274.Mrs. Younge is she in the Chamber? Is Mrs. Younge in the Chamber? Take that one out of the record. On the order of House Bills on.....concurrences appears House Bill 1289, the Gentleman from Benton, Mr. Hart, from Franklin."

Hart: "Ah...yes....this Amendment has clarifying language that was put on in the Senate ...this has to do with a Bill to allow park districts to issue notes...ah.....ah...for the purchase of real estate...and I would move that we concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1289."

Shea: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1289? On the question, all those in favor 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? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 98 'ayes', no 'nays', 8 Members voting 'present' and House Bill 1289, the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1..... Number is Mr. Schoeberlein? Mr. Schoeberlein on House Bill 1328, on concurrence."

Schoeberlein: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move we concur in the Senate Amendment #1. All it does is change one word and it does not change the Bill whatsoever."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves that the House do concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1328. On the question, all those in favor 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. On this question there are 112 'ayes', 2 'nays', no Members voting 'present' and House Bill 11....the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1328. On the order of House Bills, appears House Bill 1401, is Mr. Giglio there? What about Mr. Skinner on 1443, are we ready to go on that Sir? On the order of concurrences



appears House Bill 1443."

Skinner: "... of the Senate amendment is to eliminate the requirement for the publishing of the data about school administrators' outside trips and school board members' outside trips. Now they must be made available to whoever wants them and it also excludes Cook county. Now, there is no reason in my opinion to exclude Cook county because that's where one of the problem suburban school districts was but some of the Senators have a very large hangup about letting information be public about some of their friends. So I move to concur with the Senate Amendment #3."

Shea: "The gentleman from McHenry moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 1443. All those, on the question is there any discussion? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. This is final action and requires 89 votes. The gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider, on the question."

Schneider: "I'm sorry, I just came in off the floor. It seems to me I didn't understand the amendment. Cal, if you just give me a second would you answer to respond? Does it now require that an individual, any individual under...uh...in a county under one million can request a copy of...uh... expenditures over \$100, personal copy?"

Skinner: "Yeah."

Schneider: "Is this a senate amendment?"

Skinner: "That was part of it. The other part of it which does not seem to be listed in the digest excludes Cook county."

Schneider: "Well, I don't know, it might be picky and it might be...uh...unnecessary to oppose it but it does seem that if everybody or individuals who do make such a request can...uh...deluge a school district with...uh...these kinds of requests...uh...it could be expensive. I don't see why we just can't leave that kind of request...uh...in the school district office or if really necessary to make it available to public...uh...places like libraries rather



than putting school districts in a position of having to provide...uh...the information on an individual basis. So if people would organize and decide that they just want to harass the school district what they should do is go in and ask for copies of expenditures over \$100 and it could be kind of a full time job at that point. So I'm kind of doubtful...uh...about why we ought to have it and my own feeling is that we ought to probably oppose the amendment."

Shea: "The gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich, on the question."

Friedrich: "I think it's too late to ask a question but I'd like to ask one anyway. Uh, if now without this...uh... the expenditures are published in the newspaper, right? I'm trying to get an answer out of the sponsor, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Under the circumstances, if you want to answer, Mr. Skinner..."

Skinner: "I, I think it's been accomplished anyway. He's not going anywhere."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Stone, do you? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Skinner, do you wish to make a motion at this time? The gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, on a motion."

Skinner: "I move that the House do not concur with this miserable Senate Amendment."

Shea: "Mr. Skinner moves that the House do not concur with Senate Amendment #3. All those in favor will say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the House non-concurs with Senate Amendment #3. Senate Bills Third Reading. Well we've got one more before we leave, concurrences. On the order of concurrences appears House Bill 1401 and on that question, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Giglio."

Giglio: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 1401 was the Plumbing Licensing Law. When we had it in the House we thought we did what we were supposed to do. However, when it got in the Senate, the...uh...the



people from central Illinois and downstate that had a chance to look at it a little more, the contractors and the laborers and the plumbers and also the departments. So they got together in the Senate and they come up with Senate Amendments #2,3,4 and 5 which satisfies all the industries now and we had a conference yesterday. I put out a report that should have been on everybody's desk stating what it did and we feel that it's workable and I would ask for concurrence to Senate Amendments #2,3,4 and 5."

Shea: "The gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendments #2, 3,4 and 5 to House Bill 1401 and on the question, the gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I've been through one of these promulgation of codes for septic tank pumper outers and we just found out this year that you can't have a water softener on a septic tank according to the Department of Public Health. Now, I would like to express my misgivings at the well, at letting an administrative agency like the Department of Public Health promulgate a wide ranging set of regulations that have the force of law without having to come back to the General Assembly for approval thereafter and I have no objections, in fact I like the way that the Department of Public Health holds hearings on these things, but unfortunately, everyone who is eventually affected by the regulations promulgated don't know about it and in the case of the water softener industry which is not one of the smaller industries in this hard water state of Illinois, they didn't know about it until a year afterwards when they saw the regulations or when somebody started to enforce the regulations. And frankly, I'm afraid of Amendment #3 and I just...uh...throw that out for your consideration."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Giglio, moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendments #2,3,4 and 5 to House Bill 1401. All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. This is final action and requires 89 votes."



The gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "Yes, I just wanted to rise in support of these amendments, Mr. Speaker. We've heard from the plumbing people, plumbing contractors in our area and...uh...we feel that these amendments are good and will provide the kind of licensing and also discipline that's necessary to prevent people from having bad plumbing jobs in residential and business buildings and we support these amendments."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On these questions, there are 95 'ayes', 11 'nays' and 15 members vote. There are now 96, Mr. Hart says he will vote 'aye'. 96 'ayes', 11 'nays', 15 members voting 'present' and the House does concur with Senate Amendments #2,3,4 and 5 to House Bill 1401. Senate Bills Third Reading. The gentleman from Cook, Hoffman, R.K."

Hoffman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to catch you before you moved to another order of business to pick up the one remaining 827, which we pulled out of the record."

Shea: "We'll get back there, Mr. Hoffman. We've got get, today is the final day for Senate Bills that are non-exempt to be out of this chamber so the quicker we get them out the earlier we get out of here and it leaves us three or four days to work on the concurrences and the Conference Committee reports. Senate Bill 37."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 37, a Bill for an Act creating the Illinois Horse Racing Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sevcik, on Senate Bill 37. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, on a point of order."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, yesterday we were at the order of Senate Bills Third Reading and my recollection is that we ended somewhere beyond Senate Bill 37. According to the rules once we leave an order of business and then return to it we are to resume at the point of previous departure."

Shea: "Read that rule to me, will you, Mr. Schlickman? While



we are waiting for Mr. Schlickman to find out what point he wants me to start at, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kozubowski, what's the number of that Bill sir?"

Kozubowski: "1258."

Shea: "Senate Bill 1258, you want to take that back to Second Reading?"

Kozubowski: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I would ask leave of the House to take Senate Bill 1258 back to the order of Second Reading for amendment."

Shea: "Does he have leave? Hearing... The gentleman, the gentleman, there is objection. What's your objection? There are two amendments on the desk he tells me. Do you have the amendments, Mr. Kozubowski?"

Kozubowski: "Yes, I do and I have them distributed, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would object, if for no other reason than the fact that if this Bill is brought back to the order of Second Reading by previous rulings of the permanent speaker, it could not be called for Third Reading today and if it can't be called for Third Reading today by the joint rules of the General Assembly, the Bill is dead. So I think we would be engaging in a useless act."

Shea: "Why is that, Mr. Schlickman, that it couldn't be called today?"

Schlickman: "I cited, Mr. Speaker, the ruling, consistent ruling of the permanent speaker."

Shea: "That's on House Bills, sir. We went through that with Mr. Walsh one time on Senate Bills, that Senate Bills do not go through enrolling and engrossing but merely have the amendments stapled on to them and that they do not have to go through enrolling and engrossing and this is the last day for the calling of these Bills and I talked to the Speaker this morning and he said that that rule will be relaxed. That, his, you know his feeling, there



is no rule on that."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the purpose..."

Shea: "Mr. Walsh raised that very clearly, one day, and we found out there is no rule."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the purpose for the permanent speaker's ruling, as I understood it, was to give the membership ample opportunity like 24 hours in which to reflect upon the amendments in light of the context of the Bill. I thought it was a good ruling. I was very pleased by it. It made me happy that he was speaker and I should think that it would be proper to continue that ruling even though we are on the last day for the passage of Senate Bills in the House."

Shea: "Well, I don't know, Mr. Schlickman, but the amendments have been distributed, there's two minor amendments from what Mr. Kozubowski tells me. I understand there are no other amendments to be offered. What? Mr. Kozubowski, on the amendments."

Kozubowski: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House."

Shea: "No, wait. Now, hold on, would you please, just relax, the Bill is still on Third Reading, Mr. Collins asked about the amendments, I have no idea and I asked Mr. Kozubowski to explain to Mr. Collins about the amendments. You asked the numbers on the amendments. I don't know. He's going to explain the numbers."

Kozubowski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there are three House Amendments. Amendment #1 and 2 will be offered and Amendment #3 will be tabled."

Shea: "Mr. Kozubowski, why don't I take this out of the record and you go over and see Mr. Collins and Mr. Schlickman and get it straightened out. On the order of House Bills Second Reading or Third Reading appeared House Bill 14. Is Mr. Marovitz here? Senate Bill 14, Mr. Marovitz. Senate Bill 37, Mr. Sevcik. Now turn Mr. Schlickman on and read the rule, Mr. Schlickman."



Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, because of the previous motion I was detracted from my research of the rules and I have not found that rule but you know full well, Mr. Speaker, there is a rule that does prohibit..."

Shea: "I know the rule, Mr. Schlickman, and there is no rule to prohibit me from calling them the way that I am."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, there is a rule..."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Schlickman, I have asked you if you could point it out to me, sir?"

Schlickman: "I was distracted earlier because of the previous motion."

Shea: "Mr. Stone on a point of order."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is out of order. I would rather get on with the business than listen to him drone on about things when you are correct in your ruling."

Shea: "House Bill, or Senate Bill 241. Do you want to call that, Mr. Kornowicz?"

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 241, a Bill for an Act in relation to transportation of law enforcement officers by metropolitan transit authority, Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kornowicz on 241 but before we get there sir, Mr. Duff, do you still have a question? I see your light flashing."

Duff: "No, Mr. Speaker, I don't."

Shea: "Ms. Geo-Karis shut hers off. Mr. Kornowicz on Senate Bill 241."

Kornowicz: "Would you read off the amendment there, Clerk?"

Shea: "Third Reading, sir. On final passage stage."

Kornowicz: "It amends the Metropolitan Transit Authority Act and the Regional Transportation Authority Act and requires that the CTA and RTA to provide free transportation for law enforcement officers. I move for adoption."

Shea: "The question is, shall this Bill pass and on the question, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members of the House. I suspect the most controversial aspect of the Bill will be



the Amendment which was added yesterday and I would like to direct my remarks to that. I support the Gentleman's effort to prevent nominations from being held hostage. I think the Bill with the Amendment is a good Bill. I think the Amendment is even-handed. It applies to both nominating authorities and it applies to both approving authorities equally. I don't approve of..ah...holding things hostage, whether it's in the Legislature or whether it's executive nominations and I would urge an 'aye' vote on the Bill."

Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, are you on rules or the Bill?"

Schlickman: "We are on rules and I would register for the record an objection to the calling of the Bill at this time and will get to that rule but at this time, would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Shea: "He indicates he will, Sir."

Schlickman: "Is it your intent, as the Sponsor of House Amendment #1, which is the second half of this Bill, is it your intent that that Amendment and that second half of the Bill, have application to pending appointments whether they be by the Mayor or by the Governor?"

Kornowicz: "No. No."

Schlickman: "In other words, it is your intent that the application of this Bill be prospective in nature and relate only to future appointments."

Kornowicz: "Present and future appointments, that's right."

Schlickman: "When you say present, are you referring to pending?"

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz, on a Point of Order."

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the man who is asking the questions knows that the Bill cannot become effective until signed into law and anything that happens before that, that you can't make it retroactive. Who's he kidding?"

Shea: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 241 pass. Now, Mr.



LaFleur, you want to get in this or..."

LaFleur: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Sponsor a question is he would yield."

Shea: "He indicates he will, sir."

LaFleur: "In your explanation of the Bill, if I understood you right, it was brief but you did say that law enforcement officers could ride free on CTA and RTA, is that correct?"

Kornowicz: "That's right."

LaFleur: "What is the RTA?"

Kornowicz: "Now this is a serious problem, and I think, I mean the gentleman is asking a, he is out of order, I think."

LaFleur: "Well, I would like a definition of what the RTA is if they are going to give free rides."

Kornowicz: "It's Regional Transportation Authority."

LaFleur: "Yes, but do they have any lines or buses or trains that free rides can be granted on?"

Kornowicz: "Yes."

LaFleur: "What are they? Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I would like to, like to address myself to the Bill if I could."

Shea: "Proceed, sir."

LaFleur: "It seems to me that this might have been put together in haste and I don't really understand what the purpose of it is but I see a serious deficiency in this Bill in trying to define two things, both the law enforcement officers because we cover broad areas in this and also the CTA and the RTA. Now as an entity, I imagine the CTA could be defined and what it consists of both in operating equipment and lines. But it seems to be a serious deficiency in this Bill of describing what the RTA is and I would submit to the legislature that possibly the RTA has no lines, has no operating equipment and so the description of this and the definition of this, being lacking in this definition, I would urge a 'no' vote on this."



Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Epton on the question."

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

Shea: "The question is, shall the main question be put. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'nay', the 'ayes' have it and the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kornowicz to close."

Kornowicz: "This is a, a people's amendment and Bill and I move for the adoption of the, of the...uh...Bill."

Shea: "The question is shall Senate Bill 241 pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. The gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote 'yes' on this amendment because the Sponsor is a nice guy but the time is going to come when I am not going to vote 'yes' on any Bill that the Cook county organization wants unless they reciprocate by doing something, by getting the State Property Tax Commission Bill out of the Senate. There is no reason that other Bill should not be out of the Senate. It does not affect Cook county one bit."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 92 'ayes', 26 'nays' and the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, I don't think this Bill was debated very well, Mr. Speaker, and I would ask for a verification of the Roll Call or else more discussion on it."

Shea: "All right, the gentleman wants a verification of the Roll Call. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kornowicz, requests a poll of the absentees. Call the absentees. Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I have been trying to explain my vote for some time and in turn I have been seeking recognition, I don't know, maybe it was an oversight, but may I continue sir?"

Shea: "Go ahead and explain your vote."



Lechowicz: "And I would hope that you would open up the switches as well."

Shea: "All right, I'll open up the switches and if somebody wants to explain their vote, proceed. Dump this Roll Call and take a new one. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay' and the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz to explain his vote."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, really Senate Bill 241 is a good Bill as Representative Lundy pointed out. It provides two functions. One, it provides free transportation to the law enforcement agencies within the six county metropolitan area. As you know, the CTA presently has...uh...this provision incorporated with it, within it, and what we are doing is including the RTA region as well. To answer Representative Leo LaFleur's inquiry, there is a coordinated effort between the CTA and the suburban bus lines providing transportation within this metropolitan area. I would hope that the second part of the Bill, which many people, in fact it was adopted unanimously here yesterday stating that the governor and the mayor have, with a 15 day period if necessary to either approve or disapprove the nomination. It's a good Bill, deserves your support and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The gentleman from Cook, or the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh to explain his vote." Do you want to explain your vote, Mr. Walsh?"

Walsh: "I yield at the present time to Mr. Schlickman."

Shea: "You can't yield under the rules. Have all voted who wish? The gentleman from Dupage, Mr. LaFleur."

LaFleur: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that there is much confusion over this here and it seems like in the rush here of trying to do something we are doing the wrong thing and I would ask that the people here on the floor that are casting a 'yes' vote on this to look at this very carefully



and to consider it very carefully. I believe it's an error, I believe it's a mistake and I believe that we are going to not want this type of legislation."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? The gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham to explain his vote."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want none to think that I've taken leave of my senses for being a downstater who goes to Chicago every two or three years to give free rides on the people's carriage system to the law enforcement officials but the idea is very good. If you believe in law and order you should be voting for this particular Bill. The key point of it is is that they must be in uniform or have some means of identification. The crime rate on the public transit system is such that there needs to be some protection of the public or sensible people will quit riding. I remember when Senator Chew first advocated this idea and he is maligned much by the press but he has a very good, he has a very good suggestion. I urge that all of you vote 'aye'. It doesn't make any difference because we are going to soon subsidize the CTA to such an extent that all rides will be free anyhow so it's much ado about nothing. We should get enough green lights here that we will have no wasted time on any verification."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 111 'ayes', 37 'nays', 8 members voting 'present' and Senate Bill 241 is passed. On the order of Senate Bills Third Reading, on the order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 296."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 296."

Shea: "All right, Mr. Schlickman, what rule do you refer to?"

Schlickman: "After having rammed that Bill through, I am appreciative of your acknowledging me, Mr. Speaker. You asked earlier, when you went to the order of Third Reading Senate Bills and called Senate Bill 14 or 37 I suggested to you that the rule, rules of the House require that when



returning to an order of business, you resume where we left off. Now Rule 37 entitled Calling of Bills, Subsection A states that the point at which an order of business is left shall be at the point at which business is resumed when the House returns to that order of business."

Shea: "That is correct, sir, but when you start an order of business for the day, the Speaker has his choice of starting at the first Bill or at the point that they left on the last day."

Schlickman: "May I ask you to cite that rule, Mr. Speaker?"

Shea: "That's the way that the chair interprets the rule, sir. The gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, members of the House, if we are going to get the business done that we have to get done today, you are going to have to give the speaker a little leeway to accommodate the members. Now many times the speaker has been up there trying to get some business done and there wasn't 15 people out here and he has to figure out something in order to get an order of business so we can accomplish something. Now as the speaker is not capricious and moving around to accommodate people, I think you ought to let him alone."

Shea: "Senate Bill 296."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 296, a Bill for an Act to amend..."

Shea: "Do you want to take that out of the record? Senate Bill 345, Mr. Taylor. Do you want to call that Bill? Take that out of the record. Senate Bill 348, Mr. Beaupre. Take the out of the record. Senate Bill 347, Mr. Kosinski."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 347, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense for the local government law enforcement officers training board, Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "Can we have some order, please? Would the members please be in their seats?"

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the Bill for the ordinary and contingent expenses



of the Local Government Law Enforcement Officers Training Board and I ask for its passage."

Shea: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 347 pass? 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 128 'ayes', no 'nays', one Member voting 'present' and Senate Bill 347 is passed. On the order of Senate Bills, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 452, Mr. Capparelli. ... Take that Bill out of the record. On the order of Senate Bills, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 471, do you want that out, Mr. Keller? On the order of Senate Bills, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 632, is Mr. Byers on the floor?"



Shea: "On the order of Senate Bills, Third Reading appears Senate Bill 635. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. E.M. Barnes."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 635. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary contingent expenses of the Department of Children and Family Services. Third Reading of the Bill."

Barnes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is the ordinary and contingent expense for the Department of Children and Family Services. The appropriation..... the appropriated request for this Bill was a sum total of ah.... I'll have it in just a second, please. The sum total of \$113,630,000. It has been amended both in the House and in the Senate upward to a total of approximately \$120,598,425. I would move for the adoption of Senate Bill 635."

Shea: "The question is shall Senate Bill 635 pass. On the question, the gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers."

Borchers: "Now, Mr. Chairman, and fellow Members of the House, I'm going to vote 'no', but I do not advocate that you do this. I'm going to vote 'no' because of the investigations that I've been making in the last two or three years. There is good and there is bad. I'm voting 'no' because of the bad that I know of to alert them that many of the bureaucracy involved here do not actually take the care and the investigations that they should in relation to children. I'm not going to mention Johnny Lindquist anymore because ah... in relation to going into that deal because I know that you all know it. I know of a situation in my community where I had to fight and I had to go to unusual efforts to get a father his children back, one of them who the stepfather had taken the little boy of six with his bare bottom and set him in a skillet ah... a boiling ah... of boiling grease. The child is still in very ah... not real good condition. He killed the little eight year old girl and buried her in the backyard. My complaint here was after this happened and how the Department of Children and Family Services used and took care of the children that ah... before I was able to help get them to the father. It is these kind of things that disturb me. It is a fact that the little Feece boy,



for example, from another area of my county, which a number of the people here, like Representative Tipsword, Representative Hirschfeld, Representative Alsup, who is no longer with us, knew about and helped aid in trying to correct that situation. It's just a protest vote because I think that we should alert them and all of us should show to them or ah... someone should say to them, 'Be more careful with our children.' I might point out to you people in Cook County what happened up there in Chicago ah... about a year ago. So I'm going to vote 'no' and I hope a few more will join me, but not enough to defeat this Bill because we have to support it. We want them to continue. We just want them to know that we are watching them and for God's sake help our children."

Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson."

Anderson: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Shea: "He indicates that he will."

Anderson: "Gene, is it true that there is \$1,000,000 in this budget that the Director doesn't want in there?"

Barnes: "Yes, Representative Anderson, but let me clarify that. That was an amendment that was put on in the Senate for additional ah... daycare and after care slots which also included an additional 5% cost of living, which comes to about \$1,500,000. As you well know, we discussed that in the Appropriations Division II Committee. The Director did not approve of it, but that amendment was ah... I myself attempted to reduce the amount of that amendment, but the Committee did not agree with it so yes, it is still in there, but it is not due to the fault of the Director. It was inserted as the wishes of the Senate and the Senate Committee and also the House Appropriations Committee."

Anderson: "Is it true that you have agreed to try and work in conference to reduce this budget by \$1,000,000 if it goes there?"

Barnes: "If it goes to Conference Committee, I have agreed and I will work in conference with both the Senate and the House staff to try and keep this ah... bring this budget and keep it within line and reason."



Anderson: "To reduce that million dollars?"

Barnes: "I will attempt to do so."

Anderson: "Thank you, Sir."

Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for one question?"

Shea: "He indicates that he will, Sir."

Brinkmeier: "Gene, is there anything in here to increase the allowance for foster homes for the children to have?"

Barnes: "Yes, it is. The one ah... one really good aspect about this Bill that the Director had proposed in their original budget and working in consort with the Senate Committee will increase ah... for the first time, porportionately, the amount foster parents will get on a sliding scale for kids and within their charge. Here before, the allowance for foster kids ah... foster parents kids had been very low. Now this will not bring it up to par, as far as I'm concerned, but it will bring it a long way. They will receive an increase of over 50% in this budget."

Brinkmeier: "Thank you, very much."

Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, ah... I don't want to delay the passage of this Bill, but I feel that ah... a previous gentleman questioned the extra \$1,000,000 put in here by the Senate. This department is just beginning to see the light. This department has a long way to go yet. One of its biggest problems has been its consistent administrative refusal to up the anti to take care of state wards. I regret very much that it is the General Assembly who has to express their will in giving them enough money to pay 100% of the costs to contract a ah... private agencies and public agencies alike, to take care of kids, but please don't get hung-up in a Senate \$1,000,000 and I would pray that the Sponsor of this Bill would leave his hands off that amendment, if it goes to Conference. Please understand that we're just beginning to get a Department of Children and Family



Services. It has been in the wilderness for three years and we have a budget here that will allow them to do the job and do it well and will put their feet to the fire this time next year, should they fail. I move passage of this Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Moultrie, Mr. Stone."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, I move the Previous Question."

Shea: "The question is, shall the main question be put? All in favor will say 'aye' and those opposed 'nay' and the 'ayes' have it and Mr. Barnes to close."

Barnes: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would only say in closing that this Department has come a long way under the new Director. She should be commended. One of the unanimities in Committee was the hard work that she put into the turning around of a Department that had serious problems less than eighteen months ago and I would move for the approval of this Appropriation."

Shea: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye' and those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the Roll Call. On this question there are 142 'ayes' and 3 'nays' and 4 Members voting 'present' and Senate Bill 635 is declared passed."



Shea: "On the order of Senate Bills, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 632, the Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 632, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense for the Bureau of the Budget, Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers."

Byers: "This is the....ah....Mr. Speaker, this is the annual budget for the Illinois Economical and Fiscal Commission. It has the 6% Amendment on it, and I've asked for the approval of this budget."

Shea: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 632 pass? On the question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "You got the wrong budget, this is for the Bureau of the Budget. Their annual appropriation."

Shea: "Strike that explanation and we've got a new one."

Byers: "I've got two budgets and I did get them mixed up. This is the budget for the Bureau of the Budget and ...ah...this is the annual appropriation for that... This has ...ah...three Amendments on it...ah...one that provides for summer jobs....one for a home winterization program...and another Amendment for ...ah...the...ah...expenses of the Bureau of the Budget this next year and I would ask the approval of this budget."

Shea: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? On the question the Lady from ...ah...Effingham, Miss Keller.....We'll let your daughter explain it."

Keller: "OK.....I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question....ah. Will he yield?"

Byers: "Yes."

Keller: "Ah.....How much of an increase...ah....Harold...ah... is thisthis year for the deal...the..."

Byers: "This budget, Mr. Keller..."

Shea: "Mr. Byers, excuse me for a minute.....This is final passage state on budget items, would the Members please be in their seats and could we have some order in the Chamber..."



please?"

Byers: "This budget....."

Shea: "Would the Members.....NO, Mr. Byers, wait a minute.

We'll have some order. Will the Members please be in their seats?We have a little order...please? Allright, now proceed, Mr. Byers."

Byers: "Mr. Keller, this budget ...ah...contains a total appropriation of \$25,000,000. The...ah..

Keller: "Would you get closer to the mike?"

Shea: "Mr. Byers, why don't you pull the mike down a little bit?"

Byers: "With the General Revenue Fund....appropriating \$3,000,000 for that....\$22,000,000 of this is Federal funds."

Keller: "Wait a minute....wait a minute....now what I'd like... what I want to know is how...how much increase over last year's budget...is it?"

Byers: "There is about a.....a.....5% increase over last year's budget."

Keller: "I thinkif you'll look at it... that it is more than 5% and what Federal funds does BOB have?"

Byers: "Well, they have.....for example there is \$2,000,000 in this program for summer jobs for ...ah...boys and girls that are between the ages of 14 and 21 from low income ...ah... families of \$5,000 or less, is for example part of the budget.....of the \$2,000,000."

Keller: "Well, now...ah...this particular money that is in this budget ...ah...is that...is that....I noticed the budget is \$25,000,000 this year, is that right."

Byers: "Right."

Keller: "And I can remember back when the Bureau of the Budget was formed it was only a couple million dollars....so..... what are we....what are we using all this for? I mean, Governor Walker has this austerity program and ...ah...and from \$2,000,000 to \$25,000,000 I'd like for you to explain it."



Byers: "Well,...ah... a lot of this money is...\$22,000,000 of this is Federal tax money that...that's coming back to the State of Illinois and this money is being used for various programs ...for unemployment programs...ah... there is...ah ...a lot of this money is going to the City of Chicago for their.... Summer Youth Program...ah..."

Keller: "What does...what does...what does all this type of... money doing in the Bureau of the Budget?"

Byers: "It has to...this money has to be administered by the ...ah...the Governor's Office....and that's the reason that it is in there....the Bureau of the Budget."

Keller: "Well, shouldn't it be somewhere else....other than in the Bureau of the Budget?"

Byers: "Well, I just work here and I don't know where else it could beah...placed to be distributed."

Keller: "Well, that'sthat's ...that's just what I was.... really ...just wanting pointed out...is the fact that...ah. maybe that the increase wasn't being ...ah..."

Shea: "Excuse me....Mr. Craig....please.....Proceed, Sir.....The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 632, makes the appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Bureau of the Budget. In response to Representative Keller's inquiryah...the total overall increase out of the General Revenue Funds is \$50,000.....\$50,700...to be exact...over fiscal '75 and as it is in the Bill presently...basically... to break down the:...Personal Services is \$1,179,000; ... Retirement \$79,000; Social Security \$57,000; Contractual \$106,000; Travel \$51,000; Commodities \$8,000; Printing \$33,000; Equipment \$8,000; ED...Electronic Data Processing \$25,000; Telecommunications \$87,000; We have approximately \$300,000 in various Bond Funds and the rest of the money is Federal Funds, as Representative Byers pointed out. This Budget has been fairly reviewed by the Appropriations Com-



mittee and we suggest an 'aye' vote."

Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Shea: "He indicates he will, Sir."

Taylor: "Representative Byers, could tell me what the Amendment does on this Bill?"

Byers: "Yes, Mr. Taylor....there are three Amendments. Amendment #1 provides for ...ah...summer job program/^{for}the rural areas of the State of Illinois. It provides for...between 4,000 and 5,000 jobs and this Bill was signed into law last week on June 16th by President Ford. Amendment #2 provides for...ah...the Department of Personnel for a Skill Placement Program for the evaluation and the program development in the manpower areas of public service employment. Amendment #3 is for a Home Winterization Program for low income families.....\$212,000 ...this is another Bill that was just signed into law since the Senate handled this Bill....and that's what the three Amendments do...Representative Taylor."

Taylor: "The...the Governors Action Office is not in in control of...ah....the jobs there...are they?"

Byers: "No, Sir...Mr. Taylor."

Taylor: "Alright Sir, thank you."

Shea: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'nay'. It takes 89 votes, this is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. ...ley, 'aye'. On this question there are 153 'ayes', one 'nay', 3 Members voting 'present', Senate Bill 632 is passed. On the order of Concurrences, appears House Bill 1881. House Bill 1881, the Gentleman from Grundy, the Minority Leader."

Washburn: "Thank you....ah...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to non-concur in Senate Amendments 2 & 3 to House Bill 1881.Non-concur."



Shea: "The question is, shall the House non-concur in Senate AmendmentsHouse Bill 1881. All those in favor will say 'aye', those opposed 'nay', the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment.....and the House non-concurs with Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 1881. On the order of Concurrences appears House Bill 1882 and on that question ...the Minority Leader, Mr. Grun....from Grundy, ..."

Washburn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1882."

Shea: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1882? On the question, this is final action, all those in favor will vote 'yes', those opposed will vote 'nay'. This takes 89 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 151 'ayes', and no 'nays', two Members voting 'present' and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1882. House Bills, Third Reading,I'll be back to your Senate Bills Dolly....I'm....she hasn't got my shoes yet tho....On the order of House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 835, the Gentleman from Will, Mr. VanDuyne, do you want to call that Bill or do you want it out of the record, Sir? 835."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 835, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Illinois Fire Protection Personnel Standards and Education Commission, Third Reading of the Bill."

VanDuyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker...ah...Members of the House. This is the Fire Commission....ah...budget that was established by the 77th General Assembly for the purpose of promoting and upgrading the education of firemen throughout the State of Illinois. This is their budget and I don't know of any fire district or fire chief in the State who doesn't agree that this is a very necessary and desirable concept and without belaboring it any further I will just ask for a



favorable vote."

Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 835 pass? On the question, the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan. Is he here on the floor? Mr. Totten..... The question is shall House Bill 835 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. This is final action, it takes 89 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 146 'ayes', one 'nay', one 'present' and House Bill 835, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of House Bills, Third Reading, appears House Bill 1947."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 1947, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Transportation, Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House could we also hear 1948.....along with it?"

Shea: "Does.....is there objection to hearing 1948? Is there objection? There is objection. On 1947....proceed, Sir."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1947, is the ordinary and contingent expensesDepartment of Transportation, it was debated fully....we debated some 75 Amendments...ah...36 of which were adopted and I'd urge for its passage."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves that the House pass House Bill 1947. On that question, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Shea: "He indicates he will, Sir."

Lechowicz: "Could you give us the total appropriation in this Bill at the present time, as Amended?"

Shea: "The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Ah...I can't give you exactly...ah...Mr. 'D' can



.....plane it down, but I think it's \$2,476,000."

Lechowicz: "I think you're wrong. Do you want to take it out of the record?"

McClain: "\$2,476,000,000."

Lechowicz: "How much was it....as it was introduced?"

McClain: "\$2,196,000,000, we increased it on the Amendment someah...ah...\$96,000,000 in Special Interest Legislation."

Lechowicz: "Well, could you answer me this...is..is there .. enough money in the Road Fund in order to accomplish the task, as Amended?"

McClain: "You mean for the entire budget? No, Sir, as you know some of it com.....some of the monies come from General Revenue and some come from...ah...from Federal monies and ...ah...the whole budget is not from the Road Fund."

Lechowicz: "As the Bill is presently in the Amended version, is there enough money in the Road Fund to accomplish this task?"

McClain: "You mean to build every....every road construction project that was placed on the Bill in Amendments that we adopted yesterday or the day before?"

Lechowicz: "That you concurred with, yes."

McClain: "No, Sir."

Lechowicz: "May I ask you why you concurred then?"

McClain: "I think you know fully well...ah...Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "No, I'm sorry, I don't or else I wouldn't be asking the question."

McClain: "Well, I'm not goin' to answer you."

Lechowicz: "You are refusing to answer the question?...Would you mind taking this Bill out of the record until we can actually get the facts and figures that are involved."

McClain: "No, Sir, I would ask for a Roll Call."

Lechowicz: "Thank you for your courtesy."

Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Union, Mr. Choate."

Choate: "I would like to ask Mr. Totten the question that



that Representative Lechowicz asked Mr. McClain because he's the one that made the motion to have a blanket adoption of all of these Amendments and see if he knows."

Shea: "Well that's out of order but we'll see if we can get leave of the House. Does the Gentleman have leave? Mr. Totten, do you want to answer that, Sir?"

Totten: "Well, I'll try and answer it this way Mr. Speaker, I did make the motion to consider them all together but I didn't suggest that everybody vote 'yes' on them in fact I voted 'no' on them...and I would have hoped that everybody else would so we could defeat 'em."

Choate: "Well, you seemed to be quite involved and the agreement that was made on various aspects of this budget, Mr. Totten and I thought maybe you was more knowledgeable than ...than...some other peoples are maybe because...ah...having the input that you didreaching the agreements that you reached ...maybe you would understand how much is.... totally included in the Road Fund and whether it could afford toah....ah...finance all of these projects under your motion?"

Totten: "As I indicated, my motion was to consider 'em in one Roll Call and no way suggested that anybody vote 'yes', I would have hoped that they would have voted 'no' because as indicated there is a problem."

Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen...ah... could I have permission to...ah...ask the Sponsor a few questions?"

Shea: "He indicates he will yield, Sir."

Neff: "Thank you. Ah....Mike, can you tell how much...now in this Bill ...ah...as it presently stands we have the \$200,000,000 in Series 'A' Bonds. Is that right?"

McClain: "Yes, Sir."

Neff: "Yea....Now, can you tell me how much money Illinois



would loose in Federal funds if we did not appropriate the \$200,000,000 in these Bonds?"

McClain: ".....Lined out about \$225,000,000 worth of projects ...ah...if we were not able to receive the \$200,000,000 appropriation."

Neff: "Ah....but Mike...ah...as I've tried to study this pretty thorough and study the whole budget and particularly this bond issue, I personally don't think...as far as the Federal Funds are concerned that we would loose anything....Ah.. I guess I don't understand you when you say ...ah...that these would be cut out because we don't have to have matching to get these Federal Funds, do we?"

McClain: "Well, Mr. Neff, I ...I tried to explain that when we adopted Amendment #41. I thought I did...ah...an acceptable jobthe...what I tried to stress with the....as we addressed ourselves to Amendment #41 I tried to stress hard that the purpose of the \$200,000,000 appropriation was so that we could pay out monies in order....for the contract ...in order to get the reimbursement within two weeks..... and I also stated as a practical matter that...ah...any Department of Transportation personnel who advised the Governor to go ...ah...with the entire ..Road program as originally announced....considering that we did receive this \$200,000,000 appropriationwithout this \$200,000,000 should be...should be fired...ah..because you just can't.... without the \$200,000,000 you'd be bankrupting the Road Fund for sure."

Neff: "In other words ...ah...you do admit that you don't need the money to get the ...bo...the..ah..Government...the ..ah Federal Government money but you need it otherwise."

McClain: "Sir...I tried to bring out two points ..ah...I guess I didn't say it very clearly again. The first point is ... you need money in the Road Fund to pay out in order to receive the Federal reimbursement. That's point number one. Point number two is that if you did not have..if you did the



entire road program without this appropriation going into the Road Fund, you would be assured of bankrupting the Road Fund. Those are the two reasons, Mr. Neff."

Neff: "Well, thanks for the answer, Mike, but as I still say, you don't have to have this to get the federal money and that's what I wanted to get out of you. Another thing, despite the fact that the Transportation Committee has held dozens of meetings this spring, many related to the accelerated program and so forth, no one ever informed any of the members of this Committee of any additional dollars that we would have a chance to save. And I wonder if anybody's told you why we weren't informed of this, during...all of these hearings and when we discussed the accelerated program which we discussed on several different meetings."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Neff. I don't, I fully understand what you are saying. It's my own personal belief and I think Benny Garmisa will endorse what I am saying, it's my full belief that I believe any appropriation budget ought to first go through the Substantive Committee. I think the transportation budget always should go through your and Sparky's Transportation Committee first before it ever reaches the Appropriations Committee. That's where the experts are in the area of transportation and then go to Ted Lechowicz's and Don Totten's committee on, in the appropriation matters. I fully agree with you there, sir."

Neff: "Yes, well, first point I am speaking of and I appreciate that, Mike but what I am speaking of, when we were discussing the accelerated program which we did go into in depth in committee, why didn't the Department of Transportation inform us of this money that was going to be available and I'm not putting you on the spot on this, Mike, you may have not been told this, but the Department should have knew."

McClain: "O.K., I understand what you are saying now, sir."



The impounded monies, as I recall, were released by President Ford in late winter. House Resolution 3786 then was introduced to help the 15 states who did not have road funds matching as required. In other words, House Resolution 3786 released those 15 states from the matching that is usually required until January 1, 1977. Until that time, it passed through the Congress and it finally was signed into law June 4, Mr. Neff and June 4 wasn't very long ago. I would probably say that I would agree that the Department ought to have a closer relationship with the Transportation Committee but that would be the only reason I could give you, sir."

Neff: "Yes, well thank you, and as I say I am not trying to put you on the spot on this but I think the Department did know about these funds possibly becoming available and we were never informed. One other question, Mike. Now we have a copy, most all of us have, and I have a copy laying here of the proposed road program with notations on the projects that DOT says will be wiped out if the legislature fails to provide this \$200,000,000 in additional aid bonds. Now how did the Department select these projects on the list of those who says it will be killed? What was the system they used on going through this book and putting the little yellow lines through certain projects? They surely have some kind of a system and I hope they have informed you of just how they come about doing this."

McClain: "I can probably give you a few reasons. I have told the Department not to show up this morning so I can give you two reasons that I can recall."

Shea: "Mr. McClain, would you wait a minute, sir? Could we have some order and would the members please be in their seats? Could we have some order and would the members please be in their seats? I think that a \$2,000,000,000 budget, a \$2,000,000,000 budget, the members ought to at least listen. Proceed Mr. Neff and Mr. McClain."

McClain: "I'm sorry, I lost the trend of thought, there, Mr.



Neff. Would you mind repeating it, please?"

Neff: "Mike, in regard to this wiping out of the little books that we've all been given and the yellow drawn through certain projects and what I was trying to get at is how we, the Department selected these particular projects? What kind of a system did they use to go about picking out? Did they go through there and just make sure they picked out some in every district to get the legislators to vote for this \$200,000 bond issue or just what?"

McClain: "Oh, no, Mr. Neff, I'm sure they wouldn't do that. I tried to state in the enclosed letter to you when you received that black book dated June 23 and I will read from the second paragraph on that, in that letter. I said that cuts sent on the attachment by GOP's Bureau of Programming were not arrived at arbitrarily. They are based on preserving a maximum amount of road work while decreasing state outlays by amounts required to maintain the solvency of the Road Fund without the \$200,000,000 in Series A bonds requested by the Department and then it goes further on explaining the effect on roads and bridge construction and safety improvement. As an example, I stated in that paragraph because if the \$200,000,000 had not been adopted which was adopted by our body, the entire \$30,000,000 state only road, highway program would have to be entirely eliminated."

Neff: "Well, Mike, you are not telling me how they come to this here, to pick these, go to each district and pick these certain roads and possibly they haven't informed you of that and so I won't question you any further on that."

McClain: "I'm sure that they tried to be as fair as they could considering the loss in revenue, Mr. Neff."

Neff: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, may I speak on the Bill?"

Shea: "Proceed, Mr. Neff. The Republican spokesman on the Transportation Committee, proceed sir."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now that we have had this brought out here, just a few questions, I could bring up



many more and I am particularly talking about the \$200,000,000 bond issue. Now, I think it's been pretty well come out here that this isn't needed to get the federal money, the approximate \$340,000,000 as I recall it. Now this money will probably be used as a working capital, a working fund and it probably be used as that temporarily. But let's all keep in mind that when this money comes back, federal money comes back it comes into the general revenue and what I think is happening here is that the, when the money comes back there will be \$200,000,000 that won't be used on roads but it will be listed in the general revenue to help the governor and his people to increase the budget of the general revenue. I think this is a, without a question, is what is intended here. I think this Bill should be voted down. Now let's don't get excited. I've seen it here before when this budget was held over for even a couple or three days and to say well, we've got to pass it, we've got to get it over to Senate, we've got to have the money, well, they're going to get the money, all right. But I think that we all should consider what we're doing here on this \$200,000,000. We're taxing for 20 years bond issue that the people are going to be paying for, the future generation are going to be paying for. Money that's going to be used today and tomorrow and not in the future. This is the wrong way of doing it. I don't think anybody would run a business like this and therefore I think we should vote 'no' on this entire budget and try to get this straightened out on the \$200,000,000 bond issue."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman would yield to a question or two?"

Shea: "He indicates he will, sir."

Mann: "Representative McClain, what would be the underwriting cost for the \$200,000,000 bond issue if you know?"

McClain: "The interest of the, excuse me, Representative Mann?"



Mann: "Yes, sir."

McClain: "The interest on the \$200,000,000 is 5.5%. I would like to state that maybe again, I'm not stating myself very ...clearly but the \$200,000,000 appropriation is going into the road fund and not into the general revenue fund. So it's not going for what Mr. Neff might have been led to believe."

Mann: "Well, my question sir, although I was happy to have that information, was what would the underwriting cost be? Not the interest cost."

McClain: "Mr. Mann, I really don't have that information on the tip of my, I'll be happy to get it to you this afternoon."

Mann: "All right, could you tell me this? How much money is currently in the road fund?"

McClain: "Currently?"

Mann: "Yes, sir."

McClain: "I believe we have on hand balance of \$97.9 million."

Mann: "89,000,000?"

McClain: "\$97.9 million projected for the end of this fiscal year."

Mann: "I see. And this additional money would go into that road fund, is that correct?"

McClain: "That is if it's the rule of the General Assembly."

Mann: "All right, can you tell me this? With regard to the expenditure of this \$200,000,000 is it discretionary with regard to the Director of the Department or is it pinpointed for particular projects?"

McClain: "It is for projects, Representative Mann. I would like to say that there were some feelings from members in the General Assembly and from myself and especially Representative Kane that we're concerned that monies could be spent, since it is road fund, also spent for salary, that I would be more than happy to either co-sponsor a Bill that Representative Kane or others to say that these monies or the federal reimbursement, when we receive the



federal reimbursement back, shall be only expended for road projects and not for salaries or operations."

Shea: "Thank you very much. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, members of the House, I arise in joining with the chairman of the Republican Conference and the minority spokesman on the House Transportation Committee in opposition to this Bill and to solicit your 'no' vote. This Bill provides for a \$200,000,000 bond obligation that in my opinion is unnecessary, if not fiscally irresponsible and the total appropriations in this Bill is of such a magnitude that it will result in a bankruptcy in the road fund and inevitably require an increase in the state gas tax. And for those reasons I urge a 'no' vote."

Shea: "The gentleman from Kane, Mr. Friedland."

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

Shea: "The question is, shall the main question be put. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'nay', in the opinion of the Chair, the question does not have the requisite 2/3 vote. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz, on a parliamentary inquiry."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, on a point of parliamentary inquiry, with the adoption of Amendment #41 and I would hope that the Clerk has the amended Bill."

Shea: "I have the enrolled and engrossed copy before me, sir."

Lechowicz: "Could you tell me under Section 24.1, there reads the following named sum or so much thereof may be necessary to be appropriated from the transportation bond Series A bond to the Department of Transportation for federally assisted construction, reconstruction, extension and improvement of highways. Now according to the Bond Authorization Act, it reads the same except for instead of the transportation for federally assisted construction, reconstruction, extension and improvement it should be



state highways. And Mr. Speaker, on a point of parliamentary inquiry, I'm asking if this Bill, as amended, is in it's proper form, especially when you are asking for \$200,000,000 when it does not comply with the Bond Authorization Act."

Shea: "Mr. Lechowicz, that question was raised on Second Reading which was the proper time to raise it, by many members. The Gentleman that was then Speaker held that that Bill, or that amendment, was germane and the question, the question you raise was also raised at that time by one of the members from the floor and the then Speaker in the chair ruled that the amendment was technically correct and Sir, on Third Reading I don't think it can be raised again and if there is some question about the wording of that and the Gentleman made a mistake, perhaps that will be raised in a court and that will take much longer to litigate than before we will be back here next session."

Lechowicz: "I just wanted to put it on the record one more time, Mr. Speaker. Thank you."

Shea: "You are raising which point, Sir? The point that in Amendment #24 the word before highways in the bond act is state and which is a limiting aspect of that bond act and it is not in this Bill to limit it to use of State roads only."

Lechowicz: "That is correct, Mr. Speaker, except that was Amendment #41."

Shea: "All right. But that's the technical point you want to raise for the record and it will be so noted sir."

Lechowicz: "Yes, sir."

Shea: "On the Bill, is there any further discussion? The gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Would the sponsor yield to a question or two?"

Shea: "He indicates he will, sir."

Skinner: "How much does this budget propose to spend beyond projected income?"

McClain: "Representative Skinner, would you mind explaining what you mean by projected income? Does that include...uh..."



all Federal monies and ...ah...and State Road Fund?"

Skinner: "I refer to Article 7, The Finance Act of State Constitution, it says 'pro...proposed expenditures shall not exceed funds estimated to be available for the fiscal year as shown in the budget' and I want to know if this Bill complies with that Constitutional Mandate? That is Section 2 of Article VIII, Paragraph A, last sentence,.... page 93 of the Handbook of Illinois Government if that happens to be what you have on your desk."

Shea: "What are you raising, Mr. Skinner?....I'm sorry I missed that....the Chair was distracted.....The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I think that question...is...is blatantly out of order....The...the Gentleman knows that the budget for the Department of Transportation as amended is somewhere in the neighborhood of \$2,000,000,000 to \$2,500,000,000 and the Gentleman knows full well that there is ...ex...estimated revenues for the State of Illinois for fiscal1976....surely exceeds \$2,500,000,000, so that question is out of order."

Shea: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, would you rephrase your question? ...Would the Ladies and Gentlemen please be in their seats? We are discussing aa..... \$2,000,000,000 bond....er....\$2,000,000,000 Road Fund and some of the Members cannot hear. Now Mr. Lechowicz, what's your point, Sir?"

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, just for the edification of everyone concerned, in House Bill 1947, as introduced, is \$1,194,110,600as amended is \$457,854,150 additional, so in House Bill 1947 alone it's \$1,651,964,750, so the.... the \$2,400,000,000 comes with the combination of 1947 and 1948, for the record."

Shea: "Allright. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like a ...ah...ah...to rise for a parliamentary inquiry. In pursuing Representative Lechowicz's



point earlier, with respect to the bonds, and since the purpose of the bonds has been changed from what the Series A Bonds were authorized previously, how many votes will it take to pass to pass this Bill?"

Shea: "89, Sir."

Walsh: "Well, pursuing that, Mr. Speaker.....Mr. Speaker....."

Shea: "Yes, Sir."

Walsh: "Did you research that?...Did that....did it occur to you that that question might come up.....and if it did, I wonder if you could explain what your thinking is?"

Shea: "Sir, the original Transportation A Bond Series, approved in 1971, was an appropriation of \$600,000,000 or an authorization of \$600,000,000 for Transportation Series A Bond Fund. As part of the CTA agreement or RTA agreement the authorization for that Bond Fund was increased from \$600,000,000 to \$800,000,000 that's authorized. It is the opinion of the Chair to raise the authorization requires 107 votes to appropriate from an authorized amount requires 89 votes."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, what.....what I'm suggesting to you is that the authorization has been changed and in effect it's a new or different authorization. That's all, and it would seem to me it would take 107 votes."

Shea: "Sir, the appropriation seeks to appropriate from the Transportation Bond Series A.....er....Transportation Series A Bond Fund an amount of \$200,000,000 of Transportation Series A Bonds. One of the speakers.....er one of the people from the floor....one of Members raised the other night that point, in debate, the then Speaker in the Chair said that.....that was a permissible appropriation within the terms of the Bond Actthe then person who asked the then Speaker that objected, the Speaker still ruled against him and Sir that is what I ambound by on Third Reading. Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain, to close."



McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1947 is the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Transportation Appropriation. It has now on it the largest road program in the State's history ...is \$791,000,000....ah....ah...appropriation for road programs throughout the State of Illinois. I would like to say there is a line item by every district throughout the State to show accountability to the General Assembly and that Amendment was co-authored by myself, the House Sponsor, and I would like to again state for the record thatah...for the \$200,000,000 appropriation from the Series A Bonds I quote from Chapman and Cutler a telegram dated June 23, 1975, which I believe again will clear up the pointit reads, 'In our opinion the authorization in Section 2 of Transportation Bond Act to issue Bonds for the acquisition, construction, reconstruction, extension...improvement of State Highways would include expenditure of proceeds of Transportation Bonds, Series A, for construction of Federally assisted highways.....and would not be limited to supplemental Freeway System. Preliminary engineering costs directly related to specific construction projects authorized under the Bond, could be paid from Bond proceeds. Chapman and Cutler', I again say that this ...clears up any cloud over the misgivings of ...of several of the Members. I again would like to say that I would be happy to co-author ..ah... any Bill which would say that on the Federal reimbursement those monies shall not be expended for personnel or operations and should only go for projects and I would urge your 'aye' vote."

Shea: "The question is, shall House Bill 1947 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'..... and the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I thought that I still had the floor.... I thought that I hadn't been interrupted by anything but



parliamentary questions, but since I am constrained to explaining my vote I would suggest to my fellow Members that the Constitution when it speaks of proposed expenditures not exceeding estimated funds speaks of the appropriation Bill....ah...We are....we have in this appropriation Bill more little goodies running up into the tens of millions if not hundreds of millions of dollars which cannot be financed out of any type of anticipated revenues let alone budgeted revenues as the Constitution says, enough to bankrupt the Road Fund several times over. This Department of Transportation Budget is a complete abdication of Legislative responsibility. In the first place there is \$100,000,000 too much in Bond money and we know that, in the second place on one Roll Call.....18 Amendments on a voice Roll Call we put on \$62,000,000 in expenditures and we're hoping that it'll get taken out in Conference Committee. Well you know how the Ethics Bill, the very strict Ethics Bill in Maryland got passed? Well the House passed the Bill because the Senate.....they knew the Senate was going to weaken it.... and then the Senate passed the Billin fact they strengthened it because they knew the Governor was going to veto it....and lo and behold the Governor didn't veto it, and it got signed.....ah....Representative Mann has asked an interesting question which has not been answered and that is.....it has to do with the underwriting of the Bonds not the interest on the Bonds....the underwriting of the Bonds.....who has it....who is going to get the goodies? To all who have been voting on every appropriation Bill that's come down the pike I would suggestyou only have three chances to make sure the total appropriation don't exceed the amount of revenue when they.....then your opponent adds up your record. One's the Education....the State Aid to Education Budget.....that's already passed. The second is the Public Aid Budget, some of us can vote against that without fear of retribution. This is the third



one, if you vote for this and the....and those other three,
^{are}
 you/going to have voted for more money than there is any
 chance in this God's earth is ever going to come into the
 State of Illinois Budget. To those worried about Constitu-
 tionality the broadening of authorization of Series A
 Transportation Bonds in the appropriation Bill is another
 reason...Chapman and Cutler is not God, more important they
 are not the Illinois Supreme Court. Another reason a final
 reason....if this Bill is passed enacted in its present form
 it's going to provide the precinct workers to renominate a
 Governor whose promises have consistently outstripped his...
 performance.....I ask you to join me in voting 'no'."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart, to explain his
 vote."

Hart: "Well, thank you very much Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and
 Gentlemen of the House. This \$200,000,000 Bond Issue that
 ...ah...was clearly explained by Representative Neff is
 money that this Legislature morally committed to some of
 its Members and to some of its former Members for use in
 the Supplemental Freeway and the passage of this Bill in its
 present form authorizing the expenditures of these
 \$200,000,000 for this purpose clearly to me violates our
 agreement that we made when we authorized the money for the
 Supplemental Freeway and puts the Supplemental Freeway.....
 building of it....in jeopardy. This money we've paid back
 over twenty years and it's going to cost the taxpayers of
 the State of Illinois \$340,000,000 over those twenty years
 for this \$200,000,000 appropriation. This money is going
 to be used to finance current expenses in the Road Fund
program....whereby ...ah...it will....ah...be used
 by the Governor to avoid an increase in motor fuel taxes
 during the time of his first term in office....and his last
 term in my judgment....and ...ah...we will not have to have
 a increase in taxes before the election, but I object to
 the use of Bonds to finance current expenses, I think it's



fiscal policy....it's a policy that this Legislature should reject by not voting for this Bill in its present form. Representative Neff is probably ...as the...as...as knowledgeable an individual on transportation as anybody in this House ...clearly pointed out the issue about this Bond andah....the response was that the Bill should have gone through the Transportation Committee before it went through the Appropriations Committee. Well, in my judgment that would have been an exercise in futility, the \$200,000,000 appropriation was defeated in Appropriations Committee it was put on ...on the floor of the House....and in fact the way this Bill was handled it was ridiculous to waste the time of any Committee because the deals were made on the floor of the House to pass the Bill and...ah...no Committee action was actually necessary....so I would hope that the Members would join me in supporting opposition to this Billkeeping the Bill in the House until it's amended to be in proper form and take out this unnecessary \$200,000,000 appropriation which...ah....after the testimony that was elucidated on the....in Committee ...ah...by...ah.....ah Representative Shea in his questions to the Department of Transportation it was clear to the Members of the Appropriations Committee I that the Department of Transportation could capture all of the Federal funds without the necessity of...of an additional Bond issue. They have the capability of taking care of it....with their current authorization and I would urge that the Members do not support this Bill."

Shea: "Would you bring your remarks to a close, Sir....."

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell, to explain his vote."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I want to say that I'm grateful for the \$1,000,000 project across 95th..... Street which this ...ah...massive budget is going to give to my District in conjunction with two others and I am also very thankful for the \$200,000 project that they are"



going to do along Halsted Street which I share with two other Districts. I'm grateful for this \$1,200,000 to all of the people of the State of Illinois that you're kicking into our District and I don't want to hear anybody on the other side of the aisle talking about an average of.....ah \$13,000,000 for this budget but I'd like to point out to the Members of this General Assembly we can pass this budget any way you want to now, you can vote up...down...in the middle and it's not going to mean a cotton pickin' thing. The next time you see this thing come back from a Conference Committee you aren't even going to be able to find your way to your home town by picking through this budget. And so at this time I'm grateful to all of the people and I want to help everybody get all of the things that they want and just remember when it comes back from a Conference Committee you better start finding a map to your home town to try to pick your way through the particular thing because you won't recognize it and I'm glad to vote 'aye'."

Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham.....and the debate timer."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I got such an awful cold....you won't even need the full time....Mr. Speaker. I'm voting red here and I want to explain to you just in a minute or so why I'm doing it. One of the reasons but not the most persuasive reason is the unconscionable neglect by the Department of Transportation toward the 54th District. With this Administration neglect of the 54th District in matters of Highways is a way of life. But they're not alone, the preceding administrations were just as bad and I pray that some day we can reverse that. I can't see how any Representative from our District can vote for this particular Bill. It ...it leaves nothing for us whatever....oh...it's true that some of us put in some Bills there for 14,000,000 or 15,000,000, but with a flick of a pen they are gone and we all know that it's a DOT program



that prevails. But the real reason and to me the persuasive reason and if it were just for us alone you....you...some of you have so many goodies in it that you will get that it would be ungracious of us not to vote for it if it were not for the grave question^s/that are involved here. Chapman and Cutler, notwithstanding as has been pointed out by pr..... ..prior speakers there is no question of the moral obligation in regard to freeways and I think that the legal obligation will ultimately be established too....but what's really the crime that is involved here is that the \$200,000,000 that this administration cajoled, threatened, traded,did everything within its power.....twisted arms, promised you things and I hope you get whatever you are promised and whatever you deserve to get it passed the other night.... that \$200,000,000 is going to be used to finance the regular customary day to day expenses of highways during the next year and the funds that come in from MFT and from the Motor Vehicles will not be used for that they'll be used for other expenses of Government. We have the process here of calculated diversion to conceal from the public the financial condition that exists in the State of Illinois and when you j....."

Shea: "Finish your remarks, Sir."

Cunningham: "When you jointhe electrician there....when you join in this conspiracy you're just as guilty as the perpetrators of it if you believe in fiscal responsibility you need to change those green votes to red or to yellow while there is still time."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hoffman...to explain his vote.."

Hoffman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that we've spent considerable time on and for those 122 green lights out there I hope as some of the other speakers have indicated that you're sure the pound of flesh that you think you have involved here. This is one of the largest budgets



.....largest appropriations ...that we have considered in this session of the General Assembly and it's seething.... seething...Ladies and Gentlemen of what unanswered questions. Consider the way it was handled, consider the way the debate went on thisare you totally sure what you're involving yourself in? After this is passed and you get back and you start checking to see what is involved in this the impropriety in which it was handled, the Amendments that were tubed, as they relate to this....you better be sure with those green lights on there exactly what questions have not been answered. How many times on this floor have questions been denied as it has been in this debate. There are too many unanswered questions and I am not going to participate in moving a Bill of this magnitude without proper information supplied to us and I would suggest for those voting green that as the previous speakerd indicate vote red or abstain."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce to explain his vote. He don't....I guess that wasn't Mr. Pierce. The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, to explain his vote."

Borchers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of the House. I just have one or two thoughts. I'd rather be in this case the 'bee' and think of the future than the...the 'grass-hopper' who wants to live just for today. I'd rather do for my children and my grandchildren and try to do what I think is right for them than what we're doing today. This is the heighth ...the very heighth of financial irresponsibility and I cannot understand how peoplelike I see in front of me here can do and carry out such a program."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer to explain his vote."

Griesheimer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I too wish to echo the comments of the prior speaker. There is no doubt that I would be willing to support a present budget of the Department of Transportation had it



not had included the \$200,000,000 Bonding package. I cannot see where anyone who has any fiscal responsibility whatsoever can support this concept. It's not just bad because we have a Democratic Governor, this concept was bad under a Republican Governor. We're taxing the lives of our inheritance and when it comes right down to it our grandchildren and our great-grandchildren will be saddled with a debt that they cannot pay. I believe that we are on the course of economic disaster in this State merely because of the avarice of each Legislator who demands their own pet product be finished in their own District. Please consider the long term effects of a vote on an issue such as this. Vote 'no' is the only way you can show any responsibility which will have an effect of keeping our taxes down. In 1978 and '79 as each one of us faces the responsibility of voting for a tax increase don't ask yourself where it came from, we're doing it today."

Shea: "The Lady from Lake, Ms. Geo-Karis, to...explain her vote."

GeoKaris: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.... I put on an Amendment to this Bill, in explaining my vote, for my County because ...my county was completely ignored in completing a Lake Front Highway, although promises were made to it the last two years. However, I'm not going to vote for this budget because if we're going to be told by the Leader of the State that we are in a crunch, in a recession, we have to cut down, yet we're told to cut down \$300,000,000 but we should put on \$200,000,000 worth of monies in Bonds for most of which is going to go to contractual servicesI think we're loosing sight of our common sense. I/^{am}willing to support a DOT Budget provided it's reasonable and not inflationed by the ego.....egomaniacs that are advising whoever is putting this budget together. Let me tell you.....it's the taxpayers money...and there will be a tax increase if we keep doing these things and



I'm not going to vote for a tax increase and I don't want to see the State of Illinois bankrupted by other people's figmentations of the mind. So I'm voting 'present' since I have a conflict of interest and that I have a piece of pork right in there."

Shea: "The gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff, to explain his vote."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my 'no' vote I think this should have a 'no' vote. I'm surprised that the people here are voting for something so irresponsible as this particular piece to have in the \$200,000,000. Now I know that lots of Republicans and others are voting for this thinking they are going to get certain areas on these amendments done. Well, just wait and see and I just tell you, just wait and see what you get done. You won't get a bit more done by voting for this \$200,000,000 bond issue which you are doing when you vote for this Bill than you would have before. And again it's been brought out here how we can be responsible for something we are going to spend in the next few months to finance for twenty years. No business or individual would think of doing...uh...such a thing as this and we as legislators should be more responsible. And I'm certainly surprised at the Republicans that are voting for this and going to get kidded when it gets through."

Shea: "Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 117 'ayes', 20 'nays', 38 members voting 'present'. House Bill 1947 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of House Bills Third Reading appears House Bill 1948."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 1948, an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Transportation, Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "Now I'm going to take a minute of our time and let our good friend Representative DiPrima introduce one of his good friends."



DiPrima: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have a very dear friend of mine here. State Commander of the Am-Vets from Champaign, Illinois. Say a few words."

Ken Mullins: "Thank you. Distinguished members of the House, I know how busy you are. I won't take up your time but as I leave office on the first of July I would like to take this opportunity to thank you on behalf of the Am-Vets and all the veterans organizations for the veterans' legislation. Thank you."

Shea: "The gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain, on House Bill 1948."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1948 is a much easier appropriation. It's a reappropriation to the Department of Transportation as introduced is \$982,809,000. We accepted Committee Amendment #1 which reduced that to \$224,297,600 which really reflect the unliquidated obligations of the Department. It was an agreed upon amendment. It was sponsored by Representative Ted Lechowicz and I would urge for your 'aye' vote."

Shea: "The question is shall House Bill 1948 pass. On the question, is there any discussion? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 142 'ayes', 5 'nays', 3 members voting 'present'. House Bill 1948 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Grothberg 'aye'. On the order of House Bills Third Reading appears House Bill 2103. The lady from Cook, Ms. Chapman on 2103. Take that out of the record. On the order of House Bills Third Reading appears House Bill 2445, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell. You want to take that sir?"

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a ..."



Fred Selcke: "House Bill 2445, an Act to make an appropriation to the Department of Revenue, Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This House Bill 2445 appropriates \$100,000 to the Department of Revenue for additional expenses incurred in administering Home Rule Unit tax ordinances. This is a companion Bill to Senate or House Bill 2627 and this is in agreement with the Director of the Budget, Director Allphin and the amendment in the Senate was agreed upon and I move for the favorable vote on House Bill 2445."

Shea: "The gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, the gentleman spoke of House Bill 2627 and he said the Department of Revenue agreed with that Bill. He also said he agreed with the Bill now under discussion, 2445. During the discussion on that House, the other House Bill, I thought the Sponsor was incorrect. But to be sure whether I was right or wrong, I called the Department of Revenue and asked them their position and asked them if they would confirm the fact they still opposed this piece of legislation. I was furnished a letter after that request and the Department emphatically stated they opposed this piece of legislation. I have made continual inquiry on this piece of legislation from the Department of Revenue. The Department of Revenue has never, and let me say never, changed their position on this piece of legislation. The Department of Revenue does not want to collect taxes imposed by local municipalities. That has been very clear and very concise. Now I don't care personally what you do with this Bill but I would want to clear up the misconception that the Department of Revenue is in favor of this legislation. The Department of Revenue under the Deputy Director has indicated that he is opposed to this legislation and I just want to point that out to you."



Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Shea: "He indicates he will, sir."

Schlickman: "You made reference to House Bill 2627. What is the status of that Bill?"

Yourell: "That I understand is on Third Reading in the Senate."

Schlickman: "Are you sure you've got the correct Bill because 2627 is the Bill that amended the Civil Administrative Code authorizing the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities to provide mental health care to persons in Illinois institutions."

Yourell: "I might answer your question and also Representative Schraeder's question at the same time or Representative Schraeder's comment rather. What Representative Schraeder is referring to is House Bill 2443 and he is completely right in his analysis of that Bill but we are not talking now about 2443. Senate Bill or House Bill 2627 in the Senate was amended and with that amendment that would call for the appropriation contained in House Bill 2445 is acceptable to the Director of Revenue, Mr. Allphin. That from him yesterday."

Schlickman: "May I direct myself to the Bill, Mr. Speaker?"

Shea: "Is there any further discussion?"

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, may I address myself?"

Shea: "Please, sir."

Schlickman: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and members of the House, we are being asked to pass House Bill 2445 which appropriates the sum of \$100,000,000 from the general revenue fund, an unbudgeted item for expenses incurred in administering home rule unit tax ordinances. Now I suggest to you without going into the merits of this matter that the custom of this House, and I think it's been a wise and proper custom, is to treat both the substantive Bill and the appropriations Bill together because one without the other is ineffective and it seems to me Mr.



Speaker and members of the House that we ought to withhold any support of House Bill 2445 until we are informed through the Clerk and the Senate that the Senate has given its' approval to House Bill 2627 and we act upon the concurrence of Senate Amendment #1. In that way we will be operating, I think, in an efficient, expeditious manner and assured of what we are doing. So I urge a 'no' vote so that this Bill can be put on consideration postponed, if not defeated."

Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The gentleman from Madison, or from Cook, Mr. Madison. I'll move you down to the other part of the state."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Matijeovich: "He indicates he will."

Madison: "Representative Yourell, does this Bill have any relationship to House Bill 2443?"

Yourell: "The House Bill 2443 provided that if a county wished to have a tax that was compatible to a tax already collected by the Department of Revenue that they could do so in writing and that the county making the request would pay for the cost, any additional cost of collecting this tax. Senate Bill 2627 was amended to contain the provisions they originally outlined in part of House Bill 2443."

Madison: "Thank you very much."

Matijeovich: "The assistant minority leader from Cook, Representative William Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this appropriation is for a purpose that we in the House have not agreed to. We did not pass the substantive Bill, in fact we defeated it. The Bill is in interim study right now. Now what has happened is that the Senate in their wisdom amended a Bill that we passed in the House and here is what the Bill did when we passed it in the House. It authorized the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities to provide mental health care to persons in Illinois institutions whatever that means and



it was effective immediately. That's what the Bill did and I think we will find interestingly that that probably passed on May 23. Well, it passed on May 22. It was a nothing Bill. It was a shell. And it worked very well because the Senate then amended it to add the substance that this appropriation is for, namely that the state can collect the taxes levied by local units of government, home rule units of government. It's funny, the home rule units, one in particular, they want their cake and they want to eat it too. They want the state to collect their taxes to do their dirty work and they want to levy it and spend it and they want no inhibitions over how they spend it. Mr. Speaker, this is a terrible Bill. It's a terrible concept. It removes responsibility from the people levying and spending the taxes for collecting it. If anybody who pays a tax to the state figures the state is using that money for state purposes it's a state tax. We are fooling them with this kind of legislation. This does not deserve to be passed. We have been fooled in passing House Bill 2627 for an entirely different purpose. Let's beat this resoundingly."

Matijevich: "The gentleman from McHenry, Representative Calvin Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, Calvin is a derivative of Calvitaum which is Latin meaning bald and I'm almost there but until I am just leave the vin off. I would rise to, I do rise to speak against this Bill. This is the Bill that will allow the state of Illinois to collect the liquor tax that's being imposed on suburban Cook county residents, I am not sure anybody noticed but they changed the collection point from the retail level to the wholesale level, I believe in order to qualify under this Bill. Worse yet, this is the predecessor Bill for the city of Chicago income tax which will be imposed on suburbanites and will allow the state to collect the income tax and then funnel it into the city coffers. Now, if anybody doesn't think it



is serious in the outlying areas of Cook county and the collar counties where there are commuters, I would sincerely suggest that if anybody finds out that you voted in favor of this, they are going to be as mad at you eventually when some opponent brings it up as they will be, as they are if you voted for RTA. And we all know what happened to a couple of people who voted for RTA who were in the suburbs. I would urge a resounding defeat for this Bill which the mayor of Chicago obviously wants very, very much...uh...because he sent it back through the legislative process three or four times this year alone. Twice, excuse me, I stand corrected."

Matijevich: "The gentleman from Will, Representative Sangmeister."

Sangmeister: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there appears to be some problems with this Bill and if the Sponsor is persisting on going forward maybe until we get some of these things settled we ought to vote present on this Bill."

Matijevich: "Before we turn it over to Bud Yourell to close, I understand that someone will take pictures on the Republican side for about fifteen minutes, everybody be in good shape. To close, Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I judge by the comments made by several prior speakers that there is some concern about this legislation. I might point out that the Department of Revenue is already collecting taxes for counties and other units of local government such as the sales tax, liquors taxes, and other taxes that are compatible with taxes...uh...revenues that go back to the different units of local government. So this is nothing different than is already being done. Now as to the bugaboo about a income tax raised by any municipality, you know, Representative Skinner, that this has to be done by a vote of the General Assembly and it cannot be invoked by any unit of local government without



following the constitutional provision. So in order to make this Bill work what we are trying to do is to provide the greatest amount of benefits to those units of local government that are collecting or levying certain taxes. If a unit of local government decides, a home rule unit of local government decides to levy a tax and pass a tax ordinance for that purpose, the collection of that tax must be taken from the benefits that the tax provides and thus diminishing the effect of the tax as far as the benefits are concerned that are recurrent to the unit of local government. Now the Department of Revenue testified after amendments were placed to this Bill, the original 2443, that they did not have any objection. Senator Harris in the Senate placed the amendment, I understand, on 2627 that would make this Bill the Bill that it is today. Now all we are asking is that if Senate Bill 2627 passes we do have the seed money to give to the Department of Revenue to make it work and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Matijevich: "The question is shall House Bill 2445 pass. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The gentleman from Cook, Representative Madison to explain his vote."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Here we go Mr. Speaker, with another procedure whereby we are being asked to appropriate money when the substantive Bill has not been considered. The original substantive Bill for this appropriation was House Bill 2443 which got caught in the deadline and is now on interim study. The new substantive Bill now is House Bill 2627 which was amended in the Senate to give it, to make it the substantive Bill for this appropriation, an amendment of which I suggest had nothing to do with the subject matter in the Bill that was amended. Notwithstanding the merit or lack of merit of this substantive Bill and its' appropriation, I think that we are remiss in our



duty whenever we attempt to appropriate money when the substantive issue has not been considered nor discussed by us, or we may find ourselves appropriating money for something that in the future may never exist. I think this Sponsor is ill advised to call this Bill at this time as opposed to calling it at the time that we have concurred with the Senate amendment and for that reason I would urge a 'present' vote on this Bill."

Matijevich: "The gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder to explain his vote."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, let me point out, make it a little bit clear, I think the statements that have been made in opposition to this are basically correct but let me clear up a couple of issues in case they are not clear to you. 2443 was the substantive Bill that was a companion Bill to 2445. After hearings in the Revenue Committee, 2443 was sent to interim study because it had no background worth believing. The Department of Revenue and their Deputy Director testified against it. Willard Ike testified against it. This vote didn't sustain enough to get out of Committee and now here we find another Bill with \$100,000,000 appropriation to the Department of Revenue to do the thing that the Committee said wasn't proper. And so now they are trying to pass this in putting an amendment on a shell Bill in the House that went to the Senate, 2627 I believe, because they couldn't get the other Bill out of Committee. I think this is a little bit silly. But let me go to the text of the Bill and this protects you and any action that might be taken in your own municipality. Do you want your municipality to pass an income tax, a cigarette tax, a liquor tax and then pass it on to state collectors and you get the responsibility of passing that tax? I don't want that responsibility. I say if the municipalities and "the City of Chicago" wants to tax their citizens let them collect the same tax they put on.



Don't make us collect it and then take the responsibility. This is an extremely bad Bill, the Department of Revenue opposes it at this moment and continues to, I understand. Thank you."

Matijevich: "The Clerk, take the record. On this issue there are 48 voting 'aye', 68 voting 'nay', 31 voting 'present' and this Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. Senate Bill 2942."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill..."

Matijevich: "Or House Bill rather."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 2942, an Act making an appropriation to the education of the Service Regional Study Commission, Third Reading of the Bill."

Matijevich: "The gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, the substantive Bill for 2942 was the Bill that would have created a study commission for ESR which this House in its' wisdom declined to support, therefore there is no need for 2942 and I would ask leave of the House to have it tabled."

Matijevich: "The gentleman asks leave to table House Bill 2942. Does he have leave? He has leave. House Bill 3006. Is Representative Young..."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 3006..."

Matijevich: "I don't see Representative, take that out of the record. The gentleman from Peoria, Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to point, speak on a point of personal privilege if I may."

Matijevich: "Proceed."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, we just defeated House Bill 2445. And then since that Bill has been defeated the Sponsor came to me and called me a liar. Well, if I made any mis-statements, I apologize. But I resent, because a Bill was killed, the Sponsor said I was a liar and I think apology from this floor is in order. And I will continue



to do my job as I am elected to do whether or not the Sponsor or any Sponsor feels I am wrong. I don't lie on this House floor, I don't lie on Committee, I don't lie, and believe me I resent any accusations, personal, private or otherwise that I do and I resent it very much and I would like to have it recorded on the record the Sponsor of 2445 called me a liar. He is wrong."

Matijeovich: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House and Representative Schraeder, on page 1930 of the digest when I went back you, sir, I said you mis-represented the facts. As this Bill is recorded in the digest, House Bill 2443, you said that it did not, did not come out of the Committee and I submit to you that it came out of your Committee and you can look on page 1933, the vote was 13-5 with 3 voting present."

Matijeovich: "House Bill 3036, is Representative Maragos or anybody prepared on that Committee Bill? I don't see him here. House Bill 3040, Representative Peters ready on that Bill? Take that Bill out of the record. House Bill 3041, take that out of the record. House Bill 3067, Representative Chapman, take that Bill out of the record. House Bill 3094, Representative Terzich."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 3094, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Matijeovich: "The gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to have leave to table House Bill 3094."

Matijeovich: "The gentleman asks leave to table House Bill 3094. Does he have leave? He has leave. House Bill 3096, Representative Beaupre, Committee Bill."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 3096, a Bill for an Act to amend the Capitol Development Bond Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Matijeovich: "The gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre, on



House Bill 3096."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Capitol Development Bond Authorization for \$150,600,000ah....it's a Bill for....ah..or.....or authorization for bonding for our State Universities and Colleges, the Community Colleges, the School Building Commission, for Correctional Institutions and our State prisons, for open spaces for recreational and conservation purposes, and for child and mental health care facilities. There are a number of Amendments to the Bill and I would like to ask leave to move the Bill back to Second Reading for the purpose of other Amendments."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman asks leave to move the Bill back to Second Reading for purposes of Amendment. Does he have leave? He.....the Bill is on Second ReadingProceed."

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #1, Beaupre...Amends House Bill 3096, and so forth."

Matijevich: "Mr. Beaupre:"

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House... ah....this Amendment was to include additional amounts for the Springfield and Chicago Office Building. As you know in the Appropriations Bill.....ah...House Bill 802.....ah.. the Chicago Office Building...ah...was not approved ...ah.. in that Appropriations Bill....ah..and therefore this Amendment is technically incorrect and I would move to table Amendment #1."

Matijevich: "Leave to table Amendment #1.....Further Amendments?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #2, Beaupre, Amends House Bill 3096, Page 1, line 11 and so forth."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House... Amendment #2 to House Bill 3096....ah...was to provide funds for the Chicago Office Building....Ah....As you know that appropriation was defeated in House Bill 802 and I would move to table Amendment #2."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment



#1 toAmendment #2 to House Bill 3096....Oh....moved to table, I wason the telephone....move to table ... does he have leave? Amendment #2 is tabled. Further Amendments?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #3, Beaupre, amends House Bill 3096 and so forth."

Beaupre: "Amendment #3....ah...also was an Amendment that dealt with the Office Buildings, it was a contingency Amendment in case Amendment #1...ah...was not adopted....it is technically incorrect and I would move to table Amendment #3."

Matijevich: "Does he have leave to table Amendment #3?..... Amendment #3 is tabled."

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #4, amends House Bill 3096, page 1, line 11 and so forth."

Beaupre: "Amendment #4 is the Amendment which provides the authorization for the sale of bonds for the Springfield Office Building....ah...that Amendment....ah...that Amendment to House Bill 802 was passed by this House the other night and I would move for the adoption of Amendment #4."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Kankakee is moved the adoption of Amendment #4 to House Bill 3096. Is there any discussion? All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay', Amendment #4 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #5 is technically incorrect and I would move to table Amendment #5."

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #5, Beaupre, amends House Bill 3096 and so forth."

Beaupre: "The Amendment deals with the total, assuming that theboth the Chicago and the Springfield Office Building was appropriated for.....in House Bill 802. It is therefore technically incorrect and I would move to table Amendment #5....Mr. Speaker."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman have leave to table Amendment #5? He has leave. Are there further Amendments?"



Fred Selcke: "Amendment #6, Beaupre, amends House Bill 3096 and so forth."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #6 was the authorization for bonds for the Energy Conservation Appropriation. That was defeated in House Bill 802 and I would move to table Amendment #6."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman have leave to table Amendment #6? He has leave. Further Amendments?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #7, Beaupre, amends House Bill 3096 on line 11 and so forth."

Beaupre: "Amendment #7 also delt with the Energy Conservation Appropriation....ah...it is technically incorrect and I would move to table Amendment #7."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman have leave to table Amendment #7? He has leave. Further Amendments?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #8, Leverenz, Amends House Bill 3096, on page 1 by deleting line 1 and so forth."

Matijevich: "Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. SpeakerMr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House...Amendment #8 ...ah...deals with the Waterways Appropriation, I believe that Amendment to be technically incorrect with Amendment #4 and I would move to table that Amendment."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman have leave?I don't see Representative Leverenz....does he have leave to table Amendment #8?.....Leave....Amendment #8 is tabled."

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #9, Giorgi, amends House Bill 3096, page 2, by inserting after line 31 the following and so forth."

Matijevich: "Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe Amendment #9 to be technically incorrect in regard to the total ...ah...amount on line.....page 1, line 11 and I would move to table Amendment #9."

Matijevich: "Leave to table Amendment #9?...He has leave.... Further Amendments?"



Fred Selcke: "Amendment #10, Mudd, amends House Bill 3096 on page 1, line 12 and so forth."

Beaupre: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House....Amendment #10 to House Bill 3096 is technically in conflict with Amendment #4 which we have just adopted and I would move to table Amendment #10."

Matijevich: "Leave to table Amendment #10. Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill ...ah...is....a Amendment ...an Amendment...this Amendment is an Amendment to ...ah..complete the authorization which this House authorized on 802 to insure that those monies that were authorized in that Bill would be ...ah...authorized to the category in which it was amended. So I don't understand ...ah...Representative Beaupre's motion here ... that this would have anything to do to delete the Amendment to which was attached to 802 or not....so I'd like an answer on that."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I really have no opposition to this particular Amendment. The problem is that Amendment #4, after being passed, ..ah...is technically in conflict with the Amendment with regard to ...ah...page 1, line 12, which deleted \$750,600,000 and inserted in its place \$752,200,000. I would suggest that ... ah...Representative Mudd if he ...ah...is serious about placing this Amendment on the Bill that....that he get with the Senate Sponsor and make some attempt to do so over there.because there are technical problems with the Amendment and it is time that the Bill move out of here."

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

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would move that we adopt Amendment #10 to House Bill 3096, the Sponsor has had that Amendment for some time on the....at the Clerks desk and



even with the adoption of Amendment #4, I believe we can correct it on its face. What it doesit refers ...ah it adds 1,600,000 to both the total authorization and the category for education... I move the adoption of Amendment #10."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook moves the adoption of Amendment #10 to House Bill 3096. Is there discussion? All in favor of the adoption of Amendment #10....say..... signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. Further Amendments?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #11, Lechowicz, amends House Bill 3096, page 1, line 1 and so forth."

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

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #11 is dealing with the Waterway portion of the ...of the authorization, I move for the adoption."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved for the adoption of Amendment #11 to House Bill 3096. Is there a discussion? All in favor sig.....er...the Gentleman from K.....no..... All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed by.....just a minute....Representative.....er....ah...from Cook, Representative Mann."

Mann: "Yes, I wonder if the House ...ah...Sponsor....would explain the Amendment?"

Matijevich: "Representative Lechowicz, would you explain that again, for Representative Mann?"

Lechowicz: "As I pointed out earlier, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the....Amendment #11 deals with Waterways Amendment and provides \$12,500,000 for the acquisition, development, construction, reconstruction, modification, financing, architectural planning, installation of Capitol facilities, consisting of building structures, durable equipment, and the land for water resource management proj.....projects, all within the State of Illinois, and was contained in House Bill 802 as far as for the



JUN 26 1975

78.

appropriation for those matters. Move for the adoption."

Mann: "Would you ...would you answer one more question....ah
Representative, Lechowicz?"

Lechowicz: "Sure."

Mann: "Is any of this ...ah...ah....for construction along
Lake Michigan?"

Lechowicz: "No, Sir."

Mann: "I thank you."

Matijevich: "Mr. Beaupre, did you seek recognition on the
Amendment?"

Beaupre: "This Amendment I think is supported by all ...ah...
of the parties concerned with this Bill. It is indeed a
good Amendment and I would hope that it would be adopted."

Matijevich: "On the adoption of the Amendment, all in favor
say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The Amendment #11 is adopted.
Further Amendments?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #12, Kane, amends House Bill 3096 as
amended and so forth."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what
this Amendment does is ...ah...switch the authorization for
\$10,000,000 ...ah...from one category to another and...it
allows for the Capital Grant to the private hospitals
around the State to ...ah...change their facilities in
conjunction with the Medical Schools in Rockford, Peoria,
Chicago and Springfield ...and I move the adoption of the
Amendment."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Sangamon has moved the adoption
of the Amendment #12 to House Bill 3096. The Gentleman from
Kankakee, Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
this Amendment would provide some very neededah...
medical health services and I would hope that it would be
supported."

Matijevich: "There being no further discussion, those in favor



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

of the Amendment signify by saying 'aye', opposed by saying 'nay' and Amendment #12 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #13, Beaupre, amends House Bill 3096, page 1, line 11 and so forth."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #13, which I am the Sponsor of is technically incorrect and I would move to table Amendment #13."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman asks leave to table Amendment #13, he has leave. Further Amendments?.....No further Amendments....Third Reading. House Bill 3101."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 3101, a Bill for an Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McLendon.....Just a minute, Jim.....now...."

McLendon: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act. It increases the number of members of the Industrial Commission from 5 to 7.....and it raises the salaries of each Member of the Commission and each arbitrator of the Industrial Commission. There ...are....is a great need for this Bill especially since a few days we passed out of this House...ah Senate Bills 234 and 235 which will increase the number of cases that this Commission will have to handle....and I will appreciate very much a favorable vote."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved for the passage of House Bill 3101. In discussion, the Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Tuerk: "What is the fiscal implication of this Bill?"

McLendon: "The fiscal implication, Representative Tuerk, this will cost approximately \$80,000 for the new members who are to be appointed, there is two new members to be appointed... and \$100,000 including the salaries and the office expense."

Tuerk: "So a total of \$180,000."



McLendon: "That is correct, Sir."

Tuerk: "Where is that money provided for?:....Where is it in the budget.? What appropriation Bill?"

McLendon: "There is no provision for it.....in any appropriation Bill at the present time."

Tuerk: "How does the Chairman of the Industrial Commission plan to pay these people?"

McLendon: "I assume that they will pay it out of the Revenue Fund."

Tuerk: "Out of what, Sir?"

McLendon: "Out of the General Revenue Fund."

Tuerk: "Well, I don't see how that's possible.....butWell, if I could speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Matijevich: "Proceed."

Tuerk: "I think the Members of the House have heard me elaborate on this Bill on two separate occasions so hopefully the third time will be the charm that I can defeat this Bill. It's not against the Sponsor, of course, he's well intentioned but he mentioned and by his own admission the passage of 234 and 235 the need for the extra people and the need for the extra expense provided for in those two previous Bills and that is a truism. However, there is no need to add to the Commissioners or the Chairman of the Industrial Commissions staff to the extent of what this Bill provides because as I have testified on this floor and in Committeebecause of the Industrial Commissions Chairmans own admission earlier this year he said there really is no need to have two additional Commissioners because it's difficult for him to keep his present staff busy on a full time basis. And what this Bill provides is to add to that staff and add to the expense to the extent of \$180,000 and when the need isn't there I see no reason to pass this Bill and provide for that extra expenditure of funds. And I would ask for the Membership to reject this Bill on the basis of the facts of the case."



Matijeovich: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak against this Bill. First, I....I of course respect the Sponsor as much as any Member of this House, however, when we adopted the temporary rules we set certain deadlines for the introduction of Bills and for the passage of Bills which while didn't work too well....nevertheless did work and should enable us to get out perhaps earlier than we would otherwise. Now we didn't leave the safety valves of the Committee Bill process but I think that the use of the Committee Bill process for a Bill such as this is a real abuse and will attend to wreck the whole idea behind it. If we intend to put out every Bill that was defeated that couldn't be passed that doesn't have overwhelming public support as a Committee Bill, we are going to look upon all Committee Bills as unnecessary and the Senate will do likewise. We discussed this this morning at....at a...at a breakfast meeting and it was felt that the Committee Bills will probably all be tubed in the Senate because of the fact that we put out over 80 or 90 or 100 of them in the short time that has lapsed since the Bill deadline. I think to preserve the Committee Bill process....to preserve the attempt to meet deadlines that we ought to vote against this Bill despite the good intentions of the Sponsor and ...ah.. I'm sure the good intentions and the value of the Bill."

Matijeovich: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in opposition to this Bill let me say that the....actual hearings in most of these cases are done by hearing officers, and the Board itself merely sits in judgement in the finality as a review Board. When they sit together certainly it doesn't ...it works just as well with 5 or 7. Now, this is just another example of proliferation and...and when you get these guys they have to have an office and a secretary and stationery



and everything that goes with it....and you're just adding an unneeded cost to Government."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Beatty."

Beatty: "I'd like to speak briefly on this Bill. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, yesterday we passed a Bill out which was the ...ah...budget for the Industrial Commission and I spoke against it briefly. It contained a provision that the Industrial Commission hire certain people of a social worker nature ...where we'll be going out to people that are injured and will actually be stirring up litigation. It's estimated that the amount of claims are going to increase at least two-foldpossibly two and a half times due to the plans that this new....the new plans of the ...ah...head of the Industrial Commission, he has a lot of new....innovations...now we passed that Bill out and there are a lot of deficiencies in it. I think is only fair.... we pass one Bill out....I think we should pass this Bill out to give the necessary personnel...ah...the chance to handle whatever changes are going to be put into effect. I think this should go to the Senate along with the other Bill so that if the Senate accepts that other Bill in full the Senate will be in a position to employ two new Commissioners to handle the volume of work that will be coming and also on the other hand if they reject some of the new prog....of the Industrial Commission as in Representative VonBoeckman's Appropriation Bill for the Industrial Commission they will then also be able to dump this Bill along with it....but I don't think we should send over the Bills to encourage the workload with the Commission and not also send the Bill over to give them a couple new Members on the Commission and I would urge the support of this Bill."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Londrigan."

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

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Sangamon has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put?"



All in favor say....signify by saying 'aye', opposed by saying 'nay' and the main question shall be put. The question is, shall House Bill 3101 pass? Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue there are 101 voting 'aye', 27 voting 'nay', 6 voting 'present' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3111. Take the Bill out of the record. House Bill 311A.....3118."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 3118, an act in relation to State Finance, Third Reading of the Bill."

Matijevich: "From Cook, the Majority Leader, Representative Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the Bill that provides ...ah...for the impoundment of State funds by the appropriate fiscal officer. It was increased last night from 6% to 8% and there was also a provision that once the appropriate certifying officer impounds the funds....before they can be released they must not only certify that the funds shall be released but they will have to come back to a Committee of the General Assembly and have that release authorized. I would move for the adoption of the Bill."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved for the passage of House Bill 3118. On discussion, the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Cal Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this Bill. This is an absolutely incredible concept that we are trying to pass here. As everyone knows, since the new Constitution completely disrupted the appropriations process, the General Assembly has virtually nothing to say about how money is spent in this State. If the Governor doesn't like what we appropriate he can veto the whole Bill. If he doesn't like what we appropriate he can reduce a single line item."



If he, or a series of line items. If he doesn't like what we have passed he can cut out a whole line item. Now as Representative Rigney put it so, so aptly after serving two years on the Appropriations Committee I asked him, you want to be on the Appropriations Committee next Year. He said no, Cal. Why should I be? We spend hours and hours and hours on the Transportation Department budget and the governor ends up getting anything he wants anyway. Well, it's worse than that. The governor not only has a total veto, a line item veto and the reduction veto, if we don't put the money in the budget he steals it from another one. Now what are we doing here? We are saying that legislative intent can be abrogated up to 8% of total appropriations. Now I don't where the Democrats in this General Assembly are at, but I'd suggest they take a lesson from their colleagues in Congress and take a look at the fight there. The fight there is to get the President to spend the money on social programs that the Democrats have passed. So what are we doing here? We are giving the governor more power over the budget than he has now. This is just an unbelievable concept and I just do not understand why the democratic leaders of this state, of this General Assembly are caving into the executive branch. This is a branch, this is a branch issue. An executive branch versus a legislative branch issue. Roll Call, Roll Call. Tremendous, tremendous. But this is a significant issue and your vote that you cast today, even with the self destruct mechanism that is in this Bill, is totally objectionable to anyone who has any interest in preserving the integrity of the legislative branch. This vote, this Bill should be defeated on its' demerits. There are, they abound."

Matijevich: "The gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield to two short questions?"

Matijevich: "He indicates he will."



Brinkmeier: "Jerry, number one do I understand correctly, as the Bill, the shape the Bill is now in, it provides that if any deduction is made for school aid, it would be in the final payment?"

Shea: "That's correct, sir."

Brinkmeier: "O.K., question number two, also it does provide for a Legislative Committee to give final approval of the release, Mr. Shea?"

Shea: "The timer went off, I think. The answer is yes."

Brinkmeier: "Thank you."

Matijevich: "The Assistant Minority Leader, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I too rise to oppose this Bill and just to point out the absurdity of the Bill. The gentleman, Mr. Brinkmeier's question with respect to school aid and its' reduction in the final payment, gives some indication of how bad this is. Now schools are budgeting now for fiscal 1975 for the coming school year. They're budgeting on the basis of anticipated state aid and they have no idea what that state aid will be because under this Bill, if enacted, and I think it very unlikely that it will go all the way, under this Bill they will have no idea what the governor will remove from their budget in the final payment. So they can't possibly budget. Now in addition to that the gentleman from Crystal Lake, Mr. Skinner, certainly made an excellent case for saying that it's totally unconstitutional. We herein abdicate our responsibility under the Constitution of the state to the people of the state of Illinois. We have the responsibility for appropriating monies. We have that jointly with the Governor under his reduction veto and absolute veto. So I suggest to you that we ought to be working together with the Governor and not trying to figure out a way to confound him. This is a bad bill. We should vote no."

Matijevich: "The chairman of the Revenue Committee, Mr. Maragos."



Maragos: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I rise in support of this Bill because of the fact that we in the Legislature, even though we don't have the proper time to do the job with a scalpel instead of a meat axe and the regards to the trimming the appropriation that may be needed in order to avoid a deficit, we do say legislatively to the Governor and to the people of the State of Illinois, we are giving you this additional authority and at the time when we come back in October, we can probably have more time to see what the full impact of the fiscal consequences will be and then we can judge if we have to amend and bring down the appropriation. As it was amended yesterday by Mr. Gaines, this Bill now gives 8% authority to the Governor beyond the 6% because in certain areas which are not in his control he may not have the authority to remove public aid in schools. So I think we should support this Bill and therefore, by legislative intent, show the people of the State of Illinois that we too are concerned about the fiscal implications of the budget."

Matijevich: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, members of the House. I rise in support of this Bill and to disagree with those speakers who have indicated their belief that this is an abdication of legislative responsibility. Quite the contrary. I believe that if we do not pass a Bill which will put into the hands of the executive branch a means, a flexible means to match state expenditures with state revenue, we will have abdicated our legislative responsibility. Let me clarify some points that were raised by the opponents to this Bill. The controversy which exists at the federal level is over the responsibility of the President to expend appropriated funds in the absence of any legislative authority to impound them. That is precisely what the controversy was about. This Bill is providing that legislative, sorry, Mr. Speaker, I wasn't aware you



were using the timer."

Matijevich: "I guess I did that and wasn't aware of it myself. Go ahead."

Lundy: "All right, this Bill is precisely an attempt to establish a clear, legal working relationship between the Legislative and Executive branches to meet their dual constitutional responsibility to insure that state expenditures do not exceed state revenues. Yes, we have an amendatory, a reduction and a line item veto. But those are clumsy tools. They provide no flexibility. They require that once the reduction veto is made the money will never again be available unless we override the veto. This impoundment procedure provides greater flexibility. It is a legislatively mandated system. I believe it is constitutional. I believe it is responsible. I believe it should be enacted. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Matijevich: "The lady from Lake, Ms. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this Bill has some merits but the thing that bothers me is this. As long as the Governor has the right of line item veto, amendatory veto, full veto, I think he should have the judgment to cut. Now, we have when you cut 6% across the board without regard to how it applies, to whom it applies, I don't think it is a fair compendium of cutting down expenses. We passed the DOT budget with \$200,000,000 in contractual services. If we take 6% of the Children and Family Services budget we might be hurting those children. I say that the 6% straight cut is not a very fair one because it should be done according to where it's cut, not just straight across on everything and consequently, I'm afraid that I cannot support this Bill because I do feel the prerogative is up to the Governor what to cut. He gave us the message. Now I think it is up to him to make the decision where and when to cut and not leave it up to us."



Matijevich: "Mr. Shea to close. Mr. Shea to close."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the..."

Matijevich: "Just a minute. I didn't see your light. I saw you standing before and was wondering why your light wasn't on. The majority leader, Representative Washburn."

Washburn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I won't take the time this afternoon to detail all the faults contained in House Bill 3118 nor expanding on my many reasons for opposing it as I did on Sunday. But just let me say that other than giving the Governor additional authority and control over the three or four so called independent agencies, it's an absolutely nothing piece of legislation. Nothing, except an abdication of legislative responsibilities and in my judgment, when it was introduced it was nothing more than another gimmick conceived by the majority party to meet a deadline and certainly I would ask for your opposition."

Matijevich: "Mr. Shea to close."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we debated this at great length on Sunday and I think one of the most important things here is if in fact we face a fiscal crisis in this state, this is one way we can address ourselves to the problem. As we said, many times, nobody has all the answers. This is another approach. It's been tried in other states. It certainly is constitutional. I think it will be a great tool and I would appreciate the support of the House."

Matijevich: "The question is, shall House Bill 3118 pass. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. Have all voted, have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue, there are 98 voting 'aye', the gentleman from McHenry, for what purpose do you rise, Representative Skinner?"

Skinner: "It's been a long time since I asked for a verification, but this is an absolute and utter abdication of the



Legislative authority and I ask for one."

Matijevich: "The gentleman is entitled for a verification.

The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea, asks that the absentees be polled. Will the Clerk poll the absentees."

Jack O'Brien: "Boyle, Byers, Capuzi, Duff, R.K. Hoffman, J.M. Houlihan, Kucharski, LaFleur, McAuliffe, McAvoy, Mugalian."

Matijevich: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Vote me 'aye'."

Jack O'Brien: "O'Daniel, Porter, Rigney, Rose, Sevcik, Simms, Stearney, Wall and Young."

Matijevich: "The count now is 99. Proceed, Mr. Clerk, with the affirmative Roll Call."

Jack O'Brien: "E.M. Barnes, Beatty, Beaupre, Berman, Birchler, Bradley, Brandt, Brinkmeier, Brummet, Caldwell, Calvo, Capparelli, Chapman, Choate, Craig, D'Arco, Darrow, Davis, DiPrima, Downs, John Dunn, Epton, Ewell, Farley, Fary, Fennessey, Flinn, Garmisa, Getty, Giglio, Giorgi, Greiman, Hanahan, Hart, Hill, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, Huff, Jacobs, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Kane, Katz, Keller, Kelly, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Laurino, Lechowicz, Kornowicz."

Matijevich: "Record Ms. Young as 'aye'."

Jack O'Brien: "Leon, Leverenz, Londrigan, Lucco, Luft, Lundy, Madigan, Madison, Mann, Maragos, Marovitz, Matijevich, McClain, McGrew, McLendon, McMaster, McPartlin, Merio, Meyer, Molloy, Mugalian, Nardulli, Neff, Patrick, Pierce, Pouncey, Rayson."

Matijevich: "Record Boyle 'aye'."

Jack O'Brien: "Richmond, Sangmeister, Satterthwaite, Schisler, Schneider, Schoeberlein, Sharp, Shea, Stone, Stubblefield, Taylor, Terzich, Tipword, VanDuyne, VonBoeckman, Washington, White, Willer, Williams, Winchester, Younge, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Matijevich: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, for what purpose do you rise?"

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, could I be record 'aye' and then



verified because I have to go over to the Senate."

Matijevich: "Record Houlihan 'aye' and leaves to go to the Senate. The gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, could I be verified, have leave to be verified now?"

Matijevich: "Leave to verify Mr. Kane. He has leave. Mr. Mautino."

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

Matijevich: "How is Mr. Mautino recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Mautino: "Please change that. Vote me 'aye'."

Matijevich: "Change that to 'aye'. Mr. Madison?"

Madison: "Yes, sir, Mr. Speaker. May I be verified, may I have leave to be verified?"

Matijevich: "Leave to verify Madison? Leave. Mr. Hoffman. Ron Hoffman."

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

Matijevich: "How is Ron Hoffman recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Hoffman: "Vote me 'no'."

Matijevich: "Record Ron Hoffman 'no'. Mr. White from Cook."

White: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave?"

Matijevich: "Leave to be verified for Mr. White. You may leave. Mr. Winchester."

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

Matijevich: "How is Winchester recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Show him as recorded as voting 'aye'."

Winchester: "Change my 'aye' to 'no'."

Matijevich: "Change Winchester from 'aye' to 'no'. Mr. Fennessey."

Fennessey: "May I have leave to be verified?"

Matijevich: "Leave to verify Mr. Fennessey. Leave. Mr. Hart. Mr. Hart, did you seek recognition? Mike McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I am recorded 'aye'. Would you change my 'aye' vote to 'no'."

Matijevich: "Change McClain from 'aye' to 'no'. Mr. Huff."



Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Requesting leave to be verified."

Matijevich: "Leave to be verified. Why don't we start with the verification. I know everybody wants to leave to go eat but we all would like to do that. Mr. Skinner on the affirmative roll. What do we start out with, Mr. Clerk? By these leaves to verify, I think you are making it more difficult for the Clerk. Yes, Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, would you record me as 'no'."

Matijevich: "I didn't hear you."

Ewing: "I would like to be recorded as 'no'."

Matijevich: "Ewing, 'no'. Hart 'no'. Mr. Skinner on the verification."

Skinner: "Mr. Brummet?"

Matijevich: "Brummet is in his seat."

Skinner: "Mr. Caldwell."

Matijevich: "Caldwell is in his seat."

Skinner: "Gene Barnes."

Matijevich: "Gene Barnes, Gene Barnes in the chamber? I don't see him. Take him off the record."

Skinner: "Mr. Epton. Mr. Epton. I don't see him in the chambers. Mr. Hanahan?"

Matijevich: "Well, slow down so the Clerk can keep up with you. Epton off the record. Mr. Hanahan is standing right here. He is right here. Proceed with the verification. You are out of order now."

Skinner: "Mr. Hart, Mr. Mann."

Matijevich: "Mr. Mann is here."

Skinner: "Mr. Emil Jones."

Matijevich: "Emil Jones. How is he recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Matijevich: "He is walking down the center aisle."

Skinner: "Mr. Farley."

Matijevich: "Mr. Farley. I don't see him here. Is Mr. Farley recorded as voting 'aye'?"

Jack O'Brien: "The gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."



Matijevich: "Take him off the record."

Skinner: "Mr. Marovitz."

Matijevich: "Mr. Marovitz? I don't see him in the chamber.

Is he recorded as voting 'aye'?"

Jack O'Brien: "The gentleman is recorded as voting aye'."

Matijevich: "Take him off the record."

Skinner: "Mr. Brandt."

Matijevich: "I don't see him."

Skinner: "Mr. Capparelli."

Matijevich: "Slow down, will you, Mr. Skinner? Marovitz.

Take Marovitz off the Roll Call."

Skinner: Mr. Capparelli. Did you get Mr. Brandt?"

Matijevich: "Mr. Brandt is not here. Take him off the record. Ray Ewell. Capparelli is here. Is Mr. Ewell, is not in his seat and I don't see him in the assembly. How is Ewell recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Ewell? The gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Matijevich: "Verify the assistant majority leader, Mike Madigan, he must make a telephone call. Ewell, take him off. Mr. Skinner, you will have to slow down so they can keep track here. Mr. Duff, what do you seek recognition for?"

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, please record me 'no'."

Matijevich: "Record Duff as voting 'no'."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker?"

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker is way in the back talking to Jim Taylor."

Skinner: "Mr. Willer?"

Matijevich: "Ms. Willer is in Representative Giorgi's quarters."

Skinner: "Mr. D'Arco."

Matijevich: "Mr. D'Arco is sitting over on the side here."

Skinner: "Mr. McGrew."

Matijevich: "Mr. McGrew, I don't see him in his seat. Is Mr. McGrew here? Take Mr. McGrew off the Roll Call and give leave to Representative Davis to make a telephone call."



Skinner: "Mr. Meyer?"

Matijevich: "Mr. Meyer. Ted Meyer. I don't see him in his seat. Mr. Meyer, I don't see him here. How is he recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Matijevich: "Take him off the record."

Skinner: "Mr. McMaster."

Matijevich: "Mr. McMaster. I don't see him back there. Is Tom McMaster here? I don't see him in the hall. Take him off the record."

Skinner: "Mr. VonBoeckman."

Matijevich: "Mr. VonBoeckman. I don't see him in his seat and I don't see him in the hall. Take VonBoeckman off the Roll Call."

Skinner: "Mr. Schisler."

Matijevich: "Slow down. Put Marovitz back on the Roll Call. He is right here."

Skinner: "Did I ask for Gene Barnes yet?"

Matijevich: "I didn't hear you, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Did I ask for Gene Barnes yet?"

Matijevich: "Jean Barnes, we have already taken off the Roll Call."

Skinner: "Mr. Taylor."

Matijevich: "Mr. Taylor is in his seat."

Skinner: "Mr. Calvo."

Matijevich: "Mr. Calvo is in his seat."

Skinner: "Mr. Schoeberlein."

Matijevich: "Schoeberlein is in the back and put Bruce Farley back on the Roll Call. Put Farley back on the Roll Call. Put Ray Ewell back on the Roll Call. Ray Ewell back on, the Roll Call. Put Gene Barnes back on the Roll Call. Mr. Clerk, could you give me the record? Put McPartlin and Brandt back on the Roll Call. And O'Daniel voting 'aye'."

Jack O'Brien: "Wait a minute. McPartlin, Brandt."

Matijevich: "McPartlin, Brandt and O'Daniel. And Byers 'aye'. And Leverenz 'aye'. This issue, 97 'ayes', 62 'nays' and



this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3122."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3122, a Bill for an Act creating the Medical Dental Schools Admission Study Commission, Third Reading of the Bill."

Matijevich: "The gentleman from Cook, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3122 creates the Illinois Medical Dental Schools Admission Study Commission. The Commission shall study the admission policies of the medical and dental schools, public and private and determine whether such admission policies are responsive to the current needs for practicing medical doctors and dentists. It is similar to the House Bill 414 which was killed in the last minute deadline. We passed the appropriation Bill. It is in the Senate. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Matijevich: "The gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 3122. Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question shall this Bill pass. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue there are 125 'ayes', 6 'nays', 4 answering 'present' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bills Third Reading. On the order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 37. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 37, a Bill for an Act creating the Illinois Horse Racing Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Sevcik: "Thank you Mr. Chairman, I mean Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 37 replaces the three existing racing statutes into one comprehensive law. This Bill has had an exhaustive hearing in discussion and debate during the amendment state that I feel at all I



am familiar with this Bill. This Bill will produce greatly increased revenues for the state of Illinois and additional revenues for the many businesses which are involved with the horse racing industry. I think everybody is very familiar with this Bill and I ask for a favorable vote."

Matijevich: "The gentleman has moved for the passage of House, Senate Bill 37. On the discussion, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe."

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

Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Jaffe: "Representative Sevcik, as you know, the Racing Board does have a number of hearings. Would you have a figure on how many hearings they actually conduct throughout the entire year?"

Sevcik: "I have nothing to do whatever with the Racing Board hearings and this Bill does not address itself to the Racing Board."

Jaffe: "No, I think that it does but I don't want to get into an argument with you. If I may speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Matijevich; "Proceed."

Jaffe: "I think that if we look we would find that in addition to all the meetings that the Racing Board members have to attend to, I think they have to attend to approximately 300 hearings that they do physically have to be present at. Because of that, Mr. Speaker, I rise to cite with regret the failure of this body to have adopted Amendment #32 which would have increased the membership of the Board called for in this Bill from the level of five to seven which is its' current level. The error of its omission is compounded by the fact that this Bill does not provide for hearing officers. To limit the available manpower places severe constraints on the functional ability of the Board to hear the appeals which result from the enforcement of the Act and as I indicated to you



beforehand there are approximately 300 hearings per year that the Board Members have to take care of. Because of this and because of the fact that they do not have Hearing Officers I don't think that at this time we can cut down on the Board Membership from 7 to 5 and I would therefore urge a no vote on this particular Bill."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I had hoped when this Bill was introduced in the Senate thatthat it would improve and modernize ...our racing laws in the State of Illinois but actually now that it is at passage stage in the House after passing the Senate, I'm convinced that this Bill is a step backward in the regulation of racing in our State. In 1972 the General Assembly passed Public Act 77-1997.....which prohibited political contributions by race tracks or officers and Directors. That wasn't a lightly arrived at Statute, that came about because of the scandal in our State at the highest level of government caused by race tracks throwing around money, stock and other temptations at public officials. I offered Amendment on Second Reading, Amendment #8 which was defeated by only 3 votes, which would have not done anything newwhat it would have done was maintain the present prohibition which this General Assembly placed on Race Tracks in 1972, on making contributions. Now,.... we've heard that since then we have a campaign disclosure law but the donor of the race track is not required in any way to disclose his contributions by this law. The donee if the contributions are \$150 a year.....at least one cent less than that does not have to disclose and as I pointed out five or ten directors of a race track and each give \$150 per year for four yearsgives thousands of dollars.....in contributionsgranted under this Bill...."

Matijevich: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Madison



Mr. Calvo, rise?"

Calvo: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker,...seems to me the gentleman is out of order, he debated the issue he is talking about on the floor for about 40 minutes the other day and his amendment was defeated. If he wants to speak to the Bill as it exists...that's one thing...but I think he is out of order."

Matijevich: "Well, I think he is true...Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not through...I'm not through, Mr. Speaker..."

Matijevich: "All right, go ahead."

Pierce: "And I resent this session of the Legislature, members who can't take it...or don't agree with what you say... getting up on point of order...to stop freedom of speech and expression. Of course I'm talking about the Bill..."

Matijevich: "You are in order..."

Pierce: "The Bill legalizes campaign contributions by race-tracks. That's why it's a bad Bill. That's why it's a regressive Bill. And if you can't stand the truth, don't get up on a point of order. Debate against it and tell me why I'm wrong."

Matijevich: "Proceed."

Pierce: "What you are doing instead is trying to shut off freedom of speech and many members on my side of the aisle."

Matijevich: "You are in order."

Pierce: "They use point of order to shut off freedom of discussion. Now because of that and because this is a regressive Bill and allows the legalized gamblers to run our racetracks, to make up political contributions to influence legislation, I'm going to vote 'no' on this Bill. It's a bad Bill and I'm surprised it got this far in the Legislature."

Matijevich: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Mr. Speaker, if the Sponsor will yield for some questions."



Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Holewinski: "Representative Sevick, can you tell me if any projections have been done in terms of what revenue return this formula in this Bill will provide as compared to that existing now in the Racing Act?"

Sevcik: "Yes, I have those figures there. I think, under the present formula, approximately about \$1,000,000 more based on the attendance and also based on the, I have the figures here, they gave them to me, the breakdown it was approximately \$1,000,000."

Holewinski: "\$1,000,000 less than what's produced now, is that it? I'm sorry."

Sevcik: "No, no. That's revenue gained. Don't forget you are putting a 3 1/2% tax on gimmick betting."

Holewinski: "I see. Can you explain to me the Racetrack Reconstruction Fund that is contained in this Bill?"

Sevcik: "I didn't hear you, sir."

Holewinski: "This Bill makes provision for a Racetrack Reconstruction Fund as I understand it. Can you explain to me what that, how it functions, where that money comes from, what it goes for?"

Sevcik: "That's where the, half the breakage is kept, a record is kept by the Racing Board for track improvements. Now they have 20 years to make the necessary track improvements with the money that they receive from the breakage at the racetracks. They keep a separate record for each track. And it's regulated by the Racing Board and before an improvement can be made or is recommended by the Racing Board, that money is used for that purpose."

Holewinski: "Just one further question and that is that money that goes for track improvements, is that money that formerly went to horsemen for purses?"

Sevcik: "No, the additional 3 1/2% tax on gimmick betting. That will take care of it."

Holewinski: "Mr. Speaker, if I might address the Bill."

Matijevich: "Proceed on the Bill."

Holewinski: "I would commend the Legislative Investigating Committee for attempting to rectify some problems with the Racing Act. However, I've got some serious problems with this Bill and it makes it very difficult for me to support it. That is the question as to revenue loss for the state, I suppose that is an imponderable but I understand, I've seen estimates as high as \$7.5 million which is considerable considering I think racing brings about 60 million into the state. The political contribution thing has already been talked about and I think that's a serious problem and is a step in the wrong direction. The problem I mentioned through my, the amendment I proposed and I won't go over that, the one regarding a corporation that can be disqualified from holding a license for failure to pay its' state taxes and yet set up a subsidiary that is a, has one outstanding share and hold the license under a subsidiary corporation. And just a question, and maybe it's confusion in my mind as to this Racetrack Reconstruction Fund and that is the state subsidizing private industry, a private industry that has been a very lucrative one for the track owners, I think and has been not as lucrative for horsemen by taking money that had previously gone to purses and putting it into track reconstruction and for that, those reasons, I'm going to vote 'no' on the Bill."

Matijeich: "The gentleman from St. Clair, Monroe Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to take issue with one of the previous speakers as calling this Bill a step backward in regulating racing. Let me tell you that if we don't have something in this way of relief to both the horsemen and the tracks, there won't be any tracks downstate to regulate. You won't have anything to regulate. There must be some relief. There has been serious consideration for the Fairmont Track as to whether or not they would build back where the fire was at. They have stood by and waited to see what we are going to do



here in this legislature. The Cahokia track wouldn't be in business right now if the Fairmont was not permitted to run their races there. And insofar as any revenue loss is concerned; the Racing Board figures, I have them here on my desk and it shows a net gain of \$1,000,000 in taxes coming into this state with this Bill. Now as far as the horsemen are concerned, take a look at those telegrams. Those are all from horsemen. They are 100% behind this Bill. I would ask for a green light when the time comes."

Matijevich: "The lady from Lake, Ms. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have heard great comment about the fact that the Bill, as amended, would allow tracks to make political contributions and that's bad. I don't think it's any worse than stockbrokers making political contributions because the stock market is a very big gamble. I don't even like racetracks. I don't even go to them but I think this is a good Bill and I am raising your support for the reasons that were represented on the other side."

Matijevich: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Klosak."

Klosak: "Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry."

Matijevich: "Proceed with your parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Klosak."

Klosak: "Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Bill is a limitation on home rule powers. I therefore make the inquiry as to how many votes are necessary for the passage of the Bill."

Matijevich: "Could you tell me what section makes this limitation, Mr. Klosak."

Klosak: "On page 31 and 32 where home rule municipalities may not regulate or tax or license racetracks, I maintain that makes it a usurpation of home rule authority."

Matijevich: "I'll check it out. We will make a ruling. While we are doing that in order to expedite matters, we will proceed with the debate on the issue. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."



Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and members of the House, in addressing Senate Bill 37 I would suggest to the members that yesterday as far as I am concerned, one cue fail/^{ed}as it relates to the racing industry. I believe an explanation of my vote on that Bill, I tried to explain to my colleagues how, what my feelings was and how I think that many of us on this side of the aisle was voting. The racing industry has simply ignored a large segment of the population of this state and the extent that the only that they have used that population for is to increase their profits and benefits from the finances that they bring in to this industry. We have tried for, I have tried personally and many of us have tried for some five to six years to get this industry to recognize its responsibility to the citizens of this state as a whole. I think that that has not been did. We attempted to amend this Bill in such a way that the Bill would at least move slightly, in a small measure, in that direction. The Sponsor of this Bill and the other that was related to this Bill certainly would not budge. They have told us in/^{no}uncertain terms that they want this industry in their own image and in their own image alone. What I am saying and I'm not supporting a move here to kill racing in this state, no I am not supporting a rule to leave racing to industry unregulated. But I am saying that it is time, high time, past time, that these industries that are operating in this state under the will of the people be responsible to the people, to all of the people. They, and no one else, have the divine right to take profit out of the pockets of the various residents of this state, yet look at those residents with disdain. There is absolutely no reason, none whatsoever, to take that attitude. I would suggest to my friends here in this legislature, to my colleagues that agreed with our position as it relates to the industry yesterday, I would suggest that you would take that same interest in this Bill because this is still the same



racings industry, it is the other end of the spectrum, this Bill should be maintained here and I would urge my friends ..and colleagues in this House to vote as I will vote on Senate Bill 37 and vote 'present'."

Matijevich: "Mr. Klosak, on your point of order under Section 27f where it states no other organization, licensee, privilege tax, excise tax or racing fee shall be assessed or collected from any such organization licensee by units of local government, the Chair feels that that is an expressed limitation of any home rule unit of government and denial of power to tax and therefore this issue will require 107 votes. The gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Keller."

Keller: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I too would like to speak out in favor of House, Senate Bill 37. Presently Illinois racing has been going down in the past. Not the parimutual handle or anything like that, but we have had some of the better horsemen in the better stables leaving Illinois and moving East. And the reason they are going there is because they can make a living there. We need to try to encourage these people to come back to Illinois and Senate Bill 37 here has those types of provisions in here where we once again can move this state forward with the racing industry and bring millions of dollars, millions of tax dollars back into this state by voting for this Bill. We think these eastern states steal our better stables and our better horses and move out there and we're not getting what we need to have in Illinois to stimulate the industry and to stimulate jobs. There are thousands of jobs out in rural Illinois that can be had if we pass this Bill out of here and that will be had over the next few years and I would like to encourage everybody here to get behind this Bill so that we can have employment of Illinois, Illinoisians in this. There is a tremendous capital investment here too, for Illinois



if we get back here and get behind this Bill and get it out of here today. I urge everybody here to get behind this Bill. This state needs the merchandise, the business of horseracing and not be one to take the back seat to other sister states around here."

Matijevich: "The gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbeson."

Ebbeson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think this Bill received very adequate discussion during Second Reading and I move the previous question."

Matijevich: "The gentleman from DeKalb has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. It is made it by one vote and the main question shall be put. To close, Mr. Sevcik."

Sevcik: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that we've had a full hearing on this Bill during the amendment stage. I think everybody knows the way they are going to vote on this Bill. I think it's a very comprehensive law and it's good for the racing industry in the state of Illinois, it's good for business, it's good for additional revenue, so I'm going to ask for your favorable support."

Matijevich: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 37 pass. This Bill needs 107 votes by the ruling made by the Chair. All those in favor of Senate Bill 37 signify by voting 'aye', those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. For explanation of vote, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Well thank you Mr. Speaker and members of the House. I rise in opposition to this Bill and explain my 'no' vote. Starting the definition of person is defined in Section 3.14 on page 4 as the reason it would allow an otherwise ineligible applicant to form a subsidiary and be eligible to apply for racing dates. It would allow a licensee that had been convicted of a crime to get dates by merely forming a wholly owned subsidiary which could then apply for dates. This type of provision provides

a subterfuge necessary to return the worst kind of elements to once again tarnish the image of Illinois racing and to my good friend from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis, I would just say this. We prohibit contributions by banks, we prohibit them by insurance companies, there is a good reason for prohibiting them by the racing industry and I would urge a 'no' vote here."

Matijevich: "The gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I would like to urge your support of this Bill. Back in December, before this legislature met, a number of us were called down to Collinsville by the Collinsville Chamber of Commerce to go over the problem with them that Fairmont Racetrack had. Cahokia has a similar problem and I am sure that Moline has the same problem. Unless we pass this Bill, we are probably going to lose three racetracks in Illinois. Now these tracks end up providing the money for the county fairs throughout this state and every district is affected besides such other things as the Chicago Exposition and others. Now a lot of suggestions have been made that there is a lot of hanky-panky going on in this Bill but if you do we better abolish the Illinois Crime Investigating Commission which is the father of this Bill. Now let me remind you again that there were amendment after amendment debated fully on this floor and put on this Bill. Everyone had a right to be heard. Now if we pass this Bill it will go back to the Senate where they will again review those amendments. If there is anything wrong, I am sure there will be ample opportunity to correct it. But again let me remind you, unless we get the 107 votes necessary, you'll probably put three racetracks out of business and I am sure your county fair boards will be quite aware of it."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I am still looking for my county fair board to discuss this issue



with them. I want to say the previous speakers should have told us about the thousands of jobs that are going to be created, but for who. I mean our community suffers one of the greatest lack of employment that we have ever found but yet we can't get anybody to sit up in the racing industry and listen to us. We talk this is good for the industry, it is good for racing, it is good for everybody but it's no good for us. And I say this, that we are just sick and tired of coming down here voting 'aye', 'aye', 'aye', 'aye', 'aye'. No matter what you want we give it to you. No matter when you want it we give it to you. All we are saying is we don't mind you having racing in Illinois, we hope that you have a profitable industry, a beautiful industry, an industry that everyone can be proud of but we would like to be a part of the mainstream of racing. I say yes, we want to do something besides come and lay down the money at the \$2 window. I say that it's high time that the Racing Board and if the tracks go out of business, it might be a good thing because then when they come back and we put the House in order and they go back in business it will become a good day for everybody. And I want to ask that if the, if the Speaker of the House at the conclusion of this vote, if by some miracle there are 107 votes there, I'd like to call for a verification."

Matijevich: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines."

Gaines: "I wish to just say Amen to my district mate, Ray Ewell and I think this is the one time that the whole House can do something to put some colorful, color in that colorful racing industry."

Matijevich: "To explain her vote, Ms. Geo-Karis. You didn't want to explain your vote? Ms. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Uh, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am rather surprised at the naivete of some of my colleagues. In explaining my vote, if banks don't give contributions I can assure them and I can guarantee them



their bank officers do. If insurance companies don't give contributions to condidates, I can assure 'em....their.... their officers and their employees do....and they're ...do they're done many time...they're done at the instructions of the heads of the companies. So, I just thought I'd like to mention it in passing."

Matijevich: "The Chairman of the Judiciary I, Mr. Washington."

Washington: "Well, thank you Mr. Speaker. Several days ago, I think it was last week, these days are running together, ... ah...several of the Minority Members of...in the House got up and viciously opposed the Racing Board Budget Bill because we laid out a pattern of discrimination in terms of hiring of employees for these various racing....ah...industries. I think we made our case pretty clear and we voted....to....voted present because we couldn't go along with the situation. There were other groups and elements who fought and presumably are still fighting that budget for different reasons. Now, I'm not one to take off after the press, they're free to write what they please, just like we're presumably free to say what we please. But it disturbed me greatly that the press didn't discriminate as finely as we attempted to do and they lumped us all together as a group who were opposed to the Racing Board's budget because we had some antipathy directed toward Tony Scariano which in my case certainly was absolutely untrue. The net result is that the public is confused. Well the public may be confused and the press may be misleading but we are consistent in that we take the position we're not going to do anything to enhance the racing industry in....in this State unless and until they rectify certain basic inequities which simply shouldn't exist in this State in light of our given, stated and clear cut public policy against discrimination based on race, color, creed nor sex. I'm not deluded into thinking that the press is going to make that any clearer or make that distinction any more finite for the



press so that the public will know our reason but just so that the Members of this General Assembly will know why we are doing what we're doing. The Minority Members of this House are voting present because we simply cannot go along with institutional racism. It's just that simple. I hope this Bill is stopped. It needs 107, I sincerely wish it wouldn't get that. Whatever your reasons are, if you really and fundamentally believe that this discrimination is bad, then give us the benefit of your doubt if you have any, vote 'present' on this Bill and let these people come to task with us. They're culprits, they are beyond the law, they are consistently violating it, we haven't put the tools together to do the job, hopefully initiatorial powers will if it is signed, but unless that's done and until that's done, we as a group simply cannot/in any way the Racing Industry in the State of Illinois which you in your wisdom have given license toto run rampant in terms of our basic and fundamental rights.....so I vote present."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I know that not very many Legislative Districts have race tracks in them, but let me re... re...remind you of something....especially you people from Chicago, that the McCormick Place was built with funds from the Ag Fund. The Belle Clair Exposition Hall in my....in my County....in my District...was built from those same funds. Much of those funds goes to support the County Fairs all over this State. There are several cities right now in the process of building....ah....what we may call exposition or ...ah....convention centers or whatever they choose to call 'em, by Legislation passed here last year. All of those are to be supported from that same fund and I am serious when I tell you there are at least two tracks that I know of and probably three which will go broke absolutely go broke if both the trackmen, the track owners and the horsemen do



not get some relief and this is the only Bill we have left, there is no other Bill in the hopper, there is no other way to do it and I.....it doesn't make sense to me that if you don't get your way now about this and I....and I was one of those who voted 'present' the other day, but if you don't get your way nowthey can go ahead and go out of business."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, to explain his vote."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Most of you will realize that ...ah...when the Racing Board Budget came up for review before this Body, every Member of this Legislature whoMembers of the Minority Community, voted either 'present' or 'no' on this Bill. Now comes before us Senate Bill 37, and we've said that we wanted to be consistent in our feelings as it related to the Racing Industry, but I note that several of our Brethern have decided to crossover in the 'aye' column. Now, I would say to those 'Soul Brothers' that that's your privilege and that's your prerogative and you may vote as you please but Brothers you're not being consistent. Thank you."

Matijevich: "For what purpose does does the Chairman of the Elections Committee, Mr. Fennessey, seek recognition?"

Fennessey: "Mr. Speaker,ah.....I would like to ask leave of the House to allow the Elections Committee to meet at three o'clock in the Speakers Office while the House is in Session for the purpose of adopting the report on the Stearney-Mahar Contest and also to hear the Stearney....D...Hearing."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman asks leave that the Election Committee may meet at three o'clock, while the House is in Session. Does he have leave?.....He has leave. The....for explanation of votesthe Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Jacobs."

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



House, I think that if we will just stop and think a minute about our conditions in racing as far as our physical plants are concerned that we will give 107 votes which is needed. You know, I listen to those who say....that....thatthe Racing Plants are not hiring certain people. I sympathized with them, and let me tell you this, if you do with racing you'll have none. I've always went along and voted with the minority groups and I think now is the time that we should all realize that if it takes something like this to do it, let's all get together and help them. But right now we need to help to keep the Physical Plants where as they can have the opportunity and I think that we're all willing to help and if we band together and save the down-State tracks, today we have the Hamiltonian in the State of Illinois but if this Bill fails we won't have it. We have a track in East Moline, in my District, this Bill fails....we wont have it. The State there will loose over \$1,500,000. Now, Illinois has set up whereas we in Illinois can be the top State in racing, which will draw millions and millions of dollars through visitors and through the horsemen. Do you realize that we have the tracks, some of the tracks in Illinois today, with a purse of \$500? How can a horseman do it? What are we trying to do? Are we going to really try to say, we don't need racing in Illinois.....when the public demands it....the public ...if you will look at the tracks in the Chicago area doing over a million dollars business in a day. Let's take and help the down-State tracks. If for no other reason, let's protect the down-State's.....and I plead with you...give us 107....we need it."

Matijeovich: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Lucco, to explain his vote."

Lucco: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote I would like to say.....start out this way.....I'm sure that there are many many reasons

whydifferent individuals have a green light up there. I'm sure that some of them have their light green for the same reason that I have mine green. I have mine green because in my area it's an economic situation. I am voting for this particular Bill because it means jobs to people. I'm not interested one bit in anyone else that's connected with the racetracks. I would like to implore those people who are voting green and hopefully others that will vote green, that they will take it upon themselves as a personal commitment that they use the same influence in what I want to ask them to do as they're using in trying to pass this Bill. You have been urged to use your influence to get this Bill passed just as I have been. I want you to commit yourself as I am committing myself this moment with this green vote to see that this so-called discrimination which I hear about and which I believe is going on that this is stopped and I think it is up to those of us who are pushing for this Bill to take it upon ourselves that this is not only cleaned up from the racing angle but cleaned up from the discriminatory angle. So I urge you, commit yourself to do what you know is right for those people here like Ewell, Washington and all the others who will stick with you and have stuck with you on many other occasions. So I ask you, make a commitment today to clean it up, wipe out this discriminatory thing."

Matijeovich: "Ten more minutes of silent....silent picture....."

The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor, to explain his vote."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain my vote. It is very seldom that I do this. I rise because of a statement made by a Gentleman on this House floor just a few moments ago. I'm serving my fourth term here. I've always solicited votes but I've never told anyone how to vote.....and in my four terms here I haven't voted just for black or just for whiteI voted for people orientation of Legislation..... I know what is going on at the racetracks. I do feel that



there is discrimination there. There is discrimination in any of the offices of this State if you want to look for it. I don't think that putting this Bill in a shape that we cannot pass it is going to help the situation any. I go to the racetrack myself and I venture to say that 80% of the people out there are minorities, they are voted....they are betting out there and they are betting in East St. Louis, they are in East....East Moline and they are at Aurora Downs and all of the other tracks and I am proud of voting now because many of the Members on this floor that this Bill will effect will be hurt by this and I'll barely support Senate Bill 37."

Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, to explain his vote."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to be consistant in explanation of votes because one of the previous speakers got up and said that he sympathized with the problem that we face. Well, let me say this to you today, here at this hour, that the people that's living on the West-Side of Chicago, the people that's living on the South-Side of Chicago, the 35 to 40% unemployed if you will, cannot eat sympathy, they need a job, what we're talking about here is a...an industry that is benefiting from 60% of the minorities that attend that track, and that's \$1,000,000 a day, 60% of that comes from the minority community. We need a job, we don't want welfare, we don't want a handup... we don't want a handout...all we want is part of the industry to give us an opportunity to work in that industry. We need jobs, we cannot get jobs if you won't give us the opportunity to get 'em. All we're asking for here on this Bill is to maintain it here where we can get a commitment from the racing industry to cut out the discrimination that's involved there. We are not asking for anyone to give us anything except an opportunity to work and I ask my friends here and I ask my other colleaguesI have helped everybody in this



legislature in the three terms I have been here and I have raised on rare occasions to ask anyone to help me and I'm asking you, our community is drowning. We need jobs and we have an opportunity here, we have an opportunity now, and I beg of you to give us that opportunity to work. Don't force our community into welfare and criticize us for using the welfare for the only way to survive. We don't want welfare, we want jobs and that's what this is about."

Matijeovich: "The gentleman from McClean, Mr. Calvo, to explain his vote."

Calvo: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just as briefly as I can let me say this. In the, the only thing I can speak about is the tracks I know a little bit about. I think I was last there some 2 1/2 years ago but I know from friends of mine who go there regularly and from my own observation when I was there and this has not changed. There is more minority employees at my, at the track in Monroe Flinn's district which my, my track is now operating there also. There are ticket-takers, they're at the passgate, they're selling food, they're dispensing the drinks, they're everywhere on that track, not the backstretch only. The minority people are all over that track and they're certainly very well represented when it comes to employment. So when the man talks about trying to kill this Bill, maybe he's got some special problem I don't know about. But I do know about that and I can tell you this. If this Bill does not pass you can forget racing in southern Illinois. This Bill gives the state of Illinois another \$1,000,000 above what they are getting now in revenue and if it doesn't pass and we don't get this released for the Moline tracks and for my track there isn't going to be any more. And that's going to deprive this state of approximately \$8,000,000 to \$10,000,000 a year or more and I tell you, you're making a big mistake. Give us those few votes."

I've got to talk for the area I know, for the employees who work there, for the minority employees who work there, the majority of whom are minority employees. These are the people that need the jobs. I don't care about the racing interests. I don't have a penny's worth of stock, never have had. I don't have a horse and probably never will have. But let's do something for these people. Get those 8 votes and get this Bill. And if this Bill is the kind of Bill that should be passed, it came out of a Commission that had hearings that was interested only in doing something to increase the sport in the state, to increase the revenues to the state of Illinois..."

Matijevich: "Calvo..."

Calvo: "I will sir. I think they did a great job and they have taken some 20 amendments to make it just as good as it possibly could be and it's compatible and I urge your support to pass this good legislation."

Matijevich: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sevcik."

Sevcik: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to answer some of the points that the minority group presented here. I feel they have a legitimate argument but their argument is against the Racing Board if they have it, not against this Bill. This Bill creates jobs for all people. If they have an argument against the unions it has nothing to do with this Bill. We do not try to regulate them. All we are trying to do is regulate the racing industry in the state of Illinois. We have made allowances here for additional racing dates so there will be more employment. We have made allowances...uh...for additional funds for county fairs, for breeders, for tracks improvements, for additional jobs for the people of the state of Illinois. I have no qualms with the minority that are not voting. I feel, I feel for them if they feel they are being discriminated in a job. But this Bill has nothing to do with employment or hiring. If their animosity is towards the Racing Board, I will



side with them. And I ask that they vote for this Bill because it is a good Bill and we need it for the state of Illinois."

Matijevid: "The gentleman from Cook, Emil Jones, to explain his vote."

Jones: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There have been remarks made on the floor by minority members about the fact that they are in sympathy with the minority problem as it relates to the racing industry in the state of Illinois. But it certainly does not create jobs. If our representative district had over half of its' people on welfare, I would have voted 'yes' to put a limit on the courtesy charge of \$1.00 to cash welfare checks and those are poor people. These people, some of these same people go to the racetracks. They need jobs. You cannot lose what you haven't got. There is not written into this Bill any jobs that go for minorities so I don't know how the Sponsor of this Bill can stand on the floor and say he is going to create jobs. Where the jobs coming from? We don't have them now. There was an opportunity to accept amendments to this Bill that would prohibit the racing industry from discriminating against / minorities but they were rejected. They were rejected so how can you lose what you haven't got? The language of this particular Bill authorizes the Racing Board to let racing dates for any association up to three years. Three years an association can be let a racing date. That's a lockout. That is a lockout. This Bill should be defeated and I urge those members who are of minority persuasion, who say they speak for minorities to change their vote from green to yellow. Stand up for one time for the people. You have an opportunity now to have, to be a man. So stand up and be a man. Support your people and change those lights from red to yellow. Thank you." /

Matijevid: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who



wish? The Clerk will take the record. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sevcik."

Sevcik: "I would like to poll the absentees."

Matijevich: "Oh, Corneal Davis, the assistant majority leader, for what purpose do you rise?"

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

Just a few minutes to explain my vote. Some people have asked me to vote for this Bill that I have all the confidence in the world in and some people have asked me to vote against it that I have all the confidence in the world in. You shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free. I'm going to tell you the truth, so help me God. The chairman, somebody said, that we were strong with the Racing Board. I respect the man who is chairman of that Board and I'm going to repeat again, I campaigned for him and I'm not sorry. And my seatmate here knows that it was storming when I was out ringing doorbells and I'll do it again because I think he has a great record. But I got put smack dab in the middle and I don't think anybody wants to be put smack dab in the middle. They called a meeting in my office of all of my soul brothers and they wound up by saying I tell you what we going to do. We going to send the deacon a letter here and we going to say what going on. I said all right, if it's in the letter, I'm going to let you know what's going on. Well, until now I haven't received that letter. Now I get word that these people who own the horses, I suppose, and that sort of thing, are going to give black people every opportunity to have racing dates and I even hear that they're going to give them an opportunity to have a racetrack. Being a preacher, I'm not going to participate in either one of them, I'm going to tell you that because I still say you can't win. But the state is a party to it and the state gets its' taxes. Now I'm going to tell you what to do if we're sincere. Let's postpone this Bill for a few minutes



here and let's see if we can't get my friend, the chairman of the Racing Board, down here and get these owners down here because they say the state needs, let's see if we can't, and let me stand up and point my finger in their face and tell them what they agreed to do and if you do that, maybe we can save the state this tax money. And the only reason I'm doing this is because I'm going to be asked to stand on this floor, in fact I've got the Bill here. I'm going to be asked to stand on this floor and ask this state, listen to me now and we need it. A billion and over 800,000,000. This is what I'm going to have to ask for. For public aid and they need it in every county in the state. And this is the only reason I want to resolve this matter. I don't want to be placed in the middle. If they are so liberal, then if the chairman of the Board will come here and if these track owners that they say are responsible for it will come here, maybe we can find out who in the devil is responsible for it and resolve this issue and this is the only way, it seems to me..."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Davis..."

Davis: "...that we're going to know the truth. I'm asking him to postpone it a few minutes."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Davis, Mr. Washington seeks recognition. Mr Washington seeks recognition."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, members of the House, I know there is a vote being recorded on the floor but I'm going to ask the Sponsor of this Senate Bill to take it out of the record. Then I'm going to ask the House to permit him to do so. I think perhaps some more quiet discussion just might come around to some kind of reasonable conclusion. Would you ask the Sponsor if he would agree to that?"

Matijeovich: "Mr. Sevcik. Just a minute, Mr. Sevcik. You will be recognized. You will be recognized. Mr. Sevcik."

Sevcik: "I agree. I agree to Harold Washington's request."

Matijeovich: "All right. Point of order by Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "My point of order I'm not opposed. I'm not opposed to some quiet, calm discussion on this issue. But I don't want this Bill taken out of the record. If he would have postponed it, fine. That's our rules. Postpone it. But don't take it out of the record. Don't do that to us."

Matijevich: "He can't do it under our rules unless the House here allows him to do it. Uh, and there has been objection...uh...do you desire postponed consideration, Mr. Sevcik?"

Sevcik: "Mr. Speaker, I was requested by Representative Washington. I did not ask for it, to take this out of the record. I acceded to his request."

Matijevich: "Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I know that we probably could suspend that rule if we had to but I think we've got two reasonable men, Representative Washington and Representative Sevcik that perhaps can solve this problem if they are allowed to sit down and try to work it out. Now everybody knows and everybody knows what's happened on the appropriation for the Racing Commission. We see what's happening here. I think it can be solved. I spent a great deal of time yesterday with Representative Washington and some of the leadership talking with Mr. Scariano, attempting to solve this problem. Harold will tell you that we've done it in good faith. I don't know where he is, Harold. No, I'm not suggesting anybody is unreasonable, Representative Barnes. What I'm suggesting is, that there isn't a problem in the world that can't be solved if people will sit down and reason together."

Matijevich: "The gentleman from Cook, the gentleman from, Mr. Davis, Mr. Jaffe now has the floor. Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, members of the House, I would suggest to you that this is not merely a battle between two individuals on this floor of this House. There are many of us up there who are voting red out of conviction. We



think that this is a bad Bill and I would have an objection if no one else did."

Matijevich: "The Bill cannot be taken out of the record while it is on the final Roll Call and there have been objections. The, on this issue there are 103 'ayes', I understand there is one add on, the and 39 'nays' and Mr. Sevcik has asked for a poll of the absentees. There is a request for a poll of the absentees. Point of order, Mr. Keller, from Effingham."

Keller: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask, this Bill now has 102 votes, it requires..."

Matijevich: "103."

Keller: "103. It requires 107. If it does not receive 107 but it receives above 89 will it take effect next July 1?"

Matijevich: "No. I understand it has 102. There has been one taken off. The Clerk will poll the absentees."

Jack O'Brien: "Beatty."

Matijevich: "Beatty 'aye'. He's got beady eyes."

Jack O'Brien: "Byers, Duff, Hoffman."

Matijevich: "Present."

Jack O'Brien: "Molloy."

Matijevich: "Molloy 'present'."

Jack O'Brien: "Rose, Sharp."

Matijevich: "All the absentees. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

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

Matijevich: "How is Mr. Lechowicz recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Lechowicz: "Change that to 'aye'."

Matijevich: "Change Mr. Lechowicz from 'no' to 'aye'. The lady from Cook, Ms. Macdonald."

Macdonald: "How am I recorded?"

Matijevich: "How is Ms. Macdonald recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The lady is recorded as voting 'present'."

Macdonald: "'Present' to 'aye'."



Matijeich: "Change Ms. Macdonald from 'present' to 'aye'.
The, Mr. Getty from Cook. Mr. Getty from Cook."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, how
am I recorded?"

Matijeich: "How is Mr. Getty recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The gentleman is recorded as voting 'present'."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I was distressed that Mr. Pierce's
amendment was not put on and that is the reason for my
'present' vote. However, within my district I do have a
racetrack that I believe would suffer and maybe go out
of business if this isn't passed. So please change my
'present' vote to 'aye'."

Matijeich: "Change Mr. Getty from 'present' to 'aye'. Mr.
Jaffe, for what purpose do you rise?"

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time..."

Matijeich: "Mr. Ewell has already requested for a verifica-
tion. Mr. Ryan, for what purpose do you rise?"

Ryan: "Change me from 'present' to 'aye' please."

Matijeich: "Change Mr. Ryan from 'present' to 'aye'. Mr.
Schuneman?"

Schuneman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. How am I recorded?"

Matijeich: "How is Mr. Schuneman recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The gentleman is recorded as voting 'present'."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, I have some real hangups with this
Bill, primarily because of the granting of permission to
make campaign contributions. I think it's wrong. I think
the minority groups have some honest objections to this
Bill but I think in the final analysis that the horse
racing industry in this state needs this Bill for proper
administration of the business and control of the business
and therefore I would like to switch my vote to 'aye'."

Matijeich: "Record Schuneman voting from 'present' to 'aye'. Mr.
Terzich wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Are there
any other requests from the membership? Mr. Merlo wants
to be recorded as voting 'aye'. And Mr. Maragos 'aye'.
Mr. Peters?"

Peters: "From 'aye' to 'present' Mr. Speaker."

Matijevich: "Change Peters from 'aye' to 'present'. Mr. Clerk, could I have the record? Is Eugenia Chapman in the hall? Who seeks recognition, is that Mr. Sevcik? Mr. Hoffman, Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, change my vote from 'present' to 'aye'."

Matijevich: "Change Mr. Hoffman from 'present' to 'aye'. Gene Hoffman. Mr. Daniels, for what purpose do you rise?"

Daniels: "Change me to 'aye'."

Matijevich: "Change Lee Daniels to 'aye'. Mr. Jones, for what purpose do you rise?"

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, what is the delay in regards to the verification to the poll of absentees? Are you trying to wait for the members to get here or what? What is the delay?"

Matijevich: "No, the delay is with the Clerk. They've got, evidently they've got two different tallies and they want to make sure they are correct."

Jones: "Well, I've never seen a delay this long, Mr. Speaker."

Matijevich: "Well, I can't help it, Emil. I have to, I think Ray Ewell would like to know where he starts off from and I usually start by telling somebody what the count is and they haven't given me a count. Soon as they give a count here, we're ready to go. Mr. Sangmeister, for what purpose do you rise?"

Sangmeister: "How am I recorded?"

Matijevich: "How is Mr. Sangmeister recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The gentleman is recorded as voting 'present'."

Sangmeister: "Well Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I like a lot of people here, I think have some reservations about this Bill but I have been talked to by some representatives whose opinion I respect and I feel whose motives are pure and clean and have asked for an 'aye' vote and on that basis I'll change from 'present' to 'aye'."

Matijeovich: "Change Sangmeister from 'present' to 'aye'."

Allright, Mr. Clerk, where are we at?"

Jack O'Brien: "113 'ayes'....."

Matijeovich: "113 'ayes' and now I recognize Mr. Ewell. Ah...."

The Clerk will proceed with the affirmative vote, Mr. Ewell will question the affirmative vote. Proceed with the affirmative vote. Mr. Jones, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Jones. "Mr. Speaker, will you have the aisles cleared and have everyone in their seats? We see so many Members here from the other side of the rotunda twisting their arms and everything so will you have all the Members sit in their seats, please.....and ...and clear the floor of those unauthorized persons."

Matijeovich: "Please take your seats and anybody holding hands or twisting arms please refrain for Mr. Jones' sake. ..Ah. Proceed with the affirmative Roll Call."

Jack O'Brien: "J. M. Barnes, Beatty, Beaupre, Birchler, Bluthardt, Borchers, Boyle, Bradley, Brandt, Brummet, ...vo, Campbell, Capparelli, Capuzi, Carroll, Coffey, Collins, ...aig, Cunningham, Daniels, D'Arco, Darrow, Deavers, DiPrima, R..... Dunn, Ebbesen, Ewing, Farley, Fary, Fennessey,"

Matijeovich: "Mr. Fennessey...?"

Fennessey: "May I be verified so I can attend a meeting in the Speakers office?"

Matijeovich: "Leave to verify Mr. Fennessey so he can go back to that Elections Committee. Mr. Leverenz asks for similar leave. Leave for Mr. Leverenz, leave for Mr. McPartlin, so they can attend the Elections Committee and leave for ... Walter Kozubowski and Mr. McAuliffe and Friedland I guess that's back there, and Mr. LaurinoVanDuyne... those all have to go to the Elections Committee. Leave.. and Doug Huff also has to go to Elections Committee..... you too Lewis?.....Caldwell has to go to the doctor..... Hope everything is all right....Lew. Mr. DiPrima has to



the Committee. Proceed."

Jack O'Brien: "Fleck, Flinn, Friedland, Friedrich, Garmisa, Geo-Karis,y, Giglio, Girogi, Griesheimer, Grotberg, Hanahan, Gene Hoffman, Ron Hoffman, Houlihan.....Dan.... Houlihan that is, Jacobs, Keller, Kent, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Kucharski, Lauer, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leinenweber, Kornowicz, Leon, Leverenz, Londrigan, Lucco,L.....Macdonald, Mahar, Maragos, Matijevidh, Mautino, McAuliffe, McAvoy, McClain, McCourt, McGrew, McMaster, McPartlin, Merlo, Miller, Mudd, Mulcahey, Nardulli, Neff, O'Daniel, Patrick, Polk,"

Matijevidh: "Excuse me. Mr. Mahar would like to have leave to be verified, he also must attend that Elections Committee.He's got an important roll in it I understand."

Jack O'Brien: "Pouncey, Randolph, Richmond, Ryan, Sangmeister, Schisler....."

Matijevidh: "Excuse me.....show Collins and Bluthardt also as attending the Elections Committee.....Collins and Bluth... Collins was here and Bluthardt just stopped right by here... ..you....well....I'll bring him back out here for you... Emil.....bring....ah.....Mr. Epton...."

Epton: "Ah....Gentlemen, ...ah...I voted 'no' and I saw Mr. Bluthardt right here ask permission. I think ...ah...they do have an important meeting. Would you be good enough to verify him?"

Matijevidh: "Yes.....Emil....please do thatbecause hedid.."

Jones: "Alright."

Matijevidh: "Bluthardt....he was right here and....ah.."

Jones: "Okay."

Matijevidh: "Ms. Dyer, for what purpose do you rise?"

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

Matijevidh: "How is Mrs. Dyer recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'present'."

Dyer: "Please change my vote to 'aye'."



Matijeovich: "Change Dyer from 'present' to 'aye'."

Jack O'Brien: "Schisler, Schlickman, Schoeberlein, Schraeder, Schuneman, Sevcik, Shea, Simms, Stearney, E.G. Steele, C.M. Steele, Stone, Taylor,"

Matijeovich: "Give Stearney leave to attend the Elections Committee....Stearney....and I already gave Huff, Doug Huff.. earlier.....Proceed."

Jack O'Brien: "Terzich, Totten, Tuerk, VanDuyn, VonBoeckman, Wall, Washburn, White, Williams, Winchester, Younge, Mr. Speaker."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Ewell.....I guess you're the quarterback.... Stearney you've been given leave to leave.....Leave."

Ewell: "Ah....Mr. Washburn...."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Washburn..."

Ewell: "Could I have the count, please?"

Matijeovich: "What's.....what's the count, Mr. O'Brien?"

Jack O'Brien: "It's....ah...."

Ewell: "Washburn here.....for....what's the count?"

Matijeovich: "114 to 38."

Ewell: "Washburn"

Matijeovich: "Mr. Washburn,....probably in his office....here.. he....coming in the front door."

Ewell: "Tuerk."

Matijeovich: "Bud, you can leave again."

Washburn: "Okay."

Ewell: "Tuerk."

Matijeovich: "Verify, Minority Whip, Tim Simms....is verified."

Ewell: "Tuerk."

Matijeovich: "Fred Tuerk.....He is in his seat."

Ewell: "Totten."

Matijeovich: "Totten,....Representative Totten...I don't see him in his seat....ah....ah...and I don't see him in the hall... How is he.....well I have to ask how he's recorded first.. Totten....How is he recorded?"

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



Matijeovich: "Take him off the Roll."

Ewell: "Schraeder."

Matijeovich: "Representative Schraeder is.... in somebody elses seat."

Ewell: "Randolph."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Randolph is sitting in his seat."

Ewell: "Patrick."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Patrick....he is standing up...right behind you."

Ewell: "Shea."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Shea, ... how is Mr. Shea recorded?"

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

Matijeovich: "I don't see him around. He'll probably be running in here in a minute.....ah....take him off."

Ewell: "McMaster."

Matijeovich: "Mr. McMaster is in his seat."

Ewell: "McGrew."

Matijeovich: "Mr. McGrew. I don't see him anywhere. Ah...Take him off the record.....if he is recorded 'aye'."

Ewell: "Georgi."

Matijeovich: "Representative Georgi.....was standing over thereand return Totten....Totten to the Roll Call. Proceed."

Ewell: "Giglio."

Matijeovich: "Giglio is in his seat."

Ewell: "Getty."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Getty....is....right behind you, Ray."

Ewell: "Garmisa."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Garmisa,....I don't see him....ah...in his seat or in the Chambers....If he is 'aye' take him off."

Ewell: "Ewing."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Ewing,I don't see Mr. Ewing, is he recorded 'aye'?"

Jack O'Brien: "Show him as recorded voting 'aye'."

Matijeovich: "Take him off."

Ewell: "Dunn."



Matijeich: "Dunn?.....eh....eh.."

Ewell: "Ralph Dunn."

Matijeich: "He is in the isle over here."

Ewell: "John Dunn."

Matijeich: "John Dunn....he is in the other isle."

Jack O'Brien: "The Gentleman voted 'present'."

Ewell: "I'm sorry, I'm sorry, I'm sorry....I meant Ralph Dunn."

Matijeich: "Return Garmisa, he is right here. Garmisa on

the Roll Call. Return Mr. Shea on the Roll Call."

Ewell: "Capparelli."

Matijeich: "Capparelli, I don't see Capparelli.....Is he
recorded 'aye'.....Here he is."

Ewell: "Boyle."

Matijeich: "Boyle is in the back isle there."

Ewell: "Beaupre."

Matijeich: "Beaupre is in his seat."

Ewell: "Grotberg."

Matijeich: "Grotberg, uh.....uh....return Ewing. I don't
see Grotberg around.....take Grotberg off the Roll Call."

Ewell: "Dan Houlihan."

Matijeich: "Dan Houlihan, is not in his seat and I don't see
him here.....take Houlihan off...if he is on 'aye'."

Ewell: "Laurino."

Matijeich: "Here is Dan Houlihan, return him.....Laurino has
been excused, he is in the Election Committee."

Ewell: "Mr. Leverenz."

Matijeich: "Mr. Leverenz has been excused, he is in the
Election Committee."

Ewell: "McCain....er....ah....I mean McClain."

Matijeich: "Idon't think he iser....are you record-
ed 'aye'? He is right here, anyhow."

Ewell: "Mudd."

Matijeich: "Mr. Mudd,Joe Mudd is right in front here....
Return Grotberg....he is standing by the well....by the
door, down in the hole.....Ray Ewell, Grotberg is down by

the....Return Grotberg. Are there any other further questions of the affirmative vote? Mr. Rose?"

Rose: "Thank you."

Matijevich: "Just a minute, for what purpose....."

Rose: "If I am not recorded, please record me 'aye'."

Matijevich: "Record Tom Rose voting 'aye'. And there are no further questions ...ah...Mr. Arnell."

Arnell: "Please vote me as 'aye'."

Matijevich: "Record Don Arnell as voting 'aye'. And there are no other further questions...if Mr. Byersrecord Byers voting 'aye'. No other questions of the affirmative vote.. Mr. Clerk, I'd like to have a tally.....This issue has 116 'ayes', and 30.....what.....?"

Jack O'Brien: "38 'nos'."

Matijevich: "38 'nos', this Bill having a 3/5 majority is here- by declared passed.....Mr. Jones, do you seek recognition?"

Jones: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I see you very conveniently called the Roll before you recognized meand I thought you were a fair and just man but I see that the Speakers Chair does things to all men. I'm so sorry that there are individuals in the House here are being threatened about ERA or on the other side if they don't voteyou know.... and every thing. I wish you had recognized me bef....."

Matijevich: "Mr. Jones, I didn't know for what purpose you were going to rise and Ithere were adequate votes and I thought it should be declared passed. Mr. Madison, for what purpose do you rise?"

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. As soon as this Roll Call is tabulated and verified. I'd like to request a copy of it please."

Matijevich: "Have a copy of what."

Madison: "Of the Roll Call."

Matijevich: "You'll have to get that from the Clerk's Office. I...I...I think there is a rule against it, but I think some have been provided and you'll have to talk to the Clerk,



not with the Speaker. Mr. Ron Hoffman....Ron Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side, I now move that the vote by which Senate Bill 37 was just passed be reconsidered."

Matijevich: "Gentleman from Cook has moved that the vote by which Senate Bill 37 has been passed be reconsidered and Monroe Flinn moved that that motion lay on the Table. All in favor of the Tabling motion say 'aye', opposed 'nay' and the 'ayes' have it. The motion has been Tabled....ah.... Mr. ...Mr. Terzich has asked that...leave that Senate Bill 894 on the ...ah...Third Reading...on the order of Third Reading be held over until the Fall Calendar. Does he have such leave? He has such leave....Ah...Ah...Senate Bill 647....run over and get Laurino....Oh, Senate Bill 647..."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 647, a Bill for an Act to Amend the Election Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Laurino..."

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

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

Walsh: "Well on this Bill, Mr. Speaker, I rise to point out that ...that this Bill changes the Primary Date in the same way that a House Bill changed the Primary Date that passed this House, that passed the Senate and is now on the Governor's desk. So it is the ultimate in folly to consider this Bill at this time and while I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker if I may, Representative Brian Duff's lovely wife, Florence is in the Speaker Gal....the Speaker's Gallery with their sons, Roddy, Kevin and Danny, I wonder if they'd stand up?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There is a possibility that the House Bill that passed out of here and out of the Senate can poss.....can conceivably be amended by the Governor and if that be the case we have nothingwe....are...the...the...House Bill that would



have.....would have passed or the Senate Bill, would put us into a predicament whereby we would not be able to effectively have a new primary date. So the reason to move this over or to pass this Bill is to have a little insurance that possibly in the Fall, if there is an Amendment to the Bill, that we can act on this in the Fall."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, at the very most that could happen would be that there would be two Bills doing exactly the same thing. The Speaker would.....er....the Governor would of course veto one and would put his amendatory veto, if he cared to that, on another one. Now he can put the Amendatory veto on the one that he has now if he is so disposed and I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that we are a little bit nervous about Bills....that....ah...Amending the Election Law. We're afraid that it may be a vehicle to do something else, frankly that's our objection really, to considering this, we don't find very many instances, Mr. Speaker, where it's absolutely absurd to consider the subject matter within a Bill and....that is....the case...."

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

Madison: "On a point of order....on a point of order, Mr. Speaker,...."

Speaker Redmond: "State your point."

Madison: "Do the Rules allow us to debate a Bill that has not been read a Third time?"

Speaker Redmond: "They do not.....Mr. Clerk."

Madison: "Well, I suggest that we're debating this issue.... Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk advises me that he read it, Representative Madison."

Madison: "I did not hear him read it, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "So, I would respectfully request of the Gentleman from



Cook, that he take this Bill out of the record or Table this Bill because it can serve absolutely no purpose for us to debate it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, rather than be the ultimate in folly as was rather surly said by our Assistant Minority Leader, I think that this Bill offers offers us each a priceless opportunity that may not come this way again very soon. Rather than pass it in its present form, which is a duplication of the other Bill, and represents a compromise about which none of you had any enthusiasm whatever, if you'll remember that we just counted the months of the year and said we've had it in March, we've had it in April, we've had it in June, we haven't had it in May, so let's set the primary in May. It's time for a brand new, brave, imaginative approach to the problem and the way we do is this, we move the Bill back to Second, we amend it to be the First Monday in March and then we bring it back and pass it and send it over for Concurrence and the logic and reason of this proposal is this, we have in the language of the prior Bill, three fine racehorses in the presidential sweepstakes next year and it would give opportunity to our two United States Senators and yes our Governor too...for a little exposure here in Illinois rather than the New Hampshire Primary. We spend millions in the Bureau of Economic Development for the tourist trade, we shouldn't ignore the economic opportunity that we have to advertise to the rest of the nation our sweepstake entries in the presidential race for next year. So at this time I would respectfully request that my distinguished friend....the Sponsor of this Bill, Representative Laurino, having heard my logic, are you willing to bring the Bill back to Second that we amend it to make it aI have...the already the Amendment ready...The first Monday in March....and that way we'll get ahead of the New



Hampshire Primary and we will do a fine thing for the three Favorite Sons of Illinois, Stevenson, Percy and....and..... Walker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Laurino....Laurino."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill was on Second Reading for quite a while....and in fact I took it out of the record for one of the other Gentlemen on the other side of the isle, and held it for a couple days until nothing happened. So I....I....desist in the motion by Representative Cunningham in bringing it back to Second again, this is the last day this Bill can be heard and I'm going to bring it back from Third."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Laurino, the fact that I'm not timely doesn't destroy the merit of my suggestion. While I'm on my feet, in view of the relaxed rules during the last week, I would point out to the Speaker in the House that we have a distinguished delegation of the leadership of the women of Cumberland County in the Speakers Gallery to the rear. If you'd welcome, I'd be appreciative."

Speaker Redmond: "You just violated the rules. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, in arising to oppose this Bill I remind the Membership that we had a Primary in April and we didn't like that, we changed it to June and we didn't like that, we changed it to March and apparently we don't like that and now we are going to find out what the month of May is like. I respectfully suggest you're not going to find it any better than June, April, or apparently March. It seems to me Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, by going to May, we simply disrupt... and will be disrupting ...disrupting the operation of State Government. You know darn well that come next year we'll have to be down here worrying about appropriations for fiscal 1977 and for Revenue matters. Also, Mr. Speaker and



members of the House, this is an agricultural state and there are agricultural activities that are at their height in May. There will be conflict there. I respectfully suggest that as much as March is not a good month, it's certainly better than April, May or June. If we really want to solve the problem and if we really want to help the people cutting down on campaign activity and cost, we ought to change the primary to September but if we can't do that leave it where it's at in March. And I urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duff. Is he in his chair? Representative Ebbesen. Ebbesen, do you seek? Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr., Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this issue has been debated on the floor of the House before but I would just like to echo the comments of the previous speaker. There is no way in the world any of us can be two places at once. If we are home campaigning, then we are being derelict in our duties to the people. If we are down here doing our duty, someone's at home taking care of our constituency in such a way that it will be detrimental to our political success. I cannot for the life of me understand why this Bill would be supported by any of us who are thinking about...uh...the future of members of the General Assembly. Now if there are some municipalities that want to get this out of the...out between primaries and general elections, that's one thing. But why don't you just stand up and tell us what you really want and let us vote on it on that basis? To use a facade and a sham and a red herring and tell us it's for something else, then you think less of us than you really should because it's pretty transparent to some of us what you are intending to do. And I for one am opposed to this primary date and would suggest that the rest of us go along and vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."



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

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman moves the previous question.

The question is, shall the main question be put. All in favor vote 'aye', signify by saying 'aye', 'no', the 'ayes' have it. Representative Laurino to close."

Laurino: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to take too much time of the House. The Committee on Elections, after considering a fistful of Bills, suggesting practically every Tuesday from March to September, overwhelmingly decided on the first Tuesday in May. The weather is a lot more practical than March. The timing is a lot more beneficial to the members of the General Assembly and to the people who would wish to vote. It gives you a lot more participation. The people that want to pass out the nominating petitions do not have to worry about the holiday rush, the horrible weather and as far as the rural areas are concerned, we heard testimony from all sides of the issues and that's the reason why we came up with the earliest week in May."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I can't believe we are going to pass another May primary Bill. You know the Elections Committee had all kinds of opportunity to pick dates other than this and this is an election Bill. It wasn't one of the Bills that was put in. If we are going to go to a decent date on a primary what we ought to do is go to September. For one thing it would cut down the expenses something tremendously, it would cut down the length of time of campaigning. You can't pick a worse time for a farm state than the month of May. The farmers are in the fields because the weather is good and frankly weather hasn't got a thing to do with an election anyway. The people either come out and vote or they don't. The weather has



nothing to do with it. It's an old wife's tale that the Republicans win when the weather is good and the Democrats win when the weather is bad and I think for the members of this House to vote for this Bill has got to be self-defeating. We'll come down here next year in January, we won't be in limited annual sessions again because we have killed every attempt we have had to go to limited annual sessions which means that next year we'll have another 3,000 Bills facing us. And out of those 3,000 Bills at least 1/3 of them will be controversial and those of you that are going to run again are going to be down here working on legislation, voting 'yea', 'nay', or 'present' on very controversial legislation and while the cat's away the mice will be playing. Now if there's an advantage to being an incumbent and there certainly is and I think there should be, this Bill will completely defeat every advantage that an incumbent has because the incumbent is going to be down here putting his reputation on the line while his opponents in the primary will be back home working the districts. And if work the type of hours we worked this year where you are down here from 7:00 or 8:00a.m. until midnight or later, you are going to have no time whatsoever to campaign. This Bill should be beaten. We should go to a September primary or leave it where it was and I respectfully request 'no' votes on Senate Bill 647."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to explain my vote. I am one of the farmers that these people are talking about. I know the farming community and I know that it's very difficult to get a farmer out of the field for an election day on the first Tuesday in May. It's almost impossible to do. I would certainly urge that this Bill be defeated and we leave the primary date where it is."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will



take the record. Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, we have already passed the May primary Bill over to the Senate. The reason I stayed with this Bill for the particular reason is this. If the governor somehow decides to amend this and we concur with his amendment, it still does not become effective until July 1. I urge eight more green votes. Now it seems ridiculous that some of these people have voted for this Bill before and are now laying off for whatever reason they are."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman 'aye'. Mr. Clerk.

Representative Fennessey, for what purpose do you rise?"

Fennessey: "I would like to explain my 'yes' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Fennessey: "Well, Mr. Speaker my 'yes' vote, I am voting 'yes' because I think the first Tuesday in May is the best date possible we can have a primary. I think Representative Laurino gave all the reasons. We heard all the arguments on the dates, we had practically every Tuesday in the year named for having a primary and after careful consideration, the first Tuesday in May was selected. There is some mention made of farmers. I happen to be a farmer myself and I think where the farmers are interested in elections they will get out and vote no matter what month of the year it's held in. And I certainly hope we get enough votes to pass this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Mr. Speaker, would you record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record the gentleman as 'aye'. Palmer."

Palmer: "Change my 'aye' vote to 'no' please."

Speaker Redmond: "Change it from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative

Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I be recorded as 'no'?"

I am recorded as not voting."

Speaker Redmond: Record him as 'no'. Schoeberlein 'no'.

Ralph Dunn, 'no'. Schoeberlein 'no'. Have all voted who



wish? The Clerk will take the record. What's the score? On this question, there are 82 'ayes', 60 'nays', the Bill having failed to received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. 649. Better tell you what the schedule is for the evening. We will be going right through again tonight and the Minority Leader and the Speaker have both arranged to have food in the Minority Leader's office and the Speaker's office at about 6:00. I would also like to call your attention to the fact that today is the last day for non-committee or non-appropriation of revenue Bills to be heard and it would be suggested in deference to your colleagues to give them an opportunity to have their Bills be heard, that you restrain yourself on explanation of the votes and discussion. These votes are pretty well known. I think your colleagues would be very fond of you if you would do that. Representative Maragos."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 6..."

Speaker Redmond: "Maragos."

Maragos: "I would like for leave to post the meeting for the Revenue...Committee at 9:00 a.m. tomorrow morning, Mr. Speaker, in Room D-1."

Speaker Redmond: "Leave granted? Leave. Post your meeting."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 649, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keller."

Keller: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this provides that the members of the United States Congress can receive duplicate sets of license plates. I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Any discussion? 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 is 1..., take the record. 119 'ayes', 1 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional



Majority is hereby declared passed. 720. Representative Daniels. Is Dan Houlihan here?"

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 720."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Fred Selcke: "A Bill for an Act to amend Section 1 of an Act to establish Appellate Courts, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 720 amends an Act relating to the Appellate Court and provides for two additional appellate court judges in the second judicial district and I ask your favorable vote for the same. I'll be happy to answer any questions that you have."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative D.L. Houlihan. Representative Giorgi."

Houlihan: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to speak in opposition to this Bill which would create two additional appellate court judgeships in the second judicial district. I would point out to the membership that this particular Bill is flatly opposed by the Illinois Court Administrator and by the Illinois Supreme Court. It is my personal feeling that if we attempt to increase judgeships, be they appellate court judgeships or trial level judgeships in any particular district, we should only do it at the, based upon findings of need and that those findings are supported by the Supreme Court. Otherwise, if we have a Bill like this which will address itself to one particular district, it is opposed by the Court Administrator, it could have a domino effect, look everybody would like to have additional appellate court judges. But the need is not there. It is unequivocally opposed by the Illinois Court Administrator and the Supreme Court and I would ask that you do not vote for this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."



Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill. While I personally live in the third appellate court district, much of my district is included in the second appellate district which stretches from DuPage county and Lake county all the way to Rockford. Now the previous gentleman said that there is probably no reason for this but I suggest there is and that is that this district includes part of the most rapidly growing area in the state of Illinois. When you look at DuPage county and Kane county and see the population moving out there and the huge developments that are occurring, this rapid growth will call for a justification of this type of an increase. In addition, recently there have been two judges on an interim basis to handle the overload on the appellate court bench. I suggest that for, that these are necessary and that this is a good Bill and it ought to be passed."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to also support this Bill and also shed some further light on this. I believe that Mr. Houlihan was asking questions or making comments on this. Personal insight in the case of appeals in the second appellate district is something to behold. I argued a case in the appellate court approximately 2 1/2 years ago and had to wait until two months ago for an opinion. I had the opportunity about nine years ago to work as a briefing clerk for a judge in the second appellate court and I know that they are very conscientious and hard working. I have a third insight in that Thomas Moran, the justice of the second appellate court and the head of one of the two divisions, is a next door neighbor of mine and I can attest to the fact further that this man works seven days a week at his job from 8:00 in the morning until about 5:00 at night. Now our district is growing by leaps and bounds. We just have no way to accommodate all the appeals that are going up to this



court. The criminal appeals business has been growing by leaps and bounds and now the civil appeals are growing at an even faster rate than they were before because of the population and because of the increased number of judges and associate circuit judges in these areas. I think it's absolutely mandatory that we be considered for these additional judgeships. We have it coming. We are in the fastest growing area of the state and if we don't have it the people will not get the justice that we have promised to give them by the Consitution that you and I swore to uphold. I feel that we have to vote for this and I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels to close. Representative Daniels to close."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to correct some things that have been mentioned here. First of all I would like to comment on the fact that the second appellate court district of the downstate districts has the population based upon a 1970 census. It has some 400,000 more people in the second appellate court district than any other downstate district. That's on the 1970 census. Since that time there is evidence to the fact that there is approximately 150,000 more people than the 1970 census reflected. Furthermore, I would like to point out to you that the second appellate court district has, at the present time, two judges assigned to it by the Supreme Court making a total of six at the present time. What this Bill is asking to do is let the second district have a total of six on a permanent basis until such time as this body can address itself to judicial reapportionment which, as you all know, is a very difficult job and one that will be rather time consuming and will take a considerable amount of time. I am asking your support of Senate Bill 720 in an effort to expedite the handling of cases that this division has seen. We have had a high degree of



sophistication of litigation due to the influx of commercial industrial businesses in the second appellate district. We have a fast growing district. The...uh... judges are working very hard there. We feel it's needed and as a further comment the matter in the Senate passed overwhelmingly by a vote of 40-3 and I would ask for your favorable vote on the same."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the second judicial district, if I recall correctly, is comprised of three counties and two are the second and third largest counties in Illinois, in four rather, Winnebago county, DuPage, Lake and McHenry. I don't think it's unreasonable to ask for two more appellate judges. I too have had two experiences in the appellate courts. Lately one case took two years. They didn't decide as yet so I finally settled it without it. The other case, I am still waiting so I would really appreciate a favorable vote on this."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there is 42 'ayes', 78 'no', the Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 751. Pardon me. Having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 751, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Community College Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Porter."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder because this Bill is related to Senate Bill 1170, whether you could take it out of the record at this time and have it heard right after 1170 is heard? Leave for that?"



Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Take it out of the record. 767. Out of the record. 792. 783, Representative Hoffman, I'm sorry, I didn't know what your..."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 78..."

Speaker Redmond: "Take it out of the record."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 792, a Bill for an Act to amend Section 12 of an Act to create sanitary districts henceforth, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan, out. How about 793? Representative Madigan? 793? That's out also. 894. I have been advised that 894 is sent to the Consent Calendar. Is that correct? 943."

Fred Selcke: "943, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to revise the law in relation to divorce, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would unanimous consent or leave of the House to have this placed in, sent back to Committee and placed in interim study calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Leave. Return to the fall calendar. 957, Representative Berman. 943, the fall calendar. 957 is up now."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 957..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Berman."

Fred Selcke: "A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Berman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that started out as a rather simple...uh...matter dealing with a advisory Committee. The House Amendment #1 description in the digest is correct. However, in addition to that, we have adopted a number of amendments which, I think, brings this Bill...uh...into...uh...conformity with what the...uh...school boards and bus operators wanted as far as...uh...relieving them of some of the obligations that were imposed upon them by the Bill that we passed at the



last session. Representative Catania put on two...uh... amendments regarding new buses and safety features not retrofitting. Representative Deuster put on 1,2,3 amendments allowing black fenders and...uh...contrasting colors of owners names and rectangular as well as hexagonal stop signals. Representative Hart put on two amendments dealing with the allocation of the bus drivers' fees. I believe that everyone has had their input in the Bill. I am not aware of any opposition to it as it stands at this moment. I would solicit your favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass. All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 116 'ayes', 3 'nays', the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 95, Representative McPartlin, for what purpose do you rise?"

McPartlin: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to have leave of the House to put Senate Bill 767 into interim study."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objection? It will appear on the fall calendar. 958. Who is the Sponsor? Geo-Karis, Keller?"

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 958, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the State Fair Agency, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Keller is better looking, I know. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 958 amends the State Fair Agency appropriation to transfer amounts between projects listed in it. It also makes changes in some project descriptions. It does not change the total appropriation. I respectfully ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Any discussion? 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. Is this your first Bill, Representative Geo-Karis?"

Geo-Karis: "I'm beginning to feel like it, yes. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question, 138 'ayes', 1 'no', the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. 986."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 986, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxation of mobile homes, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedland."

Friedland: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 986 was taken back to Second Reading yesterday and amended to conform with a similar Bill concerning the privilege tax concerning on mobile homes. The main difference in this measure is that the privilege tax would be paid...uh...twice per year on a semi-annual basis and I worked closely with Representative Grotberg, Representative Dunn and many others and I would urge your favorable consideration of this important measure."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry that I wasn't on the floor when this Bill came up, but I have some questions regarding this particular Bill as to the constitutionality of it and also the fact there is a similar Bill already in the House, the House version of the Bill in the Senate. And I feel very strongly, Mr. Speaker, that this whole approach is not the proper approach because I think the Grotberg approach to do what we do in the privilege tax area should be the approach we should use. And I ask, Mr. Speaker, that those of us, and Mr. Davis, I would appreciate it if you would listen to me before you voted, that I think this Bill does not constitute the proper approach



to this particular situation. And therefore I protest, I mean would save a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Thank you. In explaining my 'aye' vote, maybe I can answer Representative Maragos' concern, Mr. Speaker. This Bill has been, was amended yesterday, Representative Maragos, to very closely align itself with House Bill 752 which you mention as our Revenue Committee Bill. One of the major little differences, they have a bi-annual payout of the tax and they have changed the name of it to a service tax and I have no particular opposition to this Bill. Again, it's that hybrid concept that we mentioned the other day. I don't know where Mr. McMaster's real estate Bill is at this point and I don't know where these two Bills will wind up. But they are not that much in conflict and I have no objection to them as the Sponsor of the Committee Bill 752 and I would urge the passage of the Bill unless Mr. Maragos would continue with his objections."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further questions? Further discussion? Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "For the edification of those in the House, my Bill which would have made trailers or mobile homes assessed as real estate, was defeated in the Senate yesterday, I believe, John. So this is one of the few vehicles that we have left. My only regret on this Bill is the fact that we do not have the clause in there that should any part of this Bill be unconstitutional, it will not affect the rest. I think that should have been in."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, in answer to Mr. McMaster's request, the Senate did amend the...uh...the...uh...752 to include that paragraph. So that now we have one of each and I have no objections and would you suggest the same thing? Pass them both, right? Yeah, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative



Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield for one quick question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Brinkmeier: "Does this Bill provide for semi-annual payments as the digest indicates?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedland."

Friedland: "That's affirmative."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further questions? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the records. On this question there are 122 'ayes', 6 'nays', the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 987."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 987, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Porter."

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

Senate Bill 987 is a simple Bill. It provides only that School Board Members can attend not more than two meetings annually sponsored by a regional or a national educationally affiliated organization. And, by the way, the Bill was Amended and it also provides that a School Board may elect to observe Memorial Day on the fourth Monday of May in lieu of the fourth....in lieu of May 30th, and may elect to observe Veterans Day on the fourth Monday of October in lieu of November 11. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Government touches the lives of our citizens directly only in a very limited number of ways. One point where the State does touch the lives of citizens is the...is the observance of Holidays. There is no question but that our State, our Government, this General Assembly has been made to appear ridiculous by insisting that one day has more inherent patriotism in it than another. I can tell you that I felt personally more stirrings of patriotism here three days ago, listening to Captain Cernan than I ever did on a



May 30th and that was a June 23rd. That of course is not really the issue involved here though. The issue is having two celebrations of the same Holiday where children are out of school on one Holiday, while their parents are at work and they have to get a baby-sitter in many instances and parents are off work and children are in school on another. It seems to me that families who should be together for patriotic observances are not together. Is that what the veterans organizations think promotes love of Country, I think not. Now, this last time we had the observance of Memorial Day on a Monday for State purposes and on a Fridayfor...excuse me...on a Monday for Federal purposes and on a Friday for State purposes. Many of the school children of this State took off both days, 70,000 children in Cook County did not go to school on Monday, May 26, although that was not the designated State Holiday. This Bill would allow the school districts throughout the State to cope with this problem. While it would not have a direct effect on business observances I would think that most businesses would adopt the same holiday as the school holiday unless they would be required to observe the other one by law. I strongly urge every member of the House to support this Bill. I think it will correct substantially a problem that obtains in the law that has brought a great deal of protest and ridicule and anger directed toward the Government and toward the General Assembly.....ah...it will solve that problem and abate those feelings. We only touched the people directly in a few ways, I think we should make those ways that inspire confidence and I would urge an 'aye' vote for this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly, the Sponsor of this Amendment says this Legislature has been made to appear ridiculous, well he's right. Now, let's ask why? Is it because there are two holidays? Or, the celebration of two holidays? Why do we have the



celebration of two holidays? I would....I would assert, without fear of contradiction that the reason we are having problems with this issue in the press, is because the..... 'press prats' are acting as shills....you heard me...shills for big business. I've just talked with the top editorial writer for Paddock Publications, which is in Suburban Cook County and Paddock Publications has figured this out. They know that there aren't enough Federal employees in the State of Illinois to cause any consternation, whatsoever, now remember the first year after the three day holiday Bill was passed by my Congressman. The first year when we celebrated Columbus Day on one day for the Federal Holiday and for another.....H....on another day for the schools and for State Government. Did the world go to Hell that day? Did it really make any difference that the mail wasn't delivered? I don't think it did. I worked that day anyway as I worked both Memorial days this past year. I think the real issue is who runs State Government? If we want the Retail Merchants Association and the State Chamber of Commerce to be the policy making body of the State of Illinois I would sincerely suggest that we get the petitions out or the resolution adopted to change the Constitution of the State of Illinois. Now, I don't have much hope that this General Assembly cares whether it runs the State of Illinois after seeing them pass that incredible impoundment Bill this morning but that is the real issue. Does big business and big labor run this State or do youyou who are elected by the people in the State of Illinois run this State? Now, I got a letter from the largest school district in my District advocating that this Bill this approach be passed. That we allow the schools to pick the day.....and I wrote him back the argument I've just given you and that was about a month ago. I have yet to receive an answer because there is no answer. We did not cause the problem. Big business did. Big labor did. The media did in their roll as representating the



interests of their advertisers. Now, interestingly enough this argument has never appeared in any newspaper to the best of my knowledge. It's almost like we were back on the RTA Referendum in the metropolitan area and the opponents arguments made it on the obituary page when they made it at all. There is a legitimate counter argument and we're going to have to give it to our constituents on a one to one basis. The media is not going to tell them, the radio won't tell them, TV won't tell them. Now, if indeed your constituentsif indeed you've taken a random poll in your District instead of just listening to big business and the school districtsand know that your constituents want to have the Federal Memorial Day be the Memorial Day, then vote in favor of this Bill. To the best of my knowledge I am the only one in this General Assembly who has taken such a poll I asked this question, 'do you want to celebrate the State Memorial Day on May 30th even if it means a three day holiday?' and 58% of my constituents said yes. Now when you can say the same thing, I think you can justify a 'yes' vote on this Bill. Until you.....until that time I would solicit a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, now I've gone through this over and over again. Now as I've told you there is a Bill in Congress to have November 11 revert back to its original date 'November the 11' which is Veteran's Day and Memorial Day revert back to its original date of May the 30th. Now, when you talk about creati..... creating havoc you can imagine what this Bill would do with these school children. You'll have mothers in different schools all fighting one another who wants to get off on the 30th and who wants to get off the last Monday of the month and so forth and as it turns out Memorial Day, May the 30th next year falls on a Sunday and that's when the veterans organizations are going to celebrate it. So now I've asked



you to bear with me until the Congress resolves this and there has been writeups in the paper whereby I've put them on your desks at various times, whereby they are going to substitute other holidays in lieu of Decoration Day and Veteran's Day for their Monday holidays. Eventually May the 30th and November the 11th will revert back to their original dates where they should properly be and I would you to vote against this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I have consistently supported the ...the return of....ah...ah...the State observance to the same date....at least to the same date as the National observance. However, if any Bill is designed to create confusion and I admit that it already exists this Bill will double the confusion. For example, in Lockport Township in my District there are ten separate grade school districts. Each one of them, under this Bill, would be permitted to select its date for observance of Memorial Day. We also have numerous separate high school districts, each one of which may ...ah...pick a separate Memorial Day. If you can imagine people with children in two or three school districts each one of which has votes separately you're bound to have more confusion than occurs now when all the schools are off on the same date. So rather than compound the confusion I would suggest that we vote no here and if we want to make the change, let's do it the right way and restore allobs....observance of State...ah...Memorial Day to the same day as the Federal or leave it the way it is, let's not compound the confusion and vote for this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Ah....Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think everyone knows what's in this Legislation and in the interest of time and explanation of votes they can have the two minutes. 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 say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it. Representative Porter to close."

Porter: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't think this is the question of big business. I don't think it's the question of the veteran's ...org.... the veteran's organizations either. Neither one of them runs the State government. The people run this State government.....and the people want this ridiculous duel holiday nonsense ended. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is a question....."

Speaker Redmond: "Give the Gentleman order."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. We're talking about three or four different things. First of all let me point out that Representative from Chicago who was opposed to this Amendment and in fact now he has to oppose the Bill, has taken the position that we ought to honor our veterans by the celebration of Memorial Day. How in the world can we honor our veterans by celebrating two days when no one knows which day is which. A good example was the last day we celeb.....Memorial Day, half of the people were working, half of the teachers were in school, the kids were in school and no one really celebrated it. How many flags did you see? There were very few flags flying because nobody knew when the day was being celebrated. And that is one point. The second point raised by the Representative from Chicago was to fire the veteran's organizations. Let me point out since that Amendment was adopted there has been no one from any veteran's organization in the State of Illinois who has objected to this particular Amendment contrary wise there has been a number of them that have insisted that this is



the best way to go about it. And thirdly, and this is the most important, school boards throughout the State of Illinois have lost State Aid because of a loss of attendance on the day designated by a previous Legislative action. And my District for one lost thousands and thousands of dollars because the kids didn't go to school. They stayed home. Tardiness rate.....ran 25% in some of my schools.....and my District lost a tremendous amount of money and I would say if you're talking about saving money, then we better pass this Bill. This Bill is good for the citizens, it's good for the veterans and I at that ask you to give it overwhelming support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my 'no' vote.....I feel it must be said.....it's been said before but I'm going to repeat it, that this Bill is not good for the veterans, it's not good for the citizens and I wasn't aware until the other day, they talk about who's behind this thing, but there was such a thing known as the 'National Council for Monday Holidays', I'm referring to an article in the May 6th, issue of the Chicago Tribune, and it refers to the Council being composed 17 corporations, trade associations and labor unions involved in the travel business and they argue that the three day holiday weekends promote spending by the public, profits for industry and jobs for labor. Now, my friends I suggest to you that if this has anything to do families getting together and enjoying this holiday together 'I'm a monkey's uncle' it isn't going to do it, this Amendment is silly, it's ridiculous and it's going to create further confusion and I would urge.....I would urge I would urge that if you really want to eliminate the confusion vote a red light on this and let's attack the problem in the right way. Sure we want to settle down to one day, but this will not do it and further more it opens up Veteran's Day as well as Memorial Day to the problem. It will add to



the confusion as has been said before, rather than reduce it. So, if you want to do the right thing, if you want to get back to one day and the sensible day, vote red and then let's get to Congress and then let's get to....to our own Legislature here and see if we can't settle down on one....
...on one day. But this Amendment, and this Bill simply will not do it, it's utter foolishness."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish. Representative Kent.
Representative Kent."

Kent: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. When Congress began to change the holidays I was against it. For the last two years I have voted to keep the Illinois holiday on the 30th of May.... but I have seen families who have been split could not go to celebrate or to honor their veterans together, it is a sad day when we break up our families and I believe that this is what we've done in the State of Illinois, the father is off on Monday, the children are off on Friday, the wife is there the mother is there both days. Let's keep our families together, we can still urge Congress to put them back but please in the name of family let's vote for this Bill so that the schools, the children, the fathers and mothers can all be together on a day that means so much to all of us."

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

Jones: "Mr. Speaker....."

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

Jones: "Members of the House, as the Sponsor of the Legislation.
of the Legislation that put Abraham Lincoln's Birthday/^{back}on the date where it belonged, I think that Memorial Day should be back on the 30th but I'm saying here that there is no need for this Legislation at this time because next year and the year after the Memorial Day is on Sunday one year and the next year....and on Monday the next year, so that in the mean-
time maybe the Federalah...ah...Legislation that Mr.... DiPrima talks about will come into being...and so...and so



there is really no need for this action at all."

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

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker, for the fourteenth time, I wish you'd check that corner of your table. I think you've got something over it all the time....."

Speaker Redmond: "I think it's your 'present' light, it's always on.....Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Allright.....I wanted to point out that from the time I for one was a very small boy, I went and watched the GAR....the Grand....the ...ah...the...ah..ah...the Veterans of the Civil War go out to our cemetery and decorate the graves of the Civil War dead. I for one feel the tradition has a certain amount of value, I for one feel that we should remember our soldiers, perhaps ...ah...some 50,..60,...70,.. years or nearly a 100 years is not considered important, I happen to feel that it is important. I feel the blood of the dead, and more important those torn apart by cannon balls and musketry their remembrance is more important than some financial institution. I feel we should stick by our traditionand..ah...and...ah...that it's wrong for us to change it. Now in relation to families being torn apart, that's not the fault of veterans or the dead, that is simply the fault of those who those who passed our law in Congress for financial reasons and I don't like to accept any of those reasons, so I suggest we all be patriotic Illinois citizens, remember General Logan and vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis.....I would again remind the Members that they have comrads on the floor here that have Bills that they want called....Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I too an ex-veteran, I too have seen families who want to be together, I too have spoken on Memorial Day ceremonies on May 30th, the fathers weren't



there, the mothers were there with the children. I think a family should be together. I agree wholeheartedly with Representative Kent and I think after all, we are all missing the point. This Bill is simply saying the school board can decide. In this way, the children won't be out of school when the parents will be working and I certainly urge the support of this, this Bill and vote yes, in spite of the fact that I like the gentlemen who speak against it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Capuzi. Capuzi."

Capuzi: "Mr. Speaker, before you announce that Roll Call, I'm going to ask for a verification of the affirmative vote on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I find it hard to believe that people are supporting this Bill and those that are supporting it are talking about bringing families together and celebrating the holiday together. Now if you think confusion reigns now, look at this Bill. This Bill allows any school board to determine when they are going to celebrate this holiday. Now how many school districts do we have in the state of Illinois? You are going to split families wider open now under this Bill than is even possible now. If you have children in different school districts, if you have parents who may be employed by various school districts, everybody will be split apart much worse than they are now. If you want to bring up back to conform with the federal date, that's one thing. I don't agree with you, but that's a different thing. But to say that every school district in this state can elect when they are going to celebrate this holiday, this is ludicrous. You are just tearing the thing apart and I can't understand anyone lending their support to this ridiculous Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I know time is valuable, but I think



we should stress the point that was stressed by Representative David Jones. For the next two years, Memorial Day, both the Federal and State will be celebrated on the same weekend. So therefore, your fears of splitting the families for the next two weeks, next two years, will not be that incumbent on us to make a decision now. By that time maybe the federal government and the Veterans Association can work it out. So therefore, the bad points, the bad parts of these Bills, these split holidays have taken place the last two years but however the next two years they are going to fall on the same day so ask a 'no' vote and I agree with Representative Collins, that it will bring more confusion if you give the discretion to the school boards to do it because every nook and cranny and every small small village and hamlet is going to have its' own holiday celebration and there will be more splitting than there will be any unification so I ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Porter. Representative Porter."

Porter: "Would you poll the absentees before beginning the positive verification?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "This Bill has as much to keeping families together as Santa Claus has to the real meaning of Christmas or the Easter Bunny has to the real meaning of Easter. I would like to correct some of the opponents of this Bill. Next year Memorial Day will not be on the same day because the stupid federal government has set it on the fourth Monday. Do you know what the fourth Monday of May is next year? It's the 24th so the state is going to be celebrating it on the 31st, not the fourth Monday? My mistake."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deavers."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker, change my vote to 'no'. Skinner just convinced me."

Speaker Redmond: "Change it from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative



Londrigan."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker, I am for one holiday all over the country. However, this Bill will not do the job. It is unnecessary for two years and I switch my vote from 'aye' to 'no'.

Speaker Redmond: "Change him from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Byers."

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

Speaker Redmond: "How is the gentleman recorded?"

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

Byers: "Change that to 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Change it to 'no'. Representative Lechowicz. Record Representative Lechowicz as 'no'. Representative Schoeberlein. Record him as 'no'. Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to take another Roll Call and let's not pull any of those switches that aren't here and I am sure there won't be any 89 votes up there."

Speaker Redmond: "Better dump this one and get another Roll Call. 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? Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Well Mr. Speaker, we are talking a hard cold cash. C-A-S-H."

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

Fleck: "I just want to have a point of order now. We don't have a lot of time and we are going to be out of here by the 30th. If someone has explained their vote previously, could we hold it for once and not again on this Roll Call?"

Speaker Redmond: "O.K. Representative Schraeder, give him this crack and then nobody else."

Schraeder: "Well Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of cold hard cash. If you want your school districts to get the money they are entitled to under the School Aid, put a green



light on. If you don't want the school boards to get the money, then vote red. I don't see how you have any choice but the green light."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, members of the House, I think we have dealt with this subject matter four or five times as amendments and different Bills and I think we ought to call the Roll and go to the next order of business to get some of these..."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 81 'ayes', 72 'no', the Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Lost, lost, lost, lost. 992."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 992."

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

Schraeder: "I would like to poll the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "Too late, we went to the next one. Representative Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, I saw amendments on this House trying to get your attention prior to your announcing the Roll Call and in all fairness I think you should recognize me before you announce the Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I did my best. Representative Porter."

Porter: "Are you going to poll the absentees?"

Speaker Redmond: "No, you didn't make it in the second Roll Call and we declared it lost."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, could I ask the Bill be placed on postponed?"

Speaker Redmond: "It's alright with me."

Porter: "Well, my intentions, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill was a Bill of Senator Glass's that was amended by Representative Schraeder's amendment which is what you just considered. The Bill still has some substance and somehow I hope we



can revive what's left of it after taking off the amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Would you be satisfied to put it on the fall calendar?"

Porter: "Yeah, well I think so. Put it on somewhere so the original part of the Bill can remain."

Speaker Redmond: "This is a little unusual but I did vote on the prevailing side and therefore I move to reconsider the vote by which it was lost. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. Now it's been reconsidered, Representative Porter, do you desire to have it on the fall calendar?"

Porter: "Yes, I do."

Speaker Redmond: "O.K. Any objection? Hearing none, the fall calendar. 992."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 992, a Bill for an Act to amend the Capital Development Board Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "D.L. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 992 as amended, has been introduced to clarify and spell out the respective responsibilities and obligations of the public community colleges and the local common schools and the Capital Development Board in the process of the selection of sites, the selection of architects and engineers and the construction of our public community colleges and local common school buildings by the Capital Development Board. When the Capital Development Board assumed the responsibility of the construction of these buildings and campuses from the Illinois building authorities and the School Building Commission, there were many local prerogatives that the Capital Development Board, by rule or practice, has assumed unto itself. The purpose of this Bill is to clearly define the authority of the Capital Development Board in this regard and to emphasize



the rights and responsibilities of local units of government. Specifically, the Bill provides that local districts shall have the rights to establish construction priority where two or more projects are to be developed in the district. The reason for this is that certainly the local district knows best what its' own needs are as far as completion of a construction project. Secondly, local boards shall select sites subject to the Capital Development Board right of disapproval if those sites do not meet CDB's minimum engineering or construction standards. This right of refusal was added by the House amendment. Thirdly, local boards shall have the right to select the architect and engineers, again with the right of refusal and subject to the approval of the Capital Development Board. Fourthly, local boards share and the state share of funding shall be disbursed proportionately. This is an important consideration since funding is proportionate, so also should be disbursement. Presently, all local shares, all of the local units of government share of funding is disbursed prior to any other state's share being disbursed and as a result, the local units of government are not having the right, what we feel should be a right, to draw interest on the unexpended portion of their funds. Additionally, the local board and the Capital Development Board must jointly approve file drawings before construction begins. Final payment for the project should also require the joint approval of the local board and the Capital Development Board. And finally, Capital Development projects must comply with local or municipal building codes or ordinances with the exception of the case of a common school district project when the standards otherwise applicable to the project would be more stringent than those standards in the local or municipal building code. That is what the Bill does. It clearly sets forth the rights and



responsibilities both of the Capital Development Board and of the local units of government and I ask for your support of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword." Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I appreciate the full explanation that Representative Houlihan has given to this Bill and I especially appreciate the amendments that have been placed on it in the House because the amendments that have been placed here are going to assure that no one is going to insist that, that a public building is going to be built in a bog, or over a coal mine shaft that might sink, which are some of the problems that we have run into in the past. It also gives assurances that the local building authority is not going to at least have the complete insistence on an overworked architect who may be very popular and do excellent job but would delay the work of the Capital Development Board and I think with these changes that this Bill is in much better shape and I will be very pleased to vote yes on it and I urge my colleagues to do likewise."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think one of the most difficult areas that any state board finds it to develop a balance with local authorities and to attempt to create what should be the province and the jurisdiction of each of those. I think that this Bill is a, as amended, is a particularly good example of how the local authority as well as the state, state board can inter-react and can develop that sensitive balance and I recommend it and will support this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, members of the House, I listened as closely as possible because I have



or under which all construction, school construction under the Capital Development Board must follow. Which means that in regard to code standards, life safety code standards, to fire standards, to plumbing standards, we have a common line from which to depart. Under this proposed legislation we will have local and municipal building codes which were many times at great variance with the state building code. So it's conceivable that we could build one building in Elgin for \$1,000,000 and we could go into another community with a different building code and spend a million five. Now the thing you need to know is that the Capital Building Board shares the cost of building with the local school districts on the basis of a grant index. And so we are talking about a great deal of state money. This is a change in a procedure that we established two years ago when we put the School Bond Construction Act in. I would suggest that this latter section on this Bill will make it extremely difficult to build a building. It certainly will increase the cost. There is nothing wrong with the School Building Code, there is nothing wrong with the State Fire Code, there is nothing wrong with the State Plumbing Code and those are the codes that we should use so that we have a consistent point of demarcation. And therefore, I would urge your 'no' vote on this particular Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, to those of you who are concerned about the present and future fiscal problems of this state, I urge you to vote 'no' on this Bill. Senate Bill 992 will cost the state millions in increased planning design of construction costs by requiring compliance with local building codes which are conflicting, which are out of date and which do not have application necessarily to these kinds of buildings. This Bill over a period of time will cause

some disagreements and still do, frankly with Senate Bill 992. There is something very seductive, of course, about having local selection of architects and engineers because a lot of us have that preference for local control. It's equally seductive that the areas ought to be able to determine priorities for school construction sites. But that is, I think, where the Bill starts because what it does is really create a new kind of battleground for the problems that will emerge CDB and the local school districts. In fact, the Sponsor uses the word for cash disbursements. He uses the word proportionately. In fact, in the newly amended section 1014 of 992 in the second amendment says simultaneously. Now what that really means is that both the state and the local district will be required to sell their bonds early and prematurely in the case of the state and will in that sense create more of a cost to us as a state. Presently what occurs is that the local district expends its , rather sells its bonds and expends its money for the portion that is necessary to complete an early part of the project and then the state sells bonds and becomes responsible for its side, remainder of the project. So in that sense, I think it's a bit elusory to suggest that you are going to be making money by simultaneously requiring the sale of bonds when in fact we are going to be losing money. But of those three points, there is still a fourth that I think we ought to be considering and that is the requirement that relates to the municipal code versus state standards for the construction of schools whether they be junior college or whether they be common school districts. In effect, this is where the line is drawn. The other issues possibly we could content with with the exception of the cost to the taxpayer. What we are going to have is that the construction of schools, the establishment in all the communities throughout all



the state of Illinois are going to be slowed down considerably because there is no distinction in the Bill as to how you determine what is more stringent between a local code and a state code. There is no way in which the CDB although it may be given refusal rights, the local district may once again come back with another question or another requirement for another code. What this is going to do is require us to go to court to resolve our differences unless the language is changed. So what we are going to in effect with this language and with this new Bill is to create greater problems between local and state on the question of the CDB's role in state, in local jurisdiction. It's going to bog us down in even greater problems and we are going to become more entangled. School construction is going to go crying and we are going to be faced with a shortage because we could not resolve our differences. If the Sponsor wants to solve the problem, my suggestion is that again, he go back to Second Reading, that he delineate very clearly that the schools are determining the priorities of educational needs, and that the CDB is still doing the grants, and the schools are doing grant entitlements. Otherwise, all we do is compound the problem. All we do is slow down school construction. I appreciate the efforts of the Sponsor to clarify the local role but in effect he has just confused us and it is a bad Bill and I suggest a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman, G."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the last speaker has delineated very clearly some of the difficulties with this Bill and I would only like to amplify on the last point that he made and that is in reference to compliance with all applicable local and municipal building codes and ordinances. At the present time we have the School Building Code 156 A, the State Fire Coes, the State Plumbing Codes, to which



a staggering loss of revenue through the premature sale of bonds by mandating simultaneous spending of state and local funds. Also, Mr. Speaker, members of the House, this Bill will eliminate many life, health and safety provisions of the standardized school code. The net effect of Senate Bill 992 will be to slow down construction costs delaying the projects and this can be translated into additional cost. Because of its' impact on the taxpayers, the state treasury and the state school children, I urge that this Bill be defeated and that you vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Berman."

Berman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I listened carefully to the gentlemen who spoke in opposition to Senate Bill 992. I think that there may be some problem from their point of view but appears to be that there is only one section of a multi-section Bill that...uh...may cause some problems. And I would point out to you that there are other sections that I believe far outweigh the shortcomings. A year ago I was accorded the privilege of addressing a conference called by a Capital Development Board and in my remarks to the Capital Development Board and about 1000 people from local school boards, I criticized the procedures of the Capital Development Board. And among the areas that I criticized and my remarks were very generously reprinted in the publication of the Illinois Association of School Boards, the ISB Journal. I pointed out that the process of selection of architects, the site selections, the handling of the funding put local school boards at a great disadvantage. And although this was last August, I must admit there was very, has been very little done in the way of revising these procedures by Capital Development Board. In fact, one of the research assistants on the School Problems Commission headed a task force to make recommendations to the Capital



Development Board urging revision along the lines of some of the suggestions built into Senate Bill 992 and the report that came out of that task force was virtually thrown in the waste basket by the Capital Development Board. So what do we have left but the alternative to enact legislation? Now we are faced with a time deadline and I have great respect for the Sponsor of this Bill and I would suggest that some of the problems that have been voiced by the opponents very well might be able to be worked out in a conference committee. But I think that there are some important parts of this Bill that must be passed and I think that if we don't pass them today, you will be hearing a lot more from your school boards that have been treated very shabbily by the autocratic and bureaucratic approaches by the Capital Development Board. So I would urge you all to vote 'aye' on Senate Bill 992 and discuss the problems with the Sponsor and I am hopeful that they can be worked out. But don't let this Bill die. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Maher."

Maher: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Bill, Senate Bill 992 and I would like to speak the sections devoted to building code. Now every municipality in my district has adopted by reference with very little modification the BOCA code which is the Building Officials Code of America. It's a uniform code. It's a code the local inspectors know. They are familiar with it. And one of the problems we have had for a long time is these people are unable to see what's going on in the community. They are required to provide the police protection, fire protection and that sort of thing but they can't go into the building until it's all completed. Now if you really want to save the people money, if you really want to expedite construction of school buildings,



then you're going to ...to support this legislation. As a matter of fact, presently, next month Capital Development Board is going to hold public hearings on whether or not they should adopt the Building Officials Conference of America, everybody has been urging them to do that, to expedite matters of construction, what we need is uniformity, local municipalities are familiar with this and those few municipalities who may not have adopted a code or changed their code since 1955 their standards don't apply anyway. You still have to build your buildings based upon the State Funding Code, the State Electrical Code, so you are not going to deter or you're not going to have different type construction or cheaper construction, you're going to have just as good. I think what we need to do here is to pass this....pass this Bill and act it into law and insist that the Capital Development Board adopt the BOCA Code or some nationally recognized code by a reference that everybody understands and everybody knows about. I urge a support."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washington."

Washington: "Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, I have been prepared to be opposed to this Bill but I didn't....I hadn't digested the Amendments and now that I have and particularly in light of Representative Berman's, what I consider to be rather cogent remarks in terms of the possibilities of ironing out whatever bugs exist in this Bill in a Conference Committee and I think that's a reasonable expectation under the circumstances. I'm going to go along because the main thing about this Bill is that it attempts to foment and fosterah...harmony and working relationship between the State and local units and I think that's good and the Bill is good and so I'll vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Ah....Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House....ah...in the interest of the time of this



House andand....and in interest of those who have... that are Sponsors of the remaining legislation that absolutely must be heard today, I want to reemphasize thatI 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. Representative Houlihan to close."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The issues here have been very thoroughly aired and debated. I want to emphasize to the Membership that the Bill has not been put forth recklessly, I have spent many hours attempting to meet the concerns as expressed to me by the Capital Development Board and at the same time retain the intent and rationale of this Legislation. Now, let me emphasize that as far as conflicting codes, that one of the purposes in the act of the Capital Development Board is to review building code and construction codes and to advise agencies and units of local government in school districts. Now, I have also provided in the Amendment to the Bill that common school district projects will be exempted from local codes where the standards otherwise applicable under State Statutes would be more stringent. Now when you consider that I think that we have addressed ourselves to the principal objection which has been voiced here against the Bill. I submit that this is a very reasonable proposal, it will clearly define the right to the Capital Development Board, but also verily.....very clearly emphasize the rights of local units of government and I ask for your support of this Legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this ...Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, as the saying goes..'the Bill is now greased to fly', but I would just like to point out that there are still problems with it....."



JUN 26 1975

168.

Speaker Redmond: "On explanation of vote....all right he closed....The question is shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Schneider to explain his vote."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ah, very quickly we did pass the Bill out, House Bill 3050, which has been in the Senate and is now on its way back, which does exactly what Representative Berman had alluded to, I happen to be the Sponsor of that Bill, I think he is aware of it and that would solve the problem. What this is going to do, is going to serve some special interests, I think it is a bad Bill for many reasons, but that is an additional one."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to explain my vote very briefly. One of the previous speakers referred to this Bill as being seductive. Well, it certainly is, it uses the term 'local control'....ah....I wish you'd all look very carefully at what this Bill really does and how it's going to effect both State revenues and the construction of school buildings. The Capital Development Board got into this business because the local school districts couldn't handle the job, didn't have...have the financing and had limited resources. The whole principal of the Capital Development Board in this area was to allocate and husband and care for the limited resources we had and help local school districts build necessary buildings. This is a step entirely in the opposite direction, it is going to cause all kinds of problems.....It's....it's ... going to eliminate a uniformity of approach and the savings that can be accomplished by uniform design and standards that are Statewide. With local control of this kind of building with State finances we're going to have boondoggle after boondoggle, I really wish you'd look very carefully at what this Bill really does."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Duff."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would suggest a lot of people might come off there if they realized that some of these local junior college boards are not going to have the expertise that deciding whether a contractor has the backing and the financial strength to enter into some of these bids that they are going to be allowed to do, nor will they necessarily have the expertise tothat the Capital Development has in the selecting of architects. There are a thousand examples like that we could give but I guess it is not going to do any good today."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "I just wanted to plead along with Representative Hoffman, Schneider, Duff and Mugalian, that you take a look at this Bill. You are loosing cost control at the State level if you let the local school board ...let the contracts, choose the architects, and so on, it is going to cost you millions of dollars more than if you keep the c....con... the control of the architects and the costs in the Capital Development Board. I would plead with the Sponsor to pull this back to Second, put an Amendment on it and then we can vote it out as a really good Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Take the record. This question 114 'ayes', 45 'nos', the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed.....993."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 993, a Bill for an Act to Amend the School Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I request leave to take Senate Bill 993 back to the order of Second Reading for the purpose of Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections?.....Will be returned to the order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Read the Amendment."

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #2, Deuster. Amends Senate Bill 993 as



amended and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is an extremely important piece of Legislation for our public schools and for our nonpublic schools and in offering Amendment #2 I want to say that as a member of the House Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education that heard this Bill, you will note by looking at the synopsis that it's a controversial subject. It emerged from our Committee with a vote of 11 to 10 with one voting 'present'. Ah...this Bill has great significance to my District and I have friends for it and friends against it and I sincerely offering these Amendments as an effort to improve the Bill so that I can be in a position and many other can be in a position to support a good fair Bill. Now in explaining the Amendment I'd simply say this.... my Amendment #2 will put the Bill pretty much in the form it was in when it came over from the Senate. Now what the Bill does....is it requires every public school district in Illinois....it puts on them a legal obligation to go outside their districts in a peripheral area extending 15 miles and that could include going into Wisconsin, Iowa, Indiana, Missouri...into other States as well as into our own State to pick up ...not public students but nonpublic students. And so what it means is your public schools will have an obligation to go 15 miles out to pick up the private school....the nonpublic school students and bus them into schools which may be located in your school district. Now, the Bill came over from the Senate provided that the State would reimburse the schools for the actual cost to....performing this busing service for the nonpublic students... ah...it was amended ...ah...to...ah....remove that total or actual or 100% State support. Amendment #2 which I have in my hand and has been distributed will provide that if ourif we are going to tell our public schools they



have this burden and mandate them to get in the bus business going 15 miles beyond ...that the State of Illinois will hold them harmless for the expenses and it simply says that the actual cost of the transportation including a reasonable allowance if necessary for the acquisition of of any new buses they may have to buy, would be reimbursed by the State to the school district and that this should not exceed the actual cost to the school district. Now, I would point out in soliciting your vote for Amendment #2 to say that the Bill itself doesn't do anything for public school students it's entirely designed to help out the nonpublic students and I have many of them in my district, I'm anxious to help them but I don't want to financially ruin my school district or yours by putting this financial and administrative burden on them, I think Amendment #2 is reasonable, it brings the Bill in close line with what.....actual....I think identicalah... virtually identical formthe way it came over from the Senate....and I urge your support for Amendment #2...I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Questions on the adoption of the Amendment.

Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'.

Representative Madigan.....Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'.....the 'nos' have it. The Amendment is lost.
Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, may I have ...just a Roll Call quick on that?....."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, ...those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "I am sorry to have to explain my vote but in this case this is Amendment...in my case maybe in the case of other Members it means the difference between being able to vote for the Bill or against it. If the Amendment fails, I have to vote against the Bill. I'm distressed, I'm sorry, but I think it's a ...it's a....it's a reason-



able Amendment and I would urge your support for it.

Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "The question there are 24 'ayes', 74 'nays', the Amendment is lost. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Deuster, Amends Senate Bill 993, on page one, line 23 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Ah....Ah...Amendment #3 has been discussed with the Sponsor of the B....House...in the Bill....in the House and it was not in agreeable form so I would move to table Amendment #3."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved to Table Amendment #3. Any objections? Hearing none, Amendment #3 is Tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #4. Deuster, Amends Senate Bill 993, on page one, line 23 and so forth."

Deuster: "I think Amendment #4 is agreeable....what it simply provides and...and....really what the...the Catholic students and Catholic schools are trying to get at is they are trying to get a little cooperation from the public schools....some of whom are still dragging their feet in transporting the nonpublic students. This Amendment provides that the Regional Superintendent and in cooperation with all of the school districts in the Educational Region will develop and approve a plan providing for cooperation among the school districts in implementing this Act and further more it says that no school shall be required to provide this transportation prior to August 1st 1976. I think this will help save some costs under the Bill because the Regional Superintendent can get all these schools together and say all right you run your bus to your district boundry....Antioch High School....and then Mundelein or somebody else will pick it up there....it urges the cooperation Isupport....I urge your support...of ... Amendment #4."



Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 993. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "I just want to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that there has been a request for a Fiscal Note on this Bill and I wondered if the Fiscal Note had been filed?"

Jack O'Brien: "Fiscal Note is...."

Speaker Redmond: "It is on the Billn."

Dyer: "Pardon."

Speaker Redmond: "I've been advised it is on the Bill."

Dyer: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "1001."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1001, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative G. L. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1001 is defined in your Digest on page 534 and the Bill contains ...ah...really the Senate Amendment #2. This is an Amendment to define ...ah...party membership ...ah...for membership on the ...ah State Board of Education....and in the original Bill we defined party membership as having....as being a person...ah...that.... that voted in the primary of the party in the last primary before appointment....ah...preceeding the previous General Election....and what this Bill does is eliminate the language which says the preceeding....or the previous General Election so that party membership...ah...would be defined as a person who had voted in the primary of the party in the last primary before ...ah...appointment. The....the Bill....House Bill 661 provided that no more than nine members of one political party be appointed by the ...ah...Governor...ah...and serve on the Board...at



one time...and so this is an effort to clarify what is meant by a party membership and I would appreciate your support of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish?z 'aye' Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 111 'ayes', 14 'nos', the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority ...hereby declared passed. 1018."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1018, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Purchasing Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPartlin."

McPartlin: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 1018 gives permission to a State agency to evaluate a contract containing asphalt and it is justified under extra....extraordinary situations with proper engineering tabulation. It allows the negotiations for reimbursement of an increased cost. Most of the reimbursement would be paid by the Federal Government and I w.....w...would appreciate the support of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? Any discussion? Representative Mugalian..."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield to a question?.....Ah....Representative McPartlin....in the event that...ah...prices go down will there be a corresponding adjustment to thed Agency."

McPartlin: "This goes back just to ...ah...June 13th ...ah... 1973 to December 31st 1974. Just for that time period."

Mugalian: "It's only limited for that period?"

McPartlin: "Right."

Mugalian: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "An questions? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record."



On this question there is 109 'ayes', 18 'no', the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1021."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1021, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Merlo."

Merlo: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 1021 amends the Chicago Municipal Employees Retirement Fund. Some of the significant changes that are made in the Bill First: It devises the definition of a child who qualifies for child survivors annuity. Second: It provides for term annuities or refunds when the annuities computed would be less than \$100 at the present time it is 50. And it also revises the child's annuity from \$40 to \$80 per month where one parent survives and from 60 to \$120 per month in cases where no parent survives. The Bill has the approval of the City of Chicago. It came out of the Senate with a 41 to nothing vote. And it does have the approval of the Illinois Pension Laws Commission and I would appreciate your favorable consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Any questions? 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 106 'ayes', 6 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. . . 1022."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1022, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Merlo."

Merlo: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 1022 amends the Chicago Laborers Retirement Fund and our own General Assembly Retirement System. What it does is gives the Chicago Laborers the same benefits as provided in Senate Bill 1021 which I just concluded. The Bill would



then allow for the Members of the General Assemblyah System....who retired before July 1st 1967 post retirement increases. The General Assembly System is one of the few not providing provisions allowing the participation of retired Members....and this of course is also approved by the Pension Laws Commission."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions or discussion? 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 103 'aye', 6 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1031."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1031, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill...ah...a...amends the Environmental Protection Act to clarify the definition of refuse in the Environmental Protection Act. By deleting the word solid in the phrase 'discarded solid material'... the...the definition would be amended to read 'refuse is any garbage or any other discarded material'. This change would make clear that the Act is intended to cover all material disposed of on land, much of which is in liquid or semiliquid form. Further Senate Bill 1031 gives the Pollution Control Board authority to regulate the disposal of hazardous wastes which many of these liquid wastes tend to be. This proposal is supported by the Liquid Waste Haulers Association, the industry which is to be regulated. The Amendments...ah...were put on by Public Health and EPA and...ah...worked out ...ah...in Committee ...ah...in Committee on Cities and Villages...ah...there is a similar Bill...House Bill 2101 and it changed...ah...it was made



in this Bill to make it different from House Bill 2101 was that we have eliminated the definition of hazardous waste...uh...which is being worked up by the...uh... Pollution Control Board. This is an administration Bill. I would appreciate the support of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question because I think there may be a discrepancy in the digest that was carried for about two weeks here. As of Monday on Volume I there was a Senate Amendment that increased the state's attorneys fees tied to this Bill. Is this a misprint or what is the situation?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "That is a misprint. That has nothing to do with the Bill and should not have been in the digest where it was."

Mautino: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers, do you desire recognition?"

Borchers: "My only question has just been answered about the state's attorneys."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further questions? Any discussion? 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 is 137 'ayes' and 1 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1036, Representative Beaupre."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1036, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to ask leave to have Senate Bill 1036 returned to the order of Second Reading for the purposes of amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? Representative Walsh."



Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, you know what our fear is on these Bills that are amended here, that they will ultimately end up in a Conference Committee and there is no telling what might come of them so I would ask of the gentleman if he would tell me, if this is brought back and amended and passes, would you assure us that the Bill will not be used as a vehicle for reapportionment?"

Beaupre: "Well, if I have anything to do with it, it won't."

Walsh: "Well, you will have something to do with it because you would be handling I assume, unless they took you from the sponsorship, the Conference Committee report. Or concurrence and senate amendments."

Beaupre: "I assure you that I will resist any amendment to use this as a vehicle for reapportionment."

Walsh: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, back to the order of Second Reading."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Beaupre, amends Senate Bill 1036 on page 1, line 8 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #1 is a clarifying amendment to state more precisely language which removed Cook County from the provisions of this Bill and I would move for its' adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Beaupre: "Yes, indeed."

Totten: "How does it specifically remove Cook County from the provisions of the Bill?"

Beaupre: "Well, Amendment #1 inserts on page 1, line, on page 1, line 8, deletes the word 'the' and inserts in lieu thereof the following 'within counties in which precinct committeemen are elected pursuant to this Act' and as you know precinct committeeman are not elected in Cook County. On page 1, line 10, by deleting the word



'additional' and on page 1, line 11 by inserting immediately after the comma 'or additional deputy registrars in the case of a county in which precinct committeemen are elected under the Act. There are similar additional provisions. I would suggest that you take a look at a copy of the Amendment. It would take about five minutes to read them all. But that is a sample of the type of language that we are putting in, to more clearly clarify that Cook County is not in this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, one other question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Totten: "So that as amended with this Amendment, this would only apply to downstate?"

Beaupre: "That is correct."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have to apologize to the members of the House. I just caught part of the explanation of this Amendment. The parts I caught were all page 1. Is that correct?"

Beaupre: "No. There are some additional Amendments that are similar to those that I indicated. On page 3, line 17, on page 3, line 20 and on page 3, line 21. I could read the Amendment for you. I think you probably have a copy of it on your desk somewhere and in an effort to save the time of the House, I suggest that you take a look at it. If you would like, however, I would be happy to read the Amendment."

Kempiners: "O.K., Mr. Speaker, if I might, I would like to address myself in opposition to this and Amendments which follow. First of all there is a provision in the state Constitution which mandates that this type of law ought to be uniform and regular throughout the state. But basically the reason I am going to oppose these Amendments because with these Amendments on, it's going to be easier to pass the Bill which I think is a



bad Bill. So I would ask that we defeat this and succeeding Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to a question?"

Beaupre: "Yes, indeed."

Collins: "I don't have the Amendment here, I am sure it's buried here somewhere, but you say that this is to more clearly exclude Cook County. Isn't Cook County excluded under the Bill now?"

Beaupre: "It was my contention when the Bill was taken out of the record the other night, that it, that Cook County was indeed excluded. However, to satisfy some of the objections of the some of the members on the floor, we redrafted new language which I think makes it perfectly clear, to borrow a common used phrase, that Cook County is not in the Bill."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, number one, I think it's a bad Bill. Number two, I don't see any reason why the Constitution should be ignored in this type of legislation and exclude Cook County and put the rest of the state in. And number three, if it is clear already in the Bill that Cook County is excluded, I don't see any reason for this Amendment to be added to more clearly define whether Cook County is included or not. I, like Mr. Walsh, am very suspicious of this type of action at this late date and for those reasons and a few others that I am sure I will think of later, I would urge that this Amendment be defeated."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to speak to the Amendment...uh...the Amendment, as I indicated, more clearly defines that Cook County is not in. As you know, we have different types of election officials in Cook County as opposed to downstate Illinois. There is certainly nothing unconstitutional about making reference to those different types of election officials



as prescribed in the law. I believe the Amendment is constitutional and the Bill is and I would move for its' favorable support. Move for its' adoption."

Speaker Redmond: The gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1036. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. I couldn't tell the difference. Collins yells louder than anybody. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, 77 'ayes', 81 'no', and the Amendment is lost. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Beaupre, amends Senate Bill 1036 on page 3 between line 4 and 5 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1036...uh...answers some of the objections from the other side of the aisle and I am sure that with this Amendment on that they will be happy to vote for the Bill. It provides that a carbon copy of any registration taken by a deputy registrar who is appointed under this Bill be given to the potential registered voter...uh...and that that carbon copy of the registration form...uh...may be used in the next subsequent election whether it be a general election or a primary election and I would move the adoption of this very good Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, in view of Amendment #1 not having been adopted, is this Amendment in order? Does this amend the Bill as amended or does it amend the Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "The parliamentarian tells me it's in order. Representative Kempiners, for what were you dancing?"

Kempiners: "Is the answer to his question that it's in order? Right? O.K. The only thought I had is that these carbon



copies would be very valuable in those areas where vote fraud is not just suspected, but rampant. I just can imagine what would happen where you go to a skid row flop house, register a guy, and then give him ten bucks for his receipt so you can go vote for him on election day. I can see many problems with this Bill or this Amendment and I would urge its' defeat."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Does the, in the wording of the Amendment does it say carbon copy? Is that the exact word you used?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "For those members on the other side of the aisle who don't seem to be able to get distributions of their Amendments, I will read the Amendment to you. Each deputy registrar shall provide the person from whom he accepts a registration a true copy of the executed registration form signed by the deputy registrar and by such person and indicating the date on which such registration was accepted. The election authority shall provide forms for the acceptance of registrations by deputy registrars which include a copy of the registration form to be given to the registrant in compliance with this paragraph. The copy of the executed registration form signed by the voter and the deputy registrar shall be evidence of registration at the county wide election or county wide primary election next held after a registration is accepted by a deputy registrar. The judges of election shall accept as proof of registration the copy of the registration form signed by the voter and signed by the deputy registrar and a person tendering such a copy, such a proper copy of the registration form may vote at that election, notwithstanding the absence of its permanent registration card, cares for such registered voter and in the absence of the name of the registered voter on the poll list. Any copy of a registration form tendered as proof of registration shall



be retained by the judges of election and returned to the election authority."

Skinner: "Then you were using the word carbon in a generic sense?"

Beaupre: "That's correct."

Skinner: "Well, I am glad to know you are not excluding the NCR paper industry from your Amendment."

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

Madison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Madison: "Representative Beaupre, I am just not that familiar with the election process downstate. Can you tell me, on the basis of this Amendment, well, number one, on the present situation in downstate counties, is it now required that a person wishing to vote who does not have a permanent registration card in the binder, is he now required to sign an affidavit?"

Beaupre: "He has to be either on the binder or the poll list and then he may vote by affidavit."

Madison: "I'm sorry, I didn't understand it."

Beaupre: "If, the procedure is the same as in Chicago in that regard."

Madison: "Well, now under your Amendment, would producing this true copy of a registration slip preclude the individual from having to sign an affidavit?"

Beaupre: "No, the problem that this Amendment deals with is, should by some unfortunate circumstance, the deputy registrar fail to get the card into the county clerk or the proper election official, and it not, the card not be put on the polling list, that he would have evidence that he did indeed register with a duly appointed deputy registrar and he might show that to the election judges so that he might vote in the next election."

Madison: "Would he still have to give a sworn statement?"



That's the, that's the answer I'm trying to get."

Beaupre: "Yes, indeed, he would have to sign an affidavit.

This is merely in lieu of the binder card."

Madison: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I read this Amendment correctly, it is truly an incredible Amendment. It would say that any voter could walk in off the street with a carbon copy of a registration form, there is no permanent record of his registration, his name is not on the poll list, but this carbon says that he is John Smith with some address, and all he has to do is come in and sign an affidavit and vote. Now he may not, he may not be John Smith at all but as long as he has got that carbon, you have to say, you have to allow him to vote. I think the, the potential for abuse here is truly incredible. I think this Amendment should be overwhelmingly defeated. This really goes a long way towards making a bad Bill horrible."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Downs."

Downs: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question? Representative Beaupre, where in the Bill does it provide for the affidavit to be signed?"

Beaupre: "The provision for the signing of the affidavit is in the existing election code which is not being amended by this Bill in any way."

Downs: "Well, correct me if I am wrong. I read this Amendment and on its' face it absolutely mandates by using the word shall and so on that this process is, stands by itself as sufficient evidence to permit a person to vote and I do not see how the affidavit is thereby required."

Beaupre: "Well, I think if you will look at the Amendment a little more carefully you will see line 18 indicates that the person may vote notwithstanding the absence of a permanent registration card...uh...for such registered



voter in the absence of the name of the registered voter on the poll list...uh...as long as they comply with the other requirements...uh...for voting. And those requirements are not suspended."

Downs: "Well, it doesn't say what you just, you said it provides as long as the person complies with the, you know and so forth. It doesn't say that."

Beaupre: "Well, that's the way I read it."

Downs: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to just make one observation. In Cook County, the County Clerk issues a voter's registration card and as I understand the present law, it is not sufficient..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison. For what purpose do you rise?"

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, could we have some order? I can't hear the gentleman at all."

Speaker Redmond: "Will you give the gentleman order, please."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make one brief observation and perhaps the Sponsor of the Amendment can respond to it if he wishes. As I understand it, in Cook County we are given a voter's registration card and if one walks into the polling place and is not on the binder and is not on the poll sheet and produces his registration card, the production of that voter's registration card is absolutely of no avail to him in trying to vote and it seems to me that this carbon copy puts such a person in a completely superior position to one who has a voter's registration card."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the registration card that was referred to by the last speaker is truly an unofficial election document. It has no bearing on whether or not a person may have the right to vote. That's one of the things that this



Amendment is attempting to clear up. It is indeed possible that a precinct registrar could go around seeking members of the opposition party, register them or purport to register them and then dispose of the registration card. What we are trying to do is clean up this Bill so that when a person is registered by one of these precinct registrars, that he has valid proof that he may show to the judges of election. That...uh... copy of the registration which the potential registered voter retains, will be signed by both the voter and by the precinct registrar. That precinct registrar's signature will be available to the judges of election to compare to determine whether or not the copy is a valid copy of the signature of the precinct registrar. It does indeed make this a good Bill. It's important to the Bill and I would move for its' adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1036. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative VanDuyne."

VanDuyne: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, now Mr., this effort of Mr. Beaupre's to clean up this Bill is just in compliance with most of the people who are voting red. When I had my Bill before this House, the Republicans on this side of the aisle were deriding the Bill and cutting it down because they said the people could go out and register people and then get drunk after they had registered them and the poor guy, the registrant would go into the next election thinking he was registered and lo and behold, this drunken democratic registrar would have forgotten that he had registered him and he wouldn't be registered. Now this is an honest effort to show them that the people that we are going to have registering these people are going to be in compliance with the law and the county clerk. Now, this is just



a lot of B.S. and I wish the democrats would get out there and vote green."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Well, I would like to just make one observation in explaining my vote. Representative Beaupre is right in saying that the voter's registration card in Cook County has no valid effect. But then, that shows that this Amendment is entirely discriminatory against the voters in Cook County because there is no way that a Cook County voter can get what is the equivalent of this new carbon copy or authenticated copy that it refers to. This will mean that in Cook County you would have no way of proving that you registered but in all other 101 counties you could and I think that that would clearly make this Bill unconstitutional."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Well, I have to agree with the last speaker on many of the points that he has made, but as I clearly pointed out when we started this discussion on Amendment #1, this Bill does not apply to Cook County...uh...and therefore any Amendments that are adopted do not apply to Cook County. That is very clear and has been very clear from the beginning of this discussion. This is a valid attempt to make the Bill a worthwhile election reform Bill in regard to giving more people an opportunity to register. You get in some of the downstate counties in Illinois and you will find that you have to drive some 20 or 25 miles to get to the courthouse in order to register before the election. I don't think that we should impose this kind of hardship on, on what is indeed a constitutional right and a privilege for people to vote. We are trying to increase the number of deputy registrars and do it in a fair method so that, so that we can increase participation in elections. Now if we don't adopt this Amendment, I think we are going to end up with a faulty election law and I think it behooves



both of us, all of us on both sides of th aisle...uh...
to see that we have the best possible method available
to us to see that more people are registered."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will
take the record. On this question, there is 78 'ayes',
90 'nay' and the Amendment is lost. Any further
Amendment?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #3, Beaupre, amends Senate Bill 1036
on page 1, line 9 and on page 3, line 19 and so forth."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1036 merely clarifies that
it is not necessary for the deputy registrar to have an
office, that he may registrar voters anywhere within
the precinct in which he is elected and I would move for
the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House, this, this Bill now really has me suspicious
because it changed the title of deputy registrar ro
precinct registrar and then say that in spite of that
they are deputy registrars. I think it is unnecessary
and redundant. But in addition to that, it puts
Representative VanDuyne's saloon Amendment back in.
It says that, once again I don't know how many times we
are going to face this Amendment this year, but once
again it says that they can register the people in any
place in the precinct in which they are designated. Now
I don't know how many saloons Representative VanDuyne
has in his precinct, I don't know how many Representative
Beaupre has in his, but here we are allowing, or attempting
to allow registrars to give out carbon copies which will
allow people to vote. We are allowing them to register
them at any place in the precinct whether it truly be in
a saloon or on the back of somebody leaning against an
automobile. I just think that this is opening this
thing up to such a ridiculous extent that it, it has



to mean something other than this Bill facing us and I think maybe Representative Walsh hit it right on the head when he said they are trying to get any Amendment on these Bills so that we can have a vehicle coming back at us so that we can vote on reapportionment again. I would suggest that we turn down this bad Amendment also."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative VanDuyne."

VanDuyne: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, absolutely a falsehood from the outset from the start to finish. This is an honest effort to try to get the people of this country and especially this state to participate in our elections. Now you read in the papers, you see it on the T.V., you hear it on the radio, you hear people like Mr. Collins, whenever the democrats try to get their people registered to vote decry this outlandish way we have of registering people and how many dollars it costs per voters that we get registered. They decry it, they say it's a deplorable situation, they say that it's an outrage against the citizenry and taxwise and so forth. Now, all we are trying to do is get a little equity in getting our people registered. The courthouse in Will county is open from 8:30 or 9:00 until 4:30 or 5:00. It closed every Saturday, all day Saturday. People who have to work every day from 7:30 or 8:00 until 4:00 or 4:30 just cannot get registered if the only day they have off is Saturday and Sunday. I submit to any logically thinking person in this House that if you are really sincere in allowing everybody in our society to participate in our election process, that you should vote for this Amendment and also vote for the Bill. Now you might as well face up to it. If you are honest about it, you should vote for it. If you don't want to vote for it, you might as well, you know, instead of trying to make these foolish little speeches like Mr. Collins makes, why don't you just get up and admit it.



You don't want the democrats to get their people registered and you know, just say so."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beaupre to close."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out to Representative Collins that we are a rather puritanical lot in my precinct. There isn't one saloon in the precinct but neither is there a deputy registrar. The people in my precinct have to drive some six miles to get down to the county courthouse. In fact, in my county, the County Clerk decided that the League of Women Voters couldn't even register people at the county fair so that he could maintain control of who was registered and who wasn't. That's the kind of thing that this Bill is addressing itself to and this is a good Amendment and I would move for its' adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "The gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2 to, is it 2 or 3? Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1036. All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Vote 'aye', vote 'no'. Representative Byers."

Byers: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think this is a good Amendment and I think it is one that we should support. There is nothing wrong with people registering to vote and I especially think that the minority party in this state should certainly join and maybe they would not be as much of a minority. Today they are passing out pins around here and the pins say 'Republicans are people too'. Republicans can't vote unless they get registered. So let's get this Amendment on so that we can get Mr. VanDuyne's Bill passed. So I would urge you to support this Amendment and vote 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In all deference to this Amendment, I think it really is unnecessary as the Senate just passed out the Bill which I sponsored allowing



all municipal clerks to be deputy registrars so that in Mr. Beaupre's case even in his little town of Bourbonnais I am sure he must have a municipal clerk and they don't have to go into the county seat any longer. So let's have them go to the municipal clerk rather than to the local tavern."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 84 'ayes', 81 'no', the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Jack O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1057."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1057, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "1057 amends the Illinois General Assembly Pension Code and permits the period of which a member may rescind his election, not to participate to December 1, 1975. Additionally, there was a House Amendment adopted which would permit General Assembly members who were special assistant attorney generals to make the contribution and pay up and participate in the, in the General Assembly Retirement System. The second section of this Amendment would provide those who are masters in chancery to make the contribution and pay up and be members in the General Assembly Retirement System."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The question is, shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "I was going to ask the Sponsor a question. Does this Bill provide for those on contractual services to pick up some sort of credit and if so, would you explain that please?"

Meyer: "Yes, sir. It permits those that were on contractual service for any more than \$6500 a year, those who were specials, to make the contribution and pay up."



Tuerk: "Well, how many people would that include? Do you have any idea?"

Meyer: "Three Members of the House, and one Senator."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 92 'aye', 21 'no', the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Choate, for what purpose do you rise?"

Choate: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, I have a...an Agreed Resolution on the Clerk's desk and with leave of the House I would appreciate the Clerk reading the Resolution at this time."

Speaker edmond: "Does he have leave? Hearing no objections, the Clerk will read the Resolution."

Jack O'Brien: "Resolution 418, Choate, et al. WHEREAS, Today marks the 38th wedding anniversary of our friend and colleague, Joe E. Lucco, Representative from the 56th District, and his charming wife, the former Marina ..T... Tepatti; and..... WHEREAS, Throughout Joe's outstanding career as a teacher, administrator, athletic coach, he has been helped, strengthened and supported by his devoted wife; and.....WHEREAS, Joe E. Lucco prepared himself for his present duties as legislator by knowing enough about men and the right plays to be elected a charter member of the Illinois Coaches Hall of Fame; and....WHEREAS, Although he is pampered and speaks gently and softly in his home, where he is spoiled by Marina and two fine children, Marina Eovaldi and Bill; and....WHEREAS, Despite his reputation at home of being a quiet and calm husband and father at all times, early in his legislative career this session he demonstrated that upon occasion he can raise his voice several decibels and instruct even persons occupying a place considered high and mighty to immediately and forthwith change their seat for one full of fire and brimstone; therefore, be it...RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE SEVENTY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILL-



INOIS, that we express our heartfelt congratulations to genial Joe E. Lucco and Marina Lucco upon the occasion of their 38th wedding anniversary, and to extend them our best wishes for many future years of happy marriage filled with the love and devotion they have known until now; and be it further ...RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be presented to Joe and Marina Lucco to formally demonstrate our esteem and affection."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Choate."

Choate: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask leave of the House for the immediate consideration and the adoption of the Resolution and I'd like to say to the beautiful Mrs. Lucco that Joe is rapidly becoming known as ...ah...'Super Coach' and 'Mighty Legislator' and all of those good adjectives that goes to proclaim a real good person, a friend, a colleague, an outstanding Legislator and I ask all Members of the House to join with me in co-Sponsoring the Resolution for this outstanding gentleman of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Redmond: "1063. Senate Bill 1063."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1063, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act Concerning Fees and Salaries, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keller.....Keller."

Keller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House....ah...this is the increased salary for the Clerks of the Supreme Court, from \$25,000 to \$27,500. I appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Any questions? 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. This question, 95 'ayes', 13 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1135....."



Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1135, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to Wage Deductions for the Benefit of Creditors, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Caldwell. Representative Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. ..Ah...Senate Bill 1035....ah....you gave me the wrong... take it out of the record....for a minute, Mr. Speaker...."

Speaker Redmond: "Take this out of the record, temporarily...1160 Representative Hart."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1160, a Bill for an Act to amend the Coal Mining Act of 1953, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "Ah....Mr. Speaker, ah....to save the long debate that there would be on this Bill and the time of the House, I move to Table this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave? 1160 is Tabled. 1170 Representative Griesheimer."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1170, a Bill for an Act to guarantee immunity to officials, officers and employees of the State for financial loss arising out of their employment by the State of Illinois, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the Bill that came up on Third Reading approximately three days ago. During the course of explaining this Bill ...ah...issue was raised concerning ... whether it would have a retroactive effect. The opposition to the Bill seemed to be that it grew out of a resultant effect of the McBroom Amendments from last term. I took the Bill back to Second Reading, we very specifically removed any retroactive effect specifically stating by Amendment that the Bill would take effect upon its enactment into lawand...ah...I believe we've cleared up all of the objections to the Bill now. It merely gives



the State employees the same position that a private employee would have in the private sector. I would urge its adoption."

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

Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane....."

Lechowicz: "My question relates to the City Savings and Loan Association and what transpired with Mr. Mensick when he was the head of that Association and bilked the taxpayers and unfortunately the investors of that institution for many ...millions of dollars. If this Bill would pass would it protect individuals in that category be....if you recall under the investigation by the Legislative Investigating Commission they pointed out that the State and some of the department heads were negligent in the overseeing of that financial institution. My concern with Senate Bill 1170if you're granting the various financial or....whatever director may be, immunity, then what would be the protection for the....for the....people of the State of Illinois?"

Griesheimer: "To answer the question, this is not an immunity Bill. I stated that before...I state it again. It's not an immunity Bill ...it's an indemnification Bill....up to \$100,000. With regard to the question that you raised specifically concerning the...ah...individuals involved in that particular instance ...ah...I believe that was an intentional act...ah....this Bill does not cover intentional ...ah...violationsit is up to a Court of Law to make a determination whether the activity is intentional or negligent. I believe there is a rather clear distinction between negligent activity and intentional. The State will not become responsible for intentional wrong acts of its employees."

Lechowicz: "Well, under this Bill then you're stating ...the



States liability to \$100,000 per person?"

Griesheimer: "We are extending the State's responsibilities for the negligent acts of its employees up to \$100,000."

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, based upon that explanation and unfortunately what's transpired...in fact a very recent history within this State I will speak against Senate Bill 1170....be....when in turn people in my area of the city, they lost over \$20,000,000 and in turn it took them a number of years in order to get....recoup some of those losses and at that time under the investigation that was conducted under this House and the Senate it was pointed that the State..... some of the State's people were negligent in watching over the responsibilities they were charged with. Here we have a Bill ...as far as limiting the responsibility to \$100,000 which is a mere pittance in comparison to some of the tragic events that transpired ...and I would encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Porter."

Porter: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that the previous Speaker has completely misunderstood the Bill. The Bill provides for indemnification of State employees for their negligence, it has nothing to do with the liability of the State for its negligence to third party. The purpose of the Bill is merely to provide that if a State employee is sued individually for what he's done wrong in the way of negligence only that...the...and...its..is totally liable and becomes personally liable for his negligence and he can then recover under the State's Insurance Policy for that. So it has nothing to do with the liability between the State and a third party. There's really no cost involved because the State can cover this sort....the cost for the insurance....but there is no cost directly to the State other than the insurance premium for this kind of protectionfor State employees, but it has nothing



whatsoever to do with the liability of the State to people such as those who were injured by the City Savings situation"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Based on that explanation...."

Porter: "Now, Look, Mr. Speaker...."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker.....I withdraw my objection..."

Porter: "All right.....all right..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "P.....Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Maragos: "What criteria are set forth that malintent...or... mal...mass...mis... malfeasance...or...misfeasance on the part of the employee are not going to bewe're not going to be covering those actions in here?"

Lechowicz: "Now, let's clarify that for the people of the Legislature, you're asking about negligence and intentional acts. There is no reference to malfeasancewhich is a highly technical legal word, that is so technical that most lawyers don't understand it. In the Bill there is a provision that the court must find whether the act was negligent or intentional. That is a mandatory finding that must be conducted by either the Circuit Court or if it is in the United States District Court. If the finding is an intentional act, then the State has no responsibility to indemnify the employee, if the court finds that it was a negligent act then the State becomes liable and the... the Attorney General....in the processes of sending this individual...then processes the claim...through the Court of Claims, ultimately to the House and to the Senate for reimbursement."

Maragos: "My question is again, however, what is the definition between negligent and intentional, what...what are..... what criteria does the court going to be judging by?"

Lechowicz: "Now, ah...I....this question is being asked by a



very learned attorney...and I am sure that Mr. Maragos knows that there are hundreds of volumes of law books interpreting the word intentional and negligent...."

Maragos: "Exactly right...."

Lechowicz: "It is up to the discretion of the trial judge to make that determination or in the case of the special interrogatory propounded to a jury and if there is a disagreement with regard to this finding it's an appealable item. ...I...I would not want to stand before this house today and give you a set four word interpretation of the word negligent or intentional because they are highly involved words and by our very jurisprudence we have to leave this interpretation to our judges."

Maragos: "I.....I agree with the 'thrust' ...and the intent of the Bill, the only thing that concerns me is that it may be ambiguous enough that it may not serve the purpose for which it is intended. And that's why, because of the complexity of the word negligent and the ambiguity that can be set forthI have doubts whether we're going to be achieving the purpose for which this Bill is being presented. I'll give itsupport...but I'll still havemy big doubtswhether it is going to achieve it. That is why I am asking these questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I wouldI....like to speak in behalf of this Bill...It is very heavily supported by thethe....American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees Union.....which has many members in....my District in the form of prison guards....Now, prison guards and other guards at ...some....at mental health institutions are quite often sued for negligence and claims of like nature....Now, when they are done so... they are left to their own desert...they have to go out and hire a lawyer to defend the suit, they may win or they may lose, but the point of the matter is ...they've had



to defend themselves and incur the court costs and incur attorneys fees. This has given rise to a great reluctance on the part of prison guards in pursuing their tasks. So I think it's a good Bill. It gives them the rudimentary protection I think they are entitled to as they would be given if they were employees of private institutions. So I likewise urge an 'aye' vote on this good Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Would the gentleman yield for a question? I assume you will. Representative, is there an error in the synopsis of...uh...Senate Amendment #1? It seems that the Bill originally written related to negligence and the synopsis...uh...of Amendment, Senate Amendment #1 indicates its' financial loss are rising out of their employment which would seem to negate the concept of negligence. Is that correct?"

Griesheimer: "I can't answer the question 'is that correct'. I will answer your whole question."

Greiman: "All right."

Griesheimer: "To specifically answer your question, Senate Amendment #1 is completely gone. By House Amendment #2 we took the Bill from the enacting clause and completely rewrote the Bill and all of those Senate Amendments are completely gone. They have no application whatsoever today. We are speaking only as to House Amendment #2."

Greiman: "Would this provide any indemnity where there is an action under the Federal Civil Rights Act where...uh... an individual sues because of a denial of civil rights?"

Griesheimer: "Yes, it's our interpretation this would also cover those type of suits but again you would have to look at it from the standpoint of negligence or intentional and I believe that it's within the capability of the federal district trial judge to make a determination whether the breach of the alleged violation of civil rights came about as an intentional act or a negligent act."



Greiman: "Well, O.K., on the Bill I have some concern there-fore. I am not sure how you negligently deny an individual his civil rights under color of law. It seems to be more of an intentional concept and I would be somewhat concerned that we would find ourselves reimbursing or indemnifying guards or...uh...matrons or whoever who had...uh...violated civil rights where it was found actionable where people were found guilty of the violation of other civil rights under various federal acts or state acts and then we find that what the state is saying were these acts. That's an exclusion that I would be concerned about and I am afraid I am not very satisfied with the Bill in its' present state."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stone."

Stone: "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. Representative Griesheimer to close."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, by any other term still not a rose. This Bill is extremely important to all of us state employees. This offers them the same protection that they would have if they were working in the private sector. It's been endorsed by every department of government in our state. It's been endorsed by the state organization, union if you will, that represents our state employees. It provides a basis for establishing the responsibility of the state, namely negligent or intentional activity. With regard to the comments made by Mr. Greiman, they are legitimately raised. These are issues which are concerns to us today. The problem is that when you are writing a new concept into a Bill it's hard to cover every possible avenue or problem that is raised. Quite frankly, what we are trying today is to offer them this protection and hopefully you and I and other people working in the



future can actually go to this problem that you have raised and find some way of covering it in this Bill. The Reference Bureau and I and other people that worked on this Bill were not capable of specifically handling the very technical issue which you have raised. But it does offer the employees the protection which I think they deserve. It only covers those things strictly done within the line and scope of their employment. It also is limited in nature to the state. I don't think it's going to be widely used but it will grant them protection. To those people who might do something such as a prison guard, an intentional blow to a prisoner, it's clearly outside the scope of this activity. To the prison guard who fails to give a prisoner his proper medication which could either be a negligent act under state law or denial of the civil rights under federal law, it will be clearly covered. And I think this is what we are trying to do, offer some protection to our employees with really very little risk to the state. I urge your adoption of this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass.

Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Just very briefly to explain my vote, I guess very briefly. I think we are making a separate class for state employees. It occurs to me that other employees are not so protected contrary to the Sponsor's remarks. As a matter of fact, if I drive a truck for a private company and I rack up somebody I am liable and there is no real right of indemnity that I have for my employer. My liability is joint and several and we are therefore giving a special classification of immunity to state employees different from those people who work for regular corporations. I think it probably is passing anyhow, though. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will



take the record. On this question 116 'ayes', 11 'no'. Representative Marovitz 'aye'. 117 'aye', 11 'no', the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Previously we had granted leave to Representative Porter to consider Senate Bill 751 immediately following Senate Bill 1170. 751."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 751, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Community College Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Porter."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I will be very brief. Senate Bill 751 deals with the Illinois Community College Board and is exactly, has exactly the same provisions in it as did the previous Bill in relation to state employees. It's limited to the same \$100,000 and provides that the Board may cover any liability to its members or employees by reason of loss, by insurance and I would urge that you vote the same way on this Bill, on exactly the same subject."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 132 'aye', 1 'no', and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1247."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1247, a Bill for an Act to provide for the establishment of a civil service classification system for employees of certain counties, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. 1247, I believe has been changed by an Amendment so the synopsis may not quite be right. But it establishes a Commission which in turn will establish a civil service system in the areas affected by, with populations



of 350,000 to 1,000,000 which really means Lake and DuPage County. It includes special considerations for veterans and basically that is the nature of the proposal. I would solicit an 'aye' vote for 1247."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Daniels: "Representative Schneider, in looking over the synopsis on Senate Bill 1247 I am not able to determine from the Amendments that are stated forth there whether or not that this is permissive? Could you...uh...?"

Schneider: "That's right. The mandatory, the mandatory provisions for 1247 have been removed and have now become permissive...uh...rather than mandatory."

Daniels: "Would, excuse me, would that be...uh...permissive on behalf of the county board? Could they enact that?"

Schneider: "That's right."

Daniels: "And also by referendum?"

Schneider: "That is also correct, sir. Those are the two alternatives, two methods for establishing the system as you described."

Daniels: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Hudson: "J. Glenn, just a couple of questions on this. Uh, who asked for this Bill?"

Schneider: "Well, I am the House Sponsor. It's Senator Rock's proposal as you know and I think probably his concern as is mine and my agreeable as to taking it is simply that when counties reach a certain size, there is no magic of course in size, that there is a time when you want to be assuring the public that they are receiving the benefits of skilled employees who are



functioning as civil servants and unrelated to political consideration. I think that's his concern. I think that's my concern. I think that probably relates to most of the concerns of the people in our area."

Hudson: "Well, what I am getting at, is this anything that DuPage County as such wanted, or wants?"

Schneider: "Well, we could determine that by proposing a referendum."

Hudson: "Well, another question or two on this. I am a little bit curious because the population limitation started, I think originally, it started at 150,000 to 1,000,000 and at that time it would have included the counties of Winnebago, Kane, Will, Rock Island, Peoria, Sangamon, Champaign, Madison and St. Clair. Then that was...uh...amended to go up to 300,000, then up to 350,000 and it now reads that those counties between 350,000 and 1,000,000 which...uh...boils it down to now, when it went up to 300,000, I think it was Lake and DuPage and then it was boosted to 350 which boils it down to DuPage County alone, if I am not mistaken."

Schneider: "Lake county also, Ray."

Hudson: "So, we have narrowed it to only two counties."

Schneider: "Well, if your question is...uh...why do we not include the others the answer is there have been people who have approached me in the Senate. I have attached a House Amendment and they are eager and interested in becoming considered as part of this legislation when it is returned to the Senate. So because of the permissiveness, I think it is going to become possible for some counties that are interested in becoming members."

Hudson: "Well, one final question and that would be what would be the fiscal implication...uh...in setting up a Civil Service Commission in DuPage County?"

Schneider: "I have no previous experience and I did not talk to Senator Rock about any fiscal note. None was



requested and I think it would be hard for me to speculate on that but I believe there is probably enough machinery...uh...in the county to do much of that work in-house and the county board member, the head of the county board does determine commission membership. I think that will be the initial cost difference and then once they construct the service system it would be pretty minimal."

Hudson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Hudson: "I think it was Edmund Burke that once said that public life is a situation of power and energy and he trespasses against his duty who sleeps upon his watch as well as he that goes over to the enemy. Well, we are not talking here about anybody going over to the enemy. But it does seem to me that...uh...what we are talking about, perhaps, is a question of what I consider my duty to be awake while I am here as best I can on my tour of duty here in the General Assembly and particularly in regard to those questions that affect my county or my district. And this Bill, I think is a bad one. I speak in opposition to it. True enough, it started out to be a mandatory. It said that the county board shall, it was mandatory originally, set up a civil service commission and true enough, it has been amended to read that...uh...that is permissive but if the county does not do this, then by a back door referendum I think of 1% of the voters, if I read the Amendment right and somewhere, I have lost the Amendment, then by referendum, if the county doesn't do this, by a back door referendum...uh...perhaps the county will. Now I am going to suggest, Glenn, that this Bill has a curious history. I am opposing it because I feel that it's unnecessary. I think that...uh...the way the jobs and employment situation in DuPage County is being handled at the moment is O.K. There have been no gross



misuses that I know of of the power that they have. I think it is unwanted and I think it is undesirable. Furthermore, the establishment of a Civil Service Commission in DuPage County is going to cost a great deal of money. We have not had any figures given here. No figures whatsoever as to the fiscal implication, but I do know one thing about the county and that is that even now they are hard pressed for funds and they are constantly complaining that we enact legislation down here which costs our counties money that they don't have and they don't have any way to raise. They lost the 3% we have talked about so many times by the new Constitution. I know that we are hard pressed, we are hard pressed, we are hard put to it to meet the expenses we have and should this take place...uh...I'm afraid it might add to those things which are going to tend to have us go broke in DuPage County and possibly in Lake although I can't speak for them. So, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I do urge you, I do urge you to give, to give us a 'no' vote on this. It would seem to me that it is discriminatory. Here we've got a piece of legislation that affects, that's boiled down to two counties. Why pick out two Counties, DuPage and Lake?"

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

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll do that. It's discriminatory, it's unnecessary, it's going to be extremely costly and I urge you Members, it isn't going to affect Cook County, it's affecting only DuPage. Don't impose this on us or even give it a chance of being imposed on us. We don't want it. Give us a red light on this, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this is an extremely good Bill. Isn't it funny that when we talk about civil service, it's



counties of over 500,000 and then we try to get that down to say counties of over 300,000 where it might affect two other Counties in the State. And we are not making it mandatory like we said it should be in Cook County. But we are saying that the county boards may and if the county boards don't the people might ask them to do it. Now isn't this strange that some of my colleagues across the aisle say it's good enough for you in Cook County but oh no, don't do it in my county. We're Simon pure and driven and it might be expensive. For Lord's sake, if it's good enough for one county, it's good enough for every County in the State. But that's not what this Bill says. The Bill says it applies to two other Counties in the State. I think it's good legislation. I think it should pass and I would think that anybody that couldn't vote for this Bill, that all those crocodile tears they talk about cleaning up civil service and about doing things in Cook County ought to start re-examining their vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Sponsor, do I understand correctly under this Bill that only counties up to \$1,000,000 would be, pardon me 1,000,000 people would be involved?"

Schneider: "With a bottom of 350,000 to 1,000,000. That's correct."

Geo-Karis: "In other words, home rule counties, like Cook, would be exempted. Is that right?"

Schneider: "Cook has a system already that is I believe mandated."

Geo-Karis: "Of its own. All right. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak on the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,



I think if my County, which is Lake and is one of the two counties affected wants to have this kind of a system, it should be made by their option, not by any state mandate. I don't think we need a state mandate for that at all. We have already infringed constantly day by day into local government. I don't think we should bother it any more than we have. We have so many laws on the books right now that we don't know what we are doing half the time and I would like to urge a 'no' vote on this because it is absolutely unnecessary."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition against this Bill. One of the previous speakers indicated if it's good enough for one county, then it ought to be good enough for the state. Well, that's just like the theory if somebody has a rotten disease, then maybe everybody else ought to have one too. I'm not so sure what the problems of Cook County are. I wasn't here in the legislature when they voted to put in civil service in Cook County and probably if it were here at this point in time I probably wouldn't vote for it either. But I think the most important thing is that downstate counties don't want. I've had every one of my County offices write to me, both Republican and Democratic. They do not want it because they have the direct responsibility of the electorate that it's been placed on their responsibility and they have to measure up to that responsibility when they run for reelection. And I would like to give an indication, or a warning to all these other smaller counties downstate. As soon as they start passing this type of legislation for the two larger counties outside of Cook, you can bet your boots, you are going to have it here in the next session for the same thing for the smaller counties. So the best way to handle this situation is give it a nice great big red vote."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keller."

Keller: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 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. Representative Schneider to close."

Schneider: "Well, thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, again it's very simply establishment of a Civil Service Commission and the commission would be a, would assure parties that they are both involved and I would ask simply for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall this Bill pass. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am surprised at the coalition of the independent Democrat leader over there and the Majority Leader. I think each of them have got to be a little bit uncomfortable in the alliance. I hope they are. And they have a right to be uncomfortable because this is a terrible Bill. This is a Bill directed at one county in the State and it says that they must have a Civil Service Commission subject to certain requirement..."

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

Mann: "Now, Mr. Speaker, I would never interrupt the Gentleman, I just want to answer him, that's all."

Speaker Redmond: "O.K. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "How do you know you want to answer me? You haven't heard me out. Now I would say this, Mr. Speaker. We have two very, very powerful people, the House Sponsor of this Bill and the Majority Leader are endorsing it. Together I think they could do almost anything, Mr. Speaker and I would suggest to them that they address



themselves to the temporary employees in the County of Cook and and in the City of Chicago of whom there must be 350,000 anyway. We have temporary employees there under that great Civil Service Commission who have been temporary employees for 25 years."

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

Shea: "Would the Gentleman confine his remarks to that of the Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "It will be difficult, but confine your remarks to the Bill."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I am talking about the Bill. The gentleman that just spoke made a reference to Cook County and their fine Civil Service Commission which since they are a home rule county, I suppose, I suppose the county board could repeal it but there is no need to. There is no need to because they have so many temporary employees they make a joke of civil service. It's a big laugh."

Speaker Redmond: "That doesn't seem to me to be this Bill."

Walsh: "Wait a minute, now Mr. Speaker. You are not supposed to get into this now. You understand. You are a little bit involved yourself, aren't you, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh, bring your remarks to a close."

Walsh: "All right, I shall, Mr. Speaker. I am very serious and I am surprised, very much surprised at the powerful chairman of the House Education Committee getting himself involved in a rotten thing like this that involves just one county. Now he knows very well and he has amended it four or five different times to remove objections from over there and anybody from over there who has been removed and votes for this is a terrible hypocrite and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann."



Mann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ah....Billy, you are a real 'doozy', I haveI havelistened to you pontificate now for seven terms about the virtues of Civil Service and about the evils of patronage in the County of Cook....and on a number of occasions too painful to reminisce about, I have voted with you and now with 'bald face', excuse the pun, with bald face hypocrisy you stand on the floor of this house and complain about the imposition of Civil Service in the great County of DuPage. Billy, you are a 'doozy'.....Now all these battles that we fought together through the years for good government, to reform the government in the State of Illinois, in the County of Cook for election reform and all of these decent fights for Civil Service and now 'don't tread on me Walsh' we come into a Republican County and all of a sudden this is highly discriminatory. Billy, you are a 'doozy', I think we ought to have your 'aye' vote here."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Choate."

Choate: "Well, I don't know whether Representative Walsh is a doozy or not, I haven't looked at Webster yet, but I do want to say to him in reply to his statement about the unholy alliance between the Majority Leader and the SponsorGod....I...I...I....can't think that it...it...it ... even begins to approach the alliance that I saw here night before last Representative Walsh. The alliance between the rest of your Leadership, the administration and the Republican spokesman on the Appropriations Committee, now that was a really a 'dootsy' of a....of an alliance."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish?...The Clerk will take the record...on this question there is 100 'ayes', and 51 'no', the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed....1135, Representative Caldwell....1135..Representative Caldwell."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1135....."

Speaker Redmond: "Take that out of the record.....Who is that,



Representative Washburn?....Representative Washburn.."

Washburn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I know that the...ah...most of us want to get out of here and get through these Bills and adjourn sometime this weekend but I think, Mr. Speaker, that ...ah certainly the spokesman on the County and Townships Committee should have an opportunity, to be heard on this subjectone in which he is extremely interested and one in which most of us is extremely interested....And Mr. Speaker, I would hope, and I said this the other day, that even though we are small in numbers over here I would hope that you would look on our side of your board up there to see which lights are flashing on this side and recognize them when they want to heard...either on the Bill or explain their vote....and I would ask that Representative McMaster have the opportunity to explain his vote."

Speaker Redmond: "I have no objections.....You want to explain your vote, Representative McMaster?"

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, I am not going to explain my vote, I am going to speak on a matter of personal privilege. You know very well that I had my light on from the time the debate on this Bill started and you refused to recognize me before the Roll Call was taken, you refused to recognize me for Explanation of Vote and when I went up to talk to you just now you said forget it, there has been a deal made, we're going to give the Counties an extra five cents in their corporate rate....and that would be without a referendum, let me tell you Mr. Speaker, I oppose this Bill that you just passed and I'm going to oppose that five cent increase in corporate rate without referendum too."

Speaker Redmond: "1257...."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1257, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Merlo."



Merlo: "Good evening my dear Colleagues.No, I'm going to go with it... Ah...Mr. Speaker and Members of the House...Ah...this Bill is truly a 'cleanup Bill' which changes an archaic provision of the Election Code. Is someone asking for recognition, Mr. Speaker?"

Shea: "Ah...Ah....Mr. Giorgi, did you seek recognition on some point of order?...Proceed Sir."

Merlo: "Whether you know it or not, the Election Code at the present time requires a guardrailing outside of every voting booth used in an election in the State of Illinois. The present statute is mandatory. This Bill will simply change the code to make the guardrail permissive at the option of the County Clerk or the Election Commissioners. The Bill originated in an informal review of ridiculous provisions in our present Election Code, by the Legislative Committee of the Illinois County Clerks Association. This Bill was never formally approved by the full State Board but it has the strong approval of the Chairman ... on the grounds that it could save a tremendous amount of tax money. To our knowledge, a guardrailare used only by a few election officials in the State, technically therefore most election officials and most elections are thus in violation of the law. We think this is silly and that the guardrails in any case are unnecessary and a waste of taxpayers money and I ask your favorable approval of this Bill. I might addI might add...Ladies and Gentlemen that you all know there are 59 members in the Senate, 56 of them approved this Bill and one voted in opposition."

Shea: "I've been asked to make an announcementWhy....If I might inter....interrupt you Sir?....Food is now being served in the Speakers Office and in the Minority Leader's office /so that ...ah...our hosts again this evening...are the Leadership.....Mr. Merlo ...ah....I've just been informedjust on the Republican side.....we're a little slower



in the Speaker's Office.Mr. Merlo...are you through
....or am I interrupting"

Merlo: "Well,I can only say that I think it is unfair
...you know that I am a great eater and I'll be caught
at this....caught here at this speaker for a while and I
....I hope that there is some food remaining....I'm sure
there will be..."

Shea: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1257 pass? On the
question.....the Lady from Cook, Ms. Willer."

Willer: "Ah,....Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Shea: "He indicates he will."

Willer: "What guardrail are you talking about? I've never
seen any kind of a guardrail wherever I've voted."

Merlo: "Ms. Willer, I might tell you too that I've never
seen a guardrail, but obviouslyah...there must be
some County Clerks and Election Commissions that probably
adhere to the present law ...ah... in the strictest sense.
Obviously they must be doing this and know that they are
in violation. All this does is makes it permissive. It's
not shall, it's may and so it takes most of them off the
hook in the event that they don't have it."

Willer: "You mean that there are County Clerks who are really
worried about this.....and would like this type of
Amendment? They are really worried?"

Merlo: "Well, I would think that if you are in violation and
I think that if I were a County Clerk that I'd certainly
want to adhere to the Statutes. I don't think that it's
right to have a provision in our Statutes if you're not
going to abide by them....and I just say that it's a
realistic Bill and it should be written in the manner
thatit is permissive and notmandate it."

Willer: "Thank you."

Shea: "Is there any further discussion?.....The Gentleman
from Cook, Mr. Peters."

Peters: "Representative Merlo."



Merlo: "You didn't ask whether I would yield.....and the answer is 'no'."

Shea: "Do you want to speak to the Bill, Sir?"

Peters: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Shea: "He indicatesno..... Would you like to speak to the Bill?"

Merlo: "I'll yield, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "Oh.....All right.....he'll yield."

Peters: "Rep.....Representative Merlo....I.....I.....I see the Senate Amendment does indicate that the guardrails that may be permissively constructed ...ah...ah....can only end up approaching within six feet of the ballot box. Could you indicate to me whether it's your feeling that's to bring people closer to...or away from....that ballot box?"

Merlo: "I really don't know the answer....I would say that it could work both ways, Representative Peters...ah..."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, if I might just address the Bill for a second....I'm not sure what the ...ah...real background and need of this Bill is, but as you might well know, Mr. Speaker, as a Republican in the City of Chicago, we have one heck of a time getting near that ballot box to begin with and I...I...I am a bit concerned that when we talk about rails within six feet ...ah...we...we...we might even find ourselves in a more difficult ...ah...position in casting the ballot. I know that some other legislation has been passed ...that....in regard to ...ah...or is being considered ...in regard to help inside the polling boothand was ex....explained ...it's to make sure the people in fact...vote the way they want to vote...Ah I'm a little bit concerned about this Jack, it would seem to me the real answer here would be to delete this provision entirely from the Statutes and in a serious vein I think we're going to end up with some election expenses in some places that are quite unnecessary."

Merlo: "Well, Representative Peters, in answer to your ...ah..



statement, I can only tell you that you made a direction to the City of Chicago and you know that we do use machines there and not ballot boxes asas a matter of information....."

Peters: "Yea....yea.....but....we still have a time gettin'there too."

Merlo: "Yea.....All I can tell you isthat this is an archaic provision.....personally.....probably the whole thing should be stricken off the Statutes completely, but as I say....it's.....it's facing the problem realistically, there must....obviously some County Clerks who abide by the Statutes ...and rightfully so....if we do have these Statutes ...by all means we shouldwe should adhere to the law....and all you're doing here is making it permissive. How they want to set up the guard-rails, I doubt very much whether that would come into question."

Shea: "Is there any further discussion?.....The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am a little confused....ah...here on the importance of this Bill, but I would like to address some observations on it to the Members of the House. Senate Bill 1257 is Sponsored by the Democrat.. Leadership in the Senate. A very impressive Sponsorship....And then the Bill makes provision for a guardrail...so we assume it's enormous.... important.... with the Leadership.... Sponsorship...and then House Amendment #1 amends line 9 of page one where it says, where somebody has responsibilities imposed upon them, it inserts the fantastically important word 'where the responsibility is imposed by law' and ...you know...we're pretty busy...we got two days to go...we got a Bill that is as clearly a 'shell' Bill as I have ever seen in my life. I don't see how, at this stage of the game, we can be dwelling with things



like this."

Shea: "Sir, would you confine your remarks to the Legislation?"

Duff: "The....Legislation, Mr. Speaker, with House Amendment #1 on it will go back to the Senate for a Concurrence report. I wouldn't be a bit surprised if there is a non-concurrence and a Conference Committee and we see this Bill out again some time in the late hours Saturday night or Sunday night with someah...equally unimportant Amendment on it.....Ah...for our consideration...and I would say to those of you who are concerned with how election Bills might be treated in these last three days might well be concerned with whether or not we should take the chance of passing this out of this House tonight.

Merlo: "Ah...First of all....Mr..ah.."

Shea: "Mr. M....Merlo, that wasn't a question....he's...."

Merlo: "Made a statement there relative to the Sponsorship and Senator Welsh is not in Leadership....and that's number one and there are many many Bills ..Representative Duff that go through this House and I know in my seven termsthey do make technical changes....and this happens to be one."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos."

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

Shea: "The question is, shall the main question be put? All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. It takes 89 votes to pass a Bill. Do you want a Roll Call on the motion? The question is shall House....er....er Senate Bill 1257 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay' and the Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster, to explain his vote."

McMaster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm glad you finally recognized the fact that I had my light on."

Shea: "I've always recognized that, Tom."

McMaster: "Thank you. I wanted to ask Representative Merlo



a question or two, but perhaps it isn't necessary. I wanted...."

Shea: "Have all vo...."

McMaster: "...I wanted to ask him what the impetus of this Bill was, I know he cannot answer it now, but perhaps he might explain his vote too. Let me tell you....this is a 'shell' Bill Ladies and Gentlemen...just as much of a 'shell' Bill as that damn 'bug exterminator Bill' that you got passed out of my Committee, Jerry...."

Shea: "I'm concerned about bugs....Turn Mr. McMaster....on. Tom.....I'm always concerned about bugs."

McMaster: "I know, and we passed that 'shell' Bill out and fortunately it has not been used....Jerry...."

Shea: "Oh...I see...but..."

McMaster: "I just want you to know that I recognize a 'shell' Bill when I see it...including this one."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish?The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz, to explain his vote."

Katz: "Yes...ah...Mr. Speaker, I did want to take exception to the remarks that my colleague from the First District made about the distinguished Democratic Leadership in the Senate, I think that they are excellent men...I enjoy great confidence in them...but because this Bill does not appear to me to be needed and the Sponsor has not been able to state any good reason why we need it and the assumption that Election Officials need Bills without proof does not seem to be warranted....I therefore will have to vote 'no' on the Bill."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Merlo."

Merlo: "I would like to place this on Postponed Consideration."

Shea: "Postponed Consideration...The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison...Mr. Madison...wait a minute...Mr....

McMaster....the rules allow each Member to place their Bill on Postponed Consideration...Proceed, Mr. McMaster..



er...I mean, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, just checking again to see either if my light is working or if you've got your elbow on it."

Shea: "It's working fine, Sir."

Madison: "Well.....it's been working for quite a long time Mr. Speaker...and you've refused to recognize me...before you took the Roll Call."

Shea: "On the order of House Bills, Third Reading, appearser...Senate Bills, Third Reading...appears Senate Bill 1258....Now do you have a question, Mr. Collins?"

Collins: "Yes, similar to Mr. Madison's question, Mr. Speaker, ...er...my light has been on ...ah...ah...on numerous occasions today and it doesn't seem to matter who is in that Chair,...ah...I...I...have difficulty getting recognized unless I shout....Now you've asked us not to ...I would be very happy to shout for recognition but I had my light flashing early....in...on....that...that last Bill and you studiously ignored me....I...I...would ask you.....that..."

Shea: "Mr. Collins...Mr. Collins...Might I ask you a question, Sir? "

Collins: "I'm making a statement, I didn't come here to answer your questions."

Shea: "All right.....1258.....Senate Bill..1258."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1258, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kozubowski."

Kozubowski: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have the feeling that this is not the time to call on the Election Bill, however, I would like to ask leave of the House to move Senate Bill 1258 back to the ...ah...Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment.....As you said, Mr. Speaker...this Bill was moved back to Second Reading this morning for the purposes of an Amendment and and I withdrew it at that



time so I could talk about the Amendments with Representative Collins and Representative Walsh."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is one that we did discuss and Representative Kozubowski gave us assurances as to the purposes of this Bill which satisfy me, I'm prepared to support his Bill."

Shea: "Does the Gentleman have leave to take it back to Second.....Reading?....Mr. Walsh on the question."

Walsh: "Is this the Bill, Mr. Speaker, that you ...assured us would not be used as a vehicle?..."

Shea: "Mr. Walsh...somebody has asked me if I'm going to attempt to put some Amendments of the 'map' on Bills. I assured them I will not seek to amend a Bill in this House with the map on it."

Walsh: "No Bill at all?.....and what if a Senate Bill is amended?.....or a House Bill that is in the Senate?"

Shea: "I can't tell you what the Senate is going to do, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Yes, but if that Bill came back here would you find yourself in the position of supporting it or would you have to call Chicago."

Kozubowski: "Oh....Mr. Speaker....I don't think that's germane to this Bill."

Shea: "House Bill....er...this....Senate Bill 1258...Second Reading...."

Fred Selcke: "Ah....Amendment #1, Kozubowski, Amends Senate Bill 1258, in House on page 1, and so forth."

Kozubowski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #1 would allow the local election authorities to use discretion as to when paper ballots would be used in Special Elections and I would move its adoption."

Shea: "The question i.....on the questionthe Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."



Skinner: "Boy.....'You bet your Sweet Bippy on this One...'.
 May I suggestMay I suggest that women loose an RTA
 Election except for paper ballots and that was a special
 election.....and if this thing is allowedto come
 on.....MY GOD....ah....we may include DeKalb County or
 Kankakee County or Union County in the RTA District next.
 I....I....think this is an incredible Amendment and I
 would remind everybody to take a look at the Calendar and
 what Bills are coming up and maybe you can understand
 why.....point."

Shea: "Mr.....Kozubowski.....on a Point of Order...."

Kozubowski: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it is quite evident that the
 last Gentleman has not read the Bill and is not familiar
 with the contents....if he did....he would notice that
 the Senate Bill 1258 is limited at the present time to
 the only slating of one special election."

Shea: "Mr. Kozubowski, do you want to explain to them....
 what office andwhat election?"

Kozubowski: "Well, I could give them an example, Mr. Speaker,
 at the present time in Cook County, in the Fifth Congres-
 sional District we just concluded a primary in which one
 of our colleagues, Representative Fary was a candidate
 for Congress, for nomination for the Office of Congressman.
 ...And at that time we were allowed to use paper ballots
 for that particular office....and that's what this
 Amendment is striking out at....it's a clarification...."

Shea: "All right....Now, I might tell you that the Democrats
 are also servingin the Speaker's Office....The
 question is....shall this Amendment be adopted?...Mr.
 Skinner, do you still wish to go ahead...I didn't mean
 I'm sorry...I didn't mean to ..."

Skinner: ".....came in with a Parliamentary Inquiry...I
 thought I still had the floor...or at least residual
 rights....Ah....May I...May I...deviate from the rules
 of the House and ask a question now, having made a



statement, since I'm still confused?"

Shea: "Well, I would imagine the House would give you leave."

Skinner: "Well, why not. We do it every other time..."

Shea: "There has been objection."

Skinner: "Oh, ...sh...shucks...."

Shea: "The Gentleman from...."

Skinner: "Well then I guess I'll have to continue speaking on the issue. Since we don't know whether this only....since we don't know that this only...."

Shea: "Mr. Stone on a point of order."

Stone: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, you know....a point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. My point is simply this, Mr. Speaker, we have rules of this House, Sir, and one of the rules of this House states that a Gentleman or a Lady, when they desire recognition shall politely address the Chair 'Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House'. A Gentleman here just a few moments ago rose on his feet yelling, screaming or whatever you want to say and said... 'you bet your sweet bippy', that was his way of addressing the Chair, Mr. Chairman, addressing the Speaker. Now, about two sentences before that this same Gentleman used the name of our LORD in vain. I resent this very much, he does it quite often, he does it every day, Mr. Speaker, and I resent having to set in a body that I look upon as being very distinguished and to have to set here without saying anything and listen to the Gentleman make those kinds of remarks. I resent it very...very much. Now, Mr. Speaker my Mother used to tell me that a Gentleman did not have to swear and use the name of our LORD in vain in order to get attention, that there are other ways and I ...I ...just hope that for the remaining part of this session we might be spared this sort of activity."

Shea: "I personally want to thank you Mr. Stone for reminding us where we are....The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner to finish."



Skinner: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and....what did he say,....M....Members of the General Assembly....or Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly?.....The question is...is this....the question which we cannot have answered.....ah...because we are apparently attempting to sneak this little one by without full discussion....is.. whether it.....is whether this Bill applies only to candidates or whether it applies to special referenda. Now the question hasn't yet been answeredperhaps the Sponsor would ...ah....would answer the question in...in closing perhaps he wouldn't ...perhaps he is on his way to the chapel."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff, on the question."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Shea: "He indicates he will, Sir."

Duff: "Representative Kozow...Kozubowski, does this Bill really pertain...primarily to the potential ...special election in Cook County of the Circuit Clerk?"

Kozubowski: "That's Congressman and the County Clerk, you're correct."

Duff: "Well, what....since the Congressional Election is completed.....I grant there could be some in the future..... what we're confronted with at the moment ...this Bill which would allow the use of paper ballots in the Special Election in the.....for the Circuit Clerk in Cook County and is it not also the fact that the Bill would have to be considered in conjunction with the Bill that's been placed on the Governor's desk which your partyfrom Chicago....wants to make sure the Governor signs..."

Kozubowski: "The Bill....Representative Duff...applies to all special elections which require an election to fill that vacancy."

Duff: "All right, thank you. Mr. Speaker, may I address the Bill?"

Shea: "Proceed."



Duff: "Well, I am sure that if we pass this Bill, we will save Cook County a lot of money for not having used the voting machines on that Circuit Clerk Election, however, from my own experience in working precincts within the City of Chicago over the last 15 years, it has been pretty apparent to me that the use of the machines in the highly urbanized area, where the identity of the voter is more difficult to determine, frequently on the part of the judges....that the worst....and I'm not saying that this is widespread, that the worst election abuses take place in counties where there arepap...pap...where there are paper ballots. Now, Cook County and the City of Chicago have both been trying to eliminate the use of the paper ballots wherever they can but I worked a precinct in the City of Chicago in an Aldermanic Election, not too many years agowhich was...that was in those days called a preserved paper ballot precinct...ah...it was the ballroom of a hotelit was plenty large for ah....machines...but for some reason in that particular precinct they used paper ballots. And....'lo and behold' about.....when I got there at 4:30 in the morning, the Election Judges were already there and they had already counted the paper ballots, they had already initialed them, they had already started the system, before the Republican Judges showed up. Not very many hours into the dayone of the judges picked up one of the paper ballots put it in her purse and went out and got on the elevator. That starts a process, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, which is called 'kiting'....once you get a paper ballot out of a precinct...we...those of us...who and many of....most of us who have worked precincts know that throughout the rest of the day anybody who chooses to...may abuse the electoral process in a most serious and almost impossible to discover way. Now, I grant this Bill would save Cook County money, but it...."

Shea: "Mr. Maragos on a point of order, Sir."



Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Gentleman's attempt to lecture us on election procedure....not you, Sir....however, I think he is not to the point before us and I ask that he confine his remarks"

Shea: "Would you"

Duff: "I'm just getting to that, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "Would you just....keep your remarks to the Bill, Sir?"

Duff: "I will, Sir.....I grant that this Bill would save Cook County a lot of money in the impending...important...special election....if it is held, but on the other side of it ... it would make possible a regression in some of the campaign abuses that we have all seen occur in some areas of that city and I think it is a real step backwards in spite of the cost. It costs money to protect the democratic process and this Bill would be a mistake."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, partially in support of the Bill and partially in response to Representative Duff's comments. I would simply point out that passage of this Bill would certainly be in the interest of the public ... for a very simple reason...many of us in this House have voted in favor of two Bills which have passed out of the House and out of the Senate and are now on the Governor's desk. One of these Bills would provide there.....there would be no need for a special election in the County of Cook to select a Clerk of the Circuit Court until the next General Election and another Bill that has passed both Houses appropriates \$8.8 million dollars of State money to pay for that special election. So that those two Bills taken together and in particular the appropriation Bill, point out the extreme costs that we are talking about when we talk about an election in Cook County. Frequently we hear discussion, comment, regarding elections in Cook County. Quite often that comment and those discussions come from the Assistant



distinguished Assistant Minority Leader and of course quite often those comments are ill-timed, ill-mannered, not given much thought, and not too knowledgeable. But, regardless of those comments, I think that really should consider what we're talking about here ...If....in the case of the special election for the Clerk of the Court we are talking about manning 3,000 precincts with voting machines, we're talking about the expense of renting the trucks which will move those machines to the polling places, the expense of moving the machines back to the warehousesso that this is what should be considered. That's what the Bill says. The Bill says that in the case of these special elections you can have a substantial savings in cost...and in response to Representative Duff's comments on election fraud I would say to Representative Duff, if he were present in a polling place and he observed election fraud, I sincerely hope that he reported that to the proper law enforcement officials and asked for prosecution of those who violated the law because I can stand on this floor as a Democratic Ward Committeeman from Chicago and I can say that in my Ward and I'm familiar with the activities of both political parties in our Ward, there is no election fraud in the 13th Ward of Chicago and if there is and if someone would point it out to me I'll turn the evidence over to the proper law enforcement agencies whoever they may be and ask that the guilty people will be prosecuted. There should be no election fraud and there isn't where I come from. I don't know what goes on in the suburban areas....I know ...on a recent Bill we had that ...ah....that it provided that there be a uniform system of appointment of election judges and some of these distinguished people from areas other than my own in Cook County were opposed to the Bill. They didn't think that it was fair. That each political party be given an opportunity to appoint a majority of the judges in half of the precincts of the County. I don't know



why they were opposed to the Bill. I would certainly was in favor of saying that in one precinct one party controls and in another precinct another party controls. That's the system we have in the 13th ward but for some reason that's not good enough for the other areas of the county. And now we are back again and we are saying let's help the people. Let's do away with this foolishness of transporting voting machines all over the county and paying the cost of it and again we hear opposition from the same, unenlightened, reactionary sources that are always opposed to these reform measures."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor."

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

Shea: "The question is, shall the main question be put. All those in favor will say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kozubowski, to close."

Kozubowski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think the discussion here this afternoon has shown that Amendment #1 is worthwhile, that it will save the taxpayers of the entire State of Illinois a great deal of money and I would urge its adoption."

Shea: "The question is, shall Amendment #1 be adopted. Mr. Skinner on a point of order."

Skinner: "I question the quorum."

Fred Selcke: "There must be at least forty people on the floor."

Shea: "The question is, shall this Amendment be adopted. All in favor will say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it."

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #2, Kozubowski."

Shea: "The Amendment is adopted. Now wait a minute. Mr. Duff would like to raise a point of personal privilege."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I addressed myself to this Amendment as reasonably as I could and I referred to some experiences which did in fact occur. I did not say that there is



any fraud in any given ward."

Shea: "What's your point?"

Duff: "My point is your parliamentarian then walked down this aisle and walked past my desk and sternly told me I was full of shit. Now, Mr. Speaker, I may not always be accurate on this House floor, but I want, but I want an apology from the parliamentarian, Mr. Speaker. I am an elected member of this House and I can address my remarks as temperently as anybody as I did in this case. Now, Mr. Speaker, I resent your parliamentarian..."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Duff, you could have come up here and said that without shouting it over a microphone. Read the Amendment."

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #2, Kozubowski, amends Senate Bill 1258 in the House on page 1, by deleting line 24 and so forth."

Shea: "Mr. Kozubowski on Amendment #2."

Kozubowski: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #2 would provide that the local election board or authority would give discretion as to whether paper ballots could be used in a special election to fill vacancies in not more than two offices or in which no more than two propositions are to be voted upon or in which a vacancy in one office is to be filled in one proposition is to be voted upon. I would urge its adoption."

Shea: "The gentlemen moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. On the question, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan.

Did you wish recognition or was your light just flashing?"

Madigan: "I wanted to ask leave of the House to draft a resolution applauding Mr. Epstein."

Shea: "The gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was so shocked to see Representative Stone clapping at the, at the sight of a profanity I didn't get the description of this Amendment from the Sponsor. I wonder if he would give



it again."

Shea: "Mr. Skinner, you have a copy of the Amendment on your desk."

Skinner: "I'm sorry sir, I'm unable to find it."

Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The question is, shall Amendment #2 be adopted. All in favor will say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #3, Kozubowski, amends Senate Bill 1258 on page 1 by deleting 1 and so forth."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kozubowski, asks leave of the House to table Amendment #3. Is there objection? Hearing none, the Amendment is tabled. Is there further Amendments? Third Reading. On the order of House Bills, Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1285. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 1285."

Shea: "Take it out of the record at the Sponsor's request. Senate Bill 1289 and 1290 will be taken out of, 1291. On the order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1290."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 1290, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Now before I get into the, decide what to do with this Bill I want to ask is there going to be a Fall Calendar for these Bills?"

Shea: "I don't know yet. If you would like, it is the intention of the Chair at this point to go through all Third Bill, Third Reading Senate Bills at least, finish through and then go back through to give every opportunity to a member to make sure that his Bill has been called on Third Reading."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, the reason why I am bringing these remarks. I know this Bill is going to take a little



debate and the thing is I don't want to take the floor, the time of the floor in the House at this late date to discuss this Bill and that's why if I would have leave to be assured that it would be considered in the Fall, then I would postpone it."

Shea: "I have been informed by the Clerk that we are having a Fall Calendar so..."

Maragos: "I have leave then, Mr. Speaker, to put this on the Fall Calendar."

Shea: "The gentleman asks leave to place this on their Fall Calendar. Is there objection? Hearing none, leave is granted and House Bill 1290 will be placed on the Fall Calendar. Senate Bills. On the order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears, Mr. Mann, do you have a question, I see your light flashing."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't know if it was appropriate. I had a resolution I wanted to put on the Fall Calendar. Do you want to wait until you get the resolutions? Is that appropriate?"

Shea: "What I would like to do is to get the Senate Bills Second and Third Reading out and all matters off the Calendar that have to be disposed of, all non-excluded material so that..."

Mann: "Parliamentary inquiry. What would be the status of the matter on the table...uh..."

Shea: "On the table?"

Mann: "Yeah, a motion to take from the Speaker's table. Would that go over to the Fall..."

Shea: "There are no deadlines so that will go over to the Fall Calendar."

Mann: "Thank you, sir."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Houlihan, J."

Houlihan: "Uh, Mr. Speaker, what is the intentions of the Chair as regards to motions? Do you plan to go to that order of business today?"

Shea: "If we get there I will. On the order of..."



Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "On the order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1292."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 1292, a Bill for an Act to amend Section 4 and to add Sections 9 and 10 to an Act to promote the welfare of wage earners and so forth, Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Fary."

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

This is brother Lenke's Bill who passed it in the Senate, a former member of the House as you all recall and it exempts all wages, salary amounts or other compensation paid by the State, any unit of local government or a school district from wage assignment. Now if I can read brother Lee's hieroglyphics here I will go on a little further. This Bill conforms the Wage Assignment Statute to what the law was prior to Anderson vs. Foster. That is, exempts any public employees as the judges suggested. This will clear up the law without legal costs. The cost to the government eliminates, is very costly, eliminates the potential extreme hardship to municipal employers caused by complicated bookkeeping. It is supported by the American Federation of Labor (CIO), the Illinois Banks, finance companies, municipal league, park district associations, other public officials and...uh...school boards, teachers unions, police and firemen's associations. So this then briefly eliminates the wage assignment of public employees and brings the Bill back to its original status as it was prior to the court case of Anderson vs. Foster."

Shea: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1292 pass. On the question, the gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a point of personal privilege."

Shea: "Proceed, sir."

Friedrich: "Number one, if the Parliamentarian of this House



is indeed walking up and down the aisle making remarks to members of this House, he certainly should be restrained from doing it any further. I think it's abominable that he is doing that. But I think it is equally abominable that the Representative who rose and used the, repeated some four letter words here, because from time to time we have children and we have pages here who should not be subjected to that and I think, I have been gone a while from the legislative hall and absolutely I am appalled at some of the language I hear on this floor and in the Committee rooms. Now it's against the rules and a member can be evicted for 24 hours for doing things like that and I was just at the point of making a motion the other day that one of our members be sentenced for 24 hours and evicted from this floor. Now I suppose I am just one, and I have used words like that but there is no room for them on this floor or in the Committee rooms and I will tell you now that if they are used again I am going to file a motion to have that person evicted from this floor as a member of this House under the rules and under the Constitution of this State. I think maybe that he was provoked into doing it by something that was also wrong but I just, I will tell you now, if this happens again, I am going to file a motion to have those members evicted under the rules of this, under the Constitution of this State."

Shea: "I think your remarks are well taken, sir and I commend you for them. Is there any further discussion on Senate Bill 1292? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Fary to close."

Fary: "I explained in detail the purpose of this particular Bill and I ask a favorable vote."

Shea: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1292 pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. This is final action and takes 89 votes. Have



all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question, there are 109 'ayes', 13 'nays', 10 members voting 'present' and Senate Bill 1292 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1293. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. D'Arco, after the Clerk reads the Bill."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 1293, an Act to amend an Act to revise the law in relation to mechanics liens and so forth, Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. D'Arco."

D'Arco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1293 does substantially the same thing that House Bill 504 did and House Bill 504 passed this House and the Senate and what it does, it provides that a sub-contract term shall give the owner of a single family residence or a multiple dwelling up to five units notice not to pay the contractor until the owner receives a waiver of lien from the contractor and I would ask for a favorable vote on this please."

Shea: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1293 pass. On the question, all in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. This is final action and requires 89 votes. Have all voted who wish? The gentleman from Perry, Mr. Dunn to explain his vote."

Dunn: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and members of the House. I think that this is kind of a controversial Bill. I remember the Bills that went out of here before and I notice they have struck everything except the enacting clause and put the Bill back in effect and I am going to ask for a verification of the Roll Call. I don't think there is enough people here. I think that this is an important Bill that ought to be discussed and debated. We have about maybe 75 people on the floor and with 100 votes, I don't whether we should do that or not."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?"



Take the record, Mr. Clerk. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. D'Arco. On this Bill, there are 69 'aye' votes, 27 'nay' votes, 12 members voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1293 having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. On the order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1297.

Is Mr. Keller on the floor?"

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 12..."

Shea: "Take it out of the record. There is no Sponsor here.

On the order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1301. The gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Boyle."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 1301, an Act to amend Section 7 of an Act concerning fees and salaries and so forth, Third Reading of the Bill."

Boyle: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I...uh...this, this probably will be a controversial Bill. If Mr. Dunn is going to persist in verifications on these things I, I would just like to pass it now with the hopes that we could come back to it if it's the desire of the Chair. I mean I am ready to go but it's obvious we don't have...uh...

Let's just take it out of the record now."

Shea: "Take it out of the record at the Sponsor's request. Pass House Bill 1371 at the Sponsor's request. On the order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1380, Mr. Katz."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 1380, an Act to create a joint Legislative Service Commission and so forth, Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill that affects each member of the General Assembly very directly. It is a Bill that would combine the Legislative Reference Bureau and the Legislative Council and the Legislative Information Service into a single agency. It was felt by the Speaker of the House and by the leadership of the Senate that since



it does affect the members of the House so very closely that it ought to be heard at a time when more careful consideration could be given to it. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Senate Sponsor and the Speaker, I would request that the Bill be put on the Fall Calendar so that all of the members of the House can be, become familiar with it. They will be given an opportunity to be heard regarding it since it will directly affect the services they receive."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook makes a motion to place House Bill 1380 on the Fall Calendar. Does he have leave? House Bill, or Senate Bill 1384, Mr. Stubblefield, take that out of the record. 1392, Mr. Hart, take that out of the record. 1395, Mr. Garmisa."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 1395, an Act relating to certain advertising, Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what I am concerned with here is the fact that quite a few members are off the floor of the House now at the invitation of the Speaker and of the Minority Leader having their dinner, their buffet or whatever you want to call it and I understand that there's mike's going on and the squawk boxes are on in both of those places and I understand they have left other Members in the House to work their switches whenever there is any legislation comes up that's of a non-controversial nature. Now, what I am concerned with here is that the fact that there doesn't seem to be too many members out of the House and if there are, if we do come within a few votes of a passage and a verification was called for, I think that...uh...this would be unjust..."

Shea: "I think under the circumstances members might be allowed to take their Bills out of the record. Proceed, sir."

Garmisa: "Well, I'm going to go ahead with 1395 because I



do believe it is not controversial. What this Bill deals with is that a seller advertising that consumer goods are for sale and that advertisement should state that the price of the consumer goods, the stated price must include all services that would be incidental to the proper use of the goods by the purchaser. Or the ad must state clearly that such services will be furnished at extra cost and what I am trying to do here, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the 79th General Assembly, I think has been unjustly criticized of being an anti-consumer oriented General Assembly. And I think that if this Bill were enacted into law, it would be a small step forward in alleviating some of this unjust criticism. I would ask for the support of every member of the House and ask for a favorable vote for Senate Bill 1395."

Shea: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1395 pass. 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 117 'ayes', 7 'nays', 3 members voting 'present' and Senate Bill 1395 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Ms. Geo-Karis wishes to be recorded as 'aye' on that Bill. On the order of House, Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1465. Is Mr. McPartlin on the floor? Take that out of the record at the Sponsor's request. On the order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1492. Mr. Beatty, do you wish to proceed with that, sir? Turn Mr. Beatty on, please."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, I am not the House Sponsor. Representative Kosinski is."

Shea: "Do you want to handle it for him, sir?"

Beatty: "I'm not familiar with the Bill."

Shea: "Take it out of the record. On the Committee on Education, is Mr. Berman ready on that Bill? Proceed, sir."



Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 1493, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman."

Berman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1493 has amended...uh...is similar to the Bill that we had originally passed out of the House...uh...except it has a couple of additional changes. We had adopted essentially...uh...the Bill that was passed out of the House originally which was House Bill 1506 and when you have an addition to that, an Amendment that Representative Jaffe put on to address ourselves to the problem of declining average daily attendance and...uh...I think, did we, there was an Amendment by Representative McGrew but I, I don't recall if that was put on. That was put on. McGrew's Amendment was a 5% additional for the Strayor-Haig school districts. Now, this is the last...uh...well, this Bill probably will be subject to some additional changes or non-concurrences in the Senate. I want to be candid with you because the Senate has had different, a different approach to a number of these areas. But I think that the House is going to have its day in court and an opportunity to participate. I would urge that Senate Bill 1493 be passed this evening and...uh...so that the ideas that this House did endorse in 1506 with some additional considerations such as the average daily attendance decrease and the problem of the Strayor-Haig districts be incorporated and I would be glad to respond to any questions that...uh...the House may have."

Shea: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1493 pass. On the question, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Shea: "He indicates he will, sir."

Schlickman: "Would you estimate for us the cost of this Bill as amended? In other words, how many additional millions of dollars would be transferred from the General Revenue



fund to the school fund? Common school fund."

Berman: "Approximately 28 million."

Schlickman: "Is this \$28 million included within the Governor's budget?"

Berman: "I think that I could say...uh...almost yes. And let me explain why I say almost yes. If you recall, in the budget message the Governor indicated that he was allocating \$20 million over and above the full funding formula for attention to the needs of primarily downstate school districts. In addition, according to the figures of the Bureau of the Budget, the estimate for the full funding budget is approximately \$7 million overstated. So that 7 plus the Governor's 20 is just about the cost of this Bill."

Schlickman: "One further question. How would that approximate \$28 million be distributed...uh...by the city of Chicago, suburban Cook, and the remainder of the State?"

Berman: "Let me go backward and I'm sorry, I gave you a wrong answer. Representative Jaffe put an Amendment on that increased the cost of this substantially. I'm sorry. I was thinking of it without his Amendment. The cost of this Bill I think now would be approximately \$57 million. \$57 million."

Shea: "Mr. Berman, might I disturb you for a minute? The rules of the House do not permit pictures to be taken while the House is in session unless permission is granted by the Speaker. At this time, nobody has been granted permission to take pictures so would people please refrain? Proceed, sir."

Berman: "O.K., I want to go back, Gene, because I gave you a wrong answer. The Bill without the Jaffe Amendment was about \$28 million. Jaffe's Amendment is approximately \$29 million so we are talking about \$57 million and Representative McGrew's is about a million. So we are talking about...uh...28, 57, 58 million. Uh, that would be broken down to approximately...uh...8 million to



Chicago, 8 million to the suburbs and the rest to downstate.. 8 and 8 is 16, about 41 or 42 million to outside Cook county."

Schlickman: "So the amount that is contained in this Bill, or the effect that this Bill would have is not covered by the Governor's budget."

Berman: "That's right. It exceeds the Governor's figures by about the amount of the Jaffe Amendment, 28, 29, 30 million."

Schlickman: "Thank you very much."

Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The gentleman from, or the lady from Cook, Ms. Macdonald and then I'll get to Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, who did you call on?"

Shea: "I called Ms. Macdonald because someone had evidently put on her light. The gentleman from Perry, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Sponsor would yield for a question? Representative Berman, does this provide in the Bill or in the Amendment either one, for a tax increase without a referendum for local school districts for local taxes?"

Berman: "We have built in by the Amendment process...uh... allowing downstate unit districts to have an increase in their tax, permissive tax rates subject to a back door referendum. That's the same provision that we had in 1506 as it passed the House originally...uh...it would be a back door referendum that would give more time for the filing of the petition for back door referendum than presently exists. The present provision is for ten days. The provision in this Bill allows 30 days for the back door petition for referendum to be filed. There is, it is not an increase...uh...but for that."

Dunn: "Representative Berman, it says they can levy an annual tax rate of not to exceed 50¢ for operation maintenance. What is that now?"

Berman: "37 1/2."



Dunn: "Beginning July 1, 1976 a rate not to exceed \$1.72.

What is that now?"

Berman: "\$1.60."

Dunn: "And \$1.84 in July, 1977. What is that now?"

Berman: "Well, let me explain, Ralph. The..."

Dunn: "That's the same \$1.60, isn't it?"

Berman: "In other words, we provided in here for 12.5¢ the first year subject to back door referendum. 12¢, that would go to the building fund. 12¢ in the second year, a 12¢ increase in the education fund subject to back door referendum and the third year an additional 12¢ in the education fund subject to back door referendum."

Dunn: "Now, this is only unit districts grade 1 through 12. What about dual districts? How do they, how would their rates coincide with this? Could you tell me?"

Berman: "This..."

Dunn: "Under some other Bill or whatever it is."

Berman: "The duals, that's where we're giving them...uh... the combination to, the elementaries..."

Dunn: "It's not in this Bill, though, is it?"

Berman: "No. The elementary districts...uh...are...uh... at \$1.95, I'm sorry \$1.27 and \$1.27. So they are at \$2.50, \$2.54 which is their maximum non-referendum tax rate at the present time."

Dunn: "That's what they have to levy, that's what they have to extend in order to get state aid?"

Berman: "No, they are qualified for the maximum. It's \$1.95 and \$1.05."

Dunn: "I see. Thank you, Mr. Berman. Mr. Chairman, if I might speak just a minute to the Bill. I, I certainly am for schools and for education but I am not particularly sure that this is the place where we can have a back door referendum. I think that this ought to be allowed by a referendum and I intend to, personally, I'm going to vote against the Bill and I would urge that people look at it carefully before you vote a tax increase on



people in your district. If you want to go home and say I voted for a tax increase for education and you should know that this is what this Bill does. I thank you."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Pierce on the question."

Pierce: "Mr. Berman, as you know, our districts in the suburban area are concerned with the roll back provision and I wonder what the Bill as amended, I can't seem to recall what the Bill as amended, does with the roll backs under the original resource equalizer, whether they are still required to roll back their taxes or whether that's limited or eliminated."

Berman: "In the Bill as amended, we have, for those districts, number one, for the high school districts, where we have had the accelerated entitlement where there have been a decrease in assessed valuation and also allowed the total in MRFT funds to be excluded from the district's operating tax rate...uh...that is the extend to which this Bill as amended addresses itself to that problem."

Pierce: "I see. So we don't have the roll back and we don't have the, the raise from 15 to 25%...uh...in the innovated services provision either, I take it. So, I know this Bill will go back to the Senate and they will non-concur and then it will probably end up in the Conference Committee as we will on the Bill we passed out of the House, 805 or whatever it's called and so I can understand why you would support getting this Bill out of here and in the Conference Committee. I feel that the Bill that came over from the Senate and I think you know this and you may have some of the same feelings, was better both for Chicago and for the suburban area than the Bill as amended and so I won't mind if you pass it out but it seems to me a matter of principle because we didn't get any of the things that we really wanted. There were a couple of items you just mentioned that we did get of a lesser significance that I'm going to vote



'no' on the Bill and if you do pass it out, I realize we're going to be in a Conference Committee where you will represent the entire state of Illinois and that part of your district that is in suburban Cook county and therefore, although I will vote 'no', I understand this is not the final product and I take it you probably feel the same way yourself, and that there could be something slightly different from this come out of the Conference Committee as the Senate has already amended our Bill back fairly similar to their Bill. Am I right?"

Berman: "There have been Amendments and some of the elements you are talking about probably will be coming back over here."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, or from Lake, Mr. Deuster, on this question."

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to speak against this Bill and urge your 'no' vote and I will tell you why. We are getting down to the last two or three days of this session and we ought to start simplifying our work. There is no reason we have to play a shovel game and have two pieces of legislation bouncing back and forth between the Senate and the House like ping pong balls. What we have done is we passed a House Bill 1506, went over to the Senate. They passed a Bill 1493 which came back to us. Both of us had pride of authorships and pride of position in a way and so the House Bill 1506 over in the Senate was amended by putting most of 1493 in it and 1493 over here has been amended in our House to put 1506 in it. There is absolutely no reason why we need two of these ping pong balls bouncing back and forth because the conferees are going to be one and the same. Now if we want to sit down with the Senate and negotiate something that's fair for downstate, for suburban Cook, for the rich districts, the poor districts, Chicago, and everybody else, we can do it with one Bill. We don't



need two Bills or three Bills or ten Bills on the resource equalizer formula and everything that's of significance to those of us in the suburban areas or the city of Chicago can be worked out in the Conference Committee without two Bills and without playing two games instead of one game. And I would like to say that with respect to 1493 as it has now been amended, it resembles 1506 which is a Bill which the Bureau of the Budget testified in our Elementary and Secondary Education Committee that they preferred less than the other Bill. The Chicago School Board indicated that they did not like this Bill the way it was amended. I, in my downstate district, don't like it. It takes away an innovative rate and I think the Bill is mischievous to begin with but the second reason is, no matter how you feel on the merits, let's narrow things right now. We've got three or four days, or a few days remaining. We don't need juggling of two Bills. Representative Berman and other leaders who are very knowledgeable and very fair in the field of education will be on that Conference Committee I'm sure. And all they need is one vehicle. They just need one vehicle, that's enough and let's not muddy up the water by sending this second vehicle out there. I urge a strong 'no' vote against Senate Bill 1493 as it's amended."

Shea: "The gentleman from Kane, Mr. Friedland, or wait, the lady from Champaign, Ms. Satterthwaite, had her light on first."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I rise to speak in favor of a very strong positive vote for this Bill. This is a Bill that has taken quite a lot of time and study in the Education Committee and I believe that there is one aspect of funding in this Bill that is not contained in any other Bill that we have considered in either the House or the Senate and I am referring you to the digest on this



Bill and referring you specifically to House Amendment #3. This Amendment will call for the use of a weighted daily average attendance figure to go into the formula that can be calculated over a three year period rather than a single year period like it is now. In our period of declining school population this is a very important factor for us to put into the formula since it is a new concept that has not gone to the Senate by way of House Bill 1506 and since it is something that I hope will be in prominent consideration between the, for the Conference Committee that will come up with the final product for our school funding, I urge you to give your support to this Bill as it is now with the assurance that there will be some changes but that we need to have all of these concepts there for the consideration of the Conference Committee members."

Shea: "The gentleman from Kane, Mr. Friedland."

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

Shea: "The question is, shall the main question be put. All those in favor will say 'aye', those opposed will say 'nay', the 'ayes' have it. Mr. Berman to close."

Berman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in response to some of the comments, I don't take issue with any of the comments that Representative Pierce made or Representative Deuster. They are correct in their approach. However, as I have said before as is often the case with school aid formulas, no one is totally happy with the product that we put together. As I have mentioned before, speaking very politically and parochially, one of the items that is not in this Bill that I think should be addressed is the question of the Title I redefinition. One of the items that is in this Bill that does do a similar approach but even that is, has a fiscal impact in this year, which I'm not sure will pass the muster as far as the Governor is concerned is the approach that Representative Satterthwaite talked



about in the three year averaging of your average daily attendance. I...uh...don't argue with Representative Deuster when he says that our job would probably be a little simpler if we only had one Bill to deal with. So I say to you that...uh...this is a Bill that represents the House Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education. It is not everything that I, as the principal Sponsor want to see in it. I hope that I will have, along with others, an opportunity to make other suggestions if there is a Conference Committee but I do think it does represent some of the approaches that this House has endorsed previously. I don't think we are going to hurt anyone by passing it out. I think it does show our input and it does address itself to the needs of downstate as well as some of the urban areas and I would solicit your 'aye' vote."

Shea: "The question is, shall this Bill pass. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay' and the gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder, to explain his vote."

Schraeder: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to raise two questions and one of them has been raised by previous speakers, in particular, Representative Dunn across the aisle and that's the back door referendum. It seems to be the popular thing now in this session of the Legislature to overcome the voter's use of the straight referendum by institution of the back door referendum and Ladies and Gentlemen, that scares me. If we can't convince our constituents that we need the school money, tax money, with a straight out discussion with them, it appears to me then we are using subterfuge by going to the back door referendum approach. And so on that basis I certainly couldn't support this contention. Secondly, we do have a vehicle alive. It's a House Bill and it seems to me the approach ought to be made on a House Bill and not clutter up with an additional second vehicle."



For those two reasons, I decline to vote 'yes' and will vote red."

Shea: "The gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, to explain his vote."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow members of the House, this back door referendum is a most dangerous weapon, actually against the taxpayer. Now I had intended to ask a question of Mr. Berman, Representative Berman, because I couldn't remember how, what the percentage of voters takes to...uh...how many names it takes on a petition and what percentage it takes...uh...of the voters to...uh...put in a, request a referendum to turn back and to overturn a back door referendum. I don't remember. I wish I did but it's a considerable number and I feel this is wrong and objectionable that the voter is forced to take the initiative...uh...because seven men on a school board are able to initiate against the entire community by the use of this back door referendum...uh... a new tax. I think it's morally wrong, it may be legally right but it's morally wrong and it puts the emphasis on the wrong people to be able to decide for a community and I certainly feel we should vote 'no'."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian, to explain his 'aye' vote."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not sure that's a very good guess. I should like to thank Representative Schlickman for the questions that he asked of the Sponsor and thank the Sponsor for his candor in response. Representative Schlickman asked whether or not this is in the Governor's budget and Representative Berman said he almost thought it was referring to about \$20 million. Representative Berman then stated that he had made a mistake and that the actual additional cost over the Governor's budget, as I understand his remarks, was that it would cost the State another \$58 million. Now, that may represent \$58 million over the Governor's budget or



JUN 26 1975

247.

it may represent \$38 million or possibly even \$30 million. I'm not certain. However, it was just yesterday that we passed on House Bill 3118. We had an extended discussion about whether or not we were passing the buck to the Governor or whether he was trying to pass it to us. But we did talk about legislative responsibility and Ladies and Gentlemen, we thought that we might be 6% over in the Governor's budget and possibly even 8%. But we have acknowledged privately and publicly that without any additional expenses, that on the basis of the Governor's budget as submitted, we are going to have to cut from maybe \$200 million to \$300 million. I think it's time for us to face up to this and if we talk about fiscal responsibility and legislative responsibility, that we have no business even considering a Bill that would add \$58 million. One final thing. Many of us have talked about a 6% across the board. Some people have stated that's impossible to cut the Public Aid budget which represents 1/3 of the General Revenue fund. So it has been suggested that perhaps the Education budget would have to be cut 12%. Now not only have we not taken a start toward that kind of a cut or even a 6%, but we are adding \$58 million and I can't see how anybody can be voting green on a Bill of this kind at this stage in the session. I vote red, Mr. Speaker. You guessed wrong."

Shea: "The gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, to explain his 'no' vote."

Deuster: "Well, I will try and be very brief because I spoke earlier but I am going to emphasize for some who might not have been here and many of the green lights that have been pushed for members who are having dinner somewhere else in, and who probably could come out here and vote that this Bill is absolutely unnecessary first of all. It provides a second legislative vehicle. This Bill has been amended so it's a House Bill. There's



two ping pong balls. Two Bills bouncing back and forth. There is no reason at all that Representative Berman and the conferees can't go to work on the other Bill that's over in the Senate and come up with one product. We are in the last three days. Three or four days when we ought to be reducing our work instead of extending our work."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane on a point of order."

Kane: "I believe we have only two minutes for explanation of votes and we have a lot of work to do tonight."

Shea: "He's got another minute. Go ahead."

Deuster: "One last real quick point. Everybody should realize that this is another Bill that is going to land on the Governor's desk, perhaps, that will make us all look like idiots because there is about \$58 million in here extra money. Maybe the conferees will work it out. Maybe they are. But I don't think anybody wants to go back to his district and explain this vote."

Shea: "Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 117 'ayes' 40 'nays', 5 members voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1493 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Now it's the intention of the Chair to go through Senate Bills Third Reading one more time this evening to insure every member has an opportunity to have his Bills called and passed. We do have a Fall Calendar and the Chair will entertain motions to place legislation on the Fall Calendar. On that question, the gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "I just wish to ask the Chair about its intention on Senate Bills that are not exempt on consideration postponed."

Shea: "We will get there so every member will have an opportunity to have all his Bills called, sir."

Tipsword: "Thank you, sir."



Shea: "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 in the passage of the Bill of the following title to wit. House Bill 534 together with an Amendment passed by the Senate as amended June 26, 1975. Kenneth Wright, secretary."

Shea: "On the order of Senate Bills Third Reading, starting at the front of the calendar, Senate Bill 14. Mr. Marovitz. The gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, just in the hopes that this may speed up our legislative process a little bit, I took record on the last vote on House Bill 1493. The first speaker that spoke against the Bill lost 22 votes. The second speaker lost 8. The third speaker lost, I believe, 15 and the final speaker lost 2. I think to me, at least, this indicates that the explanation of votes is not going to change too many people's mind and I hope everyone will remember that if we go through this Senate Bill, Senate Bills on Third Reading."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, a point of information. It appears to me that there are some Senate Bills on Second Reading that may not be exempt from the deadline. Is that true?"

Shea: "Yes, sir."

Madison: "In light of the fact that these Senate Bills, if we move them from Second to Third we may not be recalling them today. What is the intention of the chair?"

Shea: "Sir, those Bills because they were not moved yesterday will not be called now because today is the final day for moving Senate Bills that are not exempt out of this chamber. If the Sponsor wants to put them on the Fall Calendar, he will have that option. If, by tomorrow, I am informed that it will be the intention of the



Majority Leader to make a motion to strike certain Bills from the calendar."

Madison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "That's what the Majority Leader told me so. The temporary speaker will now take the privilege of being in the Chair and would like to introduce one of the guests in the gallery. The lovely lady of the Lieutenant-Governor, Mrs. Hartigan. Would you stand up, Marge? On the order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 14. Read the Bill."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 14, a Bill for an Act for the regulation of hand guns, Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker and members of the House. I think this is our last existing hand gun Bill. It is not a creation of Judiciary II but rather of Executive. It prohibits the possession of hand guns in public except for law enforcement officials, military security personnel and other exceptions. It permits the private possession of hand guns for hunting, target practice or self defense at home and business by persons who have state registration cards. It expands the definition of the legal use of a loaded gun as compared to the present ineffective concealed weapons approach. This, for the purpose of easing the burden on police to make arrests and to convict because it would no longer be necessary to prove that the weapon is concealed. Basically, that is the purpose of this legislation, to expand the present unlawfulness from just concealed weapons to weapons whether they are concealed or not. It provides for the lawful use of a hand gun and provides for penalties for unlawful use of a loaded hand gun. There is an Amendment that was added in the Senate so that this Bill would only apply to Cook county. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on Senate Bill 14."

Shea: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 14 pass. On the



question, Gentleman and Ladies, I have always said on the question and asked if there is any discussion. The question is, shall Senate Bill 14 pass. On the question, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Shea: "He indicates he will, sir."

Madison: "Representative Marovitz, what is your understanding of the definition of unlawful use?"

Marovitz: "I don't think that I have an adequate definition of unlawful use, at least not that I have on hand at the present time. I can get one for you. I think it's the court opinion on it and I think..."

Madison: "Let me do this, then, Representative Marovitz, let me give you an example, if I may. I have a gun and it's registered and I'm registered and...uh...I have that gun not concealed but on the seat of my car and for whatever reason I am provoked by you and I shoot you in self defense. Am I guilty of unlawful use of a weapon?"

Marovitz: "I don't believe so. The purpose, Jesse, the purpose of this Bill is to prohibit, it allows, I'm sorry, it prohibits the possession of a weapon on private property without permission and on public streets, public domain except for certain exceptions whether that weapon is concealed or not."

Madison: "Well, I guess what I am a little concerned about is, is the, the use of this term unlawful use not being made specific enough in the Bill. I know people usually try and get around that and sometimes it's even appears to me left up to the discretion of the police officer as to whether or not the use of your weapon was unlawful and I can see a businessman going home from his store with his day's receipts on him and his weapon on him utilizing his weapon in self defense, for instance and being guilty of unlawful use and I am questioning you



as to whether or not that would be your interpretation under this Bill."

Marovitz: "I think, well this Bill does not change in any way the definition of unlawful use of a weapon."

Madison: "But if you can see my problem, Representative Marovitz, it carries the, the subject of possession beyond concealment. It carries this to just the fact that you've got it and under the present law, I would suspect that a businessman could carry his weapon in his hand and as long as he did not conceal it, he would not be guilty of concealment. Under your Bill, it would preclude him from doing that."

Marovitz: "On private property without permission or on the public streets or highways."

Madison: "Thanks, Bill."

Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester, I guess he doesn't want to speak now. The gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk."

Polk: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Shea: "He indicates he will, sir."

Polk: "Mr. Marovitz, how do you define fixed place of business?"

Marovitz: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear your question."

Polk: "How do you define fixed place of business?"

Marovitz: "I don't think I can give you an adequate legal definition of what fixed place of business would be. I would assume it would be the place of the principal business of the individual involved."

Polk: "A person that had a mobile business, would they also then be allowed to carry a weapon?"

Marovitz: "A person who had a mobile unit, for his home?"

Polk: "No, no a mobile business, say you had a good humor man. A good humor man who pedaled around on his bicycle. Is that a fixed place of business or is that..."

Marovitz: "No, I don't think so. I don't think it is fixed."



Polk: "Then he would not be eligible even though he was a businessman."

Marovitz: "I would assume you are correct."

Polk: "All right. Thank you."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Beatty."

Beatty: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question? Phil, then this wouldn't cover bus drivers who happened to carry a gun with them to protect their lives?"

Marovitz: "No."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stearney."

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

Marovitz: "Unfortunately, yes."

Stearney: "I see by Section 5, the penalty for this violation of this Act is a Class A misdemeanor. Now directing your attention to Chapter 38, Section 24 which is the Unlawful Use of Weapons Act, the penalty provisions there are much more severe providing up to a year in jail and in some instances even greater. Do you think this would vest undue discretion in the states attorney to reduce, to charge an offender with a reduced offense such as this and only penalize him with a Class A misdemeanor?"

Marovitz: "I think this might make it easier for law enforcement with this type of crime."

Stearney: "One other question. Considering that this is a new Act, it doesn't amend Chapter 38. Do you, do you believe that some of these provisions might conflict with existing law?"

Marovitz: "I might say that this is Senator Palmer's Bill and I think that what was done here could have and perhaps should have been done by Amendment. I don't know that there is any conflict. If there are two Acts, I think they would be construed together for the intent of the Act. It could have been done by Amendment."

Stearney: "Well, don't you think it's rather difficult for the court to construe two different Acts? It's best that the court, state proceed under one Act. We have Chapter



20, Section 24 of the Criminal Code and this is just ambiguous and of really of no import."

Marovitz: "Had this Bill initiated with me in the House of Representatives I would have done it by Amendment."

Stearney: "Well, then you are agreeing that this Bill then doesn't do anything to make penalties more severe or strict in this area."

Marovitz: "Oh, I think it does. I think it deals with an area, it expands concealed weapons to weapons whether they are concealed or not. I think that's the particular that it intends to deal with and I think it does deal with that area. I think it could have been done by Amendment rather than by, on a new Act."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, the Assistant Majority Leader, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, this sounds like a media of the Judiciary Two Committee and I move the previous question."

Shea: "The question is, shall the main question be put. All in favor will say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The gentleman to close."

Marovitz: "I don't want to take up the time of the House in making a long closing speech. I think everybody can use his conscience in voting properly on this Bill and I would ask for a green vote."

Shea: "The question is, shall this Bill pass. Shea 'no'. The gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich, to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the Sponsor some questions, but apparently I am precluded unless you want to rule otherwise."

Shea: "There are now 105 or 106 'no' votes up there. Is there any further, take the record Mr. Clerk. This Bill having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority having 18 'yes', 125 'nay', 6 'present' is hereby declared lost. On the order of Senate Bills



Third Reading appears Senate Bill 452. Is Mr. Capparelli on the floor? Senate Bill 452, is Mr. Capparelli on the floor? On the order of Senate Bills Third Reading is Senate Bill 751. Mr. Porter on the floor? Is Mr. Porter on the floor on 751? I am informed that's already been passed. 783, Mr. G.L. Hoffman. Mr. G.L. Hoffman, is Mr. Hoffman here? Is Mr. Hoffman here? The gentleman asks leave for the Fall Calendar. Is there objection? Hearing none, Fall Calendar. On the order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 792, Mr. Madigan."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 792, a Bill for an Act to amend the Chicago Sanitary District Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I request leave to consider Senate Bill 792 and 793 together."

Shea: "Does the gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 793."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move that those two Bills be sent back to the Committee on Townships, Counties and Townships and be placed on the order of interim study."

Shea: "The gentleman asks leave to place those two Bills, take from the order of Third Reading on the calendar and place in the Counties and Town, Counties and Townships Committee and be placed on interim study. Does he have leave? Jesse, I haven't even got a plate. On the order of Senate Bills, the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that there is a distinction between interim study and Fall Calendar and if there is I would request the Fall Calendar for those last two Bills."

Shea: "The gentleman asks leave to table his last motion and then to place them on the Fall Calendar. Does he



have leave? Fall Calendar. The next Bill we see is 993. Mr. Beatty."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 993, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Shea: "Mr. Beatty on Senate Bill 993. Mr. Madigan on 993."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, has the Bill been read a third time?"

Mr. Speaker, Senate Bill 993 provides that school districts shall provide the same transportation services within the district to both public and non-public school pupils. It also provides that a school district shall transport students attending non-public schools outside the district up to 15 miles beyond the school district boundaries and provides that the district shall be reimbursed by the State for transporting the students to non-public schools outside the district. I request a favorable Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "The gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 993 and on the question, the gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members of the House. 993 is another in a series of Bills relating to the drain on the General Revenue fund for...uh...public education. We have passed out aid to non-private schools in a number of other Bills. This one differs inasmuch as it relates to transportation. It had a little bit more difficult time in the Committee than the previous Bills as I understand it. The Bill passed out, I believe 11, 10 and 1 present out of Elementary and Secondary. I would like to be very specific on some of the things within the legislation beginning somewhat backwards and suggesting that Amendments that were adopted today at the request of Representative Deuster would complicate the matter even more so because one of those Amendments would require that the Superintendent of Educational Service Region would be establishing bus routes between the school districts



which has the nonsensical notion that once the bus leave the school district and goes to another district then you are going to have to set up separate routes. That's bad enough. We have also had now with, I understand the Deuster Amendment, it was adopted maybe I am incorrect on that, that the State would be picking up a greater percentage of its share for non-public transportation than it would in public transportation. So that's a beginning. We have, I think, the complication of a few other things and that is basically that school routes today can accommodate non-public schools if different routes do not have to be drawn to make such an accommodation. What this Bill does is make it inconceivable and indeed almost impossible to do it without establishing a separate system so that's going to be inconsistent with almost any court case that relates to transportation. Ultimately, you must know, of course, that the cost for transportation is borne by the local district. They can tax up to 12¢ and many of the districts throughout the State have not reached that levy. What is going to happen once you begin to provide for school transportation, that levy is going to be increased to its maximum in order to accommodate non-public students. Now I have no grief with that except that we were unable to pass a public school transportation Bill that Representative McClain offered for the very same reason, that is, that many downstate school districts are going to face the burden of adding taxes to their school transportation fund. So on the basis, I think, of some very real questionable grounds that relate to the Constitution of which I am not an expert, on the question of whether or not the State ought to bear more money for non-public schools as compared to public schools, whether or not you think your school district is ready to increase its tax rate for transportation, I would solicit a 'no' vote."



Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester."

Winchester: "Mr. Speaker, would the distinguished gentleman from Cook yield to a question?"

Shea: "He indicates he will. Mr. Madigan?"

Winchester: "Representative Madigan, would you please inform this body as to what the Roll Call vote was when this Bill was reported out of Elementary and Secondary Education?"

Madigan: "Mr. Winchester, I don't recall immediately, but if you have a digest handy, it is reported in there."

Winchester: "It was reported out 11-10."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan. Is there any further discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor."

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

Shea: "Hold that for a minute, will you, Mr. Taylor? The lady from Champaign, Ms. Satterthwaite."

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

Shea: "He indicates he will."

Satterthwaite: "I noticed in the digest that a request for a fiscal note was filed. Can you tell me what figure was provided at request of that, for that fiscal note?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, would the Clerk read the fiscal note?"

Jack O'Brien: "I will have to get the Bill back. It went upstairs with that Amendment."

Shea: "Will the House be at ease for a couple of minutes? While we are at ease, might I ask the members to examine the Bills that they have on the calendar and if they would desire I would entertain motions to place those Bills on the Fall Calendar. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter, was the first to seek recognition. Turn Mr. Porter on, would you please sir?"

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, I assume that Bills that are one the order of Second Reading..."



Shea: "You tell me where you want it called..."

Porter: "Could not be heard. I would like to have Senate Bill 266 placed on the Fall Calendar on the order of Second Reading."

Shea: "The gentleman asks leave to have Senate Bill 266 placed on the Fall Calendar. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak on the Bill while we are waiting for the fiscal note?"

Shea: "Sir, could you wait until we have it down? Ms. Satterthwaite is on the floor, sir. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, the various Bills that are on Second, Senate Bills or other Bills that are on Second or Third or Fourth Reading, I mean postponed consideration, are they going to be left, are they going to be left in the same posture that they are presently on the calendar? For the Fall Calendar purposes?"

Shea: "Sir, if you make a motion, it will be. The Majority Leader tomorrow will make a motion to strike all the Bills off the calendar that aren't requested to go on the Fall Calendar."

Maragos: "That's what I wanted to bring out for the enlightenment of many of the members because we already established that but I also want to know if they would be in the same state come the Fall."

Shea: "When a request is made to place the Bill on the Fall Calendar it will come back in the same order it leaves on."

Maragos: "Thank you."

Shea: "Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I heard you make a distinction between the Fall Calendar and the interim study calendar and on May 23 I moved that 931, House Bill 931 be put on the interim study calendar not thinking there was



any difference. If there is a difference, I would like at this time to have leave of the House to place 931 on the Fall Calendar."

Shea: "Mr. Flinn, might I ask you and you can use my office if you would like to make that a written motion and file it because I am sure there will be objection because nobody knows what 931 did or is. Pardon me?"

Flinn: "I could tell them in a hurry if they want to listen."

Shea: "All right, go ahead, Sir."

Flinn: "It's the 'Jaijai' Bill and I had high hopes of getting it heard."

Shea: "Where was it on the Calendar, Sir?"

Flinn: "It was on Third Reading and May 23rd deadline was going to send it down to two and I made a motion to put it on Interim Study Calendar thinking that was the same as the Fall Calendar."

Shea: "Does the Gentleman have leave? There has been objection so would you....."

Flinn: "I will take your suggestion, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "All right, Sir. Mr. Merlo...."

Merlo: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to make inquiry of the Chair. Are you saying that Bills that we placed on the Fall Calendar, that they will be heard in the Fall?"

Shea: "Sir, I'm not guaranteeing you that but I am just thinking that some of the Members might want to protect themselves."

Merlo: "Well, then, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have leave too.....to also take out of the interim study..."

Shea: "Sir, that's the question that I don't know and I am trying to dispose of this Calendar tonight."

Merlo: "All right, then can we have the answer tomorrow, Mr. Speaker?"

Shea: "Yes, Sir."

Merlo: "O. K."

Shea: "I am talking about the Bills on this Calendar tonight. Mr. Neff."



Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to have leave to take...uh...Senate Bill 725 which is on the calendar on Second Reading and have it placed on the Fall Calendar."

Shea: "Does the gentleman have leave? Fall Calendar. The lady from Madison, or from St. Clair, Ms. Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members of the House. May I have leave to put House Bill 3006 and 3111 on the Fall Calendar?"

Shea: "The lady asks leave to put House Bill 3006 and 3011..."

Younge: "3111."

Shea: "3111 on the Fall Calendar. Does the lady have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, it would be greatly appreciated that the movers of these motions state what, state if they are on the calendar, to what state they are going to go to the Fall Calendar because..."

Shea: "Those are House Bills Third Reading."

Maragos: "Thank you."

Shea: "Do you have the fiscal note now, Mr. Clerk?"

Jack O'Brien: "Fiscal note for Senate Bill 993. It is estimated that Senate Bill 993 will affect 25,000 children at an average cost of \$100 per child for a fiscal impact of \$2.5 million."

Shea: "Ms. Satterthwaite, proceed."

Satterthwaite: "May I ask the Clerk whether there is any indication on that fiscal note if that is to be the total cost of the transportation or the State's cost or local?"

Jack O'Brien: "No further information."

Satterthwaite: "May I ask the Sponsor of the Bill another question, then? Mr. Madigan?"

Shea: "Mr. Madigan, will you yield to Ms. Satterthwaite? He indicates he will."

Satterthwaite: "Has the fiscal impact that is indicated in this fiscal note been accounted for somewhere in the



education budget?"

Madigan: "Could you restate your question?"

Satterthwaite: "Has the \$2.5 million that is indicated in the fiscal note for funding this Bill been placed somewhere in the education budget?"

Madigan: "I really don't know."

Satterthwaite: "Well, Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I would suggest that a little while ago when we were considering 1493 for funding for funding for elementary and secondary education, there were a number of red lights on the board and several spoke to the fact that they could not support that Bill because it was not in the Governor's budget in total even though we knew that that Bill was going to have to go to Conference Committee for some adjustments and I suggest that everyone who had a red light for that Bill should have a red light for this Bill because it has not been included in the budget either."

Shea: "Is there any further discussion? The gentleman from Cook, Mr. McCourt."

McCourt: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the biggest bargain that the people of Illinois can ever have. When you consider the cost of public school education today, it averages around \$1500 a student. What we are saying in this Bill by an expenditure of possibly \$100 a student, we are going to be able to preserve private education in Illinois. You don't have to be a mathematician to figure out what the savings will be eventually for the taxpayers of Illinois and I solicit your favorable support of this excellent piece of legislation."

Shea: "All right, now Mr. Taylor wants to renew his motion and I am sure there are some other people that want to talk so I will again say, shall the main question be put? All those in favor will say 'aye', those opposed will say 'no', in the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes'



have it. I will give the members an opportunity to explain their votes. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. Mr. Lucco to explain his vote."

Lucco: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this Bill. I, I am just as much interested in private and parochial schools as anyone. I believe this General Assembly if you check the record, has done more to aid private and parochial schools this session than in any past session. I want to tell you that in our district that if this Bill were to pass the public schools would have to pay for the transporting of students across the Mississippi River into St. Louis because it would lie within the 15 miles range. The gentleman to the rear of me a while ago made a pretty good point saying that the cost of transportation would be \$100 per student and that's cheap. Well have you looked at the figures lately? Five years from now there will be school buildings and school classrooms going vacant and the public schools can well take care of the students that maybe five years ago they couldn't take care of. But nevertheless, private and public and parochial schools have a place in our society. They have a place in our democracy and more power to them. But this is not the right way to help them and I urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Shea: "The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, to explain his vote."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my vote, Representative Winchester was absolutely correct when he indicated the vote by which this Bill came out of Elementary and Secondary Education, there were 11 'ayes', 10 'nos' and 1 voting 'present'. Unfortunately, I was the one that voted 'present' and so I would like the members of this assembly to help cleanse me of my sin by voting 'no' on this Bill now."



Shea: "Have all votee who wish? Have all voted who wish?"

Take the record....the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan..
....is 'aye', ...on this question there is 76 'ayes', 78
'nays', 10 Members voting 'present',Mr. Madigan...."

Madigan: "Postpone consideration.."

Shea: "Postpone consideration.Mr. Borchers on a point of
personal privilege."

Borchers: "I just want to say for the fifteenth time....my
light has been on to explain my vote or whatever I
wished....that I was not called."

Shea: "Senate Bill 1036."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1036, a Bill for an Act to amend
the Election Code, Third Reading of the Bill...."

Shea: "Mr. Beaupre, the Gentleman from Kankakee.....The Gentle-
man from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A Parliamentary Inquiry,
this Bill was on Third today and was brought back to
Second for Amendment and now we are back on Third, I believe
that the Speaker has consistently ruled that we cannot do
that. There was an Amendment put on and I would like a
ruling from the Chair."

Shea: "Mr. Totten, today is the last day for Members to hear
House Bills in this Chamber under our rules. Now, on
Senate Bills, we do not Enroll and Engross but the Amendment
is merely stapled to the front of the Bill....and the Speaker
informed me that....that with regard to that rule he thinks
that we ought to call the Bills in order to give every
Member a chance to have his Bill heard."

Totten: "Well, er.....ah.....Mr. Speaker, I believe then..."

Shea: "It is not a rule, it is a custom.....Go ahead, Mr.
Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
this is a Bill that we have discussed several times both
on Third Reading before and on Second Reading. It is a
Bill that was proposed by Representative VanDuyne in this



House. It was a Bill that was proposed very sincerely in an effort to open up the election process in the State of Illinois to give many...many...more people who have the right to vote the opportunity to conveniently register and to vote in this State. All too often we find that County Clerks who are in one....who belong to one party or anotherespecially in downstate Illinois....choose to appoint only deputy registrars of their party and often times choose to appoint very few. The unfortunate part of this is that we make it most inconvenient for the average citizen to register to vote and to participate in the election process. This is really an election reform Bill because it gives Precinct Committeemen, as a part of their official duties, the opportunity to register ...voters to vote. It gives them the opportunity to go out and to scour the countryside in their precincts to seek out those who are not registered and to give them an opportunity to conveniently register without having to travel 15 or 20 miles to the County Court House. These are elected officials in accord with our Statutes, they have very few duties, but they do participate in the election process. They know who the people are in their precinct who are unregistered and they can give them an opportunity to participate in the election process."

Shea: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? On the question the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I know that we are all beginning to all sound like a broken record on this particular Bill, we've heard it so many time and defeated it so many times, I'd hope we'd do that again. You know it seems strange to me that every time there is a Bill before us that changes something in the Election Code, people say it's reform. Well change should not be equated with reform. Reform means something for the better and I don't see how putting the election process into the political process or vice versa can be confused with reform. Now there is a



Bill that was mentioned earlier today that has passed the Senate and one which I voted for in this House which would make automatically every elected township clerk or the village clerk a deputy registrar. To me that is reform but making a political officer of a partisan organization a registrar is not reform that is a step backward. Now one thing that we've talked about earlier that I think ought to be brought to everybodys attention, look at this Bill, it does not include suburban Cook County, it does include the City of Chicago because it includes those elections authorities under a commission. This is not a uniform election law and therefore is unconstitutional. I've asked for this before and I'll ask again, please vote 'no' on this bad Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Calvo, on the question."

Calvo: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just don't understand and I respect the Gentleman who just spoke very much, but I don't know what kind of committee-man he has in his district, but our parties in our district have people who work in every walk of life.....both parites.. and I don't see anything wrong with making it convenient for people to register to vote. You know, if there is a Republican Committeeman in myin each of our precincts and there is a Democratic Committeeman and if each of them were deputy registrars it would just make it that much easier for people to vote and I tell you that I don't think their crooks....When I run for office I hope that my committeemen support me and I'm sure my Republican people who run hope that their Committeemen support them, they look for their support and if you think that the voters are not part of the political process, I don't know what you're talking about. The voters are the biggest part of the political process. Give the people a chance to register, make it easy for them, let them be able to talk to their neighbor to register, their Precinct Committeeman, regard-



less of which party or both parties. This is absolutely nonpartisan. Why do the Republicans always get up and speak against this Bill? They've got a Committeeman in every precinct. It'll register their voters the same as mine. And if you think the people don't elect you....if you think it is not political....then you had better not run for election....because that is how you win....by people voting for you...and by the voters....and this is a good Bill and should be supported."

Shea: "The Lady from Lake, Ms. Reed."

Reed: "Mr. Speaker....Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am an elected Precinct Committeeman, Republican, I don't want to be a registrar and yet this Bill is going to mandate that and it's like apples and oranges, it is an elected, partisan, political office. I would be paid by the County Clerk for registering people in my precinct. It has never occurred to me, to register either Republicans or Democrats. I have a County Clerk who does an outstanding job of registration, she happens to be a Democrat County Clerk in a Republican County. The problem does not lie in election reform by giving every Tom, Dick and Harry the right to register voters, the election reform comes in the election of a County Clerk that does his or her job in appointing registrars of their choosing."

Shea: "Ms. Reed, Mr. Pierce took exception to the Republican County part....."

Reed: "I'm sure he did."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Hill."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I think that this is one of the most important Bills that is faced by us in this legislative session. It seems to me that these people that are Precinct Committeemen and yes, County Chairmen of the various parties downstate, certainly are intelligent enough to register people to vote. It seems that along the line we have to open this up. I certainly disagree with



the other individual from my District, that a person like Bill Wake, the County Chairman of Kane County, certainly is not intelligent enough to register people in the City of Aurora or the County of Kane. Now we've had a lot of problems in the District that I represent, part of it is in DuPage County, Will, Kendall, and Kane County.....and let me tell you the people have a very difficult time registering to vote in that particular District. I believe, and I want to stick up for the Precinct Committeemen, not only of the Democratic Party but the Republican Party in that District. I think they are highly intelligent people. I think that they are capable of registering people and this Bill certainly should get a 'yes' vote from everyone in this House."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I am a Precinct Committeeman and have been for years and I think it....I probably make a greater contribution to the business of self-government in that office than any other way. If it were not for the Precinct Committeemen in both political partieshalf the people wouldn't even be registered in the first place.....and a third of them wouldn't vote in the elections because it is the Precinct Committeemen who get people registered, who get them to the polls, who tell them who the candidates are and what the political issues are.....don't downgrade Precinct Committeemen, we've got a two party system and the Precinct Committeemen are the elected officials to run that party."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers.....I guess he's gone.....The Gentleman from Will, Mr. VanDuyne."

VanDuyne: "Thank you Mr.....Mr. Speaker.....and Members of the House....I wont belabor this too long....I think it has been overdone by the Republicans so far, but let me just answer the Lady in the back of the Hall.Ah....yes, she would be a deputy registrar....but if she is so adverse



to taking in the County's money, which she is entitled to, fifty cents for every new registrar in our County and twenty-five cents for each....ah....transfer, all she has to do is sit on her 'duff' and not register them, she wont have to take any money. Now, I don't like the connotation that she also puts on the....ah...I presumeah...the Democratic Members of this contingent, when she says every 'Tom, Dick and Harry'ah...that's putting a bad light on people who are trying to do their job. Just in summationI'll just say this....the only reason there is a necessity for this Bill at all is because our County Clerks, especially on the Republican sidewill not give in to their statutory duty to certify people from our party to be deputy registrars. She....will not....they will not give us mobile registration....they will not give us registration days and so therefore if there is any blame to put on anyone it is the County Clerks who have been derelict in their sworn duties, so without belaboring it any further I will just please ask you to give us an 'aye' vote."

Shea: "The Lady from Lake raises on a point of personal privilege. Turn...."

Reed: "I'd merely like to suggest to my colleague from Will County, that he go to the source of his problem with registration, do something about your County Clerk if you can."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, on the question."

Borchers: "At last.....All I want to say is that Macon County we have an outstanding Democratic County Clerk by the name ofah....William Timeney....he has been there for quite a few years. Every now and.....now and again an 'eager beaver' will run against him on the Republican side. We generally, as last time, don't even run anyone against him, the fact is I voted for him myself a couple of times, he does an outstanding I believe in voting for the best man....that's why I'm here.....I get a lot of Democrat



votes too....believe me. Well any.....anyway he does an outstanding job and I think it is ridiculous that we..... will be paying people for going out and bringing in voters. You know what the real trouble is here in this country? We're the ones....we're the ones that turned off the votersnot the County Clerks Oh, well, maybe some exceptions, but our County Clerk doesn't turn 'em off..... we..... are the ones, this House for one and other such bodies....they're the....that's the reason they're not going to the polls any longer."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook....er.....Stephenson, Mr. Brinkmeier."

Brinkmeier: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this issue has been thoroughly debated before.....I would move the previous question."

Shea: "The question is, shall the main question be put? All those in favor will say 'aye', those opposed will say 'no'. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre, to close."

Beaupre: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't want to belabor this point. It has indeed been debated at much length. I would like to...ah..... however ask....answer a question posed by Representative Calvo as to why the people on the other side of the isle don't want to vote for this Bill. They want to make it as difficult as possible for people to register, I think that's perfectly clear. That has been the history of downstate Illinois for a long time. This Bill will solve that problem and I would ask for your favorable support."

Madigan: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1036 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. All those opposed by voting 'no'. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster to explain his vote."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, by way of explaining my vote on this matter, I think that we have very excellent Precinct Committeemen no matter which



party they belong to but the thing that I disagree with is the fact that we will have the voting public, the taxpayers pay the bill to an elected official of a political organization rather than a governmental organization.... and this I have to disagree with."

Madigan: "Are you finished, Mr. McMaster?"

McMaster: "I am."

Madigan: "Thank you. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, to explain his vote."

Totten: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Sponsor in this....of this Bill in the closing remarkshis closing remarks were as ill-tempered as his Bill is. This is, as Amended, one of the biggest vote fraud Bills that has come before this Houseⁱⁿ/this session. In addition the Bill has been very poorly written....it amends the Section of....having to do with County commi.... the County Boards of Election Commissioners it has not made this uniform in that it applies to the City of Chicago and downstate and does not apply to suburban Cook County and it...it also indicates that Precinct Committeemen in the City of Chicago will be the deputy registrars and all of you who live in the City of Chicago know that there is no statutory or elected position as the Precinct Committeeman. This Bill deserves a resounding defeat and I would also ask that those Members who are not here ...not be votedbecause at the proper time we will ask for a verification."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, to explain his vote."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.....I simply don't understand what all of the 'whoopla' is about....about this registration by Precinct Committeeman. Mr. Speaker, on May 22nd we passed a Bill out of here....House Bill 1755... that would have provided for voter registration by mail.... now that Bill went out of the House 102 to 65, but when it



got to the Senate, Mr. Speaker, it was killed by the Senate Elections Committee on a 'do not pass' motion 6 to 3. Now let me tell you why that Bill was killed by the Senate, because the Senate.....the Members of that Senate Committee recognized that that Bill had some inherent possibilities in it for conviction at the Federal level on the basis of mail f....on the basis of vote fraud and using the mails, which is a Federal offense. Now, it appears to me that if we were so concerned about an easy registration, Mr. Speaker, we....those of you that are concerned would have lobbied the hell out of your Senators to get that Bill passed in the Senate, but it did not happen, now let's not kid ourselves, this Bill is replete with vote fraud possibilities and we ought not pass it out of here, we ought to give it resounding defeat and maybe we can start all over next term trying to get a voter registration by mail Bill that is acceptable to the Senate and maybe we can get some Senators on the Committee who are a little less concerned about going to Federal prison as they are about getting out of it if it is a State offense and I vote 'no'."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea, to explain his vote."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this is a good Bill, I think it will give an opportunity for many citizens in this State to be registered, to get an opportunity to vote and it seems funny to me that every time we talk about vote fraud, we talk about the County of Cook, but when we talk about registration, nobody wants the downstate voters registered, nobody wants the downstate voter registration list cleaned up, nobody wants to put machines in the smaller counties, I cannot understand it sometimes. I think that this is an exceptionally fine Bill and I commend it to you for your support if you want decent, hardworking elections."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Champaign



Mr. Hirschfeld, to explain his vote."

Hirschfeld: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House as usual the Majority Leader has toted the Mayor's line, which is....has been his function down here the five years I've been down here, but there is a lot of problems with this Bill that aren't evenby the Majority Leader....."

Madigan: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea, arise?"

Shea: "I'd like toon a point of personal privilege.... I'm elected down here and that I vote my conscience and at least I'm here on the floor."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Hirschfeld, to continue to explain his vote."

Hirschfeld: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and I suggest that the Majority Leader get a new line, he used that last week."

Shea: "Thank you."

Hirschfeld: "Now, I would like to say this, the simple problem with this isthat you take any area that you want to take and you have a hundred Precinct Committeemen, there is a hundred different standards that will be used for registration. There is absolutely no control. It is fine for the Sponsor of this Bill to say that these people are elected and I wont talk about the Democrat Precinct Committeemen because I don't know them, but some of the Republican

Madigan: "Mr. Hirschfeld, will you bring your remarks to a close?"

Hirschfeld: "Now, just a minute...."

Madigan: "The timer is on, Mr. Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Mr. Speaker, I think I was interrupted by the Majority Leader and I have not had an opportunity to make my comments..."

Madigan: "Mr. Hirschfeld, the timer is on....if you will close your remarks...."

Hirschfeld: "All I can say is some of the Republican Precinct



Committeemen are the worst party hacks in existence and I would hate to see them registering voters and if you lived in a student precinct and you knew there were 30 some thousand students that were capable of being proselytized the last thing you'd want is for a hundred people to go out there and try and register them. It's a dastardly Bill, it's a Cook County Bill, it's a Bill by the Majority Party and ought to be soundly defeated."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers, to explain his vote."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think this is a wonderful Bill and I think that the Sponsor should be commended for his hard work, there is eight more.....seven more people that could be on that Bill.....six more....I think they should get on there.... it is a good Bill...it will only let people vote....everybody has that right...we're not doing anything that's not right at all.....people need to exercise their right and I think thatthat ...I think some of the people on the other side are afraid that they might change their Representatives if they found out that they were against this Bill."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson, to explain his vote."

Anderson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, I'm not sure this Bill is necessary or our County Clerk is breaking the law because he appoints both Democrat and Republican Precinct Committeemen ...deputy registrars.... and I think the trouble isif your County Clerk doesn't do that....you ought to get rid of him and get one in that will do it."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Hill, to explain his vote."

Hill: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd just like to say this....that we have a Democratic Clerk now in Kane



county and he just recently appointed all Republican and Democratic precinct committeemen as registrars. But I think Representative Hirschfeld hit the nail on the head when he made the statement we don't have enough control if you do this. You see, the Republican party downstate has had that controlled so much that they just refuse to let it go and Representative Hirschfeld hit the nail on the head when he said we won't have that control. It seems to me that all of us sitting down here should be vitally interested to see that every citizen in the State of Illinois is registered to vote in any election that takes place in the State of Illinois. And why the Republican party sits over there on their hands and refuse to go along with a piece of legislation that would accomplish this is beyond comprehension. It seems to me that all of us should be interested to see that the people are registered. We should do everything within our power to see that. Don't be afraid of the electorate. Be positive and think that they will go to the polls and vote properly and a 'yes' vote is proper on this piece of legislation."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt to explain his vote."

Bluthardt: "Thank you Mr. Chairman and members of the House. I have always felt that election laws were enacted to guarantee the sanctity of the ballot, the sanctity of the vote. To me, this Bill with the provision that precinct committeemen will be given election, or registration booklets or materials by which they can register voters, give the registered voter a carbon copy and that would be proof of registration and sufficient to allow the voter to vote to me is a guarantee that elections are not going to be won, they are going to be stolen. And that's what I'm concerned about. It's a ridiculous Bill. I think that's the end of my remarks, Mr. Chairman."



Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the lady from Cook, Ms. Willer to explain her vote."

Willer: "Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say to the gentleman from Champaign that I do not tote the Mayor's line and I do agree with the Majority Leader. I think this is a very good 'Bill.'"

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the lady from Lake, Ms. Geo-Karis, to explain her vote."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think the Bill has some merit but the thing that worries me is this. If a precinct committeeman knows that I'm a Republican and that precinct committeeman is a Democrat...uh...now maybe he won't turn it in, that's all, the registration, those are the things that we want to avoid. So I am voting 'no' because I feel that maybe we are getting too political when the Clerk of the county has to be fair to both parties."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell, to explain his vote."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I think that this is a very wonderful Bill. Those of you who maintain the hard line and vote against this good legislation have a fundamental doubt in the goodness of mankind. You mistrust your neighbor. You mistrust the people who sent you to office. You don't believe they know what they are doing. I hear you talking about vote fraud but I want you to know that this Bill does not apply to Cook County because it applies to precinct committeemen and there are no such animals in Cook County. Now what we are talking about is downstate and I cannot believe that the preceding speakers would have us believe that there is any vote fraud in downstate. Now I say to you that if you believe in the goodness of man, if you believe in universal suffrage if you believe in one man, one vote and the sanctity of the Constitution, you will give us a lending hand and vote



'aye' on this good Bill. To do otherwise is to confirm your disbelief in the American system, your disbelief in the sanctity that the people will decide and if we are wrong they will judge us wrong and throw us out of office. I say to you of little faith, hearken, listen to the voices of the people. Have faith and join us in a united effort to push forth a little good legislation. Thank you."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten to explain his vote."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, I believe I have already explained my vote but I did indicate I think there is many members voting who are not here and unless we take a new Roll Call, I am going to request a verification of the 'aye' vote. Even if we do, I will."

Madigan: "The Chair would admonish the membership that Mr. Totten intends to request a verification of the Roll Call and I would, the Chair would suggest that we dump the Roll and take a new one to make sure that all voted are here. Mr. Clerk. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer, to explain his vote."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am going to make this very short. I just heard an Americanism speech. I think we are all a bunch of historical nincompoops. If we paid any attention to the history of this country, you'll realize that our founding fathers had no intention of giving the vote to every person. They gave the vote to the enlightened individual, to the person that was willing to get out and learn something and do something for his vote. What you are doing is creating a hustler's paradise and we don't need a hustler's paradise when it comes to voters in this country. We need people that are willing to go out and register, at least to go down to the municipal clerk, not to be hustled by some half baked politician that is going around trying to get votes for his party and I suggest



that maybe you should sit down and wrap your historical thoughts around a few books and find out where we came from before you start beating the Americanism drum."

Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Redmond, 'aye'. On this question there are 95 'ayes', 68 'nos', 1 voting 'present' and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I still know that there are people voting who are not here and I am going to request a verification of the vote."

Madigan: "Mr. Totten requests a verification of the Roll Call and Mr. Beaupre requests a poll of the absentees. The Clerk will poll the absentees."

Jack O'Brien: "Catania, Epton, Friedrich, Greiman."

Madigan: "Greiman shall be recorded as 'aye'."

Jack O'Brien: "J.D. Jones, Klosak, Lauer, Madison, McAvoy, McGrew, Rose, Skinner and Wall."

Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, would you proceed with the verification of the affirmative Roll Call? Would you record Mr. J.D. Jones 'no'."

Jack O'Brien: "E.M. Barnes, Beatty, Beaupre, Berman, Birchler, Boyle, Bradley, Brandt, Brinkmeier, Brummet, Byars, Caldwell, Calvo, Capparelli, Chapman, Choate, Craig, D'Arco, Darrow, Davis, DiPrima, Downs, Ewell, Farley, Fary, Fennessey, Flinn, Garmixa, Getty, Giglio, Giorgi, Greiman, Hanahan, Hart, Hill, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, Jim Houlihan, Huff, Jacobs, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Kane, Katz, Keller, Kelly, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Laurino, Lechowicz, Kornowicz, Leon, Leverenz, Londrigan, Lucco, Luft, Lundy."

Madigan: "For what purpose does the gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners, arise?"

Kempiners: "Mr. Speaker, could you please ask the people on the other side of the aisle to take their seats so that we can proceed with the verification and not call people that may be present but we cannot see?"



Madigan: "At the request of Mr. Kempiners, would the Democratic members be in their chairs so that it will be easier for him to verify this Roll Call? Proceed, Mr. Clerk, with the verification."

Jack O'Brien: "Madigan, Mann, Maragos, Marovitz, Matijevich, Mautino, McClain, McLendon, McPartlin, Merlo, Mudd, Mulcahey, Nardulli, O'Daniel, Patrick, Pierce, Pouncey, Richmond, Sangmeister, Satterthwaite, Schisler, Schneider, Schraeder, Sharp, Shea, Stone, Stubblefield, Taylor, Terzich, Tipword, VanDuyne, VonBoeckman, Washington, White, Willer, Williams, Younge, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Madigan: "Mr. D.L. Houlihan has requested to be verified because of a long distance phone call waiting for him. Mr. Clerk, verify Mr. D.L. Houlihan. Are there any questions of the affirmative Roll Call? The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "E.M. Barnes."

Madigan: "Representative Barnes is standing in the center aisle next to Mr. Washington."

Totten: "Berman."

Madigan: "Mr. Berman is to the left of the Speaker's podium."

Totten: "Bradley."

Madigan: "Mr. Bradley is seated on the Republican side in front."

Totten: "Brinkmeier."

Madigan: "Mr. Brinkmeier. Is Mr. Brinkmeier in the chambers? How is the gentleman recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "Show him recorded as voting 'aye'."

Madigan: "Remove him from the Roll Call. Would the Clerk verify Mr. Kane at this time, Mr. Douglas Kane."

Totten: "Mr. Byers."

Madigan: "Mr. Byers is standing in the center aisle."

Totten: "I also understand that Mr. Choate has a party going and I'll verify him if he would like to go so he can go."

Madigan: "Mr. Choate was on the floor very recently. He is



in his chair."

Totten: "Mr. Calvo."

Madigan: "Mr. Calvo is on the right side of the Speaker's podium."

Totten: "Mr. Craig."

Madigan: "Mr. Craig. Is Mr. Craig in the chambers? How is the gentleman recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Madigan: "Remove him from the Roll Call. The gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rayson, desires to be recorded as 'aye'. How is the gentleman recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

Jack O'Brien: "The gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Madigan: "Record him as 'aye'. Are there further questions, Mr. Totten? For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. McAvoy, arise? Record the gentleman as 'aye'. McAvoy, record Mr. McAvoy as 'aye'. Record Mr. Wall as 'aye'. Are there further questions, Mr. Totten?"

Totten: "Mr. D'Arco."

Madigan: "D'Arco is in his Chair."

Totten: "Mr. DiPrima."

Madigan: "Mr. Craig has returned to the chamber. Return Mr. Craig to the Roll Call. Mr. DiPrima is seated on the Republican side of the aisle."

Totten: "Mr. Ewell."

Madigan: "Mr. Ewell. Is Mr. Ewell in the chamber. Remove the, Mr. Ewell is at the side door. For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian, arise?"

Mugalian: "How am I recorded?"

Madigan: "How is the gentleman recorded? Mugalian."

Mugalian: "The light says red and that was a mistake. Please vote me 'aye'."

Jack O'Brien: "The gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Madigan: "Reocrd the gentleman as 'aye'. Are there further questions, Mr. Totten?"

Totten: "Mr. Flinn."

Madigan: "Mr. Flinn is in his chair."



Totten: "Mr. Garmisa."

Madigan: "Mr. Garmisa is standing on the Democratic side."

Totten: "Mr. Giglio. I see him. Mr. Hanahan."

Madigan: "Mr. Hanahan. How is Mr. Hanahan recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Madigan: "Leave him on the Roll Call and record Mr. Skinner
as 'no'. How is Mr. Kozubowski recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Madigan: "Leave him that way. How is Mr. Kosinski recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Madigan: "Leave him that way. Mr. Totten, you asked a
question regarding Mr. Giglio? Is Mr. Giglio in the
chambers? Is Mr. Giglio in the chambers? Oh, I see
he is in the back on the Republican side. Mr. Brinkmeier,
how is Mr. Brinkmeier recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "He was taken off the Roll Call."

Madigan: "Restore Mr. Brinkmeier to the Roll Call. Are there
further questions?"

Totten: "Mr. Huff."

Madigan: "Mr. Huff. Mr. Huff is in his chair."

Totten: "Mr. Jacobs."

Madigan: "Mr. Jacobs, in his chair."

Totten: "Mr. Emil Jones."

Madigan: "Emil Jones, in the back of the chamber."

Totten: "Mr. Katz."

Madigan: "Mr. Katz, standing on the Democratic side."

Totten: "Mr. Laurino."

Madigan: "Laurino, standing in front of the Speaker's podium."

Totten: "Mr. Kornowicz."

Madigan: "Kornowicz in his chair."

Totten: "Mr. Londrigan."

Madigan: "Londrigan. Is Mr. Londrigan in the chamber? Remove,
the gentleman, how is the gentleman recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Madigan: "Remove the gentleman from the Roll Call."

Totten: "Mr. Maragos."



Madigan: "Maragos in his chair."

Totten: "Mr. Marovitz."

Madigan: "Marovitz. Mr. Marovitz is in the gallery to the rear."

Totten: "Mr. Mulcahey."

Madigan: "Mulcahey is in his chair."

Totten: "Mr. Pierce."

Madigan: "Mr. Pierce is in his chair."

Totten: "Mr. Pouncey."

Madigan: "Mr. Pouncey is in his chair."

Totten: "Mr. VonBoeckman."

Madigan: "VonBoeckman, in his chair. And for what purpose, do you have any more people seated in their chair that you wish to verify?"

Totten: "That's all the questions, Mr. Speaker."

Madigan: "Thank you. Restore Mr. Londrigan to the Roll Call. For what purpose does the gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword arise? Tipsword."

Tipsword: "I just wish to inquire, was Mr. Brinkmeier restored to the Roll Call?"

Madigan: "Yes, he was."

Tipsword: "Thank you."

Madigan: "On this question there are 100 'ayes', 68 'nos', 1 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1036 having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre arise?"

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 1036 was passed."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Will, Mr. VanDuyne."

VanDuyne: "Mr. Speaker, I ask that that motion lie on the table."

Madigan: "Mr. Beaupre has moved to reconsider the vote. Mr. VanDuyne has moved to lay that motion on the table. All



those in favor of Mr. VanDuyne's motion signify by saying 'aye'. All those opposed. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. On the order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1258. Mr. Kozubowski. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kozubowski."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1258, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Madigan: "Mr. Kozubowski."

Kozubowski: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill which we debated and discussed at great length before the dinner break. It allows counties that are required to use a voting machine or electronic voting devices to use paper ballots in certain election contests and I would move for a favorable Roll Call."

Madigan: "Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is shall Senate Bill 1258 pass. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kozubowski, to explain his vote."

Kozubowski: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Senate Bill 1258 would allow local election authorities to use papers ballots in special election contests and in issues in which a referendum is involved. This Bill appeared before the Election Committee and it was determined at that time that the good point of this Bill is that it would alleviate the need for the electronic voting devices or voting machines and the additional cost which accrue to the taxpayers as a result in the need of a special election. One good example was in Cook county when one of our colleagues, John Fary, was nominated to run for Congress and that primary election we were allowed to use paper ballots



and it saved the taxpayers of the city of Chicago and the county of Cook a great deal of money by that move and this is a good Bill, it's an important Bill and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Chair recognizes the gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Fennessey, to explain his vote."

Fennessey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. We hear so much about saving money. Now here's a chance that we can save some money for the taxpayers to reduce the cost of elections and I sure hope we get two more votes up on the board, green votes, and pass this Bill."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms, to explain his vote."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain my 'no' vote. Our trend here in the Legislature and especially this session has been that all elections shall try to go to uniform standards by using voting machines. So I think this is just contrary to what the Legislature's intent is and I think to change this intention would be less than effective since we have already established a principle, it seems that voting machines shall prevail throughout the State of Illinois. So I would urge that some of those green votes would at least go to present because this is just counter-productive to what this session of the Legislature has been doing."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz, to explain his vote."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just want to explain my 'yes' vote. Actually, all this Bill does is provide a requirement on special elections and in turn if anybody is conscious as far as the cost is involved, especially the county of Cook and any other of the counties where they have special election machines, that the requirement is



to provide bringing these machines out of the warehouses on a special election is very costly. Under this Bill, the provision would be as far as the respective Election Board to provide the vehicle to conduct a normal and necessary election and I would hope that if you really want to consider the fact and especially as Representative Kozubowski pointed out in Representative Fary's congressional district campaign, here we have a special election consisting of maybe 400 precincts and in turn they can provide the necessary results giving the people an opportunity to vote without the cost of procedure. This is all this Bill calls for. It provides the safeguards that are required for all people within the State but in turn eliminating the cost of procedure of bringing out the machines and in turn, bringing them back to the various warehouses that are involved. There is nothing to do with as far as any unordinary provision with any election procedure. It's a good procedure. It deserves your 'aye' vote."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell, to explain his vote."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, very briefly, we are talking about a simple matter of economics and a very simple Bill. Actually, if a party or individual can't sit up and watch one single, simple election, then they don't deserve to win it. This is not a complex election. All you are talking about is special elections and we are asking, don't make us take a bus in order to transport one single person. We are simply saying that there are adequate safeguards and why not use a paper ballot, save the taxpayer some money. The paper ballots will be preserved. They can be counted. You have Republican state's attorneys in Cook county, Republican district attorneys in Cook county and certainly you ought to be able to prosecute any election law violation. It's a very simple thing and an effort to save the people a



few dollars. Thank you."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster, to explain his vote."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think we have already established the fact that a special election was held for Congress up in Cook county and paper ballots were used. I do not disagree that in this case paper ballots might be cheaper. I think what we are talking about is a special election to fill the office of circuit clerk in Knox county. Let me say one thing. Your own Governor is the one that's responsible for that special election. He did not have to call one. The appointed successor to the circuit clerk who vacated the office could have stayed there until the next general election. I think that you are asking us to do something that you can't get out of your own Governor. I suggest that you go down to the second floor and talk to him."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, to explain his vote."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think there is substance in this Bill and that the Bill has considerable merit. There is no question that what others have said with respect to getting these monstrous machines to all of the necessary precincts for a single candidate election certainly indicates that there is merit. The Majority Leader has told me that this Bill will not be used as a vehicle for any other purpose and I, therefore, for any other purpose anywhere and I, therefore, vote 'aye'."

Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 118 'ayes', 42 'nos', 9 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1258 having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. For what purpose does the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, arise?"



Madison: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to remind you that..."

Madigan: "Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to remind you that your elbow was on my light again."

Madigan: "Thank you, Mr. Madison. On the order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1285, Mr. Collins, could you direct your attention to this Bill at this time? 1285."

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

Madigan: "This will be the last go around, Mr. Collins. Mr. Collins has requested that Senate Bill 1285, 1289, 1291 be placed on the Fall Calendar. Is there leave? Leave being granted, those Bills shall be placed on the Fall Calendar. For what purpose does the lady from Lake, Ms. Geo-Karis, arise?"

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, I have a Bill on the Speaker's table and I am wondering if I can ask that that be referred to the Fall Calendar and that's House Bill..."

Madigan: "Which Bill are you referring to?"

Geo-Karis: "House Bill 2967."

Madigan: "On the order of..."

Geo-Karis: "It's on the Speaker's table. 2967."

Madigan: "On the order of Speaker's table appears House Bill 2967. The lady from Lake has requested that that Bill be placed on the Fall Calendar. Is there leave? Leave being granted House Bill 2967 shall be placed on the Fall Calendar. On the order of Senate Bills Third Readings appears Senate Bill 1301."

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

Madigan: "For what purpose does the gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Keller, arise?"

Keller: "Yes, Mr., Mr. Speaker, did you pass over 1297?"

Madigan: "Yes I did, Mr. Keller. It was marked in such a fashion that it appeared as if you didn't want it called. Do you want it called?"



JUN 26 1975

288.

Keller: "Yes, Sir."

Madigan: "Well, we've got Mr. Boyle's Bill on the record

Can we go back to you after Mr. Boyle? All right fine.



Madigan: "On the order of Senate Bills, Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1301. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Boyle and the Clerk will read the Bill for the third time."

Jack O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1301. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning fees and salaries. Third Reading of the Bill."

Boyle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, ah... Senate Bill 1301 is a pay increase Bill for State's Attorneys. What this Bill provides is in those counties of less than 30,000 the pay of a State's Attorney ah... shall be \$25,500. In those counties of more than 30,000 the pay of a State's Attorney shall be \$42,600. Now the Bill also provides that ah... the compensation rate, the contribution rate, ah... between the state and the counties is changed so that under this Bill the state will pay 2/3rd's of the State's Attorney's salary and the county will pay 1/3rd of the State's Attorney's salary. The total cost of this Bill to the state, according to the figures that have been provided, the state contribution will be \$2,226,666. Now this Bill ah.... I would point out to the House, that the State's Attorneys Study Commission ah... that was appointed by the legislature in their ah.... and it's Chaired by Representative Palmer and their tentative findings and conclusions, one of the things that they pointed out is that the Prosecutorial function of the State's Attorneys Office should be full time and not part time. Under this Bill, the State's Attorney will not be allowed to engage in the private practice of law. In other words, he has to devote full time ah... to the Office of State's Attorney in those counties of over 30,000 where he gets the salary of \$42,600. I would urge a favorable Roll Call and I will try and answer any questions."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Rigney."

Rigney: "Mr. Speaker, could I ask a question of the Sponsor?"

Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Rigney: "Mr. Boyle, can you tell me if the counties in a range of about 40,000 to 50,000 and there a lot in and about that range, 30,000 and 40,000 and 50,000 ah... what those State's Attorneys are



making at the present time?"

Boyle: "Well, I can tell you if you give me a specific county. I can tell you not only what they are making, but I can tell you what the state share is and what is being paid by the county. I ah.... well, let's take Macoupin County which has a population of 43,000. The State's Attorney in Macoupin County is receiving ah... let's see here, ah... \$22,000. \$10,000 being paid by the County of Macoupin and \$12,000 being paid by the State of Illinois."

Rigney: "He's making \$22,000 now and he's going to be making \$42,000 after the pay raise, is that right?"

Boyle: "Well, I must point out to you that the case load of the State's Attorneys Office in the last two or three years has almost doubled because of the crime wave and because of the drug problem. The State's Attorney now, in Macoupin County if instance, has no time to practice law. He, for all practical purposes, has to devote full time ah... to being the State's Attorney and if you want to hire good qualified prosecutors, I submit that you're going to have to pay them more than \$22,000. They don't ah... they simply don't have the time to engage in private practice and we're always talking about full time professional people, professional prosecutors. We passed legislation for professional Assistant State's Attorneys, such as Representative Shea had and I think it's time that we pay the State's Attorney accordingly and deny them the right to practice law and make it a full time job."

Rigney: "Now the next question. What does the Attorney General of the State of Illinois ah.... how much is he paid?"

Boyle: "I have no idea, but I can say that I have never voted against a pay raise for the Attorney General."

Rigney: "Well, some of my cohorts over here tell me that he's in at \$45,000. So you're going to make every little, practically every little crossroads State's Attorney in downstate Illinois on approximately the same pay scale as the Attorney General of this state. In many cases, as you cited in your own county and I think mine as well, you're talking about a pay raise in the range of \$20,000. Now that's not bad for openers and ah... I think that it is very



obvious by now what my sentiments are on the Bill."

Boyle: "Well, in response to your question, I point out to the last speaker, that these folks will not be allowed if ah... unless they get a raise this time, the next shot at a raise would be 1980 because they are elected for a four year term and unless they get a raise now ah.. it will be no good ah... for four more years so the next shot will be 1980. They're not like the General Assembly that can come in here and get a raise every other year."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Will, Mr.

Sangmeister."

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

Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Sangmeister: "Did I hear you correctly, Representative Boyle, that the spread on this is for a population of 30,000 through \$1,000,000 that the pay scale is the same \$42,500?"

Boyle: "30,000...."

Sangmeister: "To 1,000,000 is that right?"

Boyle: "... to 1,000,000 is \$42,600 and the State's Attorney of Cook County, I think is \$50,000 under the Bill."

Sangmeister: "Well, now one other question that I would have. Did this come out of the State's Attorneys Study Commission? This is their recommendation?"

Boyle: "No, no, I didn't say that. I said that one of the things that they recommended in their report was that we have full time prosecutorial ah... State's Attorneys and another thing that they recommended was substantial ah... I'm referring to recommendation #6 on page 71 of the book, 'substantial financial support is needed either by the state or by the county or by both'."

Sangmeister: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to the Bill for just a moment. I think everybody here knows that if there is any group of people I'm going to stand up for, it's going to be the State's Attorneys of this county, but I must say that this Bill does give me some problem. In our Judicial District, which is the 12th Judicial District, we have three counties. Iroquois County, which is just a little over 30,000 or 40,000 on up to Will County, which



is about 260,000. I would say case load in Will County, I don't know because I don't have the figures in front of me, but its probably four, or five, or six times that of Iroquois County. And its difficult for me to conceive that those States Attorneys should receive the same salary and I would say to the sponsor that I'm, you know, this would have been an excellent bill, I think in the bigger counties, the top salary is fine. I think they earn it. But there ought to be some category somewhere along with line, here, to scale it down into the lower counties. And...a...a...I'm certainly not going to ask anybody to cast a no vote. My...my...conscience wouldn't let me do that, but my conscience did bother me enough that you ought to be aware that there should have been a spread on that salary."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, a...Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to speak to this bill and to speak in support of it. I've had personal experience in the State's Attorney's office and when you... you think about case loads between counties, I don't believe that there is the...a...difference in case loads between the small county and the large county as far as the State's Attorney goes. The large county State's Attorneys are going to have multiple assistance. In fact you may find the State's Attorney in the smaller county doing a lot more actual trial work than in the larger county. And in support of this salary, Gentlemen and Ladies of this House, we pay our judges all over this State, \$42,500. And I'll take any county in this State where the State's Attorney doesn't work as hard as the judge and I believe that they are entitled, if they are entitled to full time and give up all of their practice to a salary of \$42,600 if we're going to have qualified people in the State's Attorneys' office across this State, and I would ask for an affirmative vote."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "A..yes, will the Gentleman yield?"

Madigan: "The sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Katz: "A...a...Mr. Boyle, the questions previously have related to counties over 30,000, what is the guaranteed minimum salary for the



counties under 30,000 under the bill?"

Madigan: "Mr. Boyle."

Boyle: "\$25,500 for those counties under."

Katz: "And are the State's Attorneys in those counties...a..prohibited from practicing law?"

Boyle: "No, not in...a...counties under 30,000. Alright."

Katz: "Thank you, Mr. Boyle. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk to the bill. A...Mr. Speaker, I believe very strongly in a professional State's Attorney's office and I think, under the new Constitution, if counties get together and ban together, that it is possible to have a professional State's Attorney's office and to make the job attractive. But this bill will interfere with and impede the progress toward a professional State's Attorney. Now what is provided is a minimum salary, as is indicated by the Gentleman, of \$25,500. That's in every county of the State. That means in Pope County where they have 3,057 people, the minimum salary will be \$25,500. That means in Brown County where they have 5,086 people, it'll be the minimum of \$25,500. I believe that it is very unfair to lump together all of the categories that they have done. Previously, there existed before this bill, and there is in the present law, a distinction between counties between 30,000 and 1,000,000. A county of 40,000 does not get paid the same thing as the State's Attorney of Lake and DuPage and Will and Winnebago get. And they are obliterating that distinction in this bill. In Iroquois County, for example, that the Gentleman from Will mentioned, that State's Attorney will have under his jurisdiction, 650 cases in the last year involving felonies, misdemeanors and juveniles. In DuPage County, the State's Attorney had 8500 cases; in Will County, over 3000. In Winnebago, 6200. And yet, the State's Attorney of Iroquois, where he had 650 cases, or in Logan County, where he had 330 cases, or Jefferson County, where he had 375 cases, in the entire year would be paid under this bill exactly the same thing as the State's Attorney of Will County, and Lake, and DuPage. And the State's Attorney of the county of 3000 will be paid the same thing as the State's Attorney of the county of 25,000. That is not



6.

fair and does not recognize the valid distinction in the case load under the jurisdiction of those individuals. We have already, this session, appropriated \$350,000 for a State's Attorney prosecutorial council. We have recreated the State's Attorney Study Commission for \$30,000. I do not believe that this additional appropriation of \$2,000,000 will be money well spent. I do not know how we can cut down six percent school budgets and everything else in Illinois, and yet, increase State's Attorneys so that the State's Attorney in small counties will be making so much money that there will be no incentive to join together with other small counties that could support a single State's Attorney. While, theoretically, they could do so under the present Constitution, we will be paying the State's Attorney so much in these small counties, that they will be of such pawns for those who occupy them, that there will be no incentive to merge. There should be a system where it is graduated. Where if counties do, in fact, join together, the State's Attorney will be paid more than if they had small counties. Accordingly, I regretfully, must oppose the bill and would urge that the House not pass House Bill....Senate Bill 1301."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Will the sponsor yield?"

Madigan: "The sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Tuerk: "You mentioned that this would cost the State about two and a half million dollars. Is that right?"

Boyle: "The State contribution will be \$2,226,666 under the bill. There would be a saving to the county under this bill, a saving to the over-all county contribution under this bill of \$244,667. In other words, the counties would have to...total would be diminished by that amount."

Tuerk: "From what fund would the State's burden come?"

Boyle: "It'd come from the general revenue, but this is not next fiscal year. That's what Harold Katz was talking about and, as usual, he didn't do his home work, because this bill doesn't take effect until 1976. This would be out a fiscal year...this would be out of a fiscal year, 77, 78, and by then, I hope to God we're out of



the depression. This is not subject to six percent cuts, if that's what you're getting at. Don't worry about it cause its not in this fiscal year."

Tuerk: "I'm not getting at that at all. I'm...I'm thinking of the fact that it will be two and one half million out of general revenue. I don't think I have to speak to the bill, I think the red vote is the proper vote."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the sponsor yield?"

Madigan: "The sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Madison: "Representative Boyle, is the reason for the prohibition against private practice in your bill to avoid conflict, conflict of interest, or simply to make sure that the State's Attorney is a full time State's Attorney."

Boyle: "A...a...the reason for it in my bill is to make sure that he devotes his full time to his job. And in addition to that, I think it also helps with the conflicts that he has..."

Madison: "Well, Representative Boyle, your bill prohibits the private practice of law. Does it prohibit his employment in any other fashion?"

Boyle: "That's right, he can only be State's Attorney, that's all."

Madison: "A...the language in your bill doesn't seem to indicate that, Representative Boyle, and so I'm asking you if I were the State's Attorney of Cook County, could I, in addition, be the Vice President of Montgomery Ward?"

Boyle: "Well, you'd probably...I don't know, you'd have to ask the Attorney General that, I can't...I'm not familiar with all of the Cook County statutes, and I..I don't know whether the State's Attorney can be...a...Vice President of Montgomery Ward or Sears and Roebuck, for that matter."

Madison: "Well let me ask you this, then, does your bill prohibit a State's Attorney from being a law partner, although he may not be actively practicing law?"

Boyle: "Well the intent of the bill, and I think it would be construed by the court that a State's Attorney cannot gain any emolument, compensation or funds in any manner from the private practice of law."



Madison: "My last question, Representative Boyle, would be would you be willing to take this bill back to Second Reading for the purposes of an amendment that would preclude legislators from being anything other than legislators and increasing their salary to \$42,500?"

Boyle: "Yeh, I'd be willing to do that if I thought I could get enough votes to pass it. I think that the legislature is grossly underpaid and I think it should be full time. I've always said that and I've never failed to vote for a legislative pay increase and I never will."

Madison: "Thank you Mr. Speaker."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McClain, Mr. Deavers."

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

Madigan: "The question is shall the main question now be put. All those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed. The ayes have it. And the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Boyle, to explain his vote."

Boyle: "Well, I'd like to close first. Thank you Mr. Speaker. In answer to Representative Katz, I just happened to pick up my book here and again, as usual, Representative Katz, the distinguished Chairman of Judiciary II, didn't do his homework. I look at Iroquois County and I find, presently, in Iroquois County, that the State's Attorney of Iroquois County is now making \$25,700. And under my bill, he'll get \$25,500, Harold. So the State's Attorney in Iroquois is going to lose \$200...if the bill is passed. Secondly, I point out to Representative Katz that the State's Attorney in Iroquois County, if they had 650 cases, probably had to handle all 650 cases himself. He's not like the State's Attorneys of some of these other counties where they've got about twenty or thirty assistants, or even six or seven assistants. So the State's Attorneys there are the ones that are both the prosecutors and also, the guy that has to go in and try the case. They're not just administrators. I think that these folks are entitled to a raise. I think that we want full time professional State's Attorneys. This is the only chance...they've got to get it now or they'll be foreclosed for the next four years, and I'd ask for a favorable roll call."



Madigan: "The question is shall Senate Bill 1301 pass? All those in favor signify by voting aye. All those opposed by voting no. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Fleck, to explain his vote."

Fleck: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm gonna support this bill for a number of reasons. A lot of people have talked about the variance in the population in the counties and what the State's Attorneys are going to be paid. But I, for one, feel that the State's Attorneys should be paid a proper wage and become full time prosecutors for the benefit of the citizens of this State. We make a lot of appropriations for the public defender's office and other offices, but we forget that we have the prosecutor's office, and the only way your going to get proper prosecutorial discretion and good prosecution of cases, is to get professional people in these offices. Secondly, in regards to the counties and the populations, when I was running around the House floor and the Senate with the legislative pay raise, people never paid attention to the fact that most legislators from Chicago get hardly any of the grief that the downstate legislators get. The aldermen in Chicago get the grief and we happen to ride the golden goose to our reelection and no one pays any attention to us. But yet, we get the same salaries that the downstaters do who happen to have a more important function because they cover multiple county areas. But to use that argument, I think is very bogus. The only way you're going to get proper prosecution in the downstate counties is to pay these people the proper salary that they deserve. And you can't draw lines that how many people live in what counties and how much work they're going to be doing because I'm quite honest when I say I don't think any Chicago legislator, unless he's in leadership, does nearly as much work as the downstate legislator by the very...by the very nature of where they're selected. And I would urge an aye vote on this bill."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels, to explain his vote."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm proud



to stand up here and support this legislation. I think that we have quite a few problems that we're dealing with today in the criminal field and I know no better way than to pay State's Attorneys the proper salaries that they deserve. Now one of the prior speaker's referred to the salary structures in some of the less populous counties, and I submit to you that just because he may not be satisfied with that salary structure, doesn't mean that he should urge a no vote on the whole structure as it is here. Coming from DuPage, I know that our State's Attorney is flooded with problems of crime. The rate has gone up approximately 42% in the last year and we have considerable problems in that area. Now the only way we're going to keep good law enforcement officials is to pay them properly and I think that this bill properly addresses itself to that and I urge your yes vote in this area."

Madigan: "Have all voted who wished? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Macoupin, Mr. Boyle, to explain his vote."

Boyle: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to see some green lights up there from some of my friends that I voted for during the year. State's Attorneys work harder than judges and I..if we're going to pay the judges \$42,500, I...I...I don't know of a State's Attorney in any county in the State of Illinois that doesn't work harder than his...a...circuit judge. And I...I.. think that these people are entitled to a raise. And you gotta remember, Ladies and Gentlemen, that this is...a...that they have to get it now because they...they can't raise their salary for the next four years, so if we don't give them to them now, next time we'll be talking about this, will be 1980. And I submit that before 1980, the General Assembly will have raised its salary and I hope, I hope, I hope that we raise ours to an appropriate level where we can afford to do this full time. God only knows, we probably put in...."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. LaFleur, to explain his vote. LaFleur, from DuPage."

LaFleur: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly, I think if you would consider, when their talking about these things in relationship, and especially in paying a State's Attorney the same money as a judge,



that they are completely off base. Judges serve in a circuit and they serve many counties. They handle many more cases cumulatively than a State's Attorney would...would...a...try. Now I think we gotta realize that we have certain areas in this State that is not heavily populated. Some of our counties never even have a felony during the year, nor do they impanel a Grand Jury. It is a very easy job to be State's Attorney, and probably some law clerks could handle most of the county. Now I think we should consider that some of the counties came to us to help them because they cannot raise enough tax money to support their county. Now this would only indicate that the people in those counties were worth more money than they can pay the other officials. I think we're causing more problems than we are...than we are trying to cure here and I think we should go back and educate these counties to how much cases are handled by the State's Attorney, what the population is, and then, I think, we'd be getting to the root of this problem. I would urge a no vote."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn, to explain his vote."

Dunn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote, I would like to point out...my aye.vote....I would like to point out that I believe we are overlooking one thing. Much ado has been made about the fact that State's Attorneys jobs in some of the smaller counties may be lucrative. And there has also been reference to the fact that we have a State's Attorneys' Commission which is trying to do something about that problem. What we're talking about, here, is not consolidation of the job, you're talking about paying those who do the work. If people are doing the work of the State's Attorney, they should be paid a fair pay rate. They should receive a decent salary. The State's Attorneys Commission can help us solve the other portion of the problem, and that is to combine the counties which are smaller so that they are served by a single State's Attorney. When that happens, that State's Attorney is going to want as much as everybody else. The job is worth more than it has been in the past. As the sponsor of the bill has pointed



out, we can't talk about another pay raise for these people for a long, long period of time. I happen to know in my own county that my State's Attorney serves long and hard, its the only job he has, and he deserves more pay. I'd like to see enough green lights to get this up over 89 and we can solve that other problem. We have a Commission. The Commission is working actively. So let's get the lights up there and pay these people what they're worth."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff, to explain his vote."

Neff: "A..thank you..a...Mr...a...Speaker. In explaining my no vote.. I...a...I haven't...a...at least I know of no counties that are havin' a problem of getting qualified men for State's Attorney. I think this is rather hog-wash talkin' about that we're havin' a problem, because..I...well acquainted with quite a few counties downstate and I haven't seen any problem and think we'll find that these men are qualified. And at the time and the conditions and the finances of the State of Illinois, I think its ridiculous to talk about diggin' up another \$2,000,000, which is what this is gonna' cost. I would appreciate more no votes."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Mulcahey, to explain his vote."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, its my opinion, that first of all, nobody told anybody they had to run for State's Attorney. They knew what their salary was before they got involved, and if they can't stand the heat right now, they can always go back to their private law practice. We have people all throughout this State, today, that are on unemployment compensation, they're on public aid; fixed incomes; social security; and the unemployment around this State is atrocious, as we all know. To spend this money right now, in my estimation, is an insult to these people and its an insult to the taxpayers of this State."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Miller, to explain his vote."

Miller: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, I rise to oppose the motion. It seems to me that in the last year or two, too often the counties have come to the State and have said, 'Help us with our



problem' it would seem to me that if there is a county or two or three, where there is an increase in case load in criminal work, that that county can come to the aid of their own State's Attorney and we ought to take the burden off of our State general revenue."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder, to explain his vote."

Schraeder: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. There seems to be a lot of sentiment in favor of this bill from one particular group, and that's the members of the bar. But Ladies and Gentlemen, I don't think that's particularly important. I think what's important is the total cost to the State of Illinois in this package. And that's something like two and one half million dollars. Now I think we've got more important places to spend our money than increasing salaries by the amount that these are being increased. And I say to you, let's look at the picture we've already produced. Let's put this money where its needed. We're talkin' about education, just a few short ah... hours ago, we talked about a budget of \$63,000,000 increase, and now we're talkin' about another increase. Well let's put it on education if we're gonna' but don't put it where it isn't needed. We need it other places more so than this. I think you'd better change those red votes up there to green. I...I beg your pardon, your green votes, to red."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber, to explain his vote."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak and explain my aye vote and suggest that more people vote aye in order to put this over the top. The State's Attorneys are full time workers in their jobs. This means, and its a very important fact, that before a person becomes State's Attorney, he has to quit the private practice of law. Now you don't turn a private practice of law on or off like you do a faucet. In other words, you don't leave a \$40,000 law practice, go to work for \$32,000 for four years, you're kicked out by the voters, or decide to quit and go back and resume a \$42,000 a year law practice. That's not how it works. You have to give up your law practice. This can be very important. When you leave that office, you may not have a law practice to go back to. I think



14.

in order to get decent people, you have to offer some incentive other than just the fact that its nice to be elected and be able to do a job for the public. I think this is an important bill. Your gonna' end..in the last analysis, you get what you pay for. If you want to hire a cheap lawyer to be your State's Attorney, your going to get that type of criminal prosecution. I think its important. This General Assembly has overwhelmingly supported tough law and order measures and I think you are going to throw it all down the river if you don't hire good, capable, qualified people to administer the criminal justice system in the State's Attorneys office. I urge an aye vote."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis, to explain her vote."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, a comment was made that one of our distinguished Representatives, said the members of the bar were voting for this bill. Well some of us our voting for this bill because we've served in State's Attorneys offices and competent lawyers can make \$40,000. But if you don't get someone who is a qualified trial lawyer to be a State's Attorney, you're not going to have good prosecution of your cases. Take it from me, there has been a great crime wave in this country and you've got to have qualified personnel. You don't want a doctor who's a hack to work on you, well you don't want a State's Attorney who is going to be politically inclined only, and not do a good job. And you are not going to attract a good person as a State's Attorney if you don't pay him enough."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Coffey, to explain his vote."

Coffey: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've heard many comments here tonight of some of the attorneys talking in favor of this bill to...for the State's Attorneys to have additional increases in salary and what they're sacrificing to be State's Attorney. I happen to have left a business of my own to come down to Springfield to take a \$20,000 salary and take a decrease in salary. I had that choice at the time I ran for this office. I



15.

took that choice and you don't hear me complaining. We have six State's Attorneys in the area that I represent. I haven't had one State's Attorney in my district even say one thing to me about an increase in salary. And four of those State's Attorneys, I know are full time State's Attorneys. I don't hear them complaining, I think they are willing to sacrifice and give a little extra to their counties to help out in this case. I'm sure many of these attorneys can make more money. And I agree, across the aisle a while ago, when I heard someone say that they thought State's Attorneys deserved as much as judges, I agree with that. So I would be willing to help sponsor a bill to decrease some of the judges salaries to bring it down with the State's Attorneys salaries."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Davis, to explain his vote."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I heard it said that only the lawyers were for this bill, well, I'm not a lawyer, but I'm for the bill. We are...we...we...think of State's Attorneys in terms of prosecution. This is true. They are prosecutors. But we should also think of State's Attorneys in terms of being protectors of the people. Protectors of the people to defend innocent, if there are innocent, and you know what, it takes a qualified man. It takes a highly intelligent man to do this and you cannot get something for nothing. This is a old rule. And I believe that we ought to vote yes on this bill and pay for qualified State's Attorneys who will not only prosecute, but will be a protector of the people."

Madigan: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 98 ayes, 59 noes, 9 voting present. Senate Bill 1301 having received a constitutional majority is hereby declared passed."



Madigan: "To facilitate the posting of a House Bill for a hearing in the Senate Appropriations Committee tomorrow we will go to the order of House Bill, Third Reading, House Bill 3096. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre."

Fred Selcke: "House Bill 3096, a Bill for an Act to amend the Capital Development Bond Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Madigan: "Mr. Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen....."

Madigan: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, raise his right hand?"

Walsh: "I'm taking the pledge, Mr. Speaker."

Madigan: "Thank you."

Walsh: "Also,I'm informed that this Bill was on Second Reading today, now is thatah....correct.....? On the Supplemental Calendar?"

Madigan: "All right.....OK."

Walsh: "Well,.....it's on....OK, Mr. Speaker."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre, on House Bill 3096."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Capital Development Bond authorization of \$825,000,000, broke down as follows, and I would point out to you thatah.....the Appropriations Bill, House Bill 802 and House Bill 289 have already been approved and passed out of this House. The breakdown on the authorization for the change in bonding authority is as follows: \$483,000,000 for State Universities, Colleges, Community Colleges, and School.....The School Building Commission; \$11,000,000 for correctional purposes and State prisons; \$103,000,000 for open spaces, recreational and conservation purposes; \$77,500,000 for child care, mental and public health facilities; \$48,000,000 for department authorities ...ah....public corporations, commissions and agencies; \$6,000,000 for the Regional Park Districts; \$12,500,000



for Waterways; and \$10,000,000 for grants for private Medical Schools. This matter having been considered by the Housea....in those appropriations Bills that I have mentioned, I would move for passage of this Bill."

Madigan: "Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, shall House Bill 3096for what purpose does the Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Keller arise?"

Keller: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Keller: "Ah.....er....Jack, was this part of the accelerated bonding program?"

Beaupre: "For the.....ah....accelerated bonding program series was number something like 280 to 295....ah....there are some of the programs that were in those original Bills that have....ah....that are contained in here....However, there are a number of additional programs for which we are giving an authority....authority that was put on in the House Appropriations Committee."

Keller: "Well, er.....ah....what is the difference between this and House Bill 292and what additional programs have been put into this?"

Beaupre: "Well, House Bill 292,...and I don't have that Bill before me.....but as the Chief Sponsor of that Bill.....ah my recollection is that we were dealing with \$505,000,000 for State Universities, Colleges, Community Colleges and the School Building Commission. That has been reduced by \$22,000 in this....er....\$22,000,000 in this ...this Bill." Ah...in addition....House Bill 292 contained authorizations for ah....Mental Health, Child Care and Public Health Facilities...ah....to the tune of 55....er...ah.....ah.. \$77,500,000, that also is in this Bill. Ah....ah...House Bill 292, ah...also provided bonding for conservation facilities ...ah....some of which are in this Bill and some of which are not.....the remaining portions of the Billah...I believe were developed subsequent to the



introduction of 292 and have been approved by the Appropriations Committee and by this House."

Keller: "Can you tell us....can you tell us...this is a \$150,000,000right? For this issue?"

Beaupre: "\$825,000,000."

Keller: "Well,.....that's the.....that's the...total ...ah... but I mean it's just ain the book here it only says \$150,600,000ah.....authorization.....ah... q.....in other words....can you tell us.....what projects are going to be built out of this?"

Beaupre: "Those projects that were specifically authorized by line item, inapprop....in House Bill 802 and House Bill 289, the Appropriations Bills, this is merely the authorization."

Keller: "I'll just let him go ahead for Roll Call and I'll just vote 'no' because I'm not familiar with what's all going to be built out of this."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Hirschfeld: "Representative, is there any funds in here for reservoir projects, in the State of Illinois?"

Beaupre: ".....informs that there is not, Representative Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "None at all?.....Not...Helm, Louisville, Wren Lake, Middlefork.....Reservoirs...what about the Middlefork project?....Which is not a reservoir?..."

Beaupre: "The Staff informs me, Representative Hirschfeld, that...that there may be.....ah....related...ah...ah.... Capital Development Facilitiesah...built from this Bonding Program to that which you refer.....ah....the Reservoir itself is not included."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."



Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Totten: "Ah....How much does House Bill 3096 increase the authorization....compared to ah....House Bill 292... which was the accelerated Bond program?"

Beaupre: "The increase over House Bill 292 is \$225,000,000, \$75,000,000 of that for the State Office Building, the remainder, which was approved by the House Appropriations Committee."

Totten: "How much of that was part of the accelerated Bond program?"

Beaupre: "Well, the remaining portion of the \$825,000,000.... ah....\$600,000,000."

Totten: "\$600,000,000 of....ah...House Bill 3096 is part of the accelerated Bond Program?"

Beaupre: "Representative Totten, the Staff informs me that very little of ...ah...that which is contained in here as far as an authorization is concerned....was included in the original Bill....the original accelerated Bonding Program Bill."

Totten: "Well, speak to the Bill, as Representative Keller had indicated, there is....ah....some portion of the accelerated Bond Program included in this Bill...and.... and I think that those Members who are concerned about that should be concerned about the process by which we got this Bill from Second Reading to Third Reading on the same day....for the first time we've done this with a House Billand I would suggestso that the Members have a chance to look thoroughly at this Bill....ah....that they either vote 'no' or 'present' so ...ah....that this Bill will remain on the Calendar in Postpone Consideration so they have a chance to digest what was done today on several Amendments."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers."



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

Madigan: "The question is, shall the main question now be put?"
All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'...All those opposed.....The 'ayes' have it and the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre, to close the debate."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ah...this entire \$825,000,000 ...the bonding authorization, was approved by both the Republican and Democratic staff of the Appropriations Committee. Ah....It was approved by this House Floor in House Bill 802 and 289.....I would ask for your favorable support."

Madigan: "For what purpose does Mr. Walsh and his friends make all that noise?"

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we riseah...on a point of order....This Bill was brought back to Second Reading, it is a House Bill, it was Amended today, and therefore cannot under the rules be considered on Third Reading today because we do not have the Bill Enrolled and Engrossed.. ..further submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is an exempt Bill and ah....it can be heard tomorrow, or maybe in the fall."

Madigan: "Mr. Walsh, the Clerk informs me that the Bill has been Enrolled and Engrossed."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I submit to you, that under the Rules .. the Bill cannot be heard today....That having been Amended today it cannot be heard under the Rules. Unlike a Senate Bill, in which the Speaker has made rulings....ah..several times today....this is a House Bill and...ah...may not be heard..."

Madigan: "Mr. Walsh, would you sight the Rules to which you refer....by.....number.....page and line."

Walsh: "I will be pleased to, Mr. Speaker, we're just trying to work out the differences between the temporary rules and the Rules of the 78th General Assembly and if you will



give us just one moment we will have it."

Madigan: "Mr. Walsh, for your information, the temporary rules are the rules under which we are operating at this time."

Walsh: "I understand that, Mr. Speaker, but I've been working with the rules of the 78th General Assembly and there are some differences. If you'll give us just one moment and not disturb us...then we will have it. While we're looking at that, may I submit to you, Mr. Speaker,....."

Madigan: "Mr. Bradley, would you approach the podium?....."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, if you know the Rule, you could help us out a hell of a lot."

Madigan: "With all the help you have, Mr. Walsh, we would not interfere.....Mr. Seronas is there.....there is one Bill that we will never forget that he wrote.....The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, now, do you have the Enrolled and Engrossed Bill before you?"

Madigan: "Mr. Schlickman has it, Mr. Walsh,your associatehe is taking the Bill to the Senate."

Walsh: "Yeah.....you have the Enrolled and Engrossed ..ah.... Bill..."

Madigan: "Mr. Schlickman has it in his hands."

Walsh: "Now, ...ah...has the Amendment been distributed?..."

Madigan: "Mr. Walsh.....it has.....and Mr. Walsh, I remind you that the rules prescribe that the Members shall not pursue dilatory tactics, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Well then,turn me off."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre, to close the debate."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would merely point out to you that ...ah...this authorization merely grants the Capital Development Board the power to utilize those funds appropriated in House Bill 802 and 289 and the Water Resources Amendment that we have approved ...ah...in Appropriations Committee and I



would ask for your favorable support."

Madigan: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser, arise.....Telcser?"

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, could you....I am of the opinion this takes 107 votes for passage....Is that correct, Sir?.... It increases the bond authorization."

Madigan: "Mr. Telcser, would you state your reasons,for which you believe the Bill requires 107 votes... along with your supporting evidence gleaned from the Bill."

Telcser: "Because it increases the General Obligation Bond authority.....and incurs a State debt...'to boot'.... What else do you need.....Mike?....It takes 107."

Madigan: "Mr. Telcser,Mr. Telcser....the Chair compliments you for your wisdom in this matter and this Bill will require 107 votes for passage."

Telcser: "Thank you, Sir."

Madigan: "And, Mr. Beaupre has moved for passage of House Bill 3096 and the question is, shall House Bill 3096 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword, to explain his vote."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to explain my 'yes' vote on this Bill. Of the two Bills that this covers, the two appropriations Bills, mine was House Bill 289 that I handled and that was the acceleratedthat Bill included the accelerated bond project. Each and every accelerated bond project was removed from that Bill by the ...ah.... Amendment #1 of the Appropriations I Committee of the House. During the course of Amendments to that BillOne accelerated project to my knowledge was put back in it. That one accelerated project was put back in by Amendment offered by a Member upon the Floor of the House and adopted by the House. That was the \$75,000 for the State Office Building here. There were a couple of other Amendments that were offered, one of them....and passed....one of



them corrected some technical language in the Bill,....ah another one corrected one of the appropriation amounts for the regular appropriations that were included in the Bill out of the regular funds of the State. So the only thing to my knowledge that had appeared in the accelerated project was the \$75,000,000 project for the State Office Building that was put back in by individual Amendment upon the floor of this House by the Membership of the House. Otherwise these Bonds, to my best knowledge, do not in covering either ...Sena....House Bill 802 or House Bill 289 cover any accelerated bonding program."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, to explain his vote."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I address myself exclusively to you fiscal conservatives, those of you who blocked the Governor's Program for supplemental bondsthe four hundred million..... the \$4,000,000,000 bond issue, we're getting at it piece by piece and this is a part of it and I submit to you that if we're going to do something about keeping taxes at a reasonable rate in this State we're going to have to oppose things like this and it really isn't too hard. There are things in here that just simply do not deserve to be built at this time....at this time when money is difficult to getwhen we are fighting with inflation we simply should not do it....State revenues are way downcosts are way up ...and we're going to have to...if you vote for thiswe're going to have to have a tax increase within the very near future and you know those of you who are not too fond of the Governor, the tax increase may not come until after he is reelected. I urge you to vote 'no'."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kankakee Mr. Beaupre."

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



House, after considering...ah...Senate Bill 1036...I scoured the calendar to find a Bill that my good friends and colleagues on the other side of the isle would find appropriate to vote for. I think this is the Bill. The Bill because this Bill contains the authorization for us to build new capital facilities in each and every junior college district and each and every State college and university provides us with funds to deal with and to bring into being the kind of educational facilities in higher education that we in this State dream of. It provides for capital facilitiesprovides for capital facilities at a ...at our State parks and recreational areas....it provides for child care and mental health facilitiesit provides for facilities throughout the State that are direly needed and I would suggest to you Representative Walsh and your friends on the other side of the aisle that with the kind of inflation that we face today, with the kind of spiraling inflation that we see our economy in, that this is the time to build these facilities, when we're in a...a...a period of time of high unemployment and we're in...we're in a period of time where costs continue to rise. If we wait four or six or eight years to deal with these problems that we're going to have, to build these buildings and facilities that we in this State need and our constituents need they are going to cost many...many...many more dollars than if we deal with them today. We will actually end up saving money....and that's the real issue here. That's the reason we ought to be voting for this Bill...when everyone on both sides of the isle ought to join with me and get a green light up there."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Champaign,

Mr. Hirschfeld, to explain his vote."

Hirschfeld: "Well, very briefly, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what the Sponsor of the Bill has



said is nothing more than we've tried to put a little bit of something in it for everybody in order to get 107 votes. Now, I'd like the Sponsor to know that I think I was probably the only Republican on this side of the aisle that came out publicly and favored the accelerated bond program when the Governor came up with the idea. I thought it was an excellent program then...I still think it is an excellent program and I think it should have been passed by the Senate despite Republican opposition....but the problem with this Bill from my point of view as an environmentalist is that you've included reservoir projects ...at least on the fringe area that the environmentalists in the State of Illinois are opposingand to put money in for studies for projects that we do not feel are necessary in order to win a few votes here and a few votes there is not the way to go about and increase the capital bonding program for higher education and therefore I would suggest that anybody that is opposed to these type of reservoir projects throughout the State of Illinois vote 'no' on this Bill unless we can delete these items."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Londrigan to explain his vote."

Londrigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House both Republicans and DemocratsDemocrats and Republicans already...voted through all of the appropriations for these projects.....wasn't even close..now why don't we get on the Board and reaffirm what we've already done so we can move on to our other Bills?"

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Campbell, to explain his vote."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this particular project and I'd like to remind the Gentleman from Champaign who has been against the Middlefork Reservoir and all the other projects that if I had just one hell of a 'pork barrel' project in my district like the University of Illinois in which



\$2,090,000 are involved in this particular project, I don't think I'd say anything."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I have been voting 'present' as the light now shows because I've had that uncomfortable, uncertain thought about this Bill, but then Mr. Speaker and Members of the House..... it suddenly came to my mind that the Governor now has \$300,000,000 of authorized bonding power...\$300,000,000 that he has not been able to use. Now, to give him another \$200,000,000 for a total of \$500,000,000 seems to me to be unconscionable ...particularly ...with the kind of an election year that is coming up. I sincerely suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House that we vote 'no' on this and let's have the Governor take the \$300,000,000 that he presently has and use that."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Jones to explain his vote."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as the previous Speaker mentioned this is doing something for the Governor, this is doing something for the people.....these are projects...this is the bond authorization for projects that we in the General Assembly here in Appropriations Committee or on the floor have already approved, these are benefits to the people in Illinois and in your individual districts and including as we mentioned ...the State Office Building...which is a much needed facility for the conduct of the Government right here next door is in this project....and it needs your support in order to get it approved and to get it going.....solicit your green vote."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Hyde Park, Mr. Mann, to explain his vote."

Mann: "Woodlawn, South Shore / ^{and} South Chicago.....Mr. Speaker I'm informed that there is money in here for the Middlefork



Project and I...I...I think that's a bad idea and ...if.. the Sponsor would bring it back and eliminate that..ah... I'd be glad to vote 'aye' but I can't support anything that has the Middlefork Project."

Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 103 'ayes', 41 'nos' 22 voting 'present' and for what purpose does the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre arise?"

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, I'd request that this be put on postponed consideration."

Madigan: "House Bill 3096 shall be placed on the order of postpone consideration....For what purpose does the Gentleman from Kankakee arise?"

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to post.....to poll the absentees?....."

Madigan: "Mr.Mr.....Beaupre if we were to grant that request....Mr. Walsh might have a stroke.....On the order of Senate Bills, Third Reading....appears Senate Bill 1297....Senate Bill 1297..."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 1297, a Bill for an Act to amend the Personnel Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Keller."

Keller: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.....ah.... Senate Bill 1297 amends the Personnel Code and requires posting of information concerning the Civil Service jobs in a conspicuous place in at least oneone building on each work site where State employees are employed.....I move that ...for the passage of House ..er...Senate Bill 1297."

Madigan: "Is there any discussion? There being no discussion the question is, shall Senate Bill 1297 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted



who wish? Sevcik 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. LaFleur 'aye'. On this question there are 121 'ayes', 2 'nays', 17 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1297 having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1135, Mr. Caldwell."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 1135, an Act amending Section 18 of an Act relating to wage deductions for benefit of creditors and so forth, Third Reading of the Bill."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1135 amends the Wage Reduction Act by changing from one to three the number of indebtedness needed before an employee can be discharged. This Bill also provides that the three indebtednesses must occur within a twelve month period. This is legislation that is needed because in some communities people in the lower economic strata who work in factories and so forth are constantly subjected to...uh...indebtednesses and of course if they...uh...find themselves being, having their salaries jeopardized they have to, they have to be fired. Now we feel that three such instances in a twelve month period would be reasonable in order for a man to keep his job. If a person is fired for indebtednesses, the creditors lose and the government loses along with the individual. The creditors do not get paid and the government ends up paying unemployment compensation. Senate Bill 1135 is an attempt to avoid this type of situation. I would ask a favorable Roll Call. I think this is good legislation."

Madigan: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and members of the House. I rise to oppose this Bill, a Bill which in my opinion



is an unreasonable infringement by government upon the free enterprise sector of this State. If we are going to persist in this kind of regulation and control of the internal operations of business, business and commerce, then we might as well take them over and assume the risk that these businessmen have assumed. I call to your attention, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House that we are not talking about wage assignments, we are talking about wage deduction orders and these wage deduction orders are based on judicial processes and we are talking about employees who have gone through the judicial process up to three times before they can be subject to discharge by the employer. Now Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we do have labor contracts, we do have personnel policies and practices of the part of employers. The Sponsor of this Bill has not indicated and there is not evidence that there are abuses within the private sector. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House that this is an area about which we should be most sensitive, one that we should avoid unless there is an overriding public demand or need. He has not indicated that this is so and I therefore respectfully suggest that we cast a 'nay' vote on this Bill."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines."

Gaines: "I wish to speak in favor of this Bill. I think it's reasonable and based on my six years experience in the Attorney General's Consumer Fraud Office there are many cases where through mistaken identity and other things, a poor person finds himself with a judgment and by the time he gets around to going to legal aid and other places he's unemployed and then he can't even afford to hire a lawyer to get his record cleaned up and I think this is a reasonable restriction and not unduly harsh to the employer."



Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

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

Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Skinner: "Representative, do you mean to say that at the present time an individual can be fired because he has one court judgment against him?"

Caldwell: "There's nothing...uh...to prevent that, Mr. Skinner. What we have found in the lower economic communities is that individuals are often fired for this reason. The Bill had been introduced and there was five such instances that an employee could be discharged in a twelve month period. However, in the Senate the Bill was amended to three. I think this is reasonable and I think it would correct some inequities because of the type of work that some of these people are forced to do because they really don't have skills and take jobs in the unskilled labor force and because of certain other handicaps often find themselves victims of this type of situation."

Skinner: "Well, Mr. Caldwell as County Treasurer I probably filed three to four thousand personal property tax cases in the small claims court. If, and then filed the judgments in the recorder's office. Now, does, would the court action have to go farther than filing of the judgment in the recorder's office for someone to be fired?"

Caldwell: "I'm not, what I think is, what I think would happen here, the employer would...uh...be required, I mean this must occur at least three times within a twelve month period before the employer could automatically just dismiss the guy no matter what his record."

Skinner: "O.K., now, if my state's attorney ever decided to apply a garnishment to an individual's wages for non-payment of personal property taxes when we had the judgment, could he be fired in the State of Illinois for



that?"

Caldwell: "No, I don't think so."

Skinner: "Excuse me?"

Caldwell: "Yes, he could be fired."

Skinner: "My God. Well, I'm not sure three is too, I'm not sure three, I'm not sure that three of those judgments might not be too many but it's certainly, but certainly one is too few, that's unbelievable."

Caldwell: "Well this was my, this was my reasoning and this is why I agreed to handle the Bill in the House. I thought that bringing it to three would be reasonable and would enable the employee to recognize...uh...what holding a job really meant and it would also give the employer a chance to participate in a situation where he can have an employer, employee that could be helpful. I think it's a good Bill."

Skinner: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if I might address the Bill. I may not understand this completely now, but I sure have been on one end of the process, having sued at least every other family in one township in my district and I would hate to think that the individuals in that township, every other family, the wage earner might end up losing his job because of my State's Attorney doing, holding up his end of the tax collection process finally. Unless someone can come up with a better reason for voting against it than I have heard so far, I think we ought to vote in favor of this."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Downs."

Downs: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for the past eight years as an attorney I have opened, operated, chaired and otherwise served in the capacity of a volunteer legal aid lawyer and at this present time maintain such a clinic and while I know there are exceptions, I have handled many, many cases involving wage garnishment and just this problem. I have yet to



meet the individual and most often it's a family involved that is improvident, that is being reckless in their spending habits. They are all people who have been caught in the vice of illness or misfortune and the last thing in the world they need is to lose their job because there is a wage garnishment served on their wages, a brick as the term is often used. As long as we have things like confession of judgment, as long as we have inadequate legal services available to the indigent and lower income and long as long as we have unscrupulous collection practices, we have got this problem. And it's a problem shared by all of us in this society and while the businesses involved do suffer from inconvenience, they do not furnish solutions such as eliminating some of the practices I referred to. I strongly urge your support of this Bill. Three times is the, indeed policy of many reputable businesses but it is not the policy of many others and one and you're out is too often the policy and two and you're out is perhaps in other instances the policy, but the least we can do is say that three should be the limit because then I think some justice and then maybe we can say that this Legislature has passed a decent consumer Bill. Thank you."

Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Caldwell, to close the debate."

Caldwell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to thank Representative Skinner and Representative Downs for recognizing the fact that there is still in our society a large segment of people who are subjected to high pressure salesmanship where the wage earner has a large family and is trying to make ends meet and often times does not use good judgment in his purchases. I think that three...uh...three instances is a reasonable compromise and I believe that we would be passing a good



Bill, good legislation if we enacted this measure into law. I would appreciate a favorable vote."

Madigan: "The question is shall Senate Bill 1135 pass. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman to explain his vote."

Berman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. May I point out that those of you who may be a little apprehensive of putting a green light on, in fact you are helping the credit business and those people, merchants who sell on credit when you pass this kind of a Bill because you can't collect your debts when a guy is out of a job and when you allow legitimate people who sell on credit to exercise legal legitimate collection procedures such as a wage deduction order and a fair minimal amount of deduction to pay off that wage deduction order and the guy is allowed and in fact the employer is required to keep him in his employ, you satisfy a very important economic need. You keep the creditor getting some money on his legitimate debt and you are allowing the employee to continue his job and pay off those debts. If you don't pass this kind of law and you get employers that are heartless and don't want to take the time to enter into the very minimal kind of paperwork involved in honoring wage deduction orders, what you have is the creditor not getting paid, the employee losing his job, the welfare roll swelling, the crime rate increasing and it just becomes a very vicious circle. This is is a good Bill from both management and labor point of view and I would urge you to add more green lights to this good Bill."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich, to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "Mr., Mr. Speaker and members of the House, I was involved in operating a small loan company for over thirty years. There are people who believe when you make



it more difficult to collect that you are helping the borrower. Nothing could be farther from the truth because as a lender I can tell you as it becomes more difficult to collect you start shutting off certain people from borrowing and if you do this, you just keep on making it more difficult to collect and you will be shutting off the lines of credit for these people who need it the most."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell, to explain his vote."

Yourell: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and members of the House. I don't have a great hangup about this Bill except if I read it right it says three judgments, three garnishments within a twelve month period. So what we are actually talking about is from June to June we could have three and then in the next twelve months, three in the next twelve months and in the next two months we could have three more. So I, maybe I am not reading the Bill right but it is I think, I believe in a twelve month period. So each year, each year as time goes on you allow an individual to have three garnishments before anything can be done about it and if that's true I am voting 'no'."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Perry, Mr. Ralph Dunn to explain his vote."

Dunn: "Thank you, sir. I think that the votes have been explained pretty well. I think it has been discussed and as an employer I certainly would hate to have to think that I would have to have three judgments against a fellow before he could be dismissed. With all the work that goes into judgments, I can't understand how you can be saying this is a Bill that helps people who, labor people and people that spend their money. I think it's a Bill that hurts them and I think it's a Bill that ought to be defeated. It looks like it's not got enough votes and thank you."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr.



Lundy, to explain his vote."

Lundy: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and members of the House.

In explaining my 'aye' vote I would strongly urge other members to vote 'aye'. This is a working person's Bill. Now, we have had several people make reference to the fact that one garnishment ought to be enough to permit termination because of all the elaborate judicial procedures that you have to go through to get a judgment. Well, I have gotten some of those judgments. Let me tell you about all those elaborate procedures you have to go through. In fact, most of these judgments come about because of confession to judgment clauses that are, that are placed in contracts and judgments which are obtained when the working man who can't get to court is never even represented there and then in order to get a garnishment all you have to do is take it over to a clerk and get him to order it, to enter it in the court. There is no great judicial protection. There is no tremendous hardship on the creditor to get this. It's a very easy thing to get. They get them by the dozens, they get them by the hundreds every day. Now we are trying to protect the working man from losing his job because he couldn't get the court to defend himself, he couldn't afford to hire a lawyer to defend himself when one of these confession of judgment clauses was executed against him and I think it's the very minimum we can do in this day and age to protect the working man and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the lady from Lake, Mr.

Geo-Karis, to explain her vote."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one of the first cases I ever had was representing an old gentleman who had a judgment against him which was never his judgment. If I hadn't gone to bat for him, his employer was ready to fire him. I think it's an equitable Bill and I am tired of having collection agencies



collecting judgments and levying them on people, people who don't know any better because of a lack of education and what have you. I'm not for deadbeats any more than anyone else is here, but I think we ought to give this Bill a try."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Moultrie, Mr. Stone, to explain his vote."

Stone: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I suppose that it would be useless for me to try to put any votes on the board. I feel rather badly that we would pass up an opportunity to help all of us. Now, I don't know whether something is the matter with some Sponsor on this Bill or what the problem is and that's why I suppose it makes no difference what I say. But, you know, Ladies and Gentlemen, it's possible that a person can lose his job without ever knowing why he has lost it. I assure you that I can get judgments in two days against any working person who owes any bank or any other, or has signed any other instrument such as a promissory note. I can get a judgment and, and have a wage assignment against his wages in three days. Now it seems to me that that's a little unfair when the person who is losing his job in all probability has a family, in many, many, many cases does not even know that a judgment has been taken. Now this seems a little unfair to me and I don't know what the problem is here but I am sure that it cannot be the Bill. I would hope that whatever it is, it could be worked out and this Bill could be passed."

Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 70 'ayes', 46 'nos', 17 voting 'present' and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Would you be kind enough to poll the absentees?"

Madigan: "The Clerk will poll the absentees."

Fred Selcke: "Beatty, Brandt, Brinkmeier, Capparelli, Collins, D'Arco, Epton, Farley, Fary, Fleck, Garmisa, Hanahan,



D. Houlihan, Dave Jones, Kane, Katz, Klosak, Kozubowski, Kucharski, Laurino, Kornowicz, Leon, Leverenz, Londrigan, Madigan, Madison, Marovitz, Mautino, McPartlin, Merlo, Patrick, Peters, Polk, Pouncey, Rigney, Sangmeister, Schisler, Taylor, Telcser, Telcser 'aye', Terzich, VanDuynes, VonBoeckman, Winchester, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker 'aye'."

Madigan: "Mr. Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Announce the vote please."

Madigan: "On this question there are 72 'ayes', 46 'nos', 17 voting 'present' and Mr. Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Place it on postponed consideration."

Madigan: "Senate Bill 1137 shall be placed on the order of postponed consideration. 1135, Senate Bill 1135 shall be placed on the order of postponed consideration. On the order of Senate Bills Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1371."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 1371, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker and members of the House, this is similar to two other Bills that passed the House. It provides that a tenured teacher may upon dismissal for cause, have a hearing by an impartial hearing officer. The hearing officer is picked from a list of five furnished by the Office of Education. The hearing officers have to be accredited by a national arbitration association and this puts the notice and hearing procedures under the direction of the State Board of Education. This is merely a matter of procedural due process. The last Bill passed out of the House by 127 to 15 and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Madigan: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sevcik."

Sevcik: "Will the Sponsor yield to a few questions?"



Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Sevcik: "I understand by this Bill that a hearing will be held before an impartial hearing officer and that the hearing officer will be paid \$250 per day. Is that correct?"

Jaffe: "That is correct."

Sevcik: "And who will pay for this?"

Jaffe: "The State Board of Education."

Sevcik: "Has there been appropriation for this with the State Board of Education?"

Jaffe: "They have it in their budget, Mr. Sevcik and it's really a very small amount. I think it's probably less than 20 or \$30,000 because we don't have that many hearings in the State of Illinois."

Sevcik: "Well, you cannot, you cannot know at the present time how many hearings you will have."

Jaffe: "Well, we know what the hearings have been in the past and I can tell you based upon the hearings that we have had over the past number of years it doesn't amount to more than \$20,000."

Sevcik: "Well, you didn't have hearings in the past before an impartial hearing officer, did you?"

Jaffe: "We had hearings, but they weren't before an impartial hearing officer. They were before a different board so if you take them and you put those hearings before the impartial hearing officer for the same numbers would be the same amount."

Sevcik: "In the event that the hearing officer rules adversely against the person that was dismissed don't they have the option to go before their local school district board?"

Jaffe: "If the hearing officer rules against the board, then it goes according to the Administrative Review Act."

Sevcik: "And who pays for that?"

Jaffe: "The party who requests the hearing initially pays for the transcript, sir. So I think..."



Sevcik: "I'm not talking about the transcripts."

Jaffe: "What are you talking about?"

Sevcik: "To go before the board. Who stands the expense there?"

Jaffe: "What board?"

Sevcik: "The school board."

Jaffe: "There is no expense before the school board. No state expense, sir."

Sevcik: "Well, the Bill states that if a teacher disagrees with the decision of the hearing officer she may request a review before the local school board. In that event, the school board has to meet and somebody has to pay the expenses. I asked who pays the expenses."

Jaffe: "Hearing before a local board? There is no state expenses. That's paid by the local board."

Sevcik: "In other word, the expenses are paid by the local school board and by the State Board of Education. Is that correct?"

Jaffe: "Well, it depends upon what point of the hearing that you're at. You know, I thought I explained it to you. If you want to ask me specifically about what portion of the hearing we are at, I would be very happy to answer the specific question. But I think you are lumping them all together and getting them a little bit confused."

Sevcik: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak against this Bill?"

Madigan: "Proceed, Mr. Sevcik."

Sevcik: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask that you check into this Bill and see that any dismissed teacher, it will not cost them one dime to have a decision by a hearing officer from the State Board of Education. The hearing officer gets \$250 per day. This is before, besides going before the local school board. A dismissed teacher does not expend one dime of money into your local school district in tax money. The Sponsor mentioned that there weren't too



many hearings prior to this but now that you have an impartial hearing officer you can rest assured that any teacher that is dismissed will ask for a hearing because it does not cost one dime for the teacher. I ask that we vote against this Bill."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, members of the House, at first blush this sounds like a good idea to give that dismissed teacher an impartial hearing but during the line of questioning of Mr. Sevcik in which he asked very incisive questions, I think it's apparent that this is a bad Bill. First of all, it takes away the control from the local board and as the previous speaker pointed out, it does put the burden on the State Board of Education and in the case where a teacher wants to file for the transcript of the hearing, then at that point the local Board of Education has to stand all the costs of that transcript. Now if you recall, I tried to amend this Bill on Second Reading which would provide for a 50-50 split on the transcript cost where the aggrieved teacher would pay for the half the cost and the local Board of Education would pay the other half. I was unsuccessful in that attempt. It kept the Bill in bad shape for the reasons I have enumerated plus those enumerated by Mr. Sevcik. I would urge your 'no' vote to this Bill."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: "Will the Sponsor yield? Will the Sponsor..."

Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Hirschfeld: "Representative, can you tell me whether the State Board of Education is supporting this Bill?"

Madigan: "Mr. Jaffe?"

Jaffe: "Let me tell you that in the past years the State Board has supported this concept constantly. Under, you



know, under the time of Bakalis, under the time of Page and so on and so forth. Since Cronin has come in we have not really asked a question of him, but it has always been supported by the State Board."

Hirschfeld: "Mr. Speaker, may I briefly address the Bill?

Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there was a handout...uh...a week or so ago that listed a list of organizations that did not support the Bill and I don't know whether it's accurate. That's why I requested the question of Representative Jaffe but it was my understanding the State Board of Education does not support this Bill and those of us that have worked in education down here for a number of years have done everything we can to try and take care of a new State Board and get it on its feet and let it feel its way through the experiences it needs in order to understand the proper relationship not only of the various aspects of the Board itself, but of its dealings with teachers. And while I initially favored this Bill, I feel I am going to have to oppose the Bill the State Board of Education opposes. I think we should try and follow the dictates of the State Board as much as possible until they have some experience. They are opposed to the Bill. I think primarily they are opposed because they have no idea of how much it is going to cost if every teacher who is aggrieved goes through the entire hearing procedure and while there were only a few teachers who did this a year ago, if the new Bill becomes law it's possible that every teacher that becomes aggrieved can go before the State Board and then when they lose there, if they lose there, proceed through the court system under the Administrative Review Act and therefore, primarily because the State Board of Education does not support the Bill to my knowledge, I feel we should vote 'no' on this particular legislation."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr.



Terzich."

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

Madigan: "The question is, shall the main question now be put."

All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed, the 'ayes' have it and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe, to close the debate."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, there have been a lot of mud thrown in the water, I think, in the last couple of minutes because I don't think that the preceding people really understand this particular Bill. First of all, to the gentleman from Champaign, let me tell you that the State Board is not against this particular Bill. I told you that in response to my question. I told you that under Bakalis he was for it, under Page he was for it. Since Cronin has come in we have just merely not asked him. I am sure if we asked him he would probably be for it. Traditionally, the State Board has always been for it. Now, as to Mr. Sevcik saying that this will not cost the teachers one dime that is absolutely ridiculous. If you read the Bill you are going to find out that if a teacher wants the hearing, it's going to cost the teacher some money to have that particular hearing and that all the costs are not going to be borne by the local School Board. I think that's completely false. As to Representative Tuerk,, he says it's a great loss of control by the local School Board. That's absolutely false. The local School Board still has the power to hire and the power to fire. The hearing officer does not have that power. The only power the hearing officer has is to review the findings of the Board to make sure that they are in compliance with the law. As you know, there are certain grounds under which a teacher can be fired and they are all enumerated in the statutes. So let me say once again that we had two prior Bills, they all passed out of this House rather substantially. One was sponsored by Representative Gene Hoffman and the



other one was sponsored by me and they are very similar and they passed out of this House with more than 127 votes and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Madigan: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1371 be passed. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, to explain his vote."

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one of the interesting things about this Bill is that it only applies downstate, it doesn't apply to the city of Chicago and I did prepare an Amendment to apply it to Chicago but I was told that that would kill the Bill because the people in Chicago want no part. The leaders in Chicago want no part of this system. I don't understand that why it's good, if it's so good but I would point this out. Right now the decision on the question of whether a teacher is competent is made by a School Board, locally elected by the people. Under this proposal, that decision would be shifted probably to a lawyer, some lawyer appointed as a hearing officer out of Springfield and I think you do have to strain real hard and ask yourself, do you want the decisions made by your locally elected School Board or on the other hand, do you want the question of school teacher competence determined by lawyers. Now I am a lawyer and this House is filled with lawyers but I don't think we inherently know very much about teaching school. I think the California system is far preferable where you have a couple of school teachers on a panel, experienced school teachers who know something about teaching school. But to put it in the hands of lawyers, I think, is an abomination. I think all of you should weigh that very carefully as you consider your vote on this subject."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Madison, Mr. Lucco, to explain his vote."



Lucco: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wholeheartedly agree with Representative Deuster that it's very likely that lawyers know very little about schools. I would like to agree with him on that. Nowhere in this Bill does it say that in order to be a fair and impartial hearing officer must you be a lawyer. I believe that there are citizens in our community, in our universities, on all sorts of staffs that can be fair and impartial hearing officers without being lawyers. So I would just like to throw that in and urge your support of this Bill."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Stubblefield, to explain his vote."

Stubblefield: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think we have to deal in the area of fairness and every person who is discharged in my opinion is certainly entitled to due process. And I can't see how anyone could really object to a person going before an impartial hearing officer having his case presented by both sides. I would like to remind the Representatives of the Assembly that some of the previous speakers when we were debating collective bargaining for teachers suggested that arbitration was the right process. Now arbitration is simply a matter of an impartial arbitrator or hearing officer hearing a grievance. If that is a right procedure to avoid strikes, to avoid a confrontation and that is what the opponents of collective bargaining would want, then I think they have it in this statute. Certainly, a person who is agrieved must have some determinative process to determine whether or not they have been rightly or wrongly discharged. If they have no right to strike then they certainly must have the right to have their grievance reviewed before someone who is impartial and I would urge an 'aye' vote. It's in the area of fairness."



Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Palmer, to explain his vote."

Palmer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the.....all over the district that I represent...the people have hollered and stated that they want to maintain the local control over schools. I view this Bill as an erosion of that control as well as many other Bills that this Legislature has called upon to act. The Constitution as well as the Statutes in this State provide for a local board and that board is accountable to the people that it represents..it not...it is not only accountable in the employment practices but it should..certainly..should be accountable as to the termination of...the severance of those services. If we're goin' to stay down here as we're doing and fouling up that system, one day we're goin' to be in one whale of a mess in this State if we keep going the way that we're going. I'd like to say that I think that the people within the school districts are the people best to take care of these matters. They may go wrong on some occasions but by and large due process is provided there may be one or two exceptions...but on balance they run it and they run it good. I think this Bill should be defeated, I think that we should leave the control of the schools within those people whom we elect to do that chore.....Thank you."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Mulcahey, to explain his vote."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I agree with the last speaker to a point. But, unfortunately after spending 14 years in the classroom, and 12 of those 14 years in the athletic field....coaching, I have found out that often times boards of education don't take on that responsibility, the people of these particular areas don't particularly care what's going on at that school. I've seen time and time again one of the things that this Bill



addresses itself to,...where a coaching position had to be filled in the junior high school or the high school and in order to fill that coaching position I have seen the board of education release one, two or three non-tenure teachers in fourth grade, fifth grade, sixth grade ...whatever the case may be in order that they could bring in a coach. Now if this is fair...I don't understand how you could say that's possibly fair. People had no hearings, they had nothing to say, they were out on their ear. This is what sometimes we get with boards of education and the people of the district could care less. This is a good Bill. I ask for your support."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea, to explain his vote."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've had a lot of mail and the people in my District...and I've listened to the debate and I think that this is a good Bill...and should pass."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijeovich, to explain his vote."

Matijeovich: "No, Mr. Speaker, I want to...Mr. Speaker...Mr. Speaker...Mr. Speaker...I don't rise for that purpose... I don't mind the Members lobbying against no-fault but we've got a couple Gentlemen over there...who I want off the floor."

Madigan: "Would the Sergeant-at-Arms remove all unauthorized personnel from the floor?"

Matijeovich: "There in the blue suit."

Madigan: "The Gentleman in the blue suit..."

Matijeovich: "Get off the floor..."

Madigan: "Mr. Pierce..."

Matijeovich: "The fellow over there."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from...yea...
...Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
he Clerk will take the record. On this question there
are 111 'ayes', 28 'nos', 4 voting 'present', Senate Bill



having received...Senate Bill 1371 having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On... on the order of Senate Bills, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 1384."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 1384, a Bill for an Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, Third Reading of the Bill."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Stubblefield."

Stubblefield: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill that was sponsored in the Senate by our former colleague, Senator Lemke. As amended to comply with the legislation that we passed out of the House last week. This Bill simply provides that in cases of loss by amputation of an arm, leg, hand or foot or in the case of the loss of an eye by enucleation that the compensation payable for the appropriate number of weeks will be at the maximum benefit as if the person were earning the maximum wage. I would urge a 'yes' vote on this Bill. We're talking only about the few instances where we have an amputee and they are certainly entitled to the maximum pay."

Madigan: "Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1384 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 132 'ayes', 4 'nos', 5 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1384 having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of Senate Bills, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 1392."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 1392, an Act to amend Section 1, of an Act ..."

Madigan: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Fred Selcke: "...Third Reading of the Bill."



Hart: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1392 extends the benefits of the...ah...Act providing for the one year's pay for disability arising out of the course of employment for members of the Department of Correction and extends the benefit to those people who work in the prisons and other correctional institutions who are not actually Department of Correction officers. Such as cooks and other personnel. We've had some of them that were injured in riotsthis Bill is supported by ah....the....State Employees Association....I think it is a good Bill and should pass and I would appreciate the support of the House."

Madigan: "Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, shall Senate Bill 1392 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 134 'ayes', 2 'nos' 3 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1392, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of Senate Bills, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 1465."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 1465, an Act to create the Illinois Governmental Service Information Service, Third Reading of the Bill."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McPartlin."

McPartlin: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask....ah...leave of the House to put 1465 on the Fall Calendar, on the order of Third Reading."

Madigan: "Is there leave? Leave having been granted, Senate Bill 1465 shall be placed on the Fall Calendar. On the order of Senate Bills, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 555."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill...Senate Bill 555,...Second Reading"



A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Public Aid, Second Reading of the Bill."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Davis. Would Mr. DeWeiss let Mr. Davis address this Bill, 555, the appropriation for the Department of Public Aid?"

Fred Selcke: "Let's see, four Committee Amendments, ... Committee Amendment #1, amend Senate Bill 555, on page 1 by deleting all lines 14 through 32 and so forth."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think I should give you just a synopsis before I explain the Amendment. The...ah...the original Bill called for an appropriation of \$1,821,696,700 to the Department of Public Aid for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1975. Now, Amendment #1 reduced the total appropriation by... eight million...Senate Amendment #1 by \$8,823,314, this represented a 6.2 percent cut. In other words...ah...it represented about \$280,000 over the 6 percent as was requested by our Governor, about \$280,000 over...Ah...I move the adoption of Amendment #1, unless you want further explanation?"

Madigan: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 555, all those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed ...the 'ayes' have it and Amendment #1 is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Fred Selcke: "Committee Amendment #2 was tabled in Committee. Committee Amendment #3, amends Senate Bill 555, on page 2, by deleting lines 31 and so forth."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #3 is the FEPC Amendment which we have placed on the appropriations Bills. I move for the adoption of Amendment #3."

Madigan: "The question is, shall Amendment #3, to Senate Bill



555 be adopted? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed....the 'ayes' have it, Amendment #3 is adopted. Is there further Amendments?"

Fred Selcke: "Committee Amendment #4, amends Senate Bill 555 as amended on page 2, line 15 and so forth."

Davis: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, would the distinguished Gentleman, Mr. Ryan...this is his Amendment, would you care to explain it, Sir?...Amendment #3....er....4...I meant Amendment #4. Pardon me. Amended the School Code...yes, thank you."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Amendment #4 breaks out the funds for the Adult Ed....Basic Education and Training Program, that's operated in conjunction with the Office of Education.... and there is no dollar change here and the monies are earmarked to the Adult Education and Training Program and I would move for the adoption of Amendment #4."

Madigan: "Is there any further discussion? Does the Gentleman from Hyde Park seek recognition? Does the Gentleman from Oak Park seek recognition?...Mr. Downs....do you seek recognition?"

Downs: "Yes, will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Downs: "Was this Amendment agreed to by the Department of Public Aid?"

Davis: "Well, let me say this, the Department of Public Aid and the Department of...the Superintendent of Public Instruction his representative....have discussed this Amendment and this Amendment was proposed in the Committee and adopted. Now, the Depart...the...the...the Department is not opposing the Amendment now I....they...they...they have ...they have...."

Madigan: "You are saying the Department has no objection to this Amendment?"



Davis: "Not now."

Madigan: "The question is shall Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 555 be adopted? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye ...opposed...the 'ayes' have and Amendment #4 is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #5, Shea. Amends Senate Bill 555, as amended by deleting the first paragraph, Section 2, and so forth."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is an attempt to put back in the Public Aid budget the work training program or I....a....program that was utilized in the Cook County Department of Public Aid to train people so that they can go out and find jobs....and I would move for the adoption of the Amendment and try to answer any questions."

Madigan: "Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is...the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Representative Shea, I had several people here talking about this Amendment and I did not hear the explanation, would you run it by me again, please?"

Shea: "This attempts to put back in this budget an item that I was informed was being deleted by the Department of Public Aid. Several years ago when Raymond Hilliard was the Director of the Department of Public Aid in Cook County, he started a program that you might call rehabilitation or retraining trying to teach people either how to become usefully occupieder....usefully employed...or at least how to get the skills to go out and gain...gainful employment. My understanding was that this year the Department thought to drop that program...I think it would be absolutely foolish and I am seeking to put it back in."

Ryan: "Representative Shea, this sounds like it ties in with



my Amendment #4 that just put the funds back in for that program."

Shea: "Well, all I care about is the program...if it's your Amendment or mine... Did your Amendment take care of it?"

Ryan: "Well, I'm still not sure what your Amendment does... My...I had an Amendment...Amendment #4 put the funds there."

Shea: "I'll tell you what, Gene Barnes helped me draft the Amendment. Gene, are they inconsistent...consistent or what?"

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. No, ah...Representative Ryan, you're talking about two different things, your Amendment #4 was for adult education and child care grants in aid. That's a different line completely. What Representative Shea is addressing 'hissself' to is the welfare rehabilitation program. It's two different functions totally. This function had...ah...in the current fiscal year, I believe, rested in the Department of Labor and this year the Department of Labor was transferring that function into the Department of Public Aid but no appropriation has been specified in the Department of Public Aid Budget and that's what this Amendment #5 will do."

Ryan: "Representative Barnes, I wonder if you could tell me... ah...about the lease that's involved here? Is there a building involved in this, with a lease?"

Barnes: "A what?"

Ryan: "A lease."

Barnes: "A what?....A lease?"

Ryan: "A lease...a lease for a building."

Barnes: "No, there is no building involved...ah...in here for a lease. You're talking about a function that was related to the Department of Labor and it has no direct correlation with this program whatsoever. It's a contract that's involved with the Department of Labor and some rental



agency. It has nothing to do with the Department of Public Aid."

Ryan: "I see the...then this building that's been vacated by the Department of Labor will not be a part of this ...of this program...is that right?"

Barnes: "bsolutely not. It has nothing to do with the Department of Public Aid."

Ryan: "Thank you very much."

Shea: "I would move for the adoption of the Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Madigan: "There being no further discussion...for what purpose does the Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson rise?"

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

Madigan: "The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Anderson: "Well, we questioned the Director of the Department of Labor on that particular building and he said...'it's not my budget'...so then when the next director comes in he says...'it's not my budget either', but it's for this rehabilitation service. Now, aren't they going to have a building for this...or what...Mr. Sponsor?"

Barnes: "My understanding both of them said it is not their building, so they will not have a building for it."

Anderson: "Well, then, how is the program going to operate?"

Barnes: "Neither one of them is responsible for it so it will not operate."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff."

Huff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I think I can clear up the Department of Labor question about the building. The Department of Labor moved down...ah...to 910 South Michigan, which is the old Standard Oil Building, if you will check the General Services you will see that they had already signed the lease to make that move back in September. The Department of Labor and the...ah...Bureau of Employment Security are the two agencies that are now



occupying that building. The old Standard Oil Building, 910 South Michigan."

Anderson: "But, nevertheless, this building, there was a two lease ... a two year lease signed in March for a...\$500,000. If it's not going to be occupied, what's going to happen to that \$500,000 worth of lease that they signed."

Huff: "Mr. Speaker, let me yield to ... ah... my seatmate here, Mr. Barnes, because he's on the Appropriations Committee and he knows exactly what has happened... and... if that is acceptable to the Gentleman, he'll answer the..."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "What we did here... and... and... really the obvious answer to the question is that you've intertwined two appropriations in two different departments. The lease that you are talking about is the lease that involves... in the Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security. It has absolutely nothing to do with the Department of Public Aid whatsoever. The Department of Labor as I explained before deleted this function from their administrative charge with this current fiscal year. Now, anything relating to any leases or any outstanding obligations as it relates to the Department of Labor would have to be addressed to the Department of Labor. What we're doing here in the Department of Public Aid is picking up that function, but it has absolutely nothing to do with any outstanding contracts as it relates to the Department of Labor."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I asked the Director specifically about that lease and he said he wasn't about to authorize any funds out of his department to pay for any leasing from any other agency. And, ah... there are none of those funds here."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr.



Shea."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, might I ask...this of my colleagues? I would like to get this Amendment on and move this Bill to Third Reading so we could then go ahead and try to get to the Consideration Postponed Bills tonight. I assure you I have only one purpose in putting this on, I was a caseworker for the Department of Public Aid some years ago and I worked very closely with Raymond Hilliard who started this program, I happen to think it is an excellent program, it did train many people to get out and get into the employment market. That is all I want to do with this, if you would allow me to get this on, move this Bill to Third Reading, I would happy....be happy to sit down and if tomorrow I am wrong in any way in this I will ask Mr. Davis to bring the Bill back and I will personally take the Amendment off."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, in support of our Majority Leader, let me say this, that this Amendment adds no new general revenue, and it reserves a 6.2 percent reduction...that the Senate made in this Bill...and recommended this...this....ah... this Amendment was recommended by our House Appropriations Number II Committee. It adds no new revenue."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the Majority Leader on this particular Amendment, I happen to know ...of my own knowledge that this agency which has been phased out has been very successful in placing people and enabling them to get off the public assistance rolls. I think that it's unique in a sense that is one of a few agencies that's been successful in this and I think for that reason ...ah we ought to put it on and if the Majority Leader is willing to sit down tomorrow and discuss it I think he ought to be taken at his word."

Madigan: "The question is, shall Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 555 be adopted? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye',



opposed. The 'ayes' have it and Amendment #5 is adopted.
Are there further Amendments?"

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #6, Skinner, amends Senate Bill 555
by deleting all of Section II and so forth."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from McHenry,
Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, when^{we}were debating Amendments on
the Department of the Military and Navy and the
Department of Civil Defense of the Civil Defense Agency
members on the other side or supporters of the Public
Aid budget didn't seem to think that butter was more
important than guns. What this Amendment does very
simply is cut 6% from each line item of the Public
Aid Budget excluding EDP and food stamps which the
Senate has already reduced. It really probably should
be 12% because that is the percent of cases reviewed
by HEW which were found to be ineligible. Ineligible,
12%. That's right, almost 13% of those on AFDC in
Illinois should not be there according to the Federal
Health, Education and Welfare Department. You don't
believe it? Well, take a look at page 31 of this
report I am holding in my hand entitled Quality Control
and AFDC Findings January through June, 1974 which was
issued in March, 1975. But how could that be? Isn't
Governor Walker sweeping the welfare cheaters off the
public dole? The answer is a blunt no. It's worse
now than it was during Walker's first term in office
when he probably could claim that he hadn't had time
to turn the corner on welfare cheaters. That's right.
There were more welfare cheaters on the welfare rolls
in 1974 than there were from April to September in 1973.
During Walker's first term in office there were only
11.7% on the dole while the latest figures say 12.97%
are ineligible. Gentlemen, if you want guns, you may
have them. We'll take the butter away."

Madigan: "The question is, shall Amendment #6 to Senate Bill



555 be adopted? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed. In the opinion of the Chair, we will have a Roll Call. All those in favor of the adoption of Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 555 will signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. The Clerk will take the record. And the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann to explain his vote."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I was waiting for this demagoguery to surface and now it has. Now the gentleman from McHenry has engaged in one of the favorite pastimes of calling ineligibility cheating. Everybody in this House that knows anything about public assistance knows that ineligibility can be the result or the fault of the Department. It can be the result of a delayed action on the part of a recipient who has received no notice of a change of status and it's pure demagoguery to call ineligibility cheating. They are two different things and the gentleman knows it and if he doesn't know it he ought to know it. This is a bad Amendment and it should be beaten soundly."

Madigan: "The question is, shall Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 555 be adopted and the Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 21 'ayes', 89 'nos', 4 voting 'present' and the Amendment is lost. Are there further Amendments? Mr. Clerk, Third Reading. On the order of Senate Bills Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1500. The Clerk will read the Bill for the second time."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 1500, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code, Second Reading of the Bill. You got any Amendments?"

Madigan: "The Bill having been read a second time will be left on the order of Second Reading but the record will show that the Bill has been read a second time today on Thursday, June 26, 1975. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lundy. Mr. Lundy with a motion."



The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea.
Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Can we have some order, sir? Mr. Speaker, I understand that there are several Bills still on the order of postponed consideration that we are attempting, Mr. Speaker, there are some people, I can't hear myself think with their shouting."

Madigan: "Mr. Shea, I will attempt to get order in the chamber for you, Mr. Shea. I request all members to direct their attention to Mr. Shea who has a very important motion. Proceed, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I understand you are now going to the order of consideration postponed and that we have disposed of all of our business on Senate Bills Second Reading and Senate Bills Third Reading. I would now move that during the consideration of all Bills on the order of consideration postponed on June 26, 1975 that debate shall be limited to one two minute, one two minute presentation by the Sponsor and one two minute presentation by any opponent that the temporary rule 58 be suspended to prevent explanation of votes except by the Sponsors."

Madigan: "The motion of Mr. Shea is that the rule shall be suspended to provide that only the Sponsor of the Bill will explain the Bill and that only the Sponsor of the Bill will explain his vote. And on that motion all in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed. The 'ayes' have it. On the order of consideration postponed appears Senate Bill 210. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, thank you for calling this Bill at an such an auspicious moment in the history of the House. I am very happy to have this Bill back on Third Reading for consideration. Senate Bill 210 is a Bill that is a companion Bill sort of to Senate Bill 1036 that we heard earlier this evening. Senate Bill 210 will provide



Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that a deputy registrar may register persons at their home. This is a convenience to the people, to the voters of the State of Illinois so that they may be registered in the most convenient manner. Many people who work all day cannot get to the courthouse during the daytime and people who on weekends is the only time they are home and the courthouse is closed. This will give the deputy registrars the opportunity to be the most convenient possible to those persons who need to register so that every person can have the possibility of participating in this great participatory democracy that we have in the State of Illinois. It does not apply in the county of Cook because the Senate members from the county of Cook said that there are so many times that the county is criticized they did not wish to have any opportunity for anyone to say that anything was wrong in registration in that county but it applies to the other 101 counties in the State and I move for passage of Senate Bill 210 for the convenience of the voting public of the State of Illinois."

Madigan: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 210 be passed. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', all 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 are 91 'ayes', 59 'nos', no voting 'present' and on this question Senate Bill 210 having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of consideration postponed appears Senate Bill 391. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 210 shall be taken out of the record and the Roll Call shall be dumped and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Grundy, Mr. Washburn. Mr. Washburn."

Washburn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If we are going to get anything done at all, we have got to go by the rule book, to a degree at



least which hasn't been exhibited here. Now, I suggest we back up, scratch the record for the last five minutes, back up to Representative Shea's motion which was, I believe, to limit the explanation by the Sponsor of the Bill only. Was that correct, Representative Shea?"

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Might I read the motion again if I could have some quiet, please. I move that during the consideration of all Bills on the order of consideration postponed on June 26, 1975 one, that debate shall be limited to one two minute presentation by the Sponsor and one two minute presentation by an opponent. Too, the temporary rule 58B be suspended to prevent explanation of votes except by the Sponsor. Now, the reason I did, this, Mr. Minority Leader was that there are a number of Bills on consideration postponed. We have approximately 35 minutes to hear them. These Bills have been fully debated. What we are attempting to do here, sir, is to let each and every member at least have an opportunity to have his Bills called on Third Reading one more time."

Madigan: "Mr. Washburn will speak at this time and would everyone on the Republican side please give them his attention. They've been orderly for several minutes. Mr. Washburn."

Washburn: "Thank you."

Madigan: "Mr. Washburn, let's give the gentleman our attention."

Washburn: "Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. I know we've got 15 Bills that are here that I am sure the Sponsors want to be heard in the next 35 minutes. They have already been heard once and have been voted down. I suspect that most of them would be of a controversial nature. However, we are going back to a similar situation that we had on May 23 only a little different approach and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker and Mr. Minority Leader, that



you start at the top of the list and call the first Bill and follow the usual procedure. It might well be for you to suggest to the Sponsors of these Bills that they could be placed some way, maybe on the Fall Calendar on postponed consideration and perhaps they would be better off to do that and have them called at that time than they would be tonight. But in any event, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that you obey by the rules of the House, follow the usual procedure and go as far as we can and let everyone be heard and you did take the Bill out of the record that was slammed through, 210, that's been scratched from the record?"

Madigan: "Mr. Washburn, 210 has been taken out of the record."

Washburn: "All right."

Madigan: "It would appear on the order of consideration postponed."

Washburn: "Yeah, all right, it hasn't been heard yet tonight, in other words? All right, so it's my suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that we follow the usual course, suggest to some of the Sponsors that the Bills might be put on postponed consideration for the Fall and proceed as far as we can in an orderly, deliberate fashion. Thank you."

Madigan: "And at this time the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kornowicz, on Senate Bill 296. Mr. Kornowicz is going to move to put that Bill on the Fall Calendar. Mr. Washburn, Mr. Kornowicz would like to put a Bill on the Fall Calendar. Senate Bill 296."

Washburn: "I think that that's a proper move on Mr. Kornowicz's part and I think it's a smart, wise move at this time."

Madigan: "With leave of the House we will proceed pursuant to the suggestion of the Minority Leader, Mr. Washburn. We will proceed down the order of consideration postponed to the first Bill to ask if the Sponsor of that Bill would be willing to place the Bill on the Fall Calendar. Is that, Mr. Washburn, the Chair recognizes Mr. Washburn. Mr. Washburn."



Washburn: "I think that's a fair approach to this. If they want to place it on the Fall Calendar, start at the top and hear the Bill. If he wishes to place it on the Fall Calendar I am sure he could have leave to do so and go on to the next Bill and see what the next man wants to do. That will be fine." But follow the usual procedures."

Madigan: "On that order of business the first Bill will be Senate Bill 210 and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword. Mr. Tipsword, pursuant to agreement, Mr. Tipsword, we are asking you if you would be willing to place the Bill on the Fall Calendar."

Tipsword: "No sir, the Bill was declared passed."

Madigan: "Regretfully, Mr. Tipsword, that favorable ruling was removed from the record and I say regretfully."

Tipsword: "How so, sir? That was not with the leave of the House. I heard no leave asked. I happened to be in the restroom at the time when I couldn't even object."

Madigan: "I didn't hear for any objection, either. So, Mr. Tipsword, is it your pleasure to proceed with the Bill?"

Tipsword: "I had asked earlier this evening to have the Bill called."

Madigan: "Fine. The next Bill is Senate Bill 349."

Tipsword: "What are you going to do with it, Mr. Speaker?"

Madigan: "We are going to survey the order of consideration postponed in an attempt to find Bills to go on to the Fall Calendar and then start at the top again."

Tipsword: "Well, are we going to have any time left?"

Madigan: "We hope so. And the next Bill would be Senate Bill, and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Grundy, Mr. Washburn."

Washburn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now I assume that Senate Bill 163 and Senate Bill 207 that were bypassed are exempt."

Madigan: "That was my understanding that the line drawn, I don't know about 207 though, Mr. Parliamentarian, is



that exempt?"

Washburn: "Well, you didn't call it and the first one on my list is Senate Bill 163 which apparently is exempt. And the next one is Senate Bill 207, right?"

Madigan: "It's not exempt and it will be called. We will ask Mr. Daniels at this time relative to Senate Bill 207."

Washburn: "Thank you."

Madigan: "If he would be willing to place the Bill on the Fall Calendar. Mr. Daniels, you would like a hearing. The next Bill would be Senate Bill 349. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich. Mr. Terzich, would you be willing to place this Bill on the Fall Calendar? Mr. Terzich declines. Do you decline relative to Senate Bill 352? On Senate Bill 391 the Chair recognizes the gentleman from McLean, Mr. Deavers. Mr. Deavers wants a hearing. On 392, Beaupre. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am informed by the legal counsel of the Department of Transportation that the statutory change in Senate Bill 392 must be certified to the Federal Highway Administrator by July 9 or we will lose all federal funds involving highway programs and I want it heard tonight."

Madigan: "Senate Bill 530, Mr. Ebbesen, do you wish a hearing? Senate Bill 543, Mr. McClain, Mr. McClain, hoping to be a leader in this movement, requests that Senate Bill 543 be placed on the Fall Calendar. Is there leave? Leave having been granted, Senate Bill 543 shall be placed on the Fall Calendar. Senate Bill 646, Mr. Giglio. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Giglio."

Giglio: "Hear the Bill."

Madigan: "Mr. Giglio wishes a hearing. Senate Bill 691."



The gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd, I believe you wished a hearing."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have resolved a difference in this Bill and I am sure that it won't take much time and I would like a hearing."

Madigan: "Senate Bill 779, Mr. Berman requests the Fall Calendar. Is there leave? Senate Bill 779 shall be placed on the Fall Calendar. Senate Bill 863, Mr. McClain. Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, it's an agreed Bill now, but I will ask to put, be placed on the Fall Calendar."

Madigan: "Is there leave? Leave being granted, Senate Bill 863 shall be placed on the Fall Calendar. Senate Bill 935, Mr. Marovitz. Mr. Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Mr. Speaker, I would like a hearing on the Bill. It had 85 votes last time."

Madigan: "Senate Bill 1109, Senate Bill 1109, Mr. McPartlin. Recognize Mr. McPartlin."

McPartlin: "Yes, I would like to have leave to have 1109 put on the Fall Calendar."

Madigan: "Is there leave? Leave being granted Senate Bill 1109 shall be placed on the Fall Calendar. Senate Bill 1260, Mr. Kozubowski. The Chair recognizes Mr. Kozubowski."

Kozubowski: "Leave for the Fall Calendar, Mr. Chairman."

Madigan: "Is there leave? Leave being granted, Senate Bill 1260 shall be placed on the Fall Calendar. And the remaining Bills are either appropriation Bills or Committee Bills which are exempt from this deadline. Mr. Washburn, I would like to recognize the members who wish to request the Fall Calendar on Bills and on the order of motions appears Senate Bill 1973 and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like leave of the House to place this Bill on the Fall Calendar."



Madigan: "Is there leave? Leave being granted, Senate Bill 193 shall be placed on the Fall Calendar. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kornowicz relative to Senate Bill 296."

Kornowicz: "Put it on the Fall Calendar."

Madigan: "Mr. Kornowicz, Mr. Kornowicz requests that Senate Bill 296 be placed on the Fall Calendar. Is there leave? Leave being granted Senate Bill 296 shall be placed on the Fall Calendar. One more, one more, two more. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor. Mr. Taylor."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I would like leave of the House to have Senate Bill 550, 551 and 552 placed on the Fall Calendar."

Madigan: "Is there leave? Leave having been granted Senate Bill 550, 551 and 552 shall be placed on the Fall Calendar. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker, I would like leave to have House Bill 2056 put on the Fall Calendar."

Madigan: "Is there leave? Leave being granted, on what order of business is that Bill, Mr. McAuliffe?"

McAuliffe: "Consideration postponed."

Madigan: "On the order of consideration postponed, House Bill 2056 having received leave will be placed on the Fall Calendar. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. VonBoeckman."

VonBoeckman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to have House Bill 3054 placed on the Fall Calendar."

Madigan: "On which order of business does that appear, Mr..."

VonBoeckman: "That's under motions."

Madigan: "On the order of motions Mr. VonBoeckman has requested that House Bill 3054 be placed on, is there leave? Leave being granted House Bill 3054 shall be placed on the Fall Calendar. And also on the order of motions, Mr.,



Mr. Madigan requests that House Bill 1484, it's not on motions, Senate Bills Second Reading, Senate Bill 1484 shall be placed on the Fall Calendar. Is there leave? Leave being granted that Bill should be placed on the Fall Calendar. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Wasn't that passed earlier today?"

Madigan: "No, it wasn't, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Which one was it, 1484 and 1485?"

Madigan: "No, none of those Bills were passed today. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask leave of the House to place Senate Bill 657 on Fall Calendar."

Madigan: "What order of business is that on, Mr. Beaupre?"

Beaupre: "Motions, Mr. Speaker."

Madigan: "On the order of motions, Mr. Beaupre has requested that Senate Bill 657 be placed on the Fall Calendar. Is there leave? Leave having been granted Senate Bill 657 shall be placed on the Fall Calendar. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Will, Mr. VanDuyne."

VanDuyne: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the same thing happen to House Bill 3053 under consideration postponed."

Madigan: "On which order of business? On consideration postponed? Mr. VanDuyne requests that House Bill 3053 be placed on the Fall Calendar. Is there leave? Leave being granted House Bill 3053 shall be placed on the Fall Calendar. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. VonBoeckman. VonBoeckman. On the order of Second Reading, Mr. VonBoeckman?"

VonBoeckman: "Correct, Mr. Speaker. I would like to correct the calendar. It's in error. It says that the, it is a mobile home tax Bill and it's Mr. Berning's Bill but the Bill is actually Senator Summers' Bill and it puts a ceiling on special districts on what the bidding requirement is for purchases of \$2500."



Madigan: "What's the number of the Bill, Mr. VonBoeckman?"

VonBoeckman: "1156."

Madigan: "1156? The gentleman has requested leave that, is that a Senate Bill?"

VonBoeckman: "No, no, I don't want to put it on the Fall Calendar, I think it's in order to go. It's not a controversial issue and I would like to move it on, Mr. Speaker. I will put it on the Fall Calendar."

Madigan: "Well, well, this is an error on the part of the Speaker. We felt that we had covered all Bills on the order of Senate Bills Second Reading which needed to be moved to Third Reading today and the Chair, Mr. Grotberg, do you have objection to that? The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Mr. Speaker, I am trying to be very helpful. I filed a motion and if you would recognize it for purpose of that motion it simply puts them all on the Fall Calendar."

Madigan: "Could we dispose of this one matter?"

Grotberg: "Fine. I will leave it on file at the appropriate time, Mr. Speaker, if we run out of time..."

Madigan: "Thank you. On the order of Senate Bills Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1156."

Fred Selcke: "Senate Bill 1156, an Act in relation to competitive bidding requirements for special districts."

Madigan: "Are there any Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Fred Selcke: "Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Madigan: "Are there any Amendments from the floor? The Bill shall be placed on the order of Third Reading. Is there anyone else who seeks recognition? The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Senate Bill 1135, Mr. Speaker. I would like to have it heard if I can."

Madigan: "That's on consideration postponed?"

Caldwell: "Yes."



Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Hirschfeld."

Hirschfeld: " Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that HJRC 6 and 30 sponsored by Rep. Darrow and myself will automatically go over as exempt."

Madigan: " Well, they're exempt from the rule which states that today is the last day for the consideration of Senate Bills in the House. They're exempt from that rule, they're Resolutions."

Hirschfeld: " I'll wait until the last day of the session." Thank you."

Madigan: " And the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. McAuliffe. Mr. McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: " Mr. Speaker, I move that Senate Bill 244 which is on the order of motions be put on the Fall Calendar."

Madigan: "Mr. McAuliffe requests leave that Senate Bill 244 be placed on the Fall Calendar. Is there leave? Leave being granted Senate Bill 244 shall be placed on the Fall Calendar. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines."

Gaines: " I'd like to make a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chair."

Madigan: " State your inquiry, Mr. Gaines."

Gaines: " Is it not a rule of this House that when a Member's name is mentioned he has a right to respond?"

Madigan: " I'm not sure of the rule, Mr. Gaines."

Gaines: "I'd like that rule from the parliamentarian. Is that, or is that not the rule of this House?"

Madigan: " While the parliamentarian research the rules to provide an answer for Mr. Gaines pursuing the..ah.. pursuance of this suggestion of the Minority Leader we will now proceed down the order of consideration postponed and the first Bill on that order shall be Senate Bill 207..and..ah..Mr. Washburn could we by agreement provide that Mr. Daniels will speak for two minutes and opponent would speak for two minutes and then we would take the Roll Call? The Chair recognizes Mr. Washburn."



Washburn: "I think it would be, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House, I think it would be rather difficult to determine who the opponent would be on some of these Bills ..I..ah..see no reason you we couldn't cut the debate down but let everybody be heard to a , for a certain period of time, I'm certain the House would go along with that."

Madigan: " In light of Mr. Washburn's suggestion the Chair recognizes the gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels on Senate Bill 207, Mr. Daniels. Mr. Daniels from DuPage."

Daniels: " Yes..ah..Ladies and Gentlemen of the House I'll attempt to be as brief as possible and give consideration to the other people who have their Bills on this order of business. I have the dubious honor of being the first one to be heard on consideration postponed, but, to .. very, very briefly, I'd like to point out to you very pure and simple that this Bill provides for the payment of the members of the General Assembly. And, what it does very simply, very clearly, is it provides that you may take your salary monthly or yearly at your option. You cannot take your salary for two years at once. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would just like to comment briefly that I think that this is a very important piece of legislation, it has passed the Senate and come over to the House. I think it's something that we have to deal with at the present time, we have to be aware of the fact that out of the members of our district the constituents that we serve, that this is a very important concern to them. And it stated in the newspaper by one of our learned Representatives, he said of all the questions that he's asked, possibly two stand out more than any one else. One is a member and method of payment, and two are the official license plates. While I submit to you Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that we have an opportunity to deal with one of those very important issues. As far as the tax problems that were raised earlier I've



checked with the Comptroller's Office and he assures me that one, that no longer would we have a problem with the Internal Revenue as far as the constructive receipt doctrine if this Bill were to be passed and two that the State problems would be no problem in this Bill. Be happy to answer any questions and I solicit your 'aye' vote."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: " Yes, I'd like to ask the Sponsor with reference to a question."

Madigan: " The Sponsor indicates that he will yield."

Yourell: "How many letters of inquiry relative to this legislation have you received from your district, Sir?"

Daniels: " Are you referring to written letters of inquiry?"

Yourell: " That's right."

Daniels: " I have received no written letters of inquiry."

Yourell: " Thank you."

Madigan: " Is there any further discussion? The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman. "

Schuneman: " Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I too, am going to be very brief. I rise in support of this measure. I think if there is one thing that the Legislature is criticized most often for, it's the special privilege that we have of receiving our pay in a manner different from most people who are constituents of ours. I feel that if we were paying public school teachers, for example, for an entire years work, at the beginning of their year, we would hear a great cry of anguish from this system, from this House, and I submit to you that for those of us who might like to receive our pay on a monthly basis , that this Bill would merely make it permissive for us to request that and that this is the right thing to do. It would save the State something like \$130,000 a year if we would take our salaries annually rather than on an annual basis. I would encourage an 'aye' vote."



Madigan: " The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Jones."

Jones: " Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the question was raised whether anybody received inquiries or letters of protest about the present system of the Legislators receiving their pay, and I testify to you that we receive hundreds of petitions here in Springfield and letters protesting that procedure, because, they say, well, no other state employee can do this, why are you so special? And, in view of that, I introduced House Bill 1915 to do this very thing because the Comptroller said that I could not receive my pay by the month upon request. It had the Legislation to do that. This is only permissive, it doesn't mandate it and I solicit your support."

Madigan: "Any further discussion? Being no further discussion the question is shall Senate Bill 207 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'no'. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster to explain his vote."

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I was really arising to ask a question of the Sponsor because of the reason this got on consideration postponed is I recall is that Rep. Fleck, or somebody had a question involving a technical matter relating to what the tax consequences of this are, perhaps Rep. Fleck or the Sponsor can explain how that was resolved or what the answer to that question was."

Madigan: " Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 117 'ayes', 10 'no's', 4 voting 'present.' Senate Bill 207 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of consideration postponed appears Senate Bill 210. On the Bill 210, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: " Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, Senate Bill 210



you've heard before. Its a Bill that provides a Deputy Registrar, it may register people in their homes, it applies only to 101 downstate counties, at the request of the Senators from Cook County, I move for the adoption of Senate Bill 210. This is for the purpose of providing convenience to voters throughout the State."

Madigan: " Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: " Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to oppose this Bill and I think for a very good reason. Now, if we permit registration in the home, then those people who live in the home where they have a precinct committeeman or a registrar, who is vigorous and wants to get a lot of people registered, are going to be in a better position to be registered than someone who lives someplace where they do not have someone vigorously going around trying to get registrations. So I submit to you Mr. Speaker, that this is unequal treatment. Its unequal, also, because the people in Cook County don't have this opportunity at all. They will not have registrars, going door to door, to register them. So, it is unequal from two standpoints and I believe for the latter one unconstitutional. Now, its no difficulty at all, Mr. Speaker, for people to go out of their homes and go to a place where it is advertised that they will have precinct or polling registration. They can go to their township clerk's office, they can go to the county seat, they can go to any number of places where they have registration and that should not be too difficult to do to exercise their privilege and right to vote. So I submit to you Mr. Speaker, that this is not a good Bill, its a bad Bill....I see there's straws up there..what do they mean Tom? This is a bad Bill and I would urge you to vote 'no'.

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Grundy, Mr. Washburn."



Washburn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We passed the Bill earlier tonight I believe it was..ah..regarding registration of voters. And it was a terrible Bill...should have never passed this House in my judgement and the judgement of a lot of other people. And certainly this one isn't any better. We can go back, we can register anybody..anywhere we want, apparently,and ..ah..I certainly don't think that's the procedure that should be followed, I recall one Member on the other side of the aisle on the other Bill said that by-golly people should be willing to make at least a token effort to become registered to vote because its a real privilege in our country. And I would certainly suggest that Senate Bill 210 be soundly defeated. Thank you."

Madigan: " There be no further discussion, the question is shall Senate Bill 210 pass? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye',all those opposed by voting 'no'. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow to explain his vote."

Darrow: " I would merely say that downstate Democrats, in particular, need this Bill..I believe in this last campaign I went out and attempted to register voters.. and as a result most of them voted for Ben Polk, I think. But, needless to say, we need it downstate, and I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Madigan: " Have all voted who wish? The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh.."

Walsh: " Well, Mr. Speaker, I see that this Bill has 91 votes, I don't think there are 91 'aye' votes present in the House and I would respectfully request a verification, unless those people have pushed other peoples buttons, ah.. take them off and get that down to under 89."

Madigan: " Would everyone please change those votes for Mr. Walsh? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there



are 89 'ayes', 64 'no's', 2 voting 'present', and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: " Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request a verification. I did it respectfully."

Madigan: " For what purpose does the gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword arise?"

Tipsword: " I ask for a poll of the absentees."

Madigan: " The Clerk will pull the absentees."

Fred Selke: " Ebbesen, Friedland, Geo-Karis, Greiman, Jaffe, Katz, Klosak, Lauer, Leverenz, Lundy, Madison, Mann, McAvoy, Meyer, Randolph,Rayson, Rose, Schneider, Sevcik.."

Madigan: " The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: " Matter of inquiry, Mr. Speaker. If we begin a verification before 12 o'clock and its verified after 12 o'clock, that will be passed then after 12 o'clock.... is that right?...and that it would not in any event..ah.. be..ah..be able to be passed from what I can see."

Madigan: "Ah, Mr. Greiman, could I suggest that we proceed with the poll of the absentees and I'll call for the Parliamentarian to answer your question?..and the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: " Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker, I suggest the Bill has already passed constitutionally."

Madigan: " Proceed with the poll of the absentees and the Parliamentarian...."

Fred Selke: " Rose, Rose, Schneider, Sevcik, Sharp, Telcser, Wall....Telcser..."

Madigan: " Record Mr. Telcser as no. Have you completed the poll of the absentees, Mr. Clerk?"

Fred Selke: " Yes, Sir."

Madigan: " Proceed with the verification of the affirmative Roll Call."



JUN 26 1975

363.

Fred Selcke: "Gene Barnes, Beatty, Beaupre, Berman, Birchler, .."

Madigan: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd, arise?"

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker,I would like to make a motion... I know it already started before midnight and I think it's goin' to receive a favorable ruling regardless of which way it goes. I have a Bill here and I am very sorry that this has happened the way it did, I took it out of the record several days ago to allow this House to continue to get business ...ah...accomplished because I agreed to do that rather than have a verification of votes and I would ask that my Bill be placed on the fall calendar."

Madigan: "The Gentleman, Mr. Mudd, has requested that Senate Bill 691, Mr. Mudd, be placed on the fall calendar, is there leave? Leave being granted, Senate Bill 691 shall be placed on the fall calendar and the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Beatty, who requests that Senate Bill 993 be placed on the fall calendar, is there leave? Leave being granted Senate Bill 993, on the order of Consideration Postpone shall be placed on the fall calendar. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Yes, Mr. Speaker....Speaker, would it be timely at this moment to move to the order of motions and hear the motion to place all of the remaining Bills"

Madigan: "I believe that you ...ah....would not be timely with that motionat this time Mr. Grotberg."

Grotberg: "What would be the effect on a Parliamentary Inquiry if the motion is made after midnight?...Mr. Speaker..."

Madigan: "We'll consult with the Parliamentarian to answer that question, where is he?"

Grotberg: "I'm doing this on behalf of the Membership, I could care less whether they all die or live."

Madigan: "I know you are.The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Marovitz: "Mr. Speaker, I'd likeHouse Bill.....Senate Bill 935 placed on the Fall Calendar."

Madigan: "Is there leave? Leave being granted, Senate Bill 935 shall be placed on the Fall Calendar....For what purpose does the Gentleman fromah...DeKalb.....Mr. Ebbesen, arise?"

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker,.....er....I'd like leave to place Senate Bill 530 on the Fall Calendar under....."

Madigan: "Is there leave? Leave being granted, Senate Bill 530 shall be placed on the Fall Calendar. The Chair..... for what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines, arise?"

Gaines: "I wish an answer to my Parliamentary Inquiry....since the Parliamentarian is back."

Madigan: "The Parliamentarian is still working on it Mr. Gaines."

Gaines: "Ah...Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker...."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Mr. Speaker, will you place 1135, Senate Bill 1135 on the Fall Calendar?"

Madigan: "Is there leave? Leave being granted, Senate Bill 1135 shall be placed on the Fall Calendar. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. VonBoeckman."

VonBoeckman: "I'd like to have Senate Bill 1156 placed on the Fall Calendar."

Madigan: "Eleven what?"

Fred Selcke: "Eleven fifty?....."

Madigan: "Eleven fifty?"

Vonboeckman: "1156."

Madigan: "Is there leave?...Leave being granted, Senate Bill 1156 shall be placed on the Fall Calendar. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, Senate Bills 349 and 352, leave for a Fall Calendar."

Madigan: "Is there leave? Leave being granted Senate Bills



349 and 352 shall be placed on the Fall Calendar. Ah...

The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, could I inquire of the time?"

Madigan: "Ah...The best I can see, it is approximately one minute 'til twelve, Mr. ah..."

McMaster: "I would like to remind the Speaker that by our own 'Joint Rules' as of midnight tonight, everything that has not been put on the Fall Calendar or has not been heard is automatically dead....and I would like to have a ruling from the Chair when it is twelve o'clock midnight.... so that you might understand what's dead and what isn't."

Madigan: "You'll get that....and the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre....Kankakee..."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to move to suspend the appropriate Joint Rule so that Senate Bill 392 may be heard. Now, look, before I hear all of the 'ooo's and ah's', let me explain to you that...."

Madigan: "Mr. Beaupre....the Joint Rule requires action of the Senate."

Beaupre: "Well..."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would renew my motionif the Clerk would read it?"

Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, read the motion of Representative Grotberg."

Fred Selcke: "Motion. I move to place all remaining Bills and Resolutions that appear on the order of Consideration Postpone, on the same order on the Fall Calendar."

Madigan: "We all heard the motion. The question is, shall that Resolution be adopted? All those in favor say 'aye' opposein the opinion of the Chair we will require a Roll Call.....The Chair recognizes the Gentleman fromChristian, Mr. Tipsword."



JUN 26 1975

366.

Tipsword: "May I remind the Speaker, he is in the middle of a Roll Call."

Madigan: "The Clerk just reminded me...The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ah...We really aren't in the middle of a Roll Call because this Bill..according to the Joint Rules is now dead, since it is the 27th of June."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "I don't think any Bills are dead, it's just a question of what can be done with them...and I would like to make sure that Mr. Grotberg's motion does not include my exempt Bills, such as appropriation Bills...and Committee Bills."

Madigan: "h...The Parliamentarian...ah...Mr. Grotberg....ah.. the Parliamentarian informs me that a motion to place a Bill on the Fall Calendar is timely at any time even tomorrow."

Grotberg: "Fine...that's...."

Madigan: "So that....would obviate the need for your motionyour motion is..."

Grotberg: "That's fine...I will withdraw the motion."

Madigan: "Your motion is withdrawn, the Clerk will proceed with the verification of the affirmative Roll Call on Senate Bill 210and the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, we can't pass this Bill now because it is beyond the deadline in the Joint Rules for Senate Bills in the House...so if this Bill is not dead...it is awfully close."

Madigan: "Mr. Walsh...Senate Bill 210 received 89 votes."

Walsh: "No, it didn't receive 89 votes...there is very serious question about that...there were 89 green buttons pushed but it didn't receive 89 votes....and it has not been declared passed."

Madigan: "Mr. Walsh,...Mr. Walsh, would I complete my statement,



Mr. Walsh? May I, Mr. Walsh?...May I complete my statement?....Mr. Walsh, Senate Bill 210 received 89 votes, and 64 'no' vote and 2 'present'....prior to twelve o'clock midnight, subject to verification....and we will proceed with the verification and if the verification shows that there are 89 or more votes for Senate Bill 210, it will be declared passed....and the Clerk will proceed with the verification."

Fred Selcke: "Birchler, Boyle, Bradley, Brinkmeier, Brummet, Byers, Caldwell, Calvo, Capparelli, Chapman, Choate, Craig, D'Arco, Darrow, Davis, DiPrima, Downs, John Dunn, Ebbesen, Ewell, Farley, Fary, Fennessey, Flinn, Garmisa, Getty, Giglio, Giorgi, Hanahan, Hart, Hill, Dan Houlihan, J. Houlihan, Huff, Jacobs, Emil Jones, Kane, Keller, Kelly, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Laurino, Lechowicz, Lemke..."

Madigan: "Would the Membership remain in their chairs to.... Ladies and Gentlemen, would the Membership remain in their chairs to facilitate the verification by Mr. Walsh and Schlickman and Company....proceed with the verification."

Fred Selcke: "Kornowicz instead of Lemke....ah...Leon, Londrigan, Lucco, Luft, Madigan, Maragos, Marovitz, Matijevich, Mautino, McClain, McGrew, McLendon, McPartlin, Merlo, Mudd, Mulcahey, Nardulli, O'Daniel, Patrick, Pierce, Pouncey, Richmond, Sangmeister, Satterthwaite, Schisler, Schraeder, Shea, Stone, Stubblefield, Taylor, Terzich, Tipsword, VanDuyne, VonBoeckman, Washington, White, Willer, Williams, Younge, Yourell, and Mr. Speaker..."

Madigan: "Are there questions of the affirmative vote?...For what purpose does the Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McGrew, arise?"

McGrew: "A Point of Parliamentary Inquiry, Mr. Speaker. I would like to inquire of the Chair, by what authority, or by what right or by what rule ...we are now on Senate Bill 210....It was declared passed by the Chair...I heard no motion to reconsider and I suggest to you that there is



JUN 26 1975

368.

nothing under the rules that would suggest that we can now be on a order of business of Senate Bill 210."

Madigan: "Mr. McGrew, the Chair proceeded to remove Senate Bill 210 from the record at the time to which you refer, and there was....."

McGrew: "I suggest to you that the Speaker cannot do that without leave of the House.....Mr. Speaker."

Madigan: "No objection....."

McGrew: "I believe if you will play the tapes you will not find where the Speaker asked for leave and if there had been....I can assure there would have been objections...."

Madigan: "Mr. McGrew, there was no objections to the leave of which I inferred.....there was no..."

McGrew: "You inferred.....Mr. Speaker...would you kindly define inferred..."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipword.....Tipword...."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker, I was in a place where I could hear very well, far better than on the floor and I ...I ...had no such intimationat the time that...that there was ..ah...ah...even objection requested or leave requested... I just heard a bald statement by the Chair."

Madigan: "Are there questions of the affirmative Roll Call? Questions of the affirmative Roll Call....The Chair recognizes Mr. Walsh....Mr. Beatty....Mr. Boyle.....Mr. Boyle is Mr. Boyle in the Chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Madigan: "Remove the Gentleman from the Roll Call....For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz, arise?"

Katz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Madigan: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Katz: "Vote me as 'aye', Mr. Speaker."

Madigan: "Vote Mr. Katz as 'aye'.....Mr. Ebbesen....for what does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian arise?"

Mugalian: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, ..ah...I hate to say this because



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

I'm very fond of the House Sponsor of this Bill, but I believe if the House said that this passed with 89 votes, subject to verification. I think it's clear that no additional person can go on this Roll Call but they can be verified off the Roll Call....and I think you'd be making a very technical error if you permit anyone to get on a green vote.....your Parliamentary....Parliamentary the Parliamentarian may want to confirm this."

Madigan: "Mr. Boyle has returned to the Chamber and the Clerk shall restore Mr. Boyle to the Roll Call....For what purpose does the Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword arise?"

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker...ah....right at the moment I would like to make a formal request for a copy of the earlier Roll Call on Senate Bill 210 and a transcript of that record."

Madigan: "That request has been received by the Chair and the Clerk will proceed to provide the Roll Call and a transcript of the record for Mr. Tipsword. Are there further questions of the affirmative Roll Call. For what purpose does the Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen, arise?"

Ebbesen: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, would you change my vote from 'yes' to 'no', please? Change Mr. Ebbesen's vote from 'aye' to 'no'. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Sangamon Mr. Kane arise?"

Kane: "By what right or rule can Mr. Ebbesen change...get off of the Roll Call after midnight. I think....I think that once that Roll Call is on there and he was not off at midnight he can't get off."

Madigan: "Mr. Kane, to annunciate my earlier ruling, which was to the effect that Senate Bill 210 received 89 votes prior to twelve o'clock, subject to verification, what we are saying is that the actual casting of the vote occurred prior to twelve o'clock and we are in the process of determining the accuracy of that at this particular time....



so that for the purpose of the casting of the vote...ah... the time 'polled' at that point and time and the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "All right now, Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all a copy of the transcript on this Roll Call in which I am sure I will find that no one declared or said that 89 votes were received for that Bill. I would also like to note for the record that it is considerably past midnight and that this Bill has not been declared passed and if it has not been declared passed it is not passed or....."

Madigan: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Christian Mr. Tipsword arise, Tipsword... 'cut off Mr. Telcser'... Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, subject to what the transcript of the earlier proceedings upon Senate Bill 210 may show might I ask for a qualified privilege of placing...whatever is left of Senate Bill 210, on the Fall Calendar...subject to whatever the transcript shows on the earlier consideration."

Madigan: Leave having been granted...Senate Bill 210 shall be placed on the Fall Calendar and the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House the adjournment time will be ten o'clock tomorrow morning and I believe there is a Death Resolution for a former Member on the desk."

Madigan: "Prior to the reading of the Resolution the Clerk would like to receive some messages from the Senate."

Jack O'Brien: "Messages from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary,...Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate passed the Bills of the following titles, passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit, Senate Bill 1506 passed by the Senate June 26, 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 concurred with the House of Repres-



entatives, passage of the Bills of the following titles, to wit: House Bill 2825, together with the Amendment passed by the Senate amended June 26, 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 concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of Bills of the following titles, to wit: House Bill 853, together with Amendments passed by Senate amended June 26, 1975, Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff, on a point of personal privilege. Mr. Duff on a point of personal privilege...."

Duff: "Mr. 'Peaker'...Mr. Speaker..Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ah...I believe you ...now in retrospect.... that you were correct in not recognizing me earlier.... considering the time-bind we're under. I used some in-temperate words earlier on this House floor tonight and I've offended some of my fellow Members and I want to apologize for it, I shouldn't have done it, I've never done it before and I won't do it again. I made a mistake of quoting the Parliamentarian too accurately and...ah... I apologize."

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, the ...again I will repeat for my colleagues that the adjournment time, when we do adjourn on the Death Resolution of one of our colleagues, will be ten o'clock this morning and we will adjourn upon the Death Resolution, now, Mr. Clerk."

Madigan: "Mr. Shea, I believe that Mr. Katz has an announcement, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, I didn't have an announcement but I did want to say that the Parliamentarian has been around here a long ...long time and I have observed him, he is a very excellent Parliamentarian, he has been an excellent person



for this House and in view of what has been said here this day I would like to reaffirm the confidence I have in him and the way he has served the House for a long time. "

Madigan: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman, arise?"

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've heard an apology by Mr. Duff tonight and a eulogy for the Parliamentarian and I think he should be accorded equal time for an apology."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, could we please get on with the"

Madigan: "Read the Resolution, Mr. Clerk."

Jack O'Brien: "House Resolution 419, WHEREAS, our beloved colleague, Representative James G. "Bud" Krause, was called by his Lord and Creator on Thursday, June 26, at 5:00 a.m.; and WHEREAS, Representative Krause was a superb Representative of the people of his District and of the entire State of Illinois, giving unstintingly of his time and his boundless talents and energy for eight years in this House; and WHEREAS, He was respected and loved by every Member of this House, whose friendship he sought regardless of party; and WHEREAS, Representative Krause was a true leader of great spirit, wisdom and humanity, who served his fellow man in a multitude of capacities during his fifty-three years among us; and WHEREAS, Throughout his service among us, he held firm to his guiding principles and philosophy of: government doing for people that which they could not do for themselves, the protection of individual life, liberty, property and pursuit of happiness being the only legitimate reason for government, and of an individual's right to dispose of his own property according to his own desires; and WHEREAS, The Members of this House will miss 'Bud' Krause for his forthrightness, his courage, his talent, his integrity, his wisdom and his friendship; therefore, be it RESOLVED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE SEVENTY-NINTH GENERAL



ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we do express to his family and to the world our shock and grief at the untimely loss of State Representative James G. Krause, that we do in his honor rededicate ourselves to the service and liberty of the People of the State of Illinois, and that we do further express our admiration and appreciation of his service here among us; and be it further RESOLVED, that a suitable copy of this preamble and Resolution be presented to his widow, Mrs. James G. Krause, and to his son, James Anthony Krause; and be it further RESOLVED, that as a further mark of our respect, this House do now adjourn.

Madigan: "The Chair recognizes, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "I move that we adopt the Resolution."

Madigan: "All of those in favor of the adoption of the Resolution signify by saying 'aye' opposed...the 'ayes' have it and House Resolution 419 is adopted. Mr. Shea."

Shea: "And the House is now adjourned."

Madigan: "And the House stands adjourned."



INDEX
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
JUNE 26, 1975



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

INDEX

June 26, 1975

10:00	Bradley in Chair	House to order
		Prayer
	Bradley	Roll Call
	Bradley	Messages from Senate
	Jack O'Brien	
10:16	Bradley	Agreed Resolution
	Jack O'Brien	
	Matijevich	Resolution
10:18	Bradley	Resolution adopted
	Bradley	
10:21	Brinkmeier	HB 328, Senate Am. #1
	Bradley	House
10:23	Lechowicz)	
)	
	Brinkmeier)	
)	
	Bradley)	House Concurs
	Cunningham	HB 464, Senate Am. #1
10:24	Bradley	
	Lundy	
	Bradley	
10:28	Hoffman, R.	HB 826, Senate Am. #1 & #2
	Shea	House Concurs
10:28	Hoffman, R. ?	HB 827
	Skinner	Take out
	Shea	



10:30	Holewinski	HB 1103, SA #1,2,3,4,& 6.
	Lundy	
	Shea	
10:33	Friedrich	
	Shea	Took SA #6 out, House Concur with #1,2,3 and 4.
10:36	Friedrich	
	Shea	
10:37	Daniels	
10:38	Holewinski	
	Shea	Amendment #6
10:38	Holewinski	
	Shea	House
10:40	Holewinski	
	Shea	House does not concur
10:41	Holewinski	Poll of Absentees
	Shea	"already announced Roll Call"
10:42	Mann	Gentlemen trying to get your attention.
	Shea	
	Holewinski	Move we non-concur
	Shea	'ayes' have; House non-concurs.
	Shea	HB 1172
	Schneider	
	Shea	
	Schneider	Amendment #1,2, & 3.
	Shea	SA 1,2 & 3 HB 1172; House does concur
10:46	Hart	HB 1389; SA #1



10:46	Shea	House Concurr
	Schoeberlein	HB 1328; SA #1
10:48	Shea	House Concurr
	Skinner	HB 1443; Amendment #1
10:51	Shea	
	Schneider	Oppose
	Shea)	
10:53	Friedrich)	
	Shea	
	Skinner	
10:55	Shea	House Non-concurr
	Giglio	HB 1401; SA #2, 3,4 & 5.
	Shea	
10:57	Skinner	
	Shea	
	Hart	Support
	Shea	House Concurr; SA #2,3,4 &5 to HB 1401.
	Shea	SB,Third Reading
	Hoffman, R. K.	
	Shea	SB 37
	Jack O'Brien	SB 37; Third Reading
	Schlickman	
	Sevcik	Point of Order
	Jack O'Brien	Third Reading
	Shea	
	Schlickman	



11:01	Shea	"Read that Rule to me."
	Schlickman)	Object
	Shea)	
	Kozubowski	"On the Amendments"
11:05	Shea	
	Kozubowski	
	Shea)	
11:05	Schlickman)	SB 37
	Stone	Gentleman out of Order
	Shea	SB 241; Third Reading
11:07	Jack O'Brien	
	Shea	
	Duff	
	Kornowicz	
11:08	Shea	
	Kornowicz	SB 241
	Shea	
11:09	Lundy	urge 'aye' vote
	Shea	
11:09	Schlickman)	
	Kornowicz)	
	Shea	
11:11	Lechowicz	Point of Order
	Shea	
11:11	LaFleur	
	Kornowicz	
	Shea	



11:13	Epton	Move Previous question
	Shea	"ayes" have it
	Kornowicz	To close
11:13	Skinner	Vote yes
	Shea	
	Walsh	Wants to verify
	Shea	
11:15	Lechowicz	Explain my vote
	Shea	Dump the Roll Call
	Lechowicz	
	Shea	
	Walsh	Yield
11:17	Shea	Can't yield.
	LaFleur	
	Shea	
	Cunningham	Explain vote
	Shea	Passed, SB 241
	Shea)	
)	
11:20	Schlickman)	
11:20	Friedrich	
11:23	Shea	
	Kosinski	SB 347
11:23	Shea	Passed
	Jack O'Brien	SB 635, Third Reading
	Barnes, E.M. "Gene"	
	Shea	
	Borchers	



	Shea	
11:28	Anderson)	Question
)	
	Barnes, E.M.)	
	Shea	
11:29	Brinkmeyer)	Yield
)	
	Barnes)	
	Shea	
11:30	Grotberg	
	Shea	
	Stone	Move previous question
11:30	Shea	'ayes' have it
	Barnes	To close
	Shea	SB 635; passed
11:31	Jack O'Brien	SB 632; Third Reading
	Shea	
	Byers	
	Shea	
11:32	Lechowicz	"Wrong budget"
	Shea	Strike that explanation
	Byers	
	Shea	
11:34	Keller)	Question
)	
	Byers)	
	Shea	Calls for order
	Byers)	
)	
11:35	Keller)	
)	
	Shea	



Lechowicz		Response to Keller's inquiry
Shea		
Taylor)	Sponsor yield?
)	
Byers)	
Shea		SB 632, passed
Washburn		HB 1881; move to non-concur SA #2 & 3
Shea		House non-concurs
Washburn		HB 1882; move to concur SA #1
Shea		House concurs
Jack O'Brien		HB 835; Third Reading
VanDuyne		
Shea		HB 835; passed
Jack O'Brien		HB 1947
McClain		Can we hear 1948?
Shea		"There's objection."
McClain		HB 1947
Shea		
Lechowicz)	Yield?
)	
McClain)	
Shea		
Choate)	Like to ask Totten a question.
)	
Shea)	
)	
Totten)	
Shea		
Neff		Sponsor yield?
Shea		



11:53	McClain)	
	Neff)	
	Shea)	
	Neff	
11:56	McClain	
	Shea	
12:01	Mann)	
	McClain)	
	Shea	
12:04	Schlickman	
	Shea	
	Friedland	Move previous question
12:05	Shea	doesn't have 2/3 vote
	Lechowicz)	Parliamentary inquiry
	Shea)	
12:07	Skinner)	Question
	McClain)	
	Shea	
12:09	Madison	
	Shea	
12:10	Lechowicz	Point of Order
	Shea	
12:10	Walsh)	Parliamentary inquiry
	Shea)	
12:14	McClain	To close
	Shea	HB 1947
12:16	Skinner	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12:16	Shea	
12:16	Hart.	
	Shea	
12:21	Ewell	
	Shea	
12:23	Cunningham	Voting red
	Shea	
12:25	Hoffman, R.	Explain vote
	Shea	
12:28	Borchers	Explain vote
	Shea	
12:29	Griesheimer	Against
	Shea	
12:30	Geo-Karis	Explain vote
	Shea	
12:30	Neff	
12:32	Shea	HB 1947...passed
	Fred Selcke	HB 1948; Third Reading
	Shea	
12:33	DiPrima	Introduction...State Com- mander of Am-Vets.... Ken Mullins "Thank You"
	Shea	
	McClain	HB 1948
	Shea	HB 1948, passed
	Yourell	
	Fred Selcke	HB 2445, Third Reading
	Yourell	



	Shea	HB 2445 (cont.)
	Schneider	
	Shea	
	Schlickman)	Yield?
)	
	Yourell)	
	Schlickman	Address the Bill
	Shea	
12:39	Schlickman	
	Shea	
	Madison	
	Shea	Matijevidch in the Chair
	Madison	
12:41	Yourell	
	Matijevidch	
12:42	Walsh	Against
	Matijevidch	
12:43	Skinner	
	Matijevidch	
12:45	Sangmeister	Vote 'present'
	Matijevidch	
12:45	Yourell	To close
	Matijevidch	
12:47	Madison	Explain vote
	Matijevidch	
12:49	Schraeder	Oppose
	Matijevidch	HB 2445 ...lost



12:51	Fred Selcke	HB 2942
	Matijevidch	
12:51	Brinkmeyer	Sponsor....table
	Matijevidch	Table ..HB 2942
	Fred Selcke	HB 3006
	Matijevidch	Point
12:52	Schraeder	Personal Privilege
	Matijevidch	
12:53	Yourell	
12:54	Matijevidch	
12:55	Fred Selcke	HB 3094; Third Reading
	Matijevidch	
	Terzich	Leave to table 3094
	Matijevidch	Leave..
	Fred Selcke	HB 3096; Third Reading
	Matijevidch	
	Beaupre	Leave to bring back to Second for Amendment
	Matijevidch	Leave
	Fred Selcke	Amendment #1 to HB 3096
	Beaupre	Move to table #1
	Matijevidch	Leave...Tabled
	Fred Selcke	Amendment #2, HB 3096
	Beaupre	Move to table #2
	Matijevidch	Leave...Tabled
	Fred Selcke	Amendment #3 to HB 3096
	Beaupre	Move to table #3
	Matijevidch	Leave...Tabled



Fred Selcke

Amendment #4..HB 3096

Beaupre

Matijevich

Amendment #4 Adopted

Beaupre

Amendment #5, move to table

Fred Selcke

Amendment #5

Beaupre

Matijevich

Leave...Tabled

Fred Selcke

Amendment #6

Beaupre

Move to table

Matijevich

Tabled...leave

Fred Selcke

Amendment #7

Beaupre

move to table

Matijevich

leave....tabled

Fred Selcke

Amendment #8

Beaupre

move to table

Matijevich

Leave....tabled

Fred Selcke

Amendment #9

Beaupre

Move to table

Matijevich

leave....tabled

Fred Selcke

Amendment #10

Beaupre

move to table

Matijevich

leave to table?

Mudd)

Beaupre)

Matijevich

Lechowicz

move we adopt #10

Matijevich

Amendment #10 adopted.



	Fred Selcke	Amendment #11; HB 3096
	Matijevidch	
	Lechowicz	
	Matijevidch	
	Mann)	Sponsor explain Amendment
)	
	Lechowicz)	
	Matijevidch	
	Beaupre	Supports
	Matijevidch	Amendment #11 is adopted
	Fred Selcke	Amendment #12
	Matijevidch	
	Kane	
	Matijevidch	Amendment #12
	Beaupre	Supports
	Matijevidch	Amendment #12, adopted
	Fred Selcke	Amendment #13; HB 3096
	Beaupre	ask to table
	Matijevidch	tabled...Third Reading
	Fred Selcke	HB 3101, Third Reading
	Matijevidch	
	McLendon	
	Matijevidch	HB 3101; Third Reading
1:10	Tuerk)	Yield?
)	
	McLendon)	
	Matijevidch	
1:12	Leinenweber	Against
	Matijevidch	



1:13	Friedrich	
	Matijevich	HB 3101, Third Reading
1:13	Beatty	
	Matijevich	
	Londrigan	Move previous question
1:15	Matijevich	'ayes' have it HB 3101....passed
1:16	Fred Selcke	HB 3118
	Matijevich	
	Shea	Sponsor
	Matijevich	
1:18	Skinner	Against
	Matijevich	
	Brinkmeyer)	Question
)	
	Shea)	
1:20	Walsh	
	Matijevich	
	Marigos	
	Matijevich	
1:25	Lundy	
	Matijevich	
1:27	Geo-Karis	
	Matijevich	
	Shea	
1:27	Washburn	Oppose
	Matijevich	
1:28	Shea	To close



1:28	Matijeovich	HB 3118
1:29	Skinner	verification
	Matijeovich	poll the absentees
	Jack O'Brien	
	Matijeovich	Proceed with affirm..Roll Call
	Jack O'Brien	
	?	'aye'
	Jack O'Brien	continues
	Matijeovich	Record ...Boyle 'aye'
	Jack O'Brien	continues
	Houlihan	'aye'
	Matijeovich	
	Kane	could I be verified
	Matijeovich	
	Mautino	change to 'aye'
	Matijeovich	
	Madison	may I be verified
	Matijeovich	
	Hoffman	No
	Matijeovich	
1:39	White	
	Matijeovich	
	Winchester	Change to 'no'
	Matijeovich	
	McClain	'aye' to 'no'
	Matijeovich	
	Huff	leave to verified



1:40	Matijevich	
	Ewing	Record me as 'no'
	Matijevich)	
)	
	Skinner)	question on affirm. Roll Call
	Jack O'Brien	
	Matijevich	
	Duff	
	Skinner	
1:47	Matijevich	HB 3118 passed
	Jack O'Brien	HB 3122, Third Reading
1:47	Lechowicz	Sponsor - HB3122
1:48	Matijevich	HB3122 passed
	Jack O'Brien	SB 37
	Matijevich	
1:49	Sevcik	
	Matijevich	
1:50	Jaffe)	yield?
)	
	Sevcik)	
	Matijevich	
1:51	Pierce	
	Matijevich	
1:54	Calvo)	
)	
	Pierce)	
	Matijevich	
	Holewinski	yield?
1:55	Sevcik	
	Matijevich	



1:59	Flinn	
2:00	Matijevich	
	Geo-Karis	
	Matijevich	
2:01	Klosak	parliamentary inquiry
	Matijevich	
	Barnes, E.M.	
2:05	Matijevich	on Klosak's inquiry
2:06	Keller	
2:07	Matijevich	
	Ebbeson	move previous question
2:08	Matijevich	'ayes' have it
2:07	Sevcik	to close
	Matijevich	SB 37
2:08	Mann	explain 'no' vote
	Matijevich	
2:10	Friedrich	
	Matijevich	
2:12	Ewell	
	Matijevich	
2:13	Gaines	
	Matijevich	
2:13	Geo-Karis	explain my vote
	Matijevich	
2:14	Washington	
2:16	Matijevich	
	Flinn	



	Matijevich	
2:18	Madison	
	Matijevich	
2:19	Fennessey	
	Matijevich	
2:19	Jacobs	
	Matijevich	
2:22	Lucco	
	Matijevich	
2:25	Davis	
	Matijevich	
2:26	Barnes	
	Matijevich	
2:27	Calvo	
	Matijevich	
2:30	Sevcik	
	Matijevich	
2:32	Jones, Emil	
	Matijevich	
	Sevcik	
2:35	Davis	
	Matijevich	
2:38	Washington	will Sponsor take out of record?
	Matijevich	
2:38	Barnes	consideration postponed
	Matijevich	
	Sevcik	



2:39	Shea	
	Davis	(off mike)
	Jaffe	
2:41	Matijevich	can't be taken out
2:42	Keller	
2:42	Matijevich	poll the absentees
	Jack O'Brien	
	Lechowicz	change to 'aye'
	Matijevich	
	Macdonald	'aye'
	Matijevich	
2:43	Getty	'aye'
	Matijevich	
	?	
	Matijevich	
2:44	Ryan	'aye'
	Matijevich	
2:45	Schuneman	
	Matijevich	
2:49	Jones	
	Matijevich	
	Sangmeister	'aye'
	Matijevich	
	Jack O'Brien	113
	Matijevich	proceed with affirmative vote
2:50	Jones	
	Matijevich	



2:59	Fennessy	verified
	Matijevich	
3:01	Dyer	change to 'aye'
	Jack O'Brien	continues
	Matijevich)	
)	
3:04	Ewell)	
	Matijevich	
	Rose	
	Matijevich	
3:09	Arnell	'aye'
	Matijevich	SB 37 passed
3:10	Jones, E.	
	Matijevich	
3:11	Madison	request copy of Roll Call
	Matijevich	
	Hoffman	vote be reconsidered
	Flinn	lay on table
3:12	Matijevich	motion tabled
	Matijevich	
3:12	Fred Selcke	SB 647
	Speaker Redmond in chair	
	Laurino	
3:12	Walsh	introduces Duff's family
	Matijevich	
3:13	Laurino	
	Speaker Redmond	
3:14	Walsh	



	Speaker Redmond	
3:15	Madison	point of order
	Walsh	
3:16	Cunningham	
	Speaker Redmond	
3:18	Laurino	
	Speaker Redmond	
3:18	Cunningham	introduction
	Speaker Redmond	
3:19	Schlickman	oppose
	Speaker Redmond	
	Hoffman, G.	oppose
	Speaker Redmond	
	Ebbeson	moves previous question
	Speaker Redmond	'ayes' have it
	Laurino	to close
	Speaker Redmond	
	Hirschfeld	ought to go to Sept. - no vote
	Speaker Redmond	
	McMasters	explain vote - urge 'no'
	Speaker Redmond	
	Laurino	urge eight more green votes
	Speaker Redmond	
	Fennessey	explain 'yes' vote
	Speaker Redmond	
	Stearney	record me as 'aye'
	Speaker Redmond	



	Palmer	change to 'no'
	Speaker Redmond	
	Dunn, R.	'no'
	Speaker Redmond	Bill lost SB 647
	Speaker Redmond	gives schedule
	Fred Selcke	
	Maragos	Revenue Committee
	Speaker Redmond	leave
	Fred Selcke	SB 649, Third Reading
	Speaker Redmond	
	Keller	
	Speaker Redmond	SB 649 passed
	Fred Selcke	SB 720, Third Reading
	Speaker Redmond	
	Daniels	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Houlihan, D.L.	oppose
	Speaker Redmond	
	Kempiners	support
	Speaker Redmond	
3:34	Griesheimer	support
	Speaker Redmond	
3:35	Daniels	to close
	Speaker Redmond	SB 720
3:37	Geo-Karis	
	Speaker Redmond	SB 720 lost
	Fred Selcke	SB 751



	Speaker Redmond	
	Porter	have it heard after 1170
3:39	Speaker Redmond	take out
	Fred Selcke	943
	Campbell	
3:40	Speaker Redmond	return to Fall Calendar
	Fred Selcke	SB 957, Third Reading
	Speaker Redmond	
3:43	Berman	
	Speaker Redmond	SB 957 passed
	McPartlin	leave to put SB 757, etc.
	Speaker Redmond	appear on Fall Calendar
	Fred Selcke	SB 958, Third Reading
	Speaker Redmond	
3:44	Geo-Karis	
	Speaker Redmond	SB 958 passed
3:44	Fred Selcke	SB 987, Third Reading
	Speaker Redmond	
	Friedland	Sponsor
	Speaker Redmond	
3:45	Maragos	
	Speaker Redmond	
3:46	Grotberg	
	Speaker Redmond	
3:47	McMaster	
	Speaker Redmond	SB 986 passed
	Fred Selcke	SB 987



	Speaker Redmond	
3:50	Porter	
	Speaker Redmond	
3:51	Skinner	
	Speaker Redmond	
3:56	DiPrima	
	Speaker Redmond	
3:57	Leinenweber	
	Speaker Redmond	
3:59	Ebbeson	move previous question
	Speaker Redmond	'ayes' have it
	Porter	
	Speaker Redmond	SB 987
4:00	Schraeder	
	Speaker Redmond	
4:01	Hudson	'no'
	Speaker Redmond	
4:04	Kent	for
	Speaker Redmond	
4:05	Jones	against
	Speaker Redmond	
4:07	Borchers	
	Speaker Redmond	
4:08	Geo-Karis	for
	Speaker Redmond	
4:09	Capuzi	verification at proper time
	Speaker Redmond	



4:09	Collins	against
	Speaker Redmond	
4:10	Porter	poll the absentees
	Speaker Redmond	
4:10	Skinner	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Deavers	'aye' to 'no'
4:11	Londrigan	change to 'no'
	Fred Selcke	
	Byers	change to 'no'
	Speaker Redmond	
4:12	DiPrima	
	Speaker Redmond	dump the Roll Call
4:12	Schraeder	
	Speaker Redmond	
4:13	Fleck	
	Speaker Redmond	
4:13	Schraeder	
	Speaker Redmond	
	Mudd	
	Speaker Redmond	SB 987 lost
	Jones, Emil	
	Speaker Redmond	
4:14	Porter	ask for postponed
	Speaker Redmond	move to reconsider
	Porter	"yes I do"
	Fred Selcke	SB 992, Third Reading



Speaker Redmond	
Houlihan, D.L.	
Speaker Redmond	
Tipsword	vote 'yes'
Speaker Redmond	
Greiman	support
Speaker Redmond	
Schneider	suggest 'no'
Speaker Redmond	
Hoffman, G.	urge 'no'
Speaker Redmond	
Schlickman	urge 'no'
Speaker Redmond	
Berman	urge 'aye' vote on SB 992
Speaker Redmond	
Mahar	support
Speaker Redmond	
Washington	for
Speaker Redmond	
Ebbeson	move previous question
Speaker Redmond	'ayes' have it
Houlihan, D.L.	to close
Speaker Redmond	
Schneider	
Speaker Redmond	
Schneider	explain vote
Speaker Redmond	



Mugalian	explain vote - 'no'
Speaker Redmond	
Duff	'no'
Speaker Redmond	
Dyer	'no'
Speaker Redmond	SB 992 passed
Fred Selcke	SB 993
Speaker Redmond	
Madigan	take back to Second for amend.
Speaker Redmond	leave granted
Fred Selcke	Amendment #2
Speaker Redmond	
Deuster	
Speaker Redmond	Amendment lost
Deuster	"May I have Roll Call vote?"
Speaker Redmond	
Deuster	explain vote
Speaker Redmond	Amendment lost
Jack O'Brien	Amendment #3 (SB 993)
Speaker Redmond	
Deuster	move to table Amendment #3
Speaker Redmond	tabled
Jack O'Brien	Amendment #4
Deuster	
Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted
Dyer	request for fiscal
Jack O'Brien	has been filed



Speaker Redmond
 Dyer "Thank you."
 Speaker Redmond
 Jack O'Brien SB 1001, Third Reading
 Hoffman, G.L.
 Speaker Redmond SB 1001 passed
 Jack O'Brien SB 1018, Third Reading
 Speaker Redmond
 McPartlin
 Speaker Redmond
 Mugalian) Sponsor yield?
)
 McPartlin)
 Speaker Redmond SB 1018 passed
 Jack O'Brien SB 1021, Third Reading
 Speaker Redmond
 Merlo
 Speaker Redmond SB 1021 passed
 Jack O'Brien SB 1022, Third Reading
 Speaker Redmond
 Merlo
 Speaker Redmond SB 1022 passed
 Jack O'Brien SB 1031, Third Reading
 Speaker Redmond
 Hart
 Speaker Redmond
 Mautino)
)
 Hart)



Speaker Redmond	
Borchers	
Speaker Redmond	SB 1031 passed
Jack O'Brien	SB 1036, Third Reading
Speaker Redmond	
Beaupre	leave returned to Second for amend.
Speaker Redmond	
Walsh)	question
)	
Beaupre)	
Speaker Redmond	leave back to Second Reading
Jack O'Brien	Amendment #1
Speaker Redmond	
Beaupre	
Speaker Redmond	
Totten)	yield
)	
Beaupre)	
Speaker Redmond	
Totten)	one other question
)	
Beaupre)	
Speaker Redmond	
Kempiners)	question
)	
Beaupre)	
Kempiners	address myself-opposition
Speaker Redmond	
Collins)	yield?
)	
Beaupre)	
Collins	urge defeat



Beaupre					
Speaker Redmond					
Jack O'Brien					
Speaker Redmond					
Beaupre					
Speaker Redmond					
Walsh					
Speaker Redmond					
Kempiners					
Speaker Redmond					
Skinner)					
)					
Beaupre)					
Speaker Redmond					
Madison)					
)					
Beaupre)					
Speaker Redmond					
Collins					
Speaker Redmond					
Downs)					
)					
Beaupre)					
Speaker Redmond					
Mugalian					
Speaker Redmond					
Madison					
Speaker Redmond					
Mugalian)					
)					
Beaupre)					



Speaker Redmond	SB 1036 - Amendment #2
VanDuyne	vote green
Speaker Redmond	
Mugalian	explain vote
Speaker Redmond	
Beaupre	
Speaker Redmond	Amendment #2 SB 1036 lost
Jack O'Brien	Amendment #3
Beaupre	
Speaker Redmond	
Collins	vote 'no'
Speaker Redmond	
VanDuyne	'aye' vote
Speaker Redmond	
Beaupre	
Speaker Redmond	Amendment #3 - SB 1036
Byars	"good amendment"
Speaker Redmond	
Griesheimer	
Speaker Redmond	Amendment #3 SB 1036 adopted
Jack O'Brien	SB 1057, Third Reading
Speaker Redmond	
Myer	
Speaker Redmond	
Tuerk)	question
)	
Myer)	
Speaker Redmond	SB 1057 passed



Choate	Agreed Resolution
Jack O'Brien	Resolution 418
Speaker Redmond	
Choate	leave for adoption of Resolution
Speaker Redmond	SB 1063
Jack O'Brien	SB 1063, Third Reading
Keller	
Speaker Redmond	SB 1063 passed
Jack O'Brien	SB 1135, Third Reading
Speaker Redmond	
Caldwell	take out of record
Jack O'Brien	SB 1160, Third Reading
Speaker Redmond	
Hart	move to table
Speaker Redmond	tabled
Jack O'Brien	SB 1170, Third Reading
Griesheimer	
Speaker Redmond	
Lechowicz)	question
)	
Griesheimer)	
Lechowicz	speak against Bill
Speaker Redmond	
Porter	
Speaker Redmond	
Lechowicz	withdraw objection
Speaker Redmond	
Maragos	



Griesheimer
 Speaker Redmond
 Leinenweber speak in behald of Bill
 Speaker Redmond
 Greiman) yield?
)
 Griesheimer)
 Speaker Redmond
 Stone move the previous question
 Speaker Redmond 'ayes' have it
 Griesheimer to close
 Speaker Redmond
 Greiman to explain vote
 Speaker Redmond SB 1170 passed
 Jack O'Brien SB 751
 Speaker Redmond
 Porter
 Speaker Redmond SB 751
 Jack O'Brien SB 1247, Third Reading
 Speaker Redmond
 Schneider
 Speaker Redmond
 Daniels) yield?
)
 Schneider)
 Speaker Redmond
 Hudson) yield
)
 Schneider)
 Hudson Speak on Bill and oppose



Speaker Redmond	"Bring remarks to a close."
Hudson	continues
Speaker Redmond	
Shea	"good Bill"
Speaker Redmond	
Geo-Karis)	yield?
)	
Schneider)	
Geo-Karis	urge 'no'
Speaker Redmond	
Simms	'no'
Speaker Redmond	
Keller	move previous question
Speaker Redmond	'ayes' have it
Schneider	to close
Speaker Redmond	
Walsh	"terrible Bill"
Speaker Redmond	
Mann	
Walsh	
Speaker Redmond	
Shea	"confine his remarks"
Walsh	
Speaker Redmond	
Walsh	
Speaker Redmond	
Mann	
Speaker Redmond	



Choate

Speaker Redmond SB 1247 passed

Jack O'Brien SB 1135

Speaker Redmond

Washburn

Speaker Redmond

McMaster speak on personal priv. - oppose

Speaker Redmond

Jack O'Brien SB 1257, Third Reading

Speaker Redmond

Merlo

Shea in chair

Merlo proceeds

Shea makes announcement

Merlo

Shea

Willer) yield
)
 Merlo)

Shea

Peters) yield?
)
 Merlo)

Shea

Duff address the Bill

Shea "confine remarks to legislation"

Duff

Shea

Merlo



Shea	
Maragos	move previous question
Shea	'ayes' have it
Shea	SB 1257
McMaster	explain vote
Shea)	
)	
McMaster)	
Shea	
Katz	explain vote - vote 'no'
Shea	
Merlo	postponed consideration
Shea)	OK
)	
Madison)	my light working?
Shea	
Collins	"my light has been on"
Shea	
Jack O'Brien	SB 1258, Third Reading
Shea	
Kozubowski	leave to move 1258 back to Second for Amendment
Shea	
Collins	
Shea	leave
Walsh)	
)	
Shea)	
Kozubowski	"not germane"
Fred Selcke	Amendment #1
Kozubowski	



Shea

Skinner

Shea

Kozubowski point of order

Shea

Kozubowski

Shea) "Democrats serving etc."
)
 Skinner)

Shea

Stone point of order-point of personal
 privilege

Shea

Skinner

Shea

Duff) yield?
)
 Kozubowski)

Duff address the Bill

Shea

Maragos

Duff "not you, sir"

Maragos

Shea keep your remarks to Bill

Duff

Shea

Madigan support

Shea

Taylor move previous question

Shea 'ayes' have it



Kozubowski	to close
Shea	
Skinner	point of order
Shea	'ayes' have it-Amendment #1 adopted
Fred Selcke	
Shea)	
)	
Duff)	point of personal privilege
Shea	
Duff	
Fred Selcke	Amendment #2
Shea	
Kozubowski	
Shea	
Madigan	leave of House to draft Resolution
Shea	
Skinner	"shocked, etc."
Shea	Amendment #2 adopted
Fred Selcke	Amendment #3
Shea	leave to table - tabled- Third Reading
Fred Selcke	SB 1245
Shea	out of record
Fred Selcke	SB 1290, Third Reading
Shea	
Maragos)	Fall Calendar?
)	
Shea)	leave to place on Fall Calendar
Mann	Resolution for Fall Calendar
Shea	



Mann)	parliamentary inquiry
)	
Shea)	
Houlihan, J.	intention of chair on motions?
Shea	
Fred Selcke	SB 1292, Third Reading
Shea	
Fary	
Shea	
Friedrich	point of personal privilege
Shea	"remarks well taken"
Fary	to close
Shea	SB 1292 passed
Fred Selcke	SB 1293, Third Reading
Shea	
D'Arco	
Shea	SB 1293
Dunn, R.	explain vote, ask for verification
Shea	SB 1293 lost
Fred Selcke	SB 1301, Third Reading
Boyle	take out of record
Shea	pass 1371 at Sponsor's request
Fred Selcke	SB 1380
Shea	
Katz	motion to put 1380 on Fall Calendar
Shea	leave
Fred Selcke	SB 1395, Third Reading
Shea	



	Garmisa	
	Shea	
	Garmisa	
	Shea	SB 1395 passed
19:01	Shea	SB 1465 take out of record
	Shea	SB 1492
	Beatty	not House Sponsor
	Shea	
	Beatty	
	Shea	take out of record
	Fred Selcke	SB 1493, Third Reading
	Shea	
19:03	Berman	explains the Bill - Sponsor
	Shea	
	Schlickman	question asked
	Berman	response
	Schlickman	discusses
	Berman	
	Schlickman	distributed
	Berman	
	Shea	no pictures taken
	Berman	continues explanation and discusses
	Schlickman	
	Berman	SB 1493
	Shea	
	Duff)	question asked
)	
	Berman)	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

	Duff	speaks on the Bill
	Shea	
	Pierce	question of Sponsor
	Berman	response
19:15	Pierce	
	Berman	
	Shea	
	Deuster	speaks against the Bill
	Shea	
	Satterwaithe	speaks in favor of the Bill
	Shea	
	Friedland	moves previous question
	Shea	so moved
19:21	Berman	to close
	Shea	vote
	Schraeder	explain vote
	Shea	
19:25	Borchers	SB 1493 vote 'no'
	Shea	
19:26	Mugalian	explain vote - 'no'
	Shea	
	Deuster	explain 'no' vote
	Shea	
	Kane	point of order
	Shea	
	Deuster	continues explanation
	Shea	take the record - passed



	Tipsword	question of chair
	Shea	
	Jack O'Brien	messages from Senate
	Shea	Senate Bills Third Reading
	Brinkmeier	
	Shea	
	Madison	point of information
	Shea	discussion on shcedule
	Madison	
	Shea	
19:33	Jack O'Brien	SB 14, Third Reading
19:34	Shea	SB 14
	Marovitz	explains the Bill - Sponsor
	Shea	
	Madison	question
	Shea	yields
	Madison	question asked
	Marovitz	responso and discusses
	Madison	
	Marovitz	
19:37	Madison	
	Marovitz	
	Madison	
	Marovitz	
	Shea	
	Polk	
	Shea	



	Polk	
	Marovitz	didn't hear question
	Polk	
	Marovitz	
	Polk	
19:40	Marovitz	SB 14
	Polk	
	Marovitz	
	Shea	
	Beatty	bus drivers
	Marovitz	"no"
	Shea	
	Stearney	question
	Marovitz	"yes"
19:41	Stearney	question asked
	Marovitz	discusses
	Stearney	
	Marovitz	
	Stearney	
	Marovitz	
	Stearney	
	Marovitz	
	Shea	
	Madigan	moves previous question
	Shea	so moved
	Marovitz	to close
19:44	Shea	SB 14



Friedrich

~~Shea~~

Bill lost

Shea

SB 452

Shea

SB 751 already passed

~~Shea~~

SB 783 Fall Calendar

Jack O'Brien

SB 792, Third Reading

Shea

~~Madigan~~

request leave to hear 793 too

Shea

Jack O'Brien

Madigan

792 & 793 move to send both Bills
to interim study
leave granted

Shea

Madigan

rather have Fall Calendar

Shea

leave granted

Jack O'Brien

SB. 993, Third Reading

Shea

Madigan

explains the Bill - Sponsor

~~Shea~~

Schneider

speaks on Bill

Shea

19:50

Winchester

SB 993

Shea

Winchester

Madigan

Winchester

Shea

~~Taylor~~

moves previous question



	Shea	hold it
	¹⁷⁰⁰ Satterthwaite	question
	Shea	yields
	Satterthwaite	question asked
	Madigan	requests clerk to read fiscal note
	Shea	at ease for a few moments
	Porter	SB 266, place on Fall Calendar, Second Reading
	Shea	leave granted
	Madison	
	Shea	wait
	Maragos	
19:54	Shea	
	Maragos	
	Shea	
19:55	Flinn	HB 931 on Fall Calendar
	Shea	written motion
	Flinn	
	Shea	
	Flinn	requests leave
	Shea	objections raised
	Flinn	will put it in writing
	Shea	
	Merlo	inquiry of chair
	Shea	
	Merlo	
	Shea	
	Merlo	



	Shea	
	Neff	SB 725 on Fall Calendar - Second
	Shea	leave granted
	Younge	HB 3006, 3111 on Fall Calendar
	Shea	leave granted
	Maragos	
	Shea	
19:59	Jack O'Brien	SB 993 reads fiscal note
	Shea	
	Satterthwaite	question of clerk
	Jack O'Brien	
	Satterthwaite	question of Sponsor
	Shea	response and discussion
	Satterthwaite	
	Madigan	
	Satterthwaite	
	Madigan	don't know
	Satterthwaite	discussion, speaks on Bill
	Shea	
	McCourt	speaks on Bill - support
20:00	Shea	previous question moved - vote
	Lucco	explain vote - opposition
	Shea	
	Madison	explain vote
	Shea	take the record
	Madigan	postpone consideration
	Borchers	point of personal privilege



	Shea	SB 1036
20:06	Jack O'Brien	SB 1036, Third Reading
	Shea	
	Totten	parliamentary inquiry
	Shea	
	Beaupre	SB 1036, explains the Bill-Sponsor
	Shea	
20:09	Kempiners	opposes the Bill
	Shea	
	Calvo	supports
	Shea	
	Reed	opposes the Bill
	Shea	
	Hill	
	Shea	
	Friedrich	
	Shea	
	VanDuyne	
	Shea	
	Reed	point of personal privilege
	Shea	
	Borchers	speaks on Bill
20:19	Shea	SB 1036
	Brinkmeier	moves previous question
	Shea	so moved
	Beaupre	to close
	Madigan in chair	



	McMaster	explain vote
	Madigan	
	Totten	explain vote
	Madigan	
	Madison	explain vote
	Madigan	
	Shea	explain vote
	Madigan	
	Hirschfeld	explain vote
	Madigan	
	Shea	point of personal privilege
	Madigan	
	Hirschfeld	continues explaining his vote
	Madigan	
	Hirschfeld	
	Madigan	
	Hirschfeld	continues
	Madigan	
20:27	Byars	SB 1036
	Madigan	
	Anderson	explains his vote
	Madigan	
	Hill	explains his vote
	Madigan	
	Bluthardt	explain vote
	Madigan	
	Willer	explain vote - 'aye'



	Madigan	
	Geo-Karis	explain vote
	Madigan	
	Ewell	explains vote
	Madigan	
	Totten	Verification
	Madigan	dump Roll Call
	Griesheimer	explain vote
	Madigan	take
	Totten	requests verification
	Madigan	
	Jack O'Brien	poll of absentees
	Madigan	
	Jack O'Brien	affirmative verified
20:40	Madigan	
	Kempiners	
	Madigan	be in their chairs
	Jack O'Brien	continues verification
	Madigan	
	Jack O'Brien	
	Totten) questions of affirmative))
	Madigan	
	Mugalian	
	Madigan	
	Mugalian	vote me 'aye'
	Jack O'Brien	



	Madigan)	further questions
)	of affirmative
	Totten)	
	Jack O'Brien	
	Tipsword	inquiry
	Madigan	SB 1036 passed
	Beaupre	reconsider vote
	Madigan	
	VanDuyne	Lay on table
	Madigan	voice vote...'ayes' have it
	Jack O'Brien	SB 1258
	Madigan	
20:51	Kozubowski	explains bill...Sponsor
	Madigan	vote
	?	explain vote
	Madigan	
	Fennessey	explain vote
	Madigan	
	Simms	explain vote
	Madigan	
	Lechowicz	explain vote
	Madigan	
	Ewell	explain vote
	Madigan	
	McMaster	explain vote
	Madigan	
	Walsh	explain vote
	Madigan	take the record....SB 1258
		passed...



	Madison	
	Madigan	SB 1285 & 1290 & 1291 on Fall Calendar
	Geo-Karis	HB 2967 on Fall Calendar
	Madigan	leave granted
21:02	Keller	
	Madigan	SB 1301
	Jack O'Brien	SB 1301, Third Reading
	Boyle	1301, explains the Bill, Sponsor
	Madigan	
	Rigney	question
	Madigan	yields
	Rigney	question asked
21:06	Boyle	
	Rigney	
	Boyle	
	Rigney	
	Boyle	
	Madigan	
	Sangmeister	question
	Madigan	yields
	Sangmeister	question asked
	Boyle	response and discussion
	Sangmeister	
21:10	Boyle	
	Sangmeister	speaks to the Bill
	Madigan	



	Ewing	SB 1301 (cont.)
21:14	Madigan	SB 1301
	Katz	question
	Madigan	yields
	Katz	question asked
	Boyle	
	Katz	
	Boyle	
	Katz	speaks to the Bill
	Madigan	
	Tuerk	question
	Madigan	yields
	Tuerk	question asked
	Boyle	
	Tuerk	
21:19	Boyle	
	Tuerk	
	Madigan	
	Madison	question
	Madigan	yields
	Madison	question asked
	Boyle	response and discussion
	Madison	
	Boyle	
21:20	Madison	SB 1301, discussion
	Boyle	
	Madison	



	Boyle	
	Madison	take it back to second
	Boyle	
	Madigan	
	Deavers	moves previous question
	Madigan	so moved
	Boyle	to close
	Madigan	vote
	Fleck	explain vote
	Madigan	
	?	
	Madigan	
	Boyle	explain vote
	Madigan	
	LaFleur	explain vote
	Madigan	
21:29	Dunn	explain vote
	Madigan	
	Neff	explain vote
	Madigan	
21:31	Mulcahey	SB 1301, explain vote
	Madigan	
	?	
	Madigan	
	Schraeder	explain vote
	Madigan	
	Leinenweber	explain vote



	Madigan	SB 1301 (cont.)
	Geo-Karis	explain vote
	Madigan	
	Coffey	explain vote
	Madigan	
	Davis	explain vote
	Madigan	take the record, passed. House Bills, Third Reading
	Fred Selcke	Third Reading ..HB 3096
	Madigan	HB 3096
21:40	Walsh	3096, question of Chair
	Madigan	
	Beaupre	explains the Bill, Sponsor
	Madigan	vote
	Keller	
	Madigan	
21:42	Keller	HB 3096
	Beaupre	
	Keller	discussion
	Beaupre	
	Keller	
	Beaupre	
	Keller	what projects
	Beaupre	
	Keller	
	Madigan	
	Hirschfeld	question



	Madigan	yields...HB 3096
	Hirschfeld	question asked
	Beaupre	discussion
	Hirschfeld	
	Beaupre	
	Hirschfeld	
	Beaupre	
	Madigan	
	Totten	question
	Madigan	yeilds
	Totten	question asked
	Beaupre	
21:45	Totten	HB 3096, discussion
	Beaupre	
	Totten	
	Beaupre	
	Totten	
	Madigan	
	Byers	moves previous question
	Madigan	so moved
	Beaupre	to close
	Madigan	
	Walsh	point of order
	Madigan	discussion on procedure
	Walsh	
	Madigan	
	Walsh	



	Madigan	HB 3096 (cont.)
	Walsh	
	Madigan)	discussion on rules
)	
	Walsh)	
	Beaupre	once again to close
	Madigan	
	Telscer	
21:53	Madigan	
	Telscer	HB 3096...takes 107 votes
	Madigan	incurs State debt
	Bradley ?	
	Madigan	vote
	Tipsword	explain vote
	Madigan	
	Walsh	explain vote
	Madigan	
	Beaupre	explain vote
	Madigan	
	Hirschfeld	explain vote
	Madigan	
	Londrigan	explain vote
	Madigan	
	Campbell	explain vote
	Madigan	
	Schlickman	explain vote
	Madigan	
	Jones	explain vote



	Madigan	HB 3096 (cont.)
	Mann	explain vote
	Madigan	
	Beaupre	postpone consideration
	Madigan	so moved
	Beaupre	
	Madigan	SB 1297
	Fred Selcke	SB 1297, Third Reading
	Madigan	
22:07	Keller	explains the Bill
	Madigan	vote...Bill passed
	Fred Selcke	SB 1135, Third Reading
	Madigan	SB 1135
	Caldwell	SB 1135, explains the Bill
	Madigan	
	Schlickman	speaks on the bill
	Madigan	
	Gaines	speaks in favor of this Bill
	Madigan	
	Skinner	question
	Madigan	yields
	Skinner) question put
	Caldwell) response and discussion
)
	Skinner)
	Caldwell)
	Madigan	
	Downs	speaks to the Bill



	Madigan	SB 1135
22:20	Caldwell	to close
	Madigan	vote
	Berman	explain vote
	Madigan	
	Friedrich	explain vote
	Madigan	
	Yourell	
	Madigan	
	Dunn, R	
	Madigan	
	Lundy	
	Madigan	
	Geo-Karis	
	Madigan	
	Stone	
	Madigan	vote...Bill
	Caldwell	poll absentees
	Fred Selcke	
	Caldwell	
	Madigan	
	Caldwell	
	Madigan	postpone consideration
22:31	Fred Selcke	SB 1371, Third Reading
	Madigan	
	Jaffe	explains the Bill
	Madigan	



	Sevcik		
	Madigan)	
)	
	Sevcik)	discussion...SB 1371
)	
	Jaffe)	
	Madigan		
	Tuerk		
	Madigan		
	Hirschfeld		
	Madigan		
	Hirschfeld)	discussion
)	
	Jaffe)	
	Madigan		
	Terzich		moves previous question
	Madigan		so moved
22:40	Jaffe		to close
	Madigan		vote
	Deuster		explain vote
	Madigan		
	Lucco		explain vote
	Madigan		SB 1371
22:46	Stubblefield		explain vote
	Madigan		
	Cunningham ?		explain vote
	Madigan		
	Mulcahey		explain vote
	Madigan		
	Shea		



	Madigan	
	Matijevich	
	Madigan	passed, SB 1371
	Fred Selcke	SB 1384, Third Reading
	Madigan	
	Stubblefield	explains the Bill, Sponsor
	Madigan	vote....passed
	Fred Selcke	SB 1392, Third Reading
	Madigan	
	Hart	explains the Bill, Sponsor
	Madigan	vote.....passed
	Fred Selcke	SB 1465
	Madigan	
	McPartlin	fall calendar
	Madigan	leave granted
22:55	Fred Selcke	SB 555, Second Reading
	Madigan	
	Fred Selcke	4 Committee Amendments
	Madigan	
	Davis	explains Am. #1 & synopsis
	Madigan	Am. #1...adopted
	Fred Selcke	Am. #2..tabled, Am. #3 read
	Davis	explain Am. #3
	Madigan	Am. #3...adopted
	Fred Selcke	Am. #4...read
	Davis	explains Am. #4..yields to Ryan...



	Madigan	
	Ryan	explains Am. #4 to SB 555
	Madigan	
	?	
	Davis	
	Madigan	Am. #4...adopted
	Fred Selcke	Am. #5...read
	Madigan	
23:01	Shea	explains Am. #5
	Madigan	
	Ryan	question of sponsor
	Shea	
23:03	Ryan	SB 555...discussion on Am. #5
	Shea	
	Madigan	
	Barnes	
	Ryan	
	Barnes	
	Ryan	
	Barnes	
	Ryan	
	Madigan	
	Anderson	
	Davis	
	Anderson	
	Davis	
	Madigan	



	Huff	clear up Dept. of Labor question
	Anderson	
	Davis	
	Madigan	
	Barnes	
	Madigan	
	Campbell	
	Madigan	
23:10	Shea	SB 555 (cont.)
	Davis	
	Madigan	
	Mann	supports the Am. #5
	Madigan	Am. #5...adopted
	Fred Selcke	Am. #6...read
	Madigan	
	Skinner	explains Am. #6
	Madigan	Am. #6
	Mann	explain vote
	Madigan	Am. #6...lost...Third
	Fred Selcke	SB 1500, Second Reading
	Madigan	leave on order of Second Reading
	Shea	
	Madigan	
23:16	Shea	
	Madigan	vote on motion
	Fred Selcke	SB 210, Third READING
	Tipsword	tries to explain Bill...



	Madigan	vote..take the record..TOOR
	Washburn	
	Madigan	
	Shea	restates motion..length of debate limited
23:25	Madigan	
	Washburn	
	Madigan	
	Washburn	
	Madigan	
23:29	Washburn	
	Madigan	
	Tipsword	
	Madigan	
	Washburn	
	Madigan	SB 210
	Beaupre	
	Madigan	
	Giglio	
	Madigan	
	Mudd	
	Madigan	SB 779 on Fall Calendar
	McClain	
	Madigan	SB 863 on Fall Calendar
	Marovitz	
	Madigan	
	McPartlin	SB 1109 on Fall Calendar



23:35	Madigan	
	Kozubowski	
	Madigan	1260 on Fall Calendar
	Hart	SB 193 on Fall Calendar
	Madigan	leave granted
	Kornowicz	
	Madigan	SB 296 on Fall Calendar
	Taylor	SB 550, 551, 552 on Fall Calendar
	Madigan	leave
	McAuliffe	HB 206 on Fall Calendar... on Postpone Consideration
	Madigan	leave granted
	VonBoeckman	HB 3054 on Fall Calendar ...motions
	Madigan	leave granted
	Shea	
	Madigan	
	Beaupre	SB 657 on Fall Calendar ...motions
	Madigan	leave granted
	VanDuyne	HB 3053 on Fall Calendar ...con. post.
	Madigan	leave granted
	VonBoeckman	correction made
	Madigan	
	VonBoeckman	1156....SB
	Madigan	
23:40	VonBoeckman	move it on Fall Calendar
	Madigan	
	Grotberg	put all on Fall Calendar
	Madigan	SB 1156



	Fred Selcke	SB 1156, Second Reading
	Madigan	SB 1156, Third
	Caldwell	SB 1135...heard
	Madigan	
	Hirschfeld	exempt
	Madigan	
	Hirschfeld	
	Madigan	
	McAuliffe	SB 244, on fall
	Madigan	leave granted
	Gaines	parliamentary inquiry
	Madigan	
	Gaines	ruling by parliamentarian
	Madigan	
	Washburn	
	Madigan	SB 207
	Daniels	SB 207...explains Bill..Spon-
	Madigan	
	Yourell	
23:45	Madigan	SB 207
	Yourell	
	Daniels	
	Madigan	
	Schuneman	speaks to Bill
	Madigan	
	Jones	
	Madigan	



Deuster	
Madigan	SB 207...passed
Tipsword	SB 210..explains the Bill..
Madigan	
Walsh	opposes the Bill
Madigan	
Washburn	speaks to Bill
Madigan	SB 210...vote
Darrow	explain vote
Madigan	
Walsh	verification
Madigan	take the record
Walsh	verification
Madigan	
Tipsword	poll absentees
Fred Selcke	polls the absentees
Madigan	
Greiman	matter of inquiry
Madigan	
Tipsword	already passed
Madigan	
Fred Selcke	continues poll
Madigan	
Fred Selcke	
Madigan	
Fred Selcke	SB 210..verifies affirmative
Madigan	



Mudd	
Madigan	
Grotberg	motion
Madigan	not timely
Grotberg	
Madigan	
Grotberg	
Madigan	
Marovitz	SB 935...on fall
Madigan	leave
Ebbesen	SB 530 on Fall
Madigan	leave granted
Gaines	answer
Madigan	
Gaines	
Madigan	
Caldwell	SB 1135...on fall
Madigan	
VonBoeckman	SB 1156 ..on fall
Madigan	leave
Terzich	SB 349 & 352...on fall
Madigan	
McMasters	inquire of time
Madigan	
McMasters	ruling of chair
Madigan	
Beaupre	move to suspend rules



Madigan	
Grotberg	re-new motion
Madigan	
Fred Selcke	re-reads motion
Madigan	Roll Call
Tipsword	
Madigan	
Walsh	
Madigan	
Shea	exempt bills & Comm. Bills
Madigan	
Grotberg	withdraws motion
Madigan	
Walsh	beyond deadline
Madigan	
Walsh	
Madigan	SB 210..will rproceed with verification
Fred Selcke	proceeds
Madigan	remain in seats
Fred Selcke	
Madigan	
McGrew	parliamentary inquiry
Madigan	
McGrew) discussion
)
Madigan)
Tipsword	



Madigan)	are there questions of
)	affirmative
Walsh)	
Jack O'Brien		
Katz		SB 210...vote me 'aye'
Jack O'Brien		
Madigan		
Walsh		
Madigan		
Mugalian		technical error
Madigan		
Tipsword		formal request
Madigan		
Ebbesen		change vote to 'no'
Madigan		
Kane		by what rule?
Madigan		
Telscer		copy of transcript
Madigan		
Tipsword		place SB 210 on fall
Madigan		leave granted
Shea		
Jack O'Brien		Messages from Senate
Madigan		
Duff		point of personal privilege
Madigan		
Shea		
Madigan		



Katz	Parliamentarian is excellent
Madigan	
Schuneman	
Shea	
Madigan	
Jack O'Brien	House Resolution 419...read Death Resolution
Madigan	
Shea	move to adopt
Madigan	Resolution adopted
Shea	
Madigan	House adjourned.

