

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SEVENTY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH LEGISLATIVE DAY

NOVEMBER 21, 1975



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NOV 21 1975

1.

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to Order. Will the Members please be in their seats. We'll be lead in prayer by the Rev. Krueger."

Krueger: "In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Amen. Oh Lord, bless this House to thy service this day. Amen. It was Samuel Johnson who said 'In order that all men may be taught to speak the truth, it is necessary that all likewise should learn to hear it. Let us pray for light. Let thy mercy, oh Lord, be upon us and the brightness of thy spirit illuminate our inner souls, that he may kindle our cold hearts and light up our dark minds who abideth ever more in Thy and Thy glory. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Agreed Resolutions."

Jack O'Brien: "House Resolution 579. Winchester et al. House Resolution 580, Giorgi et al. House Resolution 581. Reed. 582. VonBoeckman. 583. Yourell. 584. Emil Jones. 590. McAuliffe. 591. Meyer and Dan Houlihan. 592. Anderson."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "House Resolution 579 by Representative Winchester honors Samuel Eliza of Pulaski County for his contribution as the Coach at Illinois Southern University at Carbondale. 580 by Representative Giorgi and all the Winnebago County Representatives honors Bolin High School in their victory over Deerfield. 581 by Representative Reed honors Steven Newlander of Deerfield who piloted a hot air balloon over Lake Michigan. 582 VonBoeckman honors Esther Peterchoate, who had a monument dedicated at Hopkinsville overlooking the Illinois River. 583 by Yourell honors Michael W. Funston who saved a drowning Japanese in the Bay of Tokyo. 584 by Emil Jones honors the Morgan Park neighborhood, South side of Chicago for the grand and glorious neighborhood that it is. 590 by McAuliffe honors Mr. and Mrs. Paul Mann of Chicago who were married for 50 years. 591 by Meyers honors Mr. Cal Spencer of Chicago who recently completed a remarkably journey by bicycle from New York City to San Diego, California. 592 by..... honors the Eureka High School Hornets who finished the 1970 football season with the outstanding record of 11 victories and only one lost. I move the adoption of the agreed resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has moved the adoption of the agreed Resolutions."



All in favor, indicate by saying 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Resolutions are adopted. Further Resolutions."

Jack O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 76. Polk et al. House Resolution 585. Polk and House Resolution 588. DiPrima et al."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee on Assignment. Death Resolutions."

Jack O'Brien: "House Resolution 589. Tipsword et al. In respect to the Memory of Mr. George P. Johns."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "I move for the adoption of this Death Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "A former Member? Jack? Who's it from? Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Senator Johns was not only a Member of this Body, but he was here, went to the Senate and came back here."

Speaker Redmond: "Take this one out of the Record. I think we should read that before..... later on in the day. Representative Shea."

Shea: "Ah..... Mr. Katz and Walsh and I have just collected between the three of us about \$8.00 and are going to give it to Representative Deuster, so he and Representative Skinner can have breakfast for the next two hours."

Speaker Redmond: "Who was the Deuster, Skinner and who was the other one? Walsh? Did you have Walsh in that one? Well, he's..... that's a switch. We'll be at ease until the call of the gavel. Would this be a good time for Senate Bill 32, Representative Shea?"

Shea: "As long as I can vote a few switches."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, ah..... when you first were elected Speaker of this House, you indicated that it would be your intent to think in terms of the Membership and that along these lines during the week, you would try to call those Bills that would take much time and on get-a-way day, which normally would be get-a-way day, you would not..... we would not have Bills that were time prolonging. Now here we are on a Friday and I understand we are going to consider the Rules, which we haven't considered for a whole year. It's probably going to take us a substantial amount of time, Mr. Speaker, and I'm wondering how this fits into the pattern of considering the Members if we're going to be getting out of here on a



windblown day, late in the evening."

Speaker Redmond: "Probably not very well, but the difficulty is that the Handbook is just about ready to go to print and it seemed inconceivable to me that we should have a Handbook go to print without having some House Rules. There never was a time in the Session when I thought we could afford the five hours or whatever it would be to ah..... possess ourselves to the Rules and we tried it many times and it never seemed to work. I'm sorry, but I just don't feel that we want the Handbook go without having Rules in it."

Shea: "On the Order of the Speaker's Table is House Resolution 237, marked House Rules. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ah..... due to the fact, as the Speaker just mentioned, ah..... we will be going to press very soon with regard to the Rules and notwithstanding the desire of the Speaker to at all times accommodate the Members of the House we move now into the adoption of the Rules of the House. Now last night there was distributed to each Members of the House a copy of the proposed House Resolution 237, along with Amendments that have been adopted. Now, they were amendments that were adopted in the Rules Committee. In addition, there are proposed Amendments that have been filed. Now the explanation of the recommendations of the Rules Committee is contained on a document that was given to each Member last night, called 'Explanatory Report on Recommendations for Permanent Rules'. Because, in the course of dealing with the Amendments, so many of these matters will be so well illustrated, I thought that we really could move on into the Amendments that had been proposed. It will be borne in mind by the Members of the House that the House Rules, of course, cover the proceedings in the House, except insofar as they might be covered by Joint Rules. Obviously, provisions that would be inconsistent with Joint Rules would not be able to be followed. In general I would want to thank the many Members of the House who appeared before the Rules Committee, appeared before the Rules Committee. There was distributed to you in the materials that you received yesterday a list of a large number of legislators, Members of this House, who came before the Rules Committee in its meetings and hearings, both in Springfield and Chicago and advanced many suggestions with regard to



improvements in the House Rules. All of those were very carefully considered by the Rules Committee. I would want to say to you that the Rules Committee has had an unparalleled degree of cooperation from the Republican Members, as well as the Democratic Members. Mr. Walsh and Mr. Washburn and the other Republican Members of the Rules Committee have participated unsittingly and I believe that in a real sense, the Rules that emerged in House Resolution 237 are not in any sense a partisan undertaking, because the Rules for the running of the House would apply and will apply regardless of which party might prevail in elections that would be taking place. And so having said all of that and having advised you that this morning there was placed upon your desk a brief summary of the Amendments that had been filed, I think it appropriate to move, then, into the Amendments that have been offered, Mr. Speaker, to permit the distinguished Members of the House, who may have presented positions to the Rules Committee, which positions the Rules Committee felt perhaps were not positions that the Rules Committee would accept, notwithstanding the ultimate determinors of the Rules of this House are the Members of this House and the ultimate forum where those issues will be decided here on the Floor of the House, and so it is entirely appropriate, Mr. Speaker, then at this point I would request that you proceed ahead and the Clerk proceed ahead with the Amendments that have been filed to House Resolution 237."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Katz, have we adopted 237?"

Katz: "Well, it would be my views, Mr. Speaker, that the correct procedure, but I would rely upon you for this, would be that we would not adopt the Report of the Rules Committee until it has been amended and then we would vote upon the adoption of the Rules as Amended. If you feel otherwise, Mr. Speaker, we could proceed ahead. We can accept the Report, but not adopt the Report until such time as it is in its final form."

Shea: "Well, I thought perhaps that we could adopt 237 and they would then become the Rules of this House and we would have the permanent Rules and we could start on the Amendments. Mr. Kane does not favor that idea, but if we could just be at ease for a minute and if you and Mr.



Walsh and perhaps Mr. Kane could come up here, we could see about getting this accomplished. Mr. Walsh. All right, Mr. Katz, you want to explain the procedure you want to follow on the adoption of House Resolution 237."

Katz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. House Resolution 237 is presented here in the posture of a Report of the Rules Committee, making recommendations with regard to permanent Rules of the House. Now a number of Members who appeared before the Rules Committee wanted opportunity to present proposed Amendments to the Report of the Rules Committee and those have been filed and marked as Amendments to House Resolution 237. So we would proceed immediately with regard to the Report of the Rules Committee with the Amendments that have been filed and we would take them in order as quickly as we could proceed and then following the conclusions of those Amendments, we would then proceed to vote with regard to the Amendments to House Resolution 237 as Amended on a Do Adopt Resolution."

Shea: "All right, Mr. Clerk, read Amendment #1."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #1....."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Are we..... Thank you Mr. Speaker. Are we going to go through this now, step by step?"

Shea: "It appears that's the order the Gentleman wishes to follow."

Ryan: "I would then question a quorum, Mr. Speaker."

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

Friedrich: "Ah..... I'd like to ask a question of Mr. Katz. Are these Amendments to the existing Rules or to the proposed Rules by the Rules Committee?"

Katz: "Mr. Frederich, these are Amendments to the proposed Rules as reported and recommended by the Rules Committee."

Friedrich: "That was my understanding. Thank you."

Shea: "Mr. Washburn. Will all those Members, please, that are in the Chamber, indicate their presence by voting 'present'. The House will stand at ease. Mr. Doorkeeper, find Members of the House of Representatives. Mr. Washburn, could I see you, please? The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis."



Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I hope all of my colleagues hear me. I've been here since ten minutes to nine. The Speaker's been here since ten minutes to nine. The Majority Leader's been here since ten minutes to nine. There are about twenty Democrats and Republicans that have been here since ten minutes to nine. I would like to get all of my colleagues either roused out of bed or whatever the dickens they're doing and get here on the Floor, because I've got plenty of correspondence to answer. I can't leave the Floor because we were suppose to be here at Nine O'Clock and I just don't think it's fair to the rest of us because we've got plenty to do here. Let's get moving and get over here, and I ask that we call the Roll Call then and either we adjourn and bring them back Monday and see how they like that."

Shea: "Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I think it would be helpful if the ah..... Speaker might announce, it looks like we have about 79 Members present and if we just get ten more in, encourage ten of our colleagues. I know when you're sitting in the office, you wonder if there's two or three, and we're up to 82 now, we just have 7 more and we'll have a quorum and we can proceed."

Shea: "The Board indicates there is now a quorum of the House of Representatives present. Mr. Katz is on House Resolution 237. Read Amendment #1, Mr. Clerk. Number 237."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #1. Kane. Amends House Resolution 237 on page 4, line 15 by deleting 'on the desk' and inserting in lieu thereof 'in the office' and so forth."

Shea: "Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a very simple Amendment. What it does is shift First Reading of House Bills from the time in which they are introduced until after they are reported out from Committee. The effect of this would be that any Committee Amendments would be enrolled and engrossed in the Bill before it's reported to the Floor of the House. That way the House itself would not have to readopt all the Amendments that were adopted in Committee. This would strengthen the Committee structure. It would remove a lot of the paperwork that ends up on our desks. The only

Bills that would be enrolled on our desks would be the Bills that are



reported out of Committee. They would include all Committee Amendments, and then on Second Reading, the only items that we would have to go through are Amendments proposed by Members of the House to the Bill as its reported out of Committee. I would move the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Resolution 237."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz, on the question."

Katz: "Ah..... the Rules Committee considered the recommendation of Representative Kane and in its consideration of it, it also had the Clerk and discussed with the Clerk the technical problems involved in the recommendation of Mr. Kane. The technical problem is that it would involve the problem of double printings. Now all the Members of the House know the problems that resulted in the spring session, when Bills were not available at the time they were scheduled when there was a deluge of problems resulting from the inability of the printer to keep up with the pace that the House was moving at with regard to the Introduction of Bills. The Clerk believes that Mr. Kane's proposal would aggravate that problem by resulting in double printings in situations where Bills are first printed under his proposal, when they are filed. They would be reprinted at the point when they come out of Committee. They would then have to be engrossed again in a double process when they come off of the floor after the Amendment and so the Rules Committee believes that until we have gone through a session that unlike the spring session, the printer has been able to keep up with our printing problems, we should not aggravate the problem by involving any double printing, and accordingly the Rules Committee reluctantly must oppose Mr. Kane's proposal. It would cost, in addition, another half a million dollars a year in printing costs for the General Assembly as far as the House is concerned and we also felt that in this time of tightened problems and also the problems of the budget that we should not add the additional half a million dollars in printing costs."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, on the question, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask if it's fair or practical that the response take longer than the presentment on each of these Amendments? If that is permitted, the peerless Chairman has the tendency to be prolex and we'll be here after Thanksgiving. Fair play should



require the response to be no longer than the presentment."

Shea: "Mr. Kane to close."

Kane: "Very briefly, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't think that any technical problems should get in the way of our operating this House as efficiently and as well as we can. As far as the duplicating of printing is concerned, there are very few Bills that we would have to have additional printing on, because right now something like 75 to 80% of our Amendments are Committee Amendments, ah..... so that the only Bills where we would have additional printing would be Bills on which Amendments are adopted that are presented on the Floor. Right now ah..... Bills have to be re-enrolled and ah.... engrossed after they pass the House and this would just move it to the place where it would be of some use to us, and so I think the half million dollar cost is considerably out of line, and I think that we can take care of our printing problems and I renew my Motion to adopt Amendment #1."

Shea: "All those in favor will say 'aye'. Those opposed will say 'nay'. In the Opinion of the Chair..... Would you like a Roll Call, Mr. Kane. All those in favor will vote 'aye'. Those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. Amendment #2. On that question, there are 59 'nos', 25 'ayes' and the Gentleman's Motion fails. Amendment #2."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #2. Kane. Amends House Resolution 237 on page 14 by deleting line 31 through 36 and so forth."

Shea: "Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What Amendment #2 does is keep the deadlines that are in House Resolution 237, but does away with all the automatic tabling of Bills if they don't meet particular deadlines or particular time. What this would do is remove the pressure to hear a Bill by a certain time particularly if that Bill has not had all of its problems worked out. I think this would encourage leaving Bills in Committee until the Committee is ready to work on them. So often last Spring, we were hearing Bills in which Sponsors were saying, look, if you don't vote out the Bill today, it's going to be automatically killed, because I've reached the 45 day deadline and I think this would remove that kind of a pressure and



allow Committees to work in a much more reasonable and orderly fashion. I would move the adoption of Amendment #2."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "The Rules Committee opposed Mr. Kane's Amendment, because the Rules Committee is against keeping all Bills alive and the Legislature meeting continuously as Mr. Kane favors. It was the feeling of the Rules Committee that most Members of the House desire to have restricted Sessions that they do not desire to, for the Legislature to meet continuously and that the present Rules are preferred by the Members of the House who desire to be in Springfield for limited sessions and not to be a full-time Legislature."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "Thank you very much. That's an interesting comment from the Chairman of the Rules Committee about the Rules Committee favoring us not being here all the time. The problem with the present set of Rules is it doesn't adapt itself to the volume of legislation that this Body can produce, and the reason that we're here all the time is because we don't have a fluid motion on these Bills that we have. We have peaks and valleys on the hearing and the deliberation of the Bills. There really are only two deadlines in my judgement that the Legislature should retain. One is the Introduction of Bills, the cutting off of a certain..... at a certain time of Introductions and the other is after a Committee has discharged a Bill, then there ought to be only a certain number of days, for instance 30 days, after the Bill appears on the Calendar after Committee, in which action should be required, but ah..... if we are going to be able to adapt ourselves to the number of Bills that we continually introduce, then then we're going to have to ah..... use a Rule, such as is suggested here, by Representative Kane. Ah..... this business of putting Bills on the Interim Study Calendar, putting them on the Fall Calendar, putting them on the Spring Calendar is only a way the Leadership kidding the Members into thinking that their Bills are going to receive consideration after the deadlines which we impose upon ourselves, and which make us operate under tremendous pressure in the Spring. To me, ah.... I think the Rules Committee and the Leadership should reconsider their position on the Rule suggested by Representative Kane, here, and ah...."



so that we can deliberate longer on matters that need more deliberation so the Committees can really study matters that need study, and ah..... if necessary take time, hold hearings, while we're not in session, because there are many important issues, which are side-tracked or which are given short, because of the fact we have deadlines and Committees can't meet when the Legislature is in Session and the Legislature is in session all the time and certain periods of time, so I feel that ah..... that the reasons given by Representative Katz for opposing this are actually the reasons that we should support it and so I hope that the Membership will give full consideration to the Rule suggested by Representative Kane and adopt it."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, to close."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm surprised that the Chairman of the Rules Committee would say that I want the House in continuous session and use that as a reason to vote against this Bill. I'm not in favor of having the House in continuous session and I think that this ah..... Bill would allow the House to work in a much more orderly fashion. Right now, I think the major problem with the House in handling Bills is that it's on an assembly line system. As if a Bill is introduced, it has to be heard in Committee and it has to be heard because we have these artificial deadlines for automatically killing Bills. If we don't have to keep going from one step to the next, we can get rid of a lot of Bills by just letting them lie in Committee without giving the Sponsor of having his Bill automatically killed. It's a lot easier to let a Bill lie in Committee than to have it killed. It's a lot easier to tell our constituents that, so I would renew my Motion to adopt Amendment #2."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. All those in favor, will say 'aye'. Those opposed you want a Roll Call? All those in favor will vote 'aye'. Those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 22 'ayes', 59 'nays' and the Gentleman's Motion fails. Amendment #3."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #3. Kane. Amends House Resolution 237 on page 43 by striking lines 7 through 18 and inserting in lieu thereof....."



Shea: "Before we proceed, Mr. Kane, excuse me. Mr. Leinenweber, the Gentleman from Will, has an Inquiry."

Leinenweber: "Ah..... Mr. Speaker, I'd like to withdraw Amendments 41 and 57, which I am the Sponsor of."

Shea: "The Gentleman asks leave of the House to withdraw Amendments 41 and 57, or Table them. Is there objection? Hearing none, Amendments # 41 and 57 will be Tabled. Mr. Walsh wishes to be recorded 'no' on Amendment #2. All right, read Amendment #3, Mr. Clerk. All right, the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, on Amendment #3."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #3 is very simple. It makes the same deadlines applicable in both years of the Session, but the first and the second year, and also what it would do is remove the necessity for Bills in the second year of a session to be approved by the Rules Committee before they can be heard in the Regular Standing Committees, and I would move the adoption of Amendment #3."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "The affect of Amendment #3 would be to have the Session next year exactly the same as the Session this year has been. For a variety of reasons, the Rules Committee opposed that. We.... It would be unfair with the primary for example coming in March for incumbent Legislators to be required to be here as we were last year in January, February and March legislating. There is a general feeling that the trend toward trying to make it so that with limited budgets that we confine or at least concentrate next year on budgetary matters and appropriation matters. That is something that is, we think is desired by the public, as well as by the Legislators, and so we would oppose Amendment #3."

Shea: "Discussion? The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, to close."

Kane: "The deadlines in the second year could be changed by House Resolution during the first legislative week of the second year and I think that would take care of the problems brought out by Representative Katz. What it would do is remove from the Rules Committee the stranglehold that they now have on Bills after June 30th of the first legislative year, and I think that stranglehold should be broken, and I



would move for the adoption of Amendment #3."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves for the Adoption of Amendment #3. All those in favor will say 'aye'. Those opposed will say 'nay'. All those in favor will say 'aye'. Those opposed will say 'nay'. In the Opinion of the Chair, the 'nos' have it. Amendment #4."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #4. Kane. Amends House Resolution 237 on Page 10 by inserting after Line 18 the following."

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

Kane: "Amendment #4 to the Rules would read 'require Chairman of Committees to file with the Clerk an agenda 24 hours in advance of Committee Hearings on the Bills which are going to be called and the witness that are to be heard in committee' and I believe that this Amendment would allow the Members of the House to plan their own time better, would allow the witnesses to plan their time and give some notice of which Bills are going to be heard, actually heard in committee and which ones are going to be postponed even though they have been posted. I think that one of the worst things that we have in the House is the way that our Committee hearings are now being held. I think if we look, refer back to what happened this past spring, they can see some real problems and I would think that Amendment #4 addresses itself to those problems and would make for much better Committee hearings."

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

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I don't like to disagree with my colleague, Representative Kane, relative to this Amendment to House Resolution 237, but as Chairman of the Counties and Township Committee and the Members will know this to be true that we had the second largest workload of any Committee in the House last session and if this Amendment were to be adopted, I think we would still be in Committee hearings. I think that the Committees have to be flexible in that they have to hear the Bills as the Sponsors appear in the Committee. We all know that we are Members of other Committees other than the one that we serve on. We have Bills in other Committee, other than the ones we serve on and many times we have to wait in committees for our Bills and then many times we fail to be there when the Bill is called, so I think we have to have the flexibility so that as a Sponsor and as a Ruleman, many times Committees are just waiting



around for a Sponsor to appear, particularly when the workload gets so great in the closing days of the Session or the Committee hearings, and as Sponsors appear in Committee, then we put them right on and get their Bill heard and get it voted up or down, so I think in order to maintain the flexibility we have to have to have to move the Bills out of Committee and certainly we can't determine what witnesses are going to appear and when, we'd have to contact every witness to have that witness contact the Committee Clerk and have their name on that Agenda in the order in which they would appear and I think that this is again adding to the paperwork and the load of the Committee Clerk. Certainly these Committee Clerks have got a hell of a lot to do now, more than they really should have to do and when you have four or 500 hundred Bills in Committee, I don't think that this Amendment will work at all and I respectfully ask that you vote 'no' on Amendment #4 to House Resolution 237."

Shea: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane to close."

Kane: "I think some of the problems that Representative Yourell mentioned in Committees having to wait around, waiting for Sponsors to show up is the very problems that this Amendment is designed to alleviate. If Members knew when their Bills are going to be called, they could schedule their own time, so that they could be there. Right now, you don't know when your Bill is going to be called and so you're running around and you don't know what's going to happen and so I would renew my Motion, to adopt Amendment #4 and ask for a Roll Call."

Shea: "You're joined by six Members for the Roll Call. All right, the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, moves that for the adoption of Amendment #4, all those in favor will vote 'aye'. Those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 28 'ayes', 66 'nays', 2 Members voting 'present' and the Gentleman's Motion fails. Amendment #5."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #5. Kane. Amends House Resolution 237 on Page 12 by striking Line 15 and 16 and inserting in lieu thereof the following. Printed copies are available in the Bill Room."

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



Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #5 is very simple. It just requires that the printed copies of Bills be available in the Bill Room prior to their being posted for a hearing...ah...Under House Resolution 237 it simply says that...ah...a Bill be available in the Clerk's Office before the Bill can be posted for Committee hearing and what that means is that neither the Members of the Committee nor the Members of the public or the media...ah...have any real access to Bills prior to hearings. I...I can remember in last spring is that Committees were being required to hear Bills...ah...within five minutes of the printed copies being delivered to the Committee hearing and I think that's an atrocious practice and I would move for the adoption of Amendment #5."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Ah...We believe that the proposal of Representative Kane is a sensible one and one that we can live with and we would support Amendment #5."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Fredrich."

Fredrich: "I...I was going to rise to support this because last year ...this year, if there's anything that we could be criticized for justifiably it was the fact that the public was excluded from getting the Bills ahead of time. I went to a Committee one time and even the Committee didn't have a copy of my Bill. I had to go them run off before the Committee got a copy. I think this is a good Amendment."

Shea: "The question is, shall we, shall the House adopt Amendment #5 to House Resolution 237? All those in favor will say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #6."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #6. Kane. Amends House Resolution 237 on page 12 by inserting after line 13, the following and so forth."

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

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I accept the last Roll Call for Amendment #6. Ah...this is a very simple Amendment also. It just simply requires that no more than thirty Bills be posted to be heard by any one Committee on any one Legislative



Day. Ah...Companion Bills would be counted as one Bill rather than several so I think that that would take care of...of that problem. What we had last spring, you'll recall that Committees were...ah...had anywhere up to sixty, seventy, eighty, a hundred Bills posted. Nobody knew which of those Bills were going to be heard, at least half of them were postponed...ah...that required witnesses to come down from Chicago and up from the Southern part of the State to appear on a Bill that there was no chance of being heard and...ah...and I think that this results in an awful lot of unhappiness with the Legislative process, I think that if Committees have to exercise some priority and are limited to thirty Bills which I think is the only reasonable amount of Bills that can be heard in any one day if we're going to give any kind of consideration to them at all and so I would move for the adoption of Amendment #6."

Shea: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "The Rules Committee..ah..would oppose the Amendment of Mr. Kane. There's nothing magical about thirty Bills, the fact is that you have to rely upon the good judgment of the Committee Chairman in scheduling Bills and if we build in these inflexibilities it would result in chaos not in a..an improved procedure and the eloquent remarks of Mr. Yourell a few minutes ago apply equally with with regard to Amendment #6 and we oppose that Amendment."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker...ah...if anything I think that #30 should be reduced to twenty. I don't see how any Committee can give the kind of consideration necessary....ah...when it has to consider thirty Bills in one day. I think if anything if we have to be arbitrary we should, we should have a presumption against new Legislation. We already have probably too many Bills to consider and too many Bills that are enacted into law. If a Committee can work on more than thirty Bills in one day you can be pretty sure that the work product of that Committee has to be inadequate for that day and I urge an 'aye' vote on this motion."



Shea: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane to close."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I thought that thirty Bills was much more than any Committee could reasonably hear in any one day. I think that the only way that this House of Representative is going to be able to get a handle on the amount of work load that we have and the number of Bills that are introduced is to force Committees to start to set priorities on the numbers of Bills that they're going to hear. There's a lot of Bills that don't deserve a hearing. Let's make the Committees set priorities and hear the important Bills and that's going to cut down on the work load that we have on the Floor, it's going to cut...it's going to improve our work product and I would move for the adoption of Amendment #6 and ask for a Roll Call."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Kane, from Sangamon, Mr. Kane moves... Mr. Friedrich, do you wish to discuss this? The Gentleman from Kane, the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane moves for the adoption of Amendment #6. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Open it up Jack. The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "We had at least one situation where we had eighty-five Bills changing woman to person and I don't see any point in taking three days to consider that."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 36 'ayes', 63 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Amendment #7."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #7, Kane. Amends House Resolution 237 on page 25 by inserting after line 18, the following and so forth."

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

Kane: "I would move to table Amendment #7."

Shea: "The Gentleman asks leave to table Amendment #7. All those... is there objection? Hearing none, Amendment #7 is tabled. Amendment #8."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #8. Kane. Amends House Resolution 237 on page 15, line 9 by striking two-thirds and inserting in lieu thereof one-half."



Kane: "I'd move to Table Amendment #8."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, moves to Table Amendment #8. Is there objection? Hearing none, Amendment #8 is tabled. Amendment #9."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #9, Lundy. Amends House Resolution 237 on page 10 by inserting after line 18, the following and so forth."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. If I may preliminary, I'd like to point out to the Members that in the copies of the Amendments that were distributed the second page of Amendment 10 was printed as the second page of nine and vice versa, so when you get to the bottom of Amendment...when you get to the point where you should go over to the second page of Amendment 9 skip down to the second page of 10 and likewise on the other Amendment. Amendment #9 to House Resolution 237 raises a very fundamental question of how the Committee system in the House will work. Traditionally the resources available to the Committees in terms of both staff and budget have been determined by the Leadership and by large that means the majority party Leadership. The Members of the Committees have taken what staff they could get, they have taken what budget they could get and...ah...nobody really has to answer for how much was available, whether it was too little, too much, whether it permitted the Committee to do it's Legislative job adequately. What Amendment 9 proposes is in my view at least a very large step toward professionalizing our approach to Legislation and that is to permit each Committee...ah...to adopt its own budget and provide for its own staff with the approval of the House. The procedure that would be followed is this. The Chairman and the Minority Spokesman on each Committee would divide the budget. It would have to be approved by the Members of the Committee forty per cent of the funds in the Committee Budget would have to be allocated to the use of the minority and the Committee would then report to the House in a Resolution it's proposed budget for the Fiscal Year. It would make its



own decisions about what staff it needs. It would make its own decisions about how much budget it needs. It seems to me that's a...a proper function for the Committees to perform, it's...ah...it would enhance the importance of the Committees and it would allow them to provide for themselves the resources they need to do an adequate job of reviewing the tremendous volume of Legislation that we have to consider. Now let me just say that I think the situation that has arisen this year is a good indication of why the decision about resources, which will be available to the Committees and the Members of the Committees, is one that ought to be in their own hands and that is that after we passed the Legislative Branch appropriation, the Speaker and the President of the Senate, on their own and as so far as I know without consultation with the Committee Chairman, simply made a determination that some part of the funds the House had appropriated for the operation of Committees and Sub-committees would be curtailed and as a result many of the Committees and Sub-committees of the House have not been able to carry out activity that they felt were essential for the proper consideration of Legislation and issues before them. I think adoption of this Amendment would be a big step in the direction of democratizing the operation of the House and letting the Committees and the Members of those Committees decide what resources they need to do a proper job. I would move the adoption of the Amendment."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Ah...We must regretfully oppose Amendment #9. Amendment #9 would build in a lot of inefficiencies into the administration of House affairs. For example, under the proposal, each Committee Chairman is supposed to be the determiner of staff, but the fact is as it now is we have a professional staff Director and we have situations where a single persons staffs several Committees. Ah...This would be a very inefficient thing to have each Committee Chairman in charge of staff and in fact I might add there is currently in New York a great deal of criticism of the Legislature due to the fact that individual Committee Chairmen



do have staff and it does not have the control and there's been considerable abuse and waste in the use of staff positions for patronage purposes. Accordingly, we must regretfully oppose Amendment #9 as a backwards step in its practical effect."

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

Yourell: "Would the Gentleman, the Sponsor of the Amendment yield for a question? Joe, on line 5, Section A, it says 'Each standing Committee may' does that mean with our structure of twenty-three Committees that some Committees will and some Committees will not do what your Amendment wants it to do?"

Lundy: "Well, that word was put in very advisably Boss, the ideas that some Committees may feel that...ah...that they're happy to let the Speaker allocate the money to them and they...they don't want to adopt a budget for themselves, they want the Speaker to hire their staff for them, they don't want to get involved in that and I felt it was certainly wise to leave that option especially since this is a new procedure. Some Committees and Chairmen very well might not want to do this, others might. Ah...so it is...it is...ah...purposely left discretionary with the Committees to adopt the budget and hire the staff or to leave it as it's presently done with the Speaker and the Leadership."

Shea: "Discussion? Mr. Yourell...er...I'm sorry. Mr. Lundy to close. Mr. Hudson did you want?"

Hudson: "Yes Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"

Shea: "I'm sorry, I didn't see your light on Mr. Hudson."

Hudson: "I didn't have it on you're right, but I would like..."

Shea: "I noticed you jumped up with great...vigor...vigor is a good word."

Hudson: "Joe...ah..."

Shea: "He indicates he'll yield Mr. Hudson."

Hudson: "Just one quickie question here Joe. Do you...do you feel. do you see any possibility in the...ah...system that you outline, a possibility of Committees becoming...ah...ah...jealous of the amount of monies they receive each seeking to justify a certain appropriation each year and perhaps...ah...seeking to raise each



year the amount of money that it might have had in the preceding year or at least feeling that if granted a certain amount of money it had to spend that money. We see this, I think this tendency in Commissions and other...ah...agencies of government that...ah...attempt to justify once having received a certain amount of money, justifying the expenditure. If they don't... if they don't spend it, they feel as if they can not ask for it again in the...ah...next year. Is there any danger in your opinion of this sort of proliferation of expense?"

Lundy: "Well, Ray, I would have to tell you honestly that yes there is some danger of it. I...I can also tell you that I don't think it's a very great danger for two reasons. Number 1...ah... the full House must approve the proposed budget of each Committee and therefore...ah...the Committee Members will have to make the case for any increase from year to year or indeed for their initial budget. Or for whether they need a budget at all...ah...to the entire House and convince the House that they do need the money or they need so much more than some other Committee does and I would point out that we have no such safeguard presently over the budgeting procedures of the House. It's left entirely in the hands of the Leadership. The second reason I don't think it's a great danger is that Members of this House are clearly publicly responsible to their constituents and to the people of the state generally for what they spend and I... I must tell you that in my short...ah...career in this House I have not noticed any penchant for overspending on...on our own perogatives...ah...certainly not for things like staff. Ah...so that I think the Members are sensitive to...to the need to not overspend, to limit their budgets and staff to those that are necessary to do the job."

Hudson: "Thank you."

Shea: "Mr. Friedrich, I would like to interrupt this discussion for a minute. The hour having reached 10:00, let's get the, at least the paper work of the Specials out of the way until this afternoon. So the Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley, would you turn him on for a moment please?"



Bradley: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I now move that the regular Session of the General Assembly stand in recess until..."

Shea: "Until after the Third..."

Bradley: "Until after the Third Special Session. Until after the recess of the Third Special Session."

Shea: "You've heard the motion. All those in favor will say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House stands in recess until after the recess of the Third Special Session."

Shea: "First Special Session of the Seventy-ninth General Assembly is now in Session. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from... McLean, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the attendance Roll Call for the regular Session be the attendance Roll Call for the First Special Session."

Shea: "Mr. Matijevich raises a sole question. You've heard the Gentleman's motion...ah...Mr. Bradley, perhaps we ought to let the Members get on a Roll Call. Somebody raised a quorum call and at the time we took the attendance Roll Call there were only ninety-one Members present in the Chamber."

Bradley: "I rem...I withdraw my motion and let's, let's take a... attendance Roll Call Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "All right, this will be the attendance Roll Call. All those will please vote 'present'. The Gentleman from...The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Well Mr. ...Mr. Speaker, I now move that the First Special Session of the Seventy-ninth General Assembly stand in recess until the hour of 3:00."

Shea: "You've heard the motion. All in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The First Special Session of the Seventy-ninth General Assembly stands in recess until 3:00."

Shea: "Second Special Session of the Seventy-ninth General Assembly is now in Session. Th Gentleman from McLean , Mr. Bradley."



Bradley: "Well Mr. Speaker, I now move that the attendance Roll Call for the First Special Session be used for the attendance Roll Call for the Second Special Session."

Shea: "You've heard the Gentleman's motion. Is there objection? Hearing none, the Roll Call of the First Special Session will be used as the Roll Call of the Second Special Session. The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Now, Mr. Speaker, I move that the Second Special Session of the Seventy-ninth General Assembly stand in recess until after the First Special Session, this afternoon."

Shea: "You've heard the Gentleman's motion. Is there objection? Hearing none...the Second Special Session stands in recess until after the First Special Session."

Shea: "The Third Special Session of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-ninth General Assembly is now in Session. The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I now move that the attendance Roll Call of the First Special Session be used for the attendance Roll Call for the Third Special of the Seventy-ninth General Assembly."

Shea: "You've heard the Gentleman's motion. Is there objection? Hearing none, be Journalized. Now the Gentleman from Bradley.. from McLean, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Thank you Mr...I now move that the Third Special Session of the Seventy-ninth General Assembly stand in recess until after the Second Special Session...The Second Special Session, this afternoon."

Shea: "You've heard the Gentleman's motion. The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. A Point of Personal Privilege, I think of interest to the whole House. For just a moment Mr. Speaker? Ah...The day before yesterday many of you were involved in...ah...memorializing our good friend Nelson Fox, the great White Sox Baseball player to please get well and...ah...come back to Illinois. He is in University Hospital in Baltimore, Maryland. With me this morning are the two Gentlemen to whom I referred, Mr.



Station, Mr. Bill Station and Mr. Michael Brian, who yesterday flew that Memorial down to Nellie Fox in the hospital, presented it to his wife... spent sometime with Mr. & Mrs. Fox. He is a very sick man. They were the only visitors that he has had for sometime, and I think that on behalf of...of the Fox Family and the House of Representatives, we all owe a deep debt of gratitude to these two gentlemen, who personally took two days off of their busy schedules to do this on our behalf. Thank you Ladies and Gentlemen of the House."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I now remo...ah...renew my Motion, to recess the Third Special Session until after the Second Special Session this afternoon."

Shea: "The...ah...Speaker, inadvertently jumped the Roll Call, so could I ask my colleagues again to vote for an Attendance Roll Call. The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley, moves that the Third Special Session now stand in recess. The Regular Session of the House of Representatives is now in Session. The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, whose decision has it been that we dispense with Prayer at these Special Sessions? Is that a decision of the House or is that a decision of the Leadership? We think that the Membership needs all of the guidance that it can have in these matters."

Shea: "Roscoe, I'm sure you need Divine Guidance."

Cunningham: "It was for you that I spoke, not for me."

Shea: "I know I need it, but for you Roscoe, we are keeping a church across from the...ah...Office Building open a little later this morning."

Cunningham: "I'll go with you."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, in that respect to Journalize the matter. May I ask...ah...the Chair to ask for leave to accept the last unanimous prayer."

Shea: "Now back to the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lundy, on Amendment #9."

Lundy: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, am I recognized to close?"

Shea: "No Sir. You have some questions that I interrupted, and as soon



as I can dump this Roll Call, they tell me...Joe Lundy is you'll just.... All right now. The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich wanted to ask a question and then Mr. Fleck."

Friedrich: "Mr. President, I merely wanted to say this sounds like a good idea, but it just won't work. You can't anticipate twenty-four months in advance what a committee's going to be doing, you don't know what Bills are going to be introduced. what investigations have to be made or hearings. What staff you're going to need or anything else. So even though it sounds good, it just won't work."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lundy, to close."

Lundy: "Yes, Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. If I may make my closing remarks in two parts. First to respond to some of the comments that were made and...about the Amendment, and secondly to state why I think this is an important and very fundamental reform in the way the House operates. First to with respect to Representative Katz' charge that instituting this system would result in excessive patronage abuses by Committee Chairmen and so forth, I would make several points. First of all I think it shows a shocking lack of confidence in the ability and integrity of our Committee Chairmen of which he is one. Secondly, I would point out that there are a number of safeguards in the Proposal. A proposed budget and a hiring of staff must be approved by a two-thirds vote of the Committee. That is certainly sufficient to provide a strong minority check on any abuses by the Chairmen, and finally, the proposed budget by the Committee must be justified to the entire House, and a House Resolution adopting that budget passed by the entire House before the Committee's budget is required to be included in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Bill. Now, just let me say as a general matter. What is really at stake here, is whether we will continue as we have in the past to leave the entire decision about staff hiring and...and budget for the Legislative Branch in the hands of a very few Legislative Leaders...ah...who may or may not be sensitive to the needs of the individual committees and the members of those committees or whether we are going to



decentralize that function to some extent while maintaining safeguards and checks on abuses and let the people who serve on the Committees determine what their own needs are and in effect give to them the prerogative to have their Committees be as active or as inactive as they want. There's no requirement that a Committee adopt budgets, but it's left entirely...ah...discretionary with the Members of the Committee, but this does, at least, provide that option. I would say with regards to Representative Friedrich's criticism that it's impossible to anticipate...ah...that may be so, but it's just as difficult for the Leadership to anticipate the needs of the Committees as it is for the Members. Indeed, I would say it's harder for the Leadership which isn't familiar with the work of the Committee or how active the individual Members wish to be. Some Committees form subcommittees and engage in interim activities, others do not. Ah...I think these are decisions that are best made by the people on the Committees. I think this would be an important step in democratizing the operation of the House. Decentralizing the very critical budget making function relating to Legislative Staff and dollar resources available to the Committee. I would renew my Motion to adopt Amendment 9 to House Resolution 237."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #9. All in favor will say 'aye', those opposed will say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'nays' have it. Do five Members wish a Roll Call? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Take the Roll. On this question there are 32 'ayes', 82 'nays', 2 Members voting 'present', and the Gentleman's Motion fails. Amendment #10."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #10, Lundy. Amends House Resolution 237 on page 10 by inserting after line 5, the following, and so forth."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #10 is intended to remedy what seems to me is one of the major deficiencies in current House procedure, and that is the inability of Members to predict the Committees to which their



Bills will be referred, and the sometimes, although I would admit not frequent, arbitrary decision with regard to the reference of Bills...ah...to Committee, by the Committee on Assignment of Bills. All of us can think of examples...ah... from the last Session where Bills which clearly should have gone to Higher Ed or to Judiciary...ah...or to other Committees, but were referred, instead, to Committees where it was felt they either would or would not get favorable treatment depending on the preferences of the Leadership. Now, I don't think that's an appropriate way to operate a Legislative Body. I think what we need is a written statement of the jurisdiction of each Committee so the Members will have some idea of not only where Bills will be referred but of what Committees they wish to serve on, and then when Bills are referred, if a Member feels that the referral of that Bill violates the...or is inconsistent with the jurisdiction of the Committee to which it is referred, you will have a right to appeal that to the House. Now let me say, that would be a very infrequent occurrence. Simply the fact that the House has a written statement of Committee Jurisdiction, I think, will go about ninety-nine and nine-tenths of the way to solving what has been a very irritating problem. Ah...but what this Amendment would do is require the Parliamentarian to develop in the House Rules Committee, to adopt a written statement of jurisdiction for each Committee, and then would give each Member the opportunity when he felt that a Bill had been misreferred, to bring the matter to the House for a final Resolution."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Ah...The Speaker has sympathy with the desire to have as clear lines of jurisdiction as possible. However, the assumption of the mover of the Motion, Mr. Lundy, is that a single Committee has jurisdiction, and another Committee doesn't. The fact of the matter is, that several committees may have jurisdiction over a particular matter and there is no mathematical precision. However, too...ah...if Mr. Lundy does believe that it is possible to do what he wants to do, the Speaker would be prepared to appoint



a Subcommittee of the Rules Committee that would include Mr. Lundy to try to work up a Statement of Jurisdiction, fairer he cannot be than that, and then Mr. Lundy, if he can come up with these clear lines of jurisdiction would have his opportunity to proceed in that manner. The Speaker would not oppose this Amendment #10, but would afford to Mr. Lundy, an opportunity to be on a Subcommittee of the Rules Committee, specifically assigned to the task that Mr. Lundy wants to achieve."

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

Washington: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I think the issue goes much deeper than the question of whether Mr. Lundy is willing and able to serve on a Subcommittee on the Rules. As Mr. Lundy indicated, this is a fundamental reform which has been too long acoming. In the first instance, if we have clear cut lines of delineation and jurisdiction for Committees, the Membership in the first instance would know where they want to serve. Now it is true that more than one Committee might have jurisdiction over a given Bill. I don't see that as a possible problem, but that simply gives flexibility to what Mr. Lundy is trying to do. Furthermore, I think the possibility, not the practice, but the possibility of hanky-panky is something that has disturbed all of us on occasion. We may sit on a given Committee, expecting that a certain Bill, because it covers a certain given area, will come to that given Committee, and we may be on that Committee because we anticipate that legislation coming there, and low and behold, it winds up on another Committee. There's too much possibility for hanky-panky under the existing rules. Now we can't carve jurisdiction in stone, and no matter how careful you delineate a jurisdiction of a given Committee, there will be some areas of ambiguity, but that is not necessarily bad, because it simply gives the Assignment Committee some degree of flexibility within the framework of lining...of outlining jurisdiction. I think this is a fundamental reform and one which we should consider very deeply before passing on it. I support it."



Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Yesterday afternoon, I believe it was. We considered a Veto on Senate Bill 16 which dealt with the Trustees for the Southern Illinois University. Incredible as it may seem, that Bill did not come to the Committee on Higher Education. It's an incredible thing, that the Committee which would normally be clothed with developing fundamental policies for Higher Education in the State of Illinois did not have a chance to consider that Bill. If anything, that kind of situation proves the need for the adoption of Amendment #10. It is as Representative Washington indicated, a fundamental reform long overdue. There ought not to be a mystery about where Bills go. Of course there may be overlaps, there may be conflicts, and there may even be some reason to jockey around and gerrymander a Bill, but basically the introducer of a Bill, the Sponsor of a Bill should have a reasonable anticipation as to where that Bill should go. I don't believe that it's so difficult to determine those jurisdictions. Normally, ninety-nine percent of the cases, as in Senate Bill 16 yesterday, we know where it should go, and if the rules are stated to clearly indicate it, we'll have no ambiguities, we'll have no problems. I think that this Amendment should be adopted. Thank you Sir."

Shea: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "I think at least one example of a misassignment of a Bill or a Constitutional Amendment should be put into the Record. I would direct my colleagues' attention to the Bill to abolish the two and a half to one ratio on the State Income Tax for business to individuals. This went to the Revenue Committee which it seems to me has clear jurisdiction over it, just as the Appropriations Committee would have clear jurisdiction over all Appropriation Bills. It was soundly defeated and lo and behold, another Constitutional Amendment, the same wording was introduced and got assigned to the more fluid, shall I say, Executive Committee. Now, that I think is absurd and I think



that's almost...ah...a fairly strong argument in the State of Illinois where we're driving business out of the state, that you ought to let the experts in the area deal with the problems."

Shea: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Fleck."

Fleck: "Mr. Speaker, out of compassion to the Members and myself, to avoid this cruel and unusual punishment, I move the Previous Question, and I will on every other Amendment if you see fit to recognize me."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves the Previous Question. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' carry. Mr. Lundy to close."

Lundy: "Yes, well...Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Ah...I suppose those who will be serving in the Judicial Branch where the rules are better established, probably don't need to hear the debate. Some of the other Members might be interested in it. Ah...I would simply say, Representative Washington, Greiman, and others who have spoken, have spoken eloquently on the need for this kind of reform in the House procedures. This is not an anti-leadership Amendment. Indeed, it is left to the Committee on Assignment of Bills and the Leadership to devise the Statement of Committee Jurisdiction. They are directed to devise it, not an attempt to tell them where to refer Bills, it simply adding to the rules a requirement that we have some rules about where Bills are to be referred, and I think it's so fundamental that not much more need be said and I would move the adoption of the Amendment and ask for a favorable vote."

Shea: "All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Take the Record. On this question there's 70 'ayes', 33 'nays', and the Gentleman's Motion carries. Amendment #11."

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #11, Lundy. Amends House Resolution 237 on page C, lines 24, 35 and so forth."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lundy."

Lundy: "Yes, Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment would have proposed the establishment of a



House Operations Committee, I must say that...ah...It seems to me that this is a reform which we need that...that it is somewhat beyond...ah...ah the mood of the House at the present time and therefore I would ask for leave to table Amendment 11."

Shea: "The Gentleman asks leave to table Amendment #11. Is there objection? Hearing none, Amendment #11 will be tabled. Amendment #12."

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #12. Lundy. Amends House Resolution 237 page 4 by inserting after line 4 and so forth."

Lundy: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. That's called quitting while you're ahead. Amendment 12 is a very simple Amendment. It simply adds one paragraph, indeed, one sentence to the duties of the Speaker. I will read it in it's entirety and I think the importance of this issue to the Membership is such that they ought to be aware of what it involves. This would direct the Speaker to issue, in cooperation with the Comptroller and after clearance with the United States Internal Revenue Service written regulations covering the administration of the contingent expense allowance. Now we have had some recent and poignant examples of the problems which Members of this House experience when we don't have adequate guidance on what our contingent expense allowance can be used for, how expenditures are to be accounted for...ah...and how the contingent expense allowance in general is to be administered. It seems to me to protect ourselves we have got to ask for guidance from our leadership on what this money can be used for and how it has to be accounted for. I move the adoption of Amendment 12."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Ah, the contingent expense allowance is governed by a statute. the Speaker is like anyone else with regard to complying with the statute...ah...the Speaker does not believe that it is within his authority to vary or change the statute and that each Member of the General Assembly must follow the statute and that if any Member of the House feels that the statute is not sufficiently clear, that he or she will propose Amendments. The Speaker does not believe that this is an area where he has any special



expertise or where it would be a situation where he wants to be the big brother that tries to interpret a statute which should be perfectly clear to each Member who votes on the statute and ought to understand it if he votes on it. Accordingly, the Speaker would prefer not to have this duty and he will be voting 'no' with regard to this Amendment."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lundy, to close."

Lundy: "Yes thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. All this Amendment asks for is a little guidance from our Leadership that to try to keep us out of trouble with both the Comptroller and the I.R.S. on what our contingent expenses...ah...can be used for and how we have to account for them...ah...the examples are...ah... too recent in memory to have to elaborate on that need...ah... I would only say in response to Representative Katz, that all the Members of this Chamber are not Lawyers, even those who are find some ambiguities in the current statute. I think in fairness to the Membership, the Speaker ought to be required to give us some guidance as to what we can use the contingent expense allowance for and how we have to account for it...ah...It's...It's really the least he can do for us. I would renew my motion to adopt Amendment 12."

Shea: "All those in favor of the Gentlemans motion will say 'aye', those opposed will say 'nay'. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this question there's 74 'ayes', 24 'nay' and the Gentlemans motion is adopted. Amendment #13."

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #13. Katz. Amend House Resolution 237 page 16 and so forth."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #13 is simply certain a few technical corrections of substantive import... importance. In going through House Resolution 237 a word here or there was found not to be correct. There are not substantive changes embodied in Resolution, Amendment #13 and I would urge it's adoption."

Shea: "Is there discussion? The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #13. All those in favor will say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment #14."



Fred Selcke: "Amendment #14. Berman, Amend House Resolution 237 on page 8 by deleting lines 21 through 26 and so forth."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman."

Berman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Amendment #14 expands and delineates the provisions regarding the call of a special order of business. The new proposed Amendment would expand the provisions to allow a special order of business to be called by the Speaker in addition to the Rules Committee and it requires posting for at least three Legislative Days of that special order of business. I think that this is an important Amendment because it will allow Bills of the same subject matter to be posted, give us three days additional notice, allow interested people from all over the state to come down and hear the debates on the Floor and I would move it's adoption."

Shea: "Is there debate? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Ah, the Speaker believes that the Amendment of Mr. Berman would permit an orderly running of the House, would aid in saving time and would not offend anyone's rights and so he would support Mr. Berman's Amendment #14."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Will the...yes. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Shea: "He indicates he will."

Schlickman: "Could you distinguish for me a special order of the day and a special order of business?"

Berman: "I'm advised Mr. Schlickman, that a special order of the day technically takes place...takes the place of the entire Calendar, a special order of business is one item on that Calendar."

Schlickman: "Well, with respect to a special order of business which would be one item on the Calendar, the Speaker now has that authority doesn't he?"

Berman: "The Rules Committee does."

Schlickman: "What would be a special order of business?"

Berman: "Ah...debate on...ah...on passage of..ah..no fault divorce for example, where you have three or four Bills on the Calendar they want to set it for a special day to set aside specific time for the attention of those Bills. That could be a special order



Schlickman: "Basically how does this proposed rule differ from the present rule?"

Berman: "Well under the present rule it...only the Rules Committee can do it and there are not the same safeguards built into the present rule as are set forth in...ah...number 14. For example, ...ah...it expands it, the Amendment expands it by allowing both the Rules Committee and the Speaker...ah...where as now it's only the Rules Committee. Secondly, the...ah...ah...it requires...ah...consent of the Sponsor, which does not exist in the present Rules and I think that's a plus..."

Schlickman: "What is the...what is the standing order?"

Berman: "A stand...The standing order is what's listed in Rule 5 as the orders of business as we go down the Calendar. I move its adoption Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "Ah...There's a few more questions."

Berman: "Oh, I'm sorry!"

Shea: "Ah, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski."

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

Berman: "Yes."

Kosinski: "Ah, Mr. Berman if I understand this correct...correctly ah...it is under the course of the day with the consent of the Sponsor of special...ah...Legislation, the Speaker can deviate from the normal procedure to consider that special order. Is that correct?"

Berman: "No. There has to...ah...Special order would require the consent of the Sponsor and it has to be on the Calendar for three Legislative Days."

Kosinski: "Thank you Mr. Berman."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Well Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose this Amendment and I feel that...ah...it's an unnecessary...ah...Amendment to make and I feel that it's a limitation on the exercise of the House and Rules Committee powers as they exist today. I feel that it is the kind of Amendment that can come back to haunt us in the future and...ah...I would very strongly suggest to the Membership that minorities are not protected under this, there is no necessity



at all to diminish the role of the Rules Committee as it exists today in this area and I hope that there are a lot of red lights on the motion."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman to close."

Berman: "Thank you. In response to the last speaker..."

Shea: "Excuse me for a minute. Mr. Richmond did you wish rec...I am sorry. Go ahead. Mr. Berman to close."

Berman: "In response to the last speaker, I'd merely point out that under this rule the minority probably has a stronger protection than under the existing rule. Under the existing rule the Rules Committee which has a...which only requires a majority...ah... and it can, could be controlled by the majority party without any consideration of the minority can set a special order. Under this rule, the minority, only eight Members of the Rules Committee can knock out an order of special, a special order of business. I think it...ah...has certain safeguards that will allow a more orderly attention to important matters of business and I move it's adoption."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #14. 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. On this question there are 96 'ayes', 15 'nays' and the motion carries."

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #15. Berman. Amends House Resolution 237 on page 42 and so forth."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman."

Berman: "This is to try to cut down some of...ah...what I think is ...ah...really nonproductive debate on the motions to suspend the rules allowing...ah...two minutes to explain the motion and two minutes to oppose it...ah...It's an attempt to try to just cut down some of the time in debate. I move its adoption."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #15. Is there discussion? On that the Gent...The Lady from Lake, Ms. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Ah, I wonder if I could ask the Sponsor a question on this. Are you saying Representative that, what are you limit...."



limiting to...limiting it to?"

Berman: "Only on motion to suspend the rules."

Geo-Karis: "Well how do you, I don't...I didn't quite follow your explanation. Would you mind restating it again?"

Berman: "I'm sorry. Okay. Let me take it a little slower. What I'm, what this Amendment would say, I'll, I'll read it. 'Motions to suspend the Rules shall be nondebatable except that the Member making the motion shall have two minutes to explain the motion and the opponent shall have two minutes to speak in opposition.'"

Geo-Karis: "Thank you."

Shea: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson."

Hudson: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Shea: "Yes, he indicates he will sir."

Hudson: "Art, in reading this I need a clarification because it says that the Member making the motion shall have two minutes to explain the motion and the opponents, shall have two minutes. Now, are you talking about opponents in the aggregate or individuals?"

Berman: "That would be up I think to...to the...ah...If the...If the Speaker of the House recognized an opponent who used only one minute then I believe that under this, the interpretation of this Amendment...ah...a second opponent could use another minute."

Hudson: "You're saying then that if...ah...six Members or eight or ten, whatever it might be, wanted to speak, they would have to.... they would have to divide their, their comments into...ah...contain them in two minutes. In other words it's the aggregate, everybody that wanted to speak would have, have to be contained within the two minutes. Is..."

Berman: "That's true. Let me point out Ray, that as you well know, rarely...ah...do you have a motion to suspend rules that has not been cleared with both sides of the aisle and that when, when you have a...ah...an item that requires, that involves debate on the spending ...ah...the issues are rather clear cut within...ah...a few sentences of debate on both sides. They either have the votes or they don't and I think this is just to cut down some of the extra..."

Hudson: "Well I...I just felt that the wording as...as I read it here



might be ambiguous. It might be a point of contention later on as to what exactly was meant. That's the...the only thing I'm seeking to clarify, Art."

Berman: "Thank you."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "Mr...Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. My concern whenever we set up...ah...time limitation is that I've noticed in my short tenure here...ah...that there are different clocks for different folks and that what seems to be two minutes for me, seems so interminably long when some other...ah...important Members of this House get up to speak and so I'm concerned that that would not really be...ah...that the little guy in this House would always be under a two minute pressure and the people who, you know, make the rules here...ah... could go on and on and on and on...ah...I think that...ah...I don't know you'd really allocate two minutes. You'd have to ask to ask someone, 'Are you an opponent of this?' and it would take him two minutes, if what I've seen around here follows, two minutes for him to tell you whether he's an opponent or not. Nobody speaks very clearly in this place. I just, I don't think it's necessary Art and I...I think we should send it to it's grave and I'm going to talk for two minutes on this whether you like it or not. Thank you."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question? And the question is ...ah...who determines who is the opponent. Who do you contemplate would do that? It's obvious who the mover is but who's the opponent and whether the Speaker would do this or..."

Berman: "Yes, the Speaker would do it. I'm sure it's workable."

Deuster: "Thank you."

Shea: "Mr. Schlickman, of Cook."

Schlickman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. If we adopt this Amendment, we might as well throw the Rules of the House out. The suspension of the rules is a very, very critical matter. It's a decision by this body as to whether or not we're going to operate without a rule. I respectfully



suggest to you that the hallmark of dictatorship is brevity, it is expediency and it's efficiency and that I don't want. I respectfully suggest that we give to this Amendment a decent burial by an overwhelming 'no' vote."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman to close."

Berman: "I move its adoption. My two minutes are up."

Shea: "All those in favor will vote 'aye' and those opposed will vote 'nay'. Mr. Clerk, do you want to open up the voting switch? 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 57...47 'ayes', 57 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion fails."

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #16. Mudd. Amends House Resolution 237 on page 17 by inserting on line 30 and so forth."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Amendment is very brief. It doesn't have too much...ah...substance as far as words but it has a great deal to do with, with the amount of Bills that would come before this House if this Amendment was adopted. What this Amendment...ah...proposes to do is to require that all pieces of Legislation that come out of the Legislative Reference Bureau have the name of the prime Sponsor on that Bill when it's sent out of that Department. Now I hope that you would think just for a minute what that would mean as far as Bills coming out of that... that Department by the hundreds and then running around this Building and this complex looking for Sponsors, I'm sure you could appreciate what this particular Amendment would actually do. It would...ah...mandate that any piece of Legislation had to be drafted or at least have the concurrence of the Sponsor before it was even considered in the Reference Bureau. No piece could come out of there and start looking for a Sponsor. A Sponsor would have to go in there and start looking for a Bill. So I would ask that you consider this very carefully. There's not much to it but it, I think that it would cut down a great deal of expense in that Department and a lot of Legislation that comes on the Floor of this House. So I would ask your favorable vote."



Shea: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd, has moved for the adoption of Amendment #16. Ms. Geo-Karis raises a Point of Order."

Geo-Karis: "Ah...Mr...Speaker...ah...I have a document in my hands saying it's an explanatory report on recommendations for permanent rules and I've wanted to see rules, where rule 16 is...ah...the amended rule 16 is involved and there's nothing on this one. I mean, I thought this would be, you know, an explanation of all the proposed..."

Shea: "I don't have any idea what document you're talking about."

Geo-Karis: "Ah...I'll bring it up and show it to you. It's called 'Explanatory Report on Recommendations for Permanent Rules, Synopsis of Recommended Changes'."

Shea: "I think what you're looking at is one on 237."

Geo-Karis: "Yeah, the whole works."

Shea: "This is an Amendment to 237."

Geo-Karis: "I see. There's no synopsis then of the proposed changes."

Shea: "I think there were, was a synopsis of the proposed changes put on your desk. If not Mr. Simms has been following them quite...ah..."

Geo-Karis: "Do you have a copy? Seriously, I never got one...the Synopsis or the..."

Shea: "Now while we're straightening out the mechanics over there. Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Ah, the Reference Bureau has a personal relationship with Legislators and...ah..generally I think Legislators over the years have found the Reference Bureau to work well. The...there are many situations where, for example, the Leadership may request certain Bills and the Bills may come back and they may want Mr. Mudd to handle it or they may want someone else to handle it. This would impose a...ah...an additional burden of erasure, it would really upset a situation that has been an established on and we would oppose the Amendment."

Shea: "Mr. Mudd, do you seek recognition for some question? Or to close?"

Mudd: "Ah...Just to close, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "Is there any further debate? The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd to close."



Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I think that...ah... as a Freshman, I...I know that there were many times that...ah... it was hard for me when I first came down here to even find the Reference Bureau, let alone understand the whole operation of the Department. The Department Reference Bureau has been most helpful to me in ...ah... when I seek information or assistance in drafting my Legislation. However, when we got close to the deadline this year, we were only about a week away and the Bills were starting to pile up in the Reference Bureau, I had a Bill that I was trying to get drafted and was having some difficulty because of the backlog in that Department. I went down for two or, oh, two or three days in a row after I'd...ah...left it go for about a week and when I got to front door of this Chambers, we had lobbyist out there with cardboard boxes full of Bills and it just got to be pretty hard for me to understand. So I thought that this may be a particular way to establish a...ah...priority in the Department's work and I would hope that you would consider this and those Members of you that...ah... certainly have more experience than I do...ah...I'm going to yield to your, your particular first judgment. But it was a thought I had that might help us resolve some of these problems. Thank you."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #16. 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 there are 33 'ayes', 52 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion fails."

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #17. Marovitz - Downs. Amends House Resolution 237 page 38 and so forth."

Shea: "Has that got two names on it?"

Fred Selcke: "Yes sir."

Shea: "All right. Mr, Downs do you want to handle this one? Because Mr. Marovitz isn't in the Chamber. Yesterday it was the consensus of the House that if a Member was not in the Chamber whose name



appears on a Amendment that the Amendment would be tabled. Well now there's two names on this Amendment. That's why I was very specific about this one. Table it twice. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Downs."

Downs: "Ah...Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The...The motion to strike the enacting clause is not new to the House. Ah...It appears to have been used when it was...ah... desired to avoid debate on the merits of a particular Bill. As such, I think that such a motion is...ah...violative of the whole deliberative process, which should mark a Democratic Assembly. I think that the motion should be eliminated as a Parliamentary device because in effect, it permits this Assembly to defeat, for instance, a Bill...ah...with a simple majority of those who may happen to be present in the Chamber and without notice that...ah...of the merits of a Bill are going to be debated or not. I think that the issue is simply and clearly drawn that the motion to strike the enacting clause is a kind of motion that is not in the spirit of a democracy or in the nature of a deliberative Assembly such as this. I ask your favorable consideration."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This motion illustrates well the...the adage about it depends on whose ideological Bill is being gored or is doing the goring. You know, we've had a couple examples of what's happened here in regard to motions to strike. We had the first one in regard to marijuana and at that time that unctuous sanctimonious newspaper, the Chicago Daily News, just went absolutely ape on the question and said how terrible it was to use phrases like, know-nothings and all of that and I want to quickly add that any implied criticism of the great newspaper doesn't extend to their reporters, because they are without earthly equal. But in that particular instance they were, they were greatly exercised at how terrible a thing about a motion to strike. But then in a few weeks later, we had a second application of this speedy remedy to nonsensical Bills and that had to do with the Congressional



reapportionment and at that time they just purred like a kitten. There was absolutely no criticism. The Chicago Daily News approved everything was well, that...ah...the rice in the kingdom, the sky was in good shape. So I suggest to you that in view of that track record, there is no merit in this effort to deprive the House of a...of a valuable implement and tool to move forward expeditiously. We should all vote 'no'."

Shea: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. My seat mate, Gale Schisler isn't here right now and if he were here he would certainly want to echo his opposition to this...ah...ah... motion and I'd like to join in the opposition to a legal attempt by any Member and it's open to any Member, to attempt to kill a Bill on Second Reading. Now there's many methods that you can not stop through this kind of rule making and that is strictly an Amendment that would almost annihilate a Bill and if you're not here, present and voting, what difference does it make whether you kill the Bill for...for the future or annihilate it to a devastating Amendment. I think the attempt to run it, the ability to Parliamentary maneuvering and Parliamentary ability of a Member is not proper. That we should have that ability to at all times stop a Bill and if the Members aren't present, that's their fault. They're being payed a decent salary and a per diem to be here. They're not being paid not to be here. If they're not here to vote on an issue or they decide not to vote on an issue, that is their prerogative. But then don't use it as an excuse to...ah...stop from allowing a Parliamentary maneuver in order to annihilate or to kill a Bill that probably isn't going to pass if it takes up two days of debate on the Floor of the House anyway."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms."

Simms: "Well Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would rise in opposition to this Amendment to disallow the striking of the enacting clause. I think history has proved in the Illinois House that this procedure on the Order of Second Reading has saved the time of the House a great many hours of debate, especially



when the Legislation was not going to pass, it saved the process of this House and kept the House moving in an orderly process and I think we have to only look at the historical input of this type of motion that is made, that it does save time and it has not historically been abused. So for these reasons I think Amendment #17 should be resoundly defeated."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berman."

Berman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would ask the opponent who spoke on this to read the Amendment and I point out to you that this Amendment does not, I want to underline, does not abolish the procedure to strike the enacting clause and I invite your attention and read the Amendment. It does two things. First, it changes the part of the Rules that gives the motion to strike the enacting clause precedence. Now that is merely to allow by his option of this type of Amendment allow other Amendments to be considered in their proper order before you get to a motion to strike the enacting clause and I think that is proper so that the person who has an Amendment and files it first can hear his Amendment and perhaps improve the Bill so that the motion to strike the enacting clause may not be proper or may not be well founded. The second part is the essence of what many of us complain about when a motion to strike the enacting clause is presented and that is that a minority, a minority of this House can determine the fate of a Bill and the second part of this Amendment is the essence of this. It says that you still can file a motion to strike the enacting clause, but it will require an affirmative vote of 89 Members to carry that motion. Now if you recall in the instances where that motion has been used in this House, I believe, that that motion had in fact carried by 89 votes. So let me pose a situation where there is sparse Membership on the Floor and somebody moves to strike the enacting clause. Without this Amendment in there forty or fifty or twenty people theoretically could carry that motion and defeat that Bill. Kill that Bill. So I suggest to you whether you're a proponent or an opponent of the method of striking the enacting clause, this Amendment is a good



safeguard. It requires an affirmative vote of 89 Members in order to, in fact, kill that Bill by the method of Striking the Enacting Clause. I urge your perusal of this Amendment and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker...ah...I was going to make the same observation that the device itself is preserved by this Amendment. But I just wanted to address myself to the notion about saving time. Ah...you will all recall one evening that we spent here debating the Enacting Clause of Senate Bill 1250. I don't think we saved any time by that device particularly. We debated it for three and a half to four hours. We debated the Marijuana Bill for two hours. I...I doubt very much whether the final debate on Third Reading would have been any longer. As a matter of fact we ended up debating the morality of a Motion to Strike the Enacting Clause, and that took half the time. So to the contrary, I think we waste a great deal of time with this kind of Motion, and I think that we now have a proper perspective in this Amendment to deal with the problem. It should be adopted. Thank you."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser. You didn't want to talk on this. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to oppose the Gentleman's Motion. I suggest that the last speaker was absolutely incorrect, in the example he uses in Senate Bill 1250, and I hesitate to open old wounds. The debate on that Motion to Strike the Enacting Clause was indeed lengthy, two or three, maybe three and a half hours. But do you know there were twenty Amendments prepared and on the Clerk's desk and they were still coming at the time that that Motion to Strike the Enacting Clause was considered. Now there's no reason at all to think that those twenty Amendments wouldn't have taken three and a half hours each themselves, so indeed the device at that time, while I'm confident that the end result would have been the same, the device used at that time



was indeed time saving, and the Motion that carried did not have 89 votes, and there was no way that it could have gotten 89 votes. But it was still the will of this House. So I suggest to you that the Striking of the Enacting Clause, while it is not used often, and I think was mentioned during that debate, is about the second or third or perhaps the fourth time, in the sixteen years that I've been here, that the device has been used. When it has been used, it has been used effectively and has been time saving and is certainly a worthwhile tool and should not be changed."

Shea: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen. Mr. Ebbesen, do you wish to talk on this Question? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Downs, to close."

Downs: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Well, I think we should keep in mind the primary function of this Body is not always to be as efficient as possible, but as fair and as deliberate as possible. The two instances in my experience where the Motion was used were devices to avoid debate of an issue of which Members did not want debate, or it was used as a device, a shortcut consideration of various Amendments which they did not wish to debate. Seems to me, that we should not spend our time trying to preserve tools and parliamentary devices. That seems to be the very thing that stands in the way sometimes of a fair and deliberative democratic process. All that is required by the adoption of this rule is that there certainly be at least 89 votes to pass such a Motion. It seems eminently fair. I urge your favorable consideration, and I do want to certainly acknowledge the point raised by the Gentleman from Lawrence. It's indeed a good point, but as a principle Sponsor of this Motion, I was consistent and I voted against that Motion to Strike the Enacting Clause on both pieces of legislation, because I felt the Motion was wrong, and those matters required debate. Thank you and I urge your favorable consideration."

Shea: "All those in favor will vote 'aye', and those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished?"



Take the Record Mr. Clerk. On this Question there are 49 'ayes', 79 'nays', and the Gentleman's Motion fails."

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #18, Marovitz. Amend House Resolution 237 henceforth."

Shea: "Now is only Mr. Marovitz' name is on that?"

Fred Selcke: "Yes Sir."

Shea: "All right, that's tabled. Amendment #19."

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #19, Matijevich. Amend House Resolution 237, page 24, henceforth."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #19 to House Resolution 237 allows the Speaker some flexibility in calling Appropriation Bills first. Ah...if we don't do this there's an occasion where somebody may have some hangup with some specific department and could use the Rules to frustrate the orderly operation of government. I think it's a good Rule and I urge your support in the adoption of the Amendment."

Shea: "Is there any debate? All right, all those in...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "The Speaker believes that it will result in the saving of Floor time and supports Representative Matijevich's Motion."

Shea: "There any further debate? All those in favor will say 'aye', 'aye", those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. That was nineteen through seventy-seven."

Fred Selcke: "Amendment #20, Bradley. Amend House Resolution 237, page 28, henceforth."

Shea: "The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ah...what Twenty does, Amendment #20 does is attempt to conform the Rules of the House with our State Constitution by expressing our desire to require that 107 votes be necessary for us to adopt a Resolution to our Federal Constitution. Ah...we all are very much aware of what we're trying to do here. Rather than have a simple majority



we have an extraordinary majority and I simply move the adoption of the Amendment."

Shea: "Is there any debate? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson."

Hudson: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would rise in support of this Amendment. I think it's long overdue. I think it's necessary. I think it's reasonable. I think it's completely consistent and in line with what the framers of the, at least, what Congress has in mind when they require Two-thirds of Congress to approve a revision to the Federal Charter and then, in turn, go ahead and require Three-quarters...ah...Three-fourths of the State to ratify an Amendment to the Federal Charter, and then for us to come in with a requirement of something beyond a...ah...89 votes, I think is entirely reasonable. I think it gives us a chance to consider carefully what we are about. I think it would be, it would make...ah...our deliberations on these matters more complete. I think they deserve any Amendment to the Federal Charter...deserves careful consideration, and I think this should cut across all Amendments regardless of what the Amendment's may be so that they're all treated alike, so that we don't get into political consideration as to what Amendment happens to be considered. So...ah...I just would urge the... ah...passage of this Amendment. I think...again...I think it's necessary and...ah...something that is long overdue."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Ah...a very bare majority of the Rules Committee voted to include a provision that those matters affecting the Federal Constitution would require 89 votes, and that is now contained in House Resolution 237. It is a very close Constitutional Question, but there is substantial legal authority that does hold that the provisions of the Federal Constitution control over the Illinois Constitution, and so the Rules Committee did report the recommendation of 89. In fairness, I do want to say that it was a very close vote, as I recall it, and I would also want to say since I have been in a dual roll here



today, that the Speaker of the House does believe that the Rules of the Illinois Constitution ought to prevail, and accordingly, the Amendment ought to carry. The Rules Committee, however, took a different position, by a bare majority."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, just briefly I rise to support this good Amendment. The Illinois Constitution provides that Three-fifths or 107 are needed to initiate Amendments to our own Constitution, and also to the Federal Constitution, and I don't think it would be good for our House Rules to be contradictory to the Constitution of our State and...ah... Mr. Bradley's Amendment conforms our House Rules to our Illinois Constitution and I urge a 'yes' green vote."

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

Washington: "Ah...Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Ah...the so-called conflict between the Illinois Constitution and the Federal Constitution are apparent, but not real. The Federal Constitution does not address itself to the question of an extraordinary vote within State Legislatures. It address itself specifically to the question of an extraordinary number of the states ratifying a Constitution. The theory being, if you have a Two-thirds ratification by State Legislatures, presumably you have a Two-thirds vote of the people of the United States. That's the base on...point which this is brought on. There is no conflict at all. I see nothing wrong with defeating this Amendment and making it very clear that we in the State of Illinois subscribe to the theory of the Constitution that you call for a Two-thirds ratification of states, not extraordinary vote of legislators of those states. I think this Amendment is designed to frustrate one major piece of legislation or a Constitutional Amendment which is floating around the country, and I'm opposed to the Amendment."

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

Geo-Karis: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, can I address a question to the Sponsor?"

Shea: "You may. He indicates he will yield."



Geo-Karis: "Ah...Mr. Sponsor, was the basis of your Amendment here the Equal Rights Amendment?"

Bradley: "No."

Geo-Karis: "Will you tell me what the basis was?"

Bradley: "The basis for moving this adoption of this Amendment, and presenting the Amendment was to give some clarification in our own Rules that...ah...we would...ah...conform with what our State Constitution says, and not that it applies, as you well know, not only to this Constitu...ah...the Amendment you refer to...ah...but it will apply to all Amendments."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Sponsor, you are aware, are you not, by your Amendment, you are imposing a greater duty on the State of Illinois Legislature than is imposed by the Rules of the Federal Government. Are you not?"

Bradley: "Well, there's some question about that. I'm not sure that you're entirely correct. I think in response to your question, when Mr. Washington was referring to, which I think extraordinary majority of states to adopt the Federal Constitution, and I think that it should take...ah...an extraordinary majority of those people voting on the ratification of any Constitutional Amendment to that particular Constitution. I don't believe that it was the intent of the...ah...when the...the drafters of our Federal Constitution to change that Constitution with a simple majority."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Sponsor, to your knowledge, has the effort been made to have 107 votes for the adoption of this Amendment, prior to the Equal Rights...ah...question in this House, to your knowledge?"

Bradley: "Not to my knowledge. Except let me say this. It was always a question brought up whatever occasion when we were addressing ourselves to an Amendment. How many votes it was going to take to adopt, and there was nothing in our Rules to give the guidelines to the Speaker at that particular time. Now it was ruled on one occasion in this House it took 89. Another occasion it took 107...ah...and it was ruled...an extra-



ordinary majority was ruled in the...ah...in the Senate, and this is simply an opportunity to give us some guidance and clarification."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address myself to the Question."

Shea: "Proceed."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's very very clear to me, very clear, and sadly clear that when other Amendments were considered by this House in the past year, this question was never brought up that solidly at all. But since the event of Equal Rights Amendment, the Federal Amendment, all of a sudden, we've gotten real sanctimonious and have been worried, worried sick that we are not complying with the Federal Constitution. I submit that the Federal Court within the last two years have said that it's up to the Legislature itself to set the majorities about accepting a Federal Amendment. Now I also submit that this is a deliberate effort to make it harder and harder for the Equal Rights Amendment to pass. Now I have supported the Equal Rights Amendment and I'm willing to wager that the Gentlemen that has spoken against the Equal Rights Amendment in the past are supporting this Amendment now. Not the Equal Rights Amendment, I mean the Amendment to the Rules. So all I can say is, it's high time that we tell the unvarnished truth about the situation, that no greater effort was made to establish a high majority for accepting the Federal Amendment until the advent of Equal Rights Amendment, and I don't think it's very nice or fair, and I speak against this Amendment."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

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

Shea: "He indicates he will Sir."

Hart: "Ah...Mr. Bradley, how many votes will it take to change this Rule, if it was adopted?"

Bradley: "Change the Rule when we...ah...at what time Mr. Hart?"

Hart: "At any time subsequent to its adoption."

Shea: "The Parliamentarian now plays his dual roll."

Bradley: "Eighty-nine votes Mr....ah..."

Hart: "Well, don't you think it's rather frivolous to bind ourselves by



107 vote requirement when it only would require a majority of the Membership to make a change in that Rule."

Bradley: "Well, you can amend anything in the House with 89 votes Mr. Hart. You're well aware of that."

Hart: "That is true, and that's my point. That it's rather ridiculous to adopt a Rule requiring an extraordinary majority of action of this Membership which can by only a majority be changed at any time. I would oppose this unnecessary, apparent, restriction on the Membership."

Bradley: "I don't think that it's frivolous Mr. Hart in response to your question."

Hart: "Well, I didn't ask you if you thought it was frivolous. I said..."

Bradley: "You said it was frivolous when the Constitution says Two-thirds, and it was the will of the people of the State of Illinois that that be done, Mr. Hart. I don't think that's frivolous at all."

Hart: "Well, the State of Illinois Constitution cannot be changed except by a referendum of the people and that is the difference. Thank you very much."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. It always seem rather presumptuous on the part of this Body to include in its Rules any provisions that are duplicative, repetitive, or in conflict with the Constitution, but the precedent has been set, so I direct myself to the merit of this Amendment. Now what we're talking about is not passing a Bill, we're talking about amending the basic organic law of the United States. Now the Federal Constitution requires an extraordinary majority by the U. S. House of Representatives and by the U. S. Senate, to present to the States a proposed Amendment, and the Federal Constitution requires an extraordinary majority of the States. The Federal Constitution is silent with respect to the vote requirement within each of the States, but we do have an Illinois Constitution, and in Section 4 of Article 14, there is a provision which was ratified by the people of this state that a 107 votes would be required for ratification of



an Amendment to the United States Constitution. It seems to me Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we should recall the theory or the philosophy as to requiring extraordinary majority for Constitutional Amendment. It's intended to protect the minority from the whim and caprice of the majority. I think that's a sound policy, one that should if we are going to have provisions in our rules that are duplicative, repetitious of Constitutional Provisions, we should adhere to that philosophy and we should support the adoption of this Amendment."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The ascertained justification of this Amendment to the House Rules is that the State Constitution requires it. Now I would simply point out that under the supremacy clause of the Federal Constitution both the state Constitution and any state statute and the Rules of this House are subordinate to...ah...to the law of the land as proclaimed in the Federal Constitution. It may be helpful to look at a couple of examples of that. Our present State Constitution says you have to be twenty-one years old to vote in this state. It also says you must have resided within this state for six months before you can vote. Now the Supreme Court has made clear that those requirements are in conflict with the Federal Constitution and no one that I know advocates six months residency for voting or twenty-one year age requirement for voting because the Federal Constitution does not permit it, not withstanding the fact that it's in the State Constitution. Now we have exactly the same situation here. A re...A proported requirement in the State Constitution which the Federal Courts have authoritatively told us is not valid. I think it's irresponsible certainly for the lawyers in this body to stand up and say that we must abide by the State Constitutional provision which the Federal Court has told us is not valid. As Representative Geo-Karis pointed out, the Federal Constitution leaves to the Legislature of each of the states to determine the majority requirement by which it will ratify proposed Amendments of the Federal Constitution. The question then

becomes as a policy matter, should it be 89 or 107? For

GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



reasons of precedence that is that every Federal Constitutional Amendment ratified by Illinois has been ratified by a simple Majority for reasons of simple fairness because the votes of some Members ought not to be worth more than the votes of other Members, which is the case if you have an extraordinary majority and because common sense tells us that a majority of the elected Members ought to be able to make the important decisions affecting the people of this state as they do when they pass laws affecting the people of this state. I say that it ought to be a simply majority. I would urge a 'no' vote on this proposed Amendment to the Rules."

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

Yourell: "I move the previous question."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. We had one more speaker who happens to be a Member of the Constitutional Convention. Would you yield to her for one minute? Miss Macdonald."

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

I just wanted to make a brief addition to the remarks of Representative Lundy, which I thought were very clear and I certainly hope that the rest of the Members were listening. Ah...In addition and I would like support from the Illinois Constitution to support his opinion that the Federal Courts have ruled that it is not necessary to have an extraordinary majority and in the State Constitution we added the last sentence to Section IV of amending the Federal Constitution and that statement says, 'The requirements of this Section shall govern to the extent that they are not inconsistent with requirements established by the United States.' Now with the court decisions that have come down, with the precedence, I think it is entirely within the right of the rules of this Body and that of the Senate to govern and make those decisions and I would urge your defeat of this Amendment."

Shea: "The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley, to close."

Bradley: "Well thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm amazed to hear that last statement by the Member of our Constitutional Convention because she was there to vote on the Section IV of the Constitution Revision Article of our Constitution



and to re...so that I can refresh you memory a little bit, it states in Section IV of the affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members elected to each House of the General Assembly shall be required to ratify a proposed Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. It's just that simple and the people, the people, not the courts decided sure that there are enough Lawyers in this Body to...ah...majority or most of them would agree that the courts are not always right. But the people spoke and said it takes three-fifths and I would like to say to my good friend and colleague, Representative Geo-Karis, that tis, that the...the, this has nothing to do with ERA. I think ...I...I introduced this Amendment simply so that there will be some clarification with the knowledge that the ERA has already passed this House, it's on it's way over and it's sitting in the Senate. So, we're going to put this in the rules I hope, with the...with the adoption of this Amendment. Ah...With ERA already gone from the House, it's not the issue, it's not the point, it's not the reason for the introduction of this Amendment. I think that our rules should conform with what the people adopted when they adopted the Constitution of the State of Illinois and I have to take exception to my colleague, Mr. Washington, when he said it is not necessary to have an extraordinary majority, but in my opinion it is the...it was the intent of the writers of the Federal Constitution that it would take an extraordinary majority to ratify or to adopt and Amendment, to adopt an Amendment to that Constitution. That's why I think that we should have in our rules 107 votes and I move the adoption of the Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley, moves for the adoption of Amendment #20. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich, to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I was also a delegate to the Constitutional Convention and I can assure you that it is my opinion that it was the intent of the Constitutional Convention to take an extraordinary majority. It's written right in that



paragraph as anybody can read. Now as far as ERA, I think the Lady from Lake is beating on the log after the fox is gone, that's a dead issue. The next time she may want an extraordinary majority. We should not take lightly the amending of our National Constitution and I think this is a good provision and should be adopted."

Shea: "The Lady from Cook, Miss Willer."

Willer: "Yes Mr. Speaker, as another Member of the Constitutional Convention, I would simply speak to one of the remarks made by I believe, Mr. Schlickman, who said the people ratified the Constitution the referendum, our State Constitution which incorporated the provision of an extraordinary majority. I would simply say to you, I can't remember the times I spoke between September and December out talking to people about the referendum, about the Constitution and I would say, I can't give you percentage, but I would say that at least eighty per cent of the people who went to the polls to vote on this and they were few in numbers sadly enough, didn't even care about this. It was never raised in questions in any meeting that I attended. There were many questions raised about local government, judiciary, etc. I don't think the people really even thought this one through. So this may be a bad thing to say, but let's not say it was the will of the people. I don't think the people were very much concerned about this at all."

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

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker...the..."

Shea: "Excuse me Mr. Deuster. Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I would just like to have those people who are in this Chambers voting and if they're not here, I object to a fellow Member running up and down the aisle, let's have a fair vote on this, I object to a fellow Member running up and down the aisle..."

Shea: "Well I'm sure that where this vote is right now, it is not only going to be poll the absentees, but I'm sure that no matter which side wins, there's going to be a verification."

Bradley: "Well we were trying, just trying to save some time Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "All right, the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."



Deuster: "Well Mr. Speaker, the Rules of the House presently now, the Rules we've been living with all year long, conform to the language of the Constitution, the language that's been ratified by the people of our State. As Representative Katz earlier pointed out, the Rules Committee by a very, very close vote suggested changing that. Now there's nothing more fundamental in importance to us than the Constitution of our State and the Constitution of our Nation. Now we have to have an extraordinary vote of 107 on many occasions when we do things that we think are more imp...significant, of lasting significance than others. For example, to have an earlier effective date on a Bill, we have to have 107 votes. Now surely all of us must think that the fabric of our Nation's Constitution is as important as changing the effective date on a Bill. This is fundamental. Our people laid it out. It's the same rule, 107, to change our own Constitution as it is to change the National Constitution. Now if there's somebody who doesn't like the Illinois Constitution they can go to court and they can have it declared unconstitutional that has not been done, but we shouldn't do it by trying to contrive and twist and turn the Rules of the House. Until this is thrown out, why, let's have our Rules at least either silent or in conformity with the clear language ratified by the people of our state and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The arguments that are made about the Constitution would be valid if we were considering the Constitution, in fact, we're not. We're not even considering the law. We're considering a change in the Rules of the House. It seems to me that this...ah...Amendment is really a complete exercise in futility. If 89 of us can require that 107 take to affirm a Constitutional Amendment, then 89 of us can say that it takes three-quarters or 89 of us or a simple majority as a matter of fact on an Amendment and say that it has to be unanimous. Now it seems to me that that's foolish, because when we get down the line and we're going to consider another Constitutional Amendment in this Chamber the same



majority that it's going to take to pass this to simply reverse the position that we might take today in adopting it. So really the power still lies in the hands of a...a simple majority, not in a 107. In adopting this, if we did, would simply be a complete exercise in futility. Seems to me, we're engaging in a completely foolish act and I would...ah...certainly urge a 'no' vote."

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

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I urge you to vote 'yes' on this Motion. The arguments that have been made, one that the people did not know what they were doing when they adopted the Constitution of the State of Illinois with this provision in it are patently silly. If that's the case, then let's forget the whole Constitution, if they didn't know what they were doing in this provision, then they didn't know what they were doing in any others. Now it seems ridiculous to me Mr. Speaker, that we should require that a Three-fifths Majority of this House and a Three-fifths Majority of the Senate pass an Amendment to the State Constitution and then have the matter submitted to the people for their ratification when an Amendment to the Federal Constitution can be passed by a simple majority of this House and the people when they adopted the Constitution of the State of Illinois so spoke. I don't know how in the world we can fly in the face of the people when they did this. Now it seems to me Mr. Speaker, that the issue here is whether we in the State of Illinois, the State of Illinois is sovereign or it is not sovereign. If it is not sovereign then we rubber stamp that which the Congress does and the rest of the states do and forget it. And we have the same requirements for a Constitutional Amendment that everybody else does. I submit to you though, Mr. Speaker, that we are sovereign, and that our Constitution says that a Three-fifths Majority is required, and if it requires that, then the least we can do is have our Rules coincide with the Constitution. So I urge an 'aye' vote."

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



Geo-Karis: "Ah...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm appalled at the way the Constitution is misstated here on the Floor. Section 4 which says 'Amendment to the Constitution of the United States', to which that distinguished Gentleman who just spoke referred to, to which the Sponsor of this Amendment referred to, has that additional last line in it and obviously it isn't convenient for them to tell you about it. It says 'the requirements of this Section shall govern to the extent that they are not inconsistent', I repeat, 'they are not inconsistent where requirements established by the United States.' The United States means also the Federal Courts of the United States which have already held that it is not true that you require a Three-fifths Majority, and I really am shocked, but then this reminds me of a line in Henry the Fourth by Shakespeare which says "The Devil quotes Scripture to his own purpose". Well I can quote it right back and there it is, and if you want to call me the other devil, at least, I have sense enough to read the whole statement, not part of it, and I would like to say again, as far as the Equal Rights Amendment goes, sure it passed in the House, but the folks who opposed it are gleefully hoping that it'll die in the Senate, so start again in the House. Who asked for a whoope about this and let's not fool the public."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Fleck."

Fleck: "Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a brief observation, and the previous speaker was wrong when she said that the Federal Courts had thrown out the Three-fifths requirement. All the Federal Court did was throw out the Constitutional Three-fifths requirement and threw the football back in our lap to determine the public policy. So I'd just like to say that I think Roscoe Cunningham earlier was talking about whose ox is being gored. Now that only happens to this Rule. I am sure that when we come in here to vote on a referendum or a Constitutional Amendment on the death penalty or abortion or something else. The people who are opposing this will be running around with Motions to change our House Rules to kick it down to 89 or increase it to 107, so as long as we have a nice fluid Constitution...ah...we might as well keep it fluid. And



if we got a fluid Rule then we might as well keep them fluid. So if we're going to have both of them fluid we might as well have them running together and keep them both at 107, and see who the hypocrites are the next time they come down, and cut it down to 89."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Caldwell."

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

Shea: "Has everybody explained their votes? Take the Record. On this question there are 76 'ayes', 75 'nays', and the Lady from Cook, Miss Chapman, if you'll get back to your seat, I'll recognize you Jeannie. Ask for a Verification of the vote. Walsh, on this question do you want to get up here? Got a big smile on your face, uh. And prior to...you've requested Verification, and you...you don't want a Verification, you just want a Poll of the Absentees? All right. The first request is for a Poll of the Absentees. Would you proceed Mr. Clerk?"

Fred Selcke: "Arnell, Bluthardt, Boyle, Campbell, Capuzi, Choate, Darrow, Dyer."

Shea: "I'm sorry, Mr. Darrow."

Darrow: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In my mind this is not a pro-ERA, anti-ERA issue. I feel that the United States Constitution is so important that 107 votes should be required, and therefore I vote 'aye'."

Shea: "Please record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. Proceed with the Call of the Absentees, Mr. Clerk."

Fred Selcke: "Ewell, Farley, Hirschfeld, Gene Hoffman, Emil Jones, Lechowicz, McAuliffe, Peters, Schisler, Stearney, E. G. Steele, Stubblefield, VanDuyne. That's it."

Shea: "All right. 77 'ayes', 75 'nays', and proceed with the Verification of the Affirmative Vote, Mr. Clerk. Well, Mr. Walsh, I don't understand that. Let's see what we do with the one, and then we'll see where we go with the...ah...yeah."

Fred Selcke: "Beatty, Bradley, Brandt, Brummet, Capparelli, Carroll, Collins, Craig, Cunningham, D'Arco, Darrow, Deavers, Deuster, DiPrima, Duff, John Dunn, Ebbesen, Ewing, Fennessey, Fleck."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan."



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

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

Houlihan: "Please vote me 'aye'."

Shea: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Proceed with the Roll Call."

Fred Selcke: "Flinn, Friedland, Friedrich, Garmisa, Giglio."

Shea: "Excuse me again, Mr. Clerk. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Laurino."

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

Shea: "You're recorded as voting 'no'."

Laurino: "Change my vote to 'aye'."

Shea: "Change Mr. Laurino from 'no' to 'aye'. Now, Miss Chapman, Mr. Giglio asked if he could be verified now. Is there objection? Miss Chapman. All right, proceed."

Fred Selcke: "Grotberg, Hanahan, Ron Hoffman, Dan Houlihan, Hudson, Jacobs, Kelly, Kent, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Lauer, Laurino."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kozubowski wishes recognition."

Kozubowski: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be recorded 'aye'."

Shea: "Change Mr. Kozubowski from 'nay' to 'aye'."

Fred Selcke: "Leinenweber, Leon, Luft, Mahar, Maragos, Mautino, McAvoy, McCourt, McMaster, McPartlin, Meyer, Miller, Molloy, Mudd, Nardulli, Neff, O'Daniel, Randolph, Rigney, Ryan, Sangmeister, Schlickman, Schoeberlein, Schraeder, Schuneman, Sevcik, Shea, Simms, Terzich, Tipword, Totten, Tuerk, Vitek, VonBoeckman, Waddell, Wall, Walsh, Washburn, Williams, Winchester, Wolf, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "Now, Miss Chapman, do you have any questions of the Affirmative Vote? At the present time, the count is 80 'ayes', and 73 'nays', and before we proceed, Mr. Stubblefield wishes to be recognized."

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

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

Stubblefield: "Would you record me as voting 'no'?"

Shea: "All right. Now it's 80 to 74, and proceed Miss Chapman."

Chapman: "Yes Sir. Ah...Carroll?"

Shea: "Mr. Carroll is in the Well."

Chapman: "Craig?"

Shea: "Mr. Craig. Is Mr. Craig on the Floor of the House? How is Mr. Craig recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "'Aye'."



Shea: "Take him off the Roll Call. Proceed."

Chapman: "D'Arco?"

Shea: "D'Arco? Is Mr. D'Arco on the Floor of the House? How's he recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "'Aye'".

Shea: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

Chapman: "Deavers?"

Shea: "Deavers? Is Mr. Deavers...he's in the back in the...ah..."

Chapman: "Don't show me where. John Dunn?"

Shea: "Who?"

Chapman: "John Dunn?"

Shea: "Mr. John Dunn? Is Mr. John Dunn on the Floor of the House? How's he recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "'Aye'."

Shea: "Take him off the Roll Call."

Chapman: "Ah...Ebbesen?"

Shea: "Is Mr. Ebbesen...there?"

Chapman: "Okay. Fleck?"

Shea: "Who?"

Chapman: "Fleck, Charlie Fleck?"

Shea: "Charles Fleck is in his seat."

Chapman: "Yes, I see him. Friedland?"

Shea: "Friedland? Mr. Friedland's in his seat ^{Mam.}"

Chapman: "Garmisa?"

Shea: "Mr. Garmisa, is he on the Floor of the House? How's he recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "'Aye'."

Shea: "Take him off the Roll."

Chapman: "Grotberg?"

Shea: "Mr. Grotberg is in his seat Mam."

Chapman: "Maragos?"

Shea: "Mr. Maragos is right at the Well here."

Chapman: "I see him. Mautino?"

Shea: "Mr. Mautino is standing in the aisle."

Chapman: "McAvoy?"

Shea: "Mr. McAvoy? He's raising his hand in his seat Mam."

Chapman: "Okay. Meyer?"



Shea: "Meyer is standing..."

Chapman: "Uh huh. Nardulli?"

Shea: "Mr. Nardulli? He's in the back Mam."

Chapman: "Molloy?"

Shea: "Mr. Molloy is in his seat Mam."

Chapman: "Ah...Randolph?"

Shea: "Mr. Randolph is in his seat Mam."

Chapman: "Ryan?"

Shea: "Mr. Ryan is in the center aisle."

Chapman: "Sevcik?"

Shea: "Mr. Sevcik? He's in his seat."

Chapman: "Wall?"

Shea: "Mr. Wall is by his seat."

Chapman: "Winchester?"

Shea: "Mr. Winchester? Is Mr. Winchester on the Floor of the House?"

He's in his seat."

Chapman: "Ah...D. L. Houlihan?"

Shea: "Mr. Houlihan?"

Chapman: "I see him. Ah...Lechowicz?"

Shea: "How is Mr. Lechowicz recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "The Gentleman's recorded as being absent."

Chapman: "His name was read."

Fred Selcke: "No, it wasn't."

Chapman: "Jones?"

Shea: "Mr. Jones? How is Mr. Jones recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "Which Jones?"

Chapman: "Emil Jones."

Fred Selcke: "The Gentleman's recorded as being absent."

Chapman: "Oh, I see him. Okay. Marovitz?"

Shea: "Pardon me. Who?"

Chapman: "Oh, Marovitz voted 'no'. Okay. I...just a minute. Mahar?"

Mahar?"

Shea: "Mahar is in the back of the aisle Mam."

Chapman: "That's all Sir. Thank you."

Shea: "Now Mr. Craig wishes to be returned to the Roll Call. Mr.

Bluthardt wishes to be recorded 'aye'. Mr. Palmer wishes to go



from 'nay' to 'aye'. Mr. Jones?"

Jones, E.: "Record me as 'no', Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "Record Emil Jones as 'no'. Give me the Roll Call now of the Affirmative Vote. There are 79 'ayes', and 74 'nays', and the Gentleman's Motion carries. Mr. Clerk, the House will stand at ease for five minutes and then we will return to the Regular Calendar Order of Business and take up the remaining Rules at a later time today. Mr. Walsh?"

Walsh: "I wonder if the Chair would give us some idea of what we are going to take up on the Regular Calendar."

Shea: "We're going to start right at the front of it and go through it Sir."

Walsh: "In the Regular Session?"

Shea: "That is what Session we're in Sir."

Walsh: "Okay, that was the question, Mr. Speaker. I hope you're not put out."

Shea: "Would you like to make the Motion with regards to yourself? There's been some question with regards to lunch. It was the intention of the Speaker that we would go right on through so that perhaps we could get away early today, so that those Members that want to get home, could get home. The House will be in Session. You got your light on? Mr. Clerk on the Resolutions, you want to call starting with 21. Mr. Deuster."

Fred Selcke: "House Resolution 23...what is it...37. 237...ah...Amendment 21...ah...House Resolution 237. Amendment #21, Deuster. Amend House Resolution 237 on page 36 henceforth."

Shea: "Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Rules Committee did a rather unusual and extraordinary thing along with much of their good work, and I would like to direct the attention to all colleagues to page 36. What the Rules Committee really did was they suggested a new idea which will very badly limit the right to debate on subjects on the part of those who are opposed to a proposal, and I would read the suggested rule change. It says 'other than the Chief Sponsor of the matter under consideration, no Member who has spoken in debate on a question shall have the



right to explain his vote on that question', and that some times means that the Sponsor of a Bill can explain it, and close, and the most knowledgeable Member of this Body who might be opposed to that proposal can talk in opposition in debate, but then since he's not the Sponsor, he can't explain his vote later. And I think that is not really a well balanced and good proposal, and so Amendment #21, which I have offered would simply return...ah...delete that and leave us the way we are right now. So that if you are opposed to a Bill, and you're the most knowledgeable person on the House, whatever the subject, you can speak in debate, and you can also explain your vote just like any other Member. I recognize that we really need to cut down on debate, but if we're going to cut down on debate, we should do it in an evenhanded manner that does not favor the proponents and disfavor the opponents of a particular question. I would be happy to answer any questions, and I believe House...Amendment #21 to House Resolution 237 will leave things as they are, and not hamstringing the opposition."

Shea: "Is there debate? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "The Gentleman of Lake...from Lake says that we should be able to waste less time here in the House. This is a very modest proposal that the Rules Committee made, and I don't believe it was accurately explained. The only individual who can't explain his vote is someone who has already spoken in debate, except that the Sponsor would have the opportunity to do both. If there is a Member who was not called upon in the course of the debate on the issue, and wants to explain his vote, he can do so, it doesn't change that. All we're doing is preventing a single individual who has already laboriously set forth his position in his case in chief, from then getting up and explaining his vote. That is a waste of time in the view of the Rules Committee and Mr. Deuster's Amendment is a step backwards."

Shea: "Mr. Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would oppose this Amendment. I think all Members have experienced



the frustration of sitting time and time and time again when Members who have already had an opportunity to speak on the question get up and insist on explaining their vote. This is a very modest limitation on the right to explain votes. Ah...I think to put it in perspective, we should remember that most parliamentary bodies have no such things as an explanation of vote. I think we should also remember that there isn't a parliamentary body in the world that I'm aware of that doesn't have some means to cutoff debate and in fact, we don't have such a means because Members can stand up and explain their votes all day and you can't move the Previous Question to stop that. This is a very modest limitation. It simply says that you already had a chance to speak to the Bill during the debate on the Bill and you shouldn't also have the right to take the time of the Membership to explain your vote, which is essentially what you should be doing in the debate, and I would urge a 'no' vote on this Amendment. Let's preserve the good reform that the Rules Committee has recommended."

Shea: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Just briefly I rise in opposition to this Amendment also. Ah... the Rules Committee only went halfway. We should have gone all the way, and we should have prohibited the explanation of votes on the Floor by all Members. Ah...and therefore, for this reason, I rise in opposition to this. We don't need more of this, we need much less, and we would be a much more deliberative Body."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster, to close."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Colleagues. Many people have said that we pass too many Bills, and that may be so, and...ah...if we want to pass more Bills, all we have to do is give the proponents three opportunities to speak and cut down the opportunity for the opponents to speak. I think that if this Amendment is not adopted, we will ^{rve} rule the day, because the way it comes out of the Rules Committee, the proponent opens, then there's discussion,



then the proponent closes, and then when you get to explaining a vote, the Sponsor, the proponent can explain again. But the most knowledgeable person on this House Floor, who spoke on that subject is precluded from saying anything in explanation of his vote. Now sure, you can abolish explanation of votes, but do it for everybody, don't just do it for the pro...opponents of a particular proposition, and I think that if you want fair play, you can limit debate in other ways, but limit it in a way that's evenhanded, and it won't encourage us passing many more bad Bills, and so I urge the adoption of this Amendment."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #21. All those in favor will say 'aye', those opposed will say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. All right. Those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the Record Mr. Clerk. On this there are 23 'ayes', 72 'nays', and the Motion fails."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment 22, Deuster. Amend House Resolution 237 on page 33, by adding immediately following line 12, the following, so forth."

Shea: "Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker...ah...this Amendment simply specifies in the Rules that when a Member is absent with the leave of the House, he can be recorded as voting if his vote doesn't effect the result. I think it specifies how to proceed in an area where, I believe, the Rules are silent, and I think we ought to provide that if you're in Canada fishing, and you don't have...if you're not absent with leave of the House, you shouldn't be able to come back here and doctor up the Record. On the other hand, if you are absent with leave of the House, you ought to be able to specify how you'd like to be recorded, and this would be, of course, if it doesn't affect the result of the vote. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Ah...the effect of this Amendment would be to return the situation automatically to...ah...a situation where Members can have their votes



recorded when they are away and there is also no provision as to when. The Clerk's Office would find itself in an impossible situation. There is no time limit imposed as to when the Member has to indicate how he wants to vote...ah...The House has always managed, when somebody was on official business, to give them leave at that time if the, if the House feels it appropriate to do so. But this is a step back toward proxy voting, it is against the efficiency of the Clerk's office and the Speaker would oppose this Amendment."

Shea: "Mr. Deuster to close."

Deuster: "Yes Mr. Speaker. With respect to the...the prior Speaker, this is limited and it's limited in this way. That you have to be absent with leave of the House and it's got to be a matter in the Journal that you're absent. You've got leave of the House to be absent. It's not going to open the door to any doctoring or any old stuff. It's simply going to clarify and make orderly a procedure that many of us would...many of us would like to follow. If you're out of the State on business or attending a Commission or something else with the leave of the House...ah...then it ought to be very clear that you have the right to be recorded so long as your vote does not affect the results. I think it's an area where the Rules are quiet and...and silent and Representative Katz is absolutely right that the House has managed to accomplish this in some other ways. I think we ought to manage it in accordance with the Rules and only allow people who are absent for a legitimate reason with leave of the House to be recorded and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #22. all those in favor will say 'aye', all those opposed will say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'no's' have it. Amendment #23."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #23. Deuster. Amnds House Resolution 237 on page 4 by adding immediately following line 4, the following and so forth."

Deuster: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, this was an Amendment that, that would have added to the duties of the Speaker. I think the Speaker has



sufficient duties and in this particular area I guess enough has been done. I would be very happy to table Amendment #23."

Shea: "It seems that leave is denied. They want an explanation of the reason for your motion. The Gentleman asks leave to table Amendment #23. Is there objections? Hearing none, the Amendment is tabled. Amendment #24."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #24. Deuster. Amends House Resolution 237 on page 36, line a, by deleting 'one minute' and inserting in lieu thereof, 'two minutes'."

Deuster: "This is an Amendment we can dispose of very quickly...ah... judging the mood of the House. Actually this Amendment was to leave things the way they are so that the Fellows and Ladies in here who are a little slower than the fast talkers might have an opportunity to express themselves. Right now, we have two minutes to explain votes. I know some people would like to abolish it entirely, the Rules Committee has moved it down to one minute. I think there are many of us who really frankly can see that even though we don't like these dragged out Sessions here everybody's explaining their votes. Once in a while it is necessary and you can hardly even say hello in one minute in some instances...ah... My Amendment would simply keep the Rules the way they are, that you've got two minutes to explain your vote."

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

Matijevich: "Representative Deuster, I have a misprint on my explanation of your Amendments. I have the one on conjugal visitation and then after it it says limit to two minutes. You didn't mean limiting the..."

Deuster: "Well the Gentleman is correct that in all things some are fast and some are slow and...ah...for those who are slow, we ought to try and accomodate them."

Matijevich: "I hear they call you Speedy Gonzales."

Deuster: "...Explanation of conduct."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Ah...The Rules Committee took an intermediate position between the statement that Mr. Hoffman made a few minutes ago, which is they



ought to eliminate explanation of votes entirely as a waste of time and the position of the proponent is this which is that it ought to be a two minute. So they adopted a provision that it would be one minute and it would be fair and reasonable and not an unnecessary burden on the House and so the Rules Committee and the Speaker would oppose this Amendment."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman."

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

It seems to me that every institution develops its own kind of dynamics and develops it's own kind of...of not rules necessarily but it's own traditions. In this House, in this House debate really takes, most of the debate really takes place after our lights are up there. On all the serious issues we have time and again...ah... moved the House in debate which comes in explanation of votes. They don't know why that is, it doesn't have to be but in fact is the institution of this House, it's the dynamics of this House, it's the way we work. I think it works. I think it works fairly well and this two minutes gives us decent time to express yourself. I think one minute is...is again a pointless...ah...it's difficult to organize a lot of thoughts in one minute and also, as I said earlier to day, to quote myself, it depends on whose clock it is. It depends very much on whose clock it is. I Just find too often there are different clocks for different people and I think that we should adopt...adopt this Amendment."

Shea: "Mr. Deuster to close."

Deuster: "I think every...I think everyone understands it and I would ask for a favorable vote on this Amendment to allow us to talk for two minutes."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #24. Those in favor will say 'aye', those opposed will say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the Roll Call will be taken. 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 Roll Call Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 53 'ayes', 69 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Amendment #25. Mr. Skinner."



Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #25. Amends House Resolution 237 on page 36 by deleting line 1 and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

Skinner: "First, I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if I might have leave to table Amendment #31 and 32, which are now irrelevant."

Shea: "With Leave of the House, the Gentleman moves to table 31 and 32. Hearing no objections, leave is granted."

Skinner: "Amendment #25 would prohibit the introduction or recognition of guests while Members are, while matters are before the House. Now all of us have seen some, one of our colleagues standing up giving an impassioned speech on something and all of a sudden the Speaker interrupts and says, 'And now here's the Kiddy College Class from...' well from some place or another and I just think that's very impolite and it certainly could wait until after the ...ah...person finishes talking or it could wait until after the vote. I'll leave it to the Chair to determine what business is, what has to be between."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Ah...The Speaker believes it would be of addition to the Rules and will support the Amendment."

Shea: "Rosco, did you have something to add to the...to the unanimous decision of the House..."

Rosco: "You couldn't be more correct Mr. Speaker..."

Shea: "All right....Those in favor will say 'aye'..."

Rosco: "No, wait a minute, I wanted to ask a question of Katz."

Shea: "Those opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Amendment #26. Mr. Lechowicz, is he on the Floor? The Amendment is tabled. Amendment #27. Mr. Fennessey."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #27. Fennessey. Amends House Resolution 237 on page 43 by adding after line 18, the following and so forth."

Fennessey: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House...ah...Amendment #27 established some guidelines in the Rules for the conduction of Election Contests. As you know, it's been a very open situation as far as Election Contests are concerned with the House and



briefly what this does it says that any voter of a District may file an Election Contest or any Member of the House may also file. It provides that...ah..every Member of that District must be notified of Election Contests, it allows the Election Commissions to..ah..Committee to dismiss Members that...ah... of a District if they do not feel the need to be involved in the contest. It involves the...it specifies that it must be done within ten days of the convening of the House. Also it, in regard to qualifications, it says that they must...ah...contests must be brought within ninety days. As you know we've had several contests that were filed...ah...even towards the end of the Session and it establishes that...ah...the House must...ah... the Committee must make recommendations to the House in regarding the reimbursement of Attorney's Fees. So I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mahar, to explain his position."

Mahar: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask a question if I might."

Shea: "He says he'll yield."

Mahar: "Did you, does that say that any single...ah...voter in the District can...ah...ask for a...ah...a recount?"

Fennessey: "Yes"

Mahar: "Any single registered voter? Wouldn't that, couldn't that become dilatory in certain cases and I can think of one?"

Fennessey: "Well that's probably in the Election Code, Representative Mahar. That's specified in the Election Code that any...any...ah.. registered voter may file an Election Contest..."

Mahar: "Thank you."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #27. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment #28. Now prior to the time we get 28, Mr. Skinner wants to tell you that he didn't mean to table 31 and 32, he meant to table 37 and 38. So does he have leave to reinstate 31 and 32 and table 37 and 38? Hearing no objection, that's the order. Amendment #28. Mr. Deuster."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #28. Deuster. Amends House Resolution 237 on



page 41 by inserting between line 2 and 3 the following. So forth."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment 28 would establish a policy that the House of Representatives would not hold Sessions after 10:00 P.M. at night unless this were approved by 107 votes. I think particularly having in mind some of the older Members who are not in good health and even having in mind some of the ridiculous...ah...photographs that are sometimes taken when we're at 3:00 in the morning down here. That it is not generally a very wise thing for us as a deliberative body to be going on through the wee hours of the morning. We all complain about it and I suppose maybe there's not an awful lot we can do about it but this Amendment would simply establish that as a policy we would adjourn at 10:00 at night and that if we felt it were necessary to keep going we can always do that by authorizing it by 107 votes. I think that this will do an awful lot to make us look better and to make our decisions wiser and I think it's going to make life more comfortable and orderly and to some extent we have to grab the bull by the horns and say, 'Do we like this the way it's going, are we satisfied with going on 3:00 in the morning sometimes, or do we believe we have rank and file the ability to establish some policy to at least say this is the way we would generally like to have it done.' I think this is ah...would be an important step forward to require that we quit at 10:00 at night but also to leave the door open so with 107 votes we could authorize going all night if that be the proponderant will of the majority and I would be happy to answer any questions on this Amendment."

Shea: "Before we get to Mr. Katz, the Speaker has informed me that we will continue on Rules until 1:00 at 1:00 we will return to the regular Calendar so that every Member may have a chance to call any motion he's got on the Calendar. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Deuster. I mean Mr. Katz."

Katz: "When the House elects a Speaker, I think the Speaker can handle these problems that are involved and when the House will close and when it will open and I believe that has not been abused even



though he's a very young fellow he does appreciate the problems of older people and I believe that we should support the Speaker and vote down this Amendment."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Marion...The Lady from Lake, Ms. Geo-Karis. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster moves for the adoption of Amendment #28. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'nays' have it, the Amendment fails. I am sure you'll be joined with five Members Mr. Deuster. All in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Ms. Geo-Karis to explain her vote."

Geo-Karis: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, briefly, I can remember when we were voting on the Department of Transportation Budget till 5:00 in the morning we really didn't have the ability, we really had debility and I do think this is...ah...a wise Amendment and I don't often agree with the Sponsor on many things but this is one time I heartily agree with him."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 32 'ayes', 72 'nays' and the Amendment is defeated. Amendment #29. Mr. R. Hoffman."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #29. Amends House Resolution 237 on page 9 by inserting after line 2, the following and so forth."

Shea: "Mr. Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, you announced that we are going into a regular Session on other Calendar matters at 1:00 was it the intention of the Chair to adjourn for lunch or not?"

Shea: "No, the Chair...we are not adjourning for lunch, we're going to try to get out of here."

Maragos: "Thank you very much, that's all I wanted to know."

Shea: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Motivated as he is to be a principal Sponsor of this proposition he has a great desire to participate on this. The Amendment only insures that the principal Sponsor would be a Member. Not necessarily a Chairman, Vice-chairman, but would be a Member. I would hate to see and I have seen in the time that I've been down here, principal Sponsors of Bills creating



Commissions excluded from participation on their own Commission after it passed the House and Senate and was approved by the Governor and I would ask for your favorable consideration."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "It is a very rare occurrence, so rare that I think I can only recall one instance since I've been down here when a Sponsor has not been appointed to a Committee or Commission created by his Bill. I believe that the flexibility of the Speaker ought to be preserved and of the minority leader their situation when a single individual may in fact Sponsor a large number of...ah... Committees or Commissions, we do have to recognize that adoption an iron clad rule like this does not permit us exceptions and in view of the fact there's only one known instance that this having not been done, it was the feeling of the Rules Committee that it was an unnecessary matter and...ah...accordingly I would oppose the Amendment."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter."

Porter: "I would just simply remind my colleague from the First District that there are two instances in our District alone Harold."

Katz: "Well I'm very happy to have you join me John."

Shea: "Harold has first hand knowledge. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, there are more than just two and I would hesitate to go into it. The only thing I say for the Members' consideration here that you don't fully appreciate the impact of how this proposition can be abused until you are the recipient of this and until such time as you have that confrontation you don't realize the impact. So for all of those that do have concerns that might possibly in the next Session be considering Sponsoring Legislation to create such a Commission...ah...I would give some thoughtful moments on this before you vote and I would ask you to support this Amendment."

Shea: "All those in favor will vote 'aye', all those opposed will vote 'nay'. Mr. Matijevich to explain his vote."

Matijevich: "I'd like to explain my vote. The intent of this is good, but



you've got to remember that there may be a member of the House who might introduce 10 commission bills, and want to be a Member of 10 different commissions, so in spite of the good intent of this Amendment, I would say that the better vote would be against this, because you're going to have a Member on a lot of Commissions and I don't think that's good policy for this House to endorse."

Shea: "Take the Roll Call. On this question, there are 61 'ayes', 34 'nays' and the Motion is adopted. Amendment #30. Mr. Grotberg."

Grotberg: "Mr. Speaker, Let's Table 35 and 61."

Shea: "The Gentleman asks leave to Table Amendment 35 and 61. Hearing no objections, they'll be Tabled. #30."

Jack O'Brien: "House Resolution, or excuse me, Amendment #30. Amends House Resolution 237 on Page 18 by deleting Lines 21 through 23 and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

Grotberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is another Amendment to insure a certain amount of equity and to avoid any embarrassment. It requires that written consent by the Senate Sponsor is obtained and submitted at the time a Senate Bill is picked up in the House for Sponsorship. We have had cases where inadvertently Bills had been picked up that have come over that was intended for other legislators and it was very embarrassing. We also leave it open to the point where some Bills, then, are picked up for purposes other than intense consideration and it would insure that we would avoid these types of circumstances for legislation coming over from the Senate, and I would ask you to support this Amendment."

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

Madison: "Well, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker I think that the Sponsor of this Amendment, I think his efforts are laudable, but I would oppose the Amendment for one reason. It would seem to me that a rule of this type ought to be adopted as a Joint Rule less it become one sided and for that reason I would oppose it."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "For the reasons so well stated by the preceding Gentleman and also because of the administrative problems that would be involved in every Member every time he was to pick up a Senate Bill, having to go and



find the Senator, it would be an over reaction to the situation and would impose a lot of unnecessary administrative details. The abuses have been very few and the way to deal with the problem is in the Joint Rules and not in the House Rules that would accord to Senators adhere a courtesy that is not given the House Members."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hoffman, to close."

Hoffman: "Again, we are encountering the situation that for a few of us we have encountered these circumstances and we have encountered the abuses, and I think that ah..... for every Member here who works very closely with the various Senators who sponsor Bills that want to be handled over in the House. They are doing this now on a verbal agreement. They go over there and they make arrangements to take up various Bills that are coming over here. The only thing we want to assure ourselves is that there are no embarrassing situations where Bills are inadvertently picked up and held by Members of the House for other than the proper consideration, and again until the individual Members run into this circumstance by themselves they can't appreciate the magnitude of this, so again, I would ask for your consideration and support of this Amendment."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #30. All in favor will vote 'aye'. Those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Mr. Lundy to explain his vote."

Lundy: "Yes, briefly, Mr. Speaker. I am voting 'no' because of the administrative problem Representative Katz pointed out. However, if Representative Hoffman were to redraft this in such a way that a Senate Sponsor could file a written request to remove the House Sponsor and designate an alternative Sponsor, I would support it and I do think it's a matter of the prerogatives of the Members of this House as he indicates, who have made arrangements with Senators and often had a Bill grabbed out from under them by some other Member."

Shea: "Mr. Katz would like to explain to you where that's in the present Rules now."

Katz: "Well, you've made the Point, Mr. Speaker. That is already in the present Rules, Representative Lundy and that is no problem."

Shea: "Have all voted who wished? Take the Roll. On this, there are 32 'ayes', 76 'nays' and the Gentleman's Motion fails."



Shea: "Now Mr. Skinner in revitalized 31."

Skinner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #31. Skinner. Amends House Resolution 237 on Page 13, line 22, by inserting after Committee the following and so forth."

Skinner: "I don't know if anybody has noticed, but an awful lot of Commissions and Joint Subcommittees and Joint Committees are controlled by the Senate and one of the reasons may be for that that they Commission meetings have been held or have been organized while we've been in Session. Now I've noticed that one meeting of the Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission, which I would suggest is a fairly important Commission, there was only one House Member present, and he had to leave early because we were going into Session. The rest of us had regular Committee meetings, so that we could not attend and I just think we shouldn't allow other things to go on, while the primary business of this House is occurring."

Shea: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "The Speaker believes that this problem will have to be handled in the Joint Rules. It is already being handled in the House and I don't think there is a problem in the House and ah..... the Speaker will undertake to try to have an understanding with the President of the Senate so that it doesn't happen."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves..... Oh, the Gentleman, Mr. Skinner, to close."

Skinner: "Well, strangely enough, it was the President of the Senate who was the Chairman of the Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission when the meeting took place, at which no House Members came, and you know, one vote at one of these meetings sets off a large staff on a major study and what if we don't care about it at all. I just..... I think I'm happy that the Speaker's interested in this subject and I ah..... I hope he can bring off what he thinks he can bring off if this doesn't pass."

Shea: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #31. Those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed say 'nay'. The opinion of the Chair will take a Roll Call. Have all voted who wished? Mr. Matijevich, to explain his vote."



Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, a Rule that you can't enforce isn't a good Rule. There's no way that we can invoke a Rule that relates to Commissions that ah..... a Joint Committee. It's got to be done by Joint Committee. I agree with Representative Skinner and his intent of this Rule, but we just can't enforce it and I think the only way to do it, Cal, is through the Joint Rules and hopefully that can be done."

Shea: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the Record, Mr Clerk. On this question, there are 45 'ayes', 57 'nays' and the Gentleman's Motion fails. Amendment #32, revitalized."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #32. Skinner. Amends House Resolution 237, on page 2, Line 14 and so forth."

Shea: "Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House, I don't quite know how to put this, because I'm probably in a Minority position. Ah..... but there are a number of People sitting on this Floor who are actually allergic to smoke. There are others who aren't allergic, but ah.... do find it distasteful. What this Amendment will require the Speaker to do is designate enough seats on each side of the aisle so that those who tell him that they want to sit in a 'no smoking' section may sit in that 'no smoking' section. Now previous to this year, the debate has been, when this has been brought up, was 'gee whiz, guys, we haven't organized the House, so we can't, you know, we sit people on the basis of seniority' and frankly I'm not too concerned about where I'd sit. I've sat up where LeRoy VanDuyne is sitting and heard about all the deals being made and I've sat back here and enjoyed babies and I'd be happy to sit back underneath the rotunda, or underneath the balcony....."

Shea: "Leave is granted."

Skinner: "If we all get snowed in here today, it may be just like the 30's. We may have to put cots out in the Rotunda."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "The Speaker supports this fine Amendment of Mr. Skinner."

Shea: "All those in favor..... Mr. Hudson, do you want to oppose the Amendment?"



Hudson: "I'd like to ask a question if I might, Mr. Speaker? As to what we're really talking about here."

Shea: "We're talking about, as I understand it, is that the Speaker can designate certain seats as areas where nonsmokers will sit."

Hudson: "Of the Sponsor, may I ask a question of the Sponsor, or am I too late."

Shea: "No. No, we're never too late, Mr. Hudson."

Hudson: "Very good, Mr. Speaker. Cal, I'm a little bit confused as to what your Amendment here really means. Now does it mean that ah.... during the course of debate on a..... and let me point out first all that I'm a nonsmoker and I think that I am sensitive to the rights of the nonsmokers, as well as those who choose to smoke, so I'm not knocking your idea necessarily, but does it mean that in the course of debate on a..... where are we going to sit? In other words, when we're discussing Bills here and the ah..... let's say somebody wants to light up a cigarette, does he then have to move from where he's seated to a nonsmoking area? And if so, what does he use for a voting device? A symbol or a code or something like that?"

Shea: "Turn Mr. Skinner on so he can answer."

Skinner: "Well, I think the answer to the question is almost ah..... I would expect anyone who wanted to smoke occasionally would not ask the Speaker to be put in the nonsmoking section. I think there are those of us who just don't want smoke around us, and ah..... I would hope that ah..... those who wanted to smoke occasionally would not ah..... be allowed to sit in ah.... Section, the no smoking section."

Hudson: "What you're saying is, in the course of a prolonged debate on a Bill, those who want to smoke, simply would not smoke."

Skinner: "They can smoke in their own seat. Just don't have a seat in the no smoking section. I mean, if you want.... Let's just say that the first three rows here were no smoking sections. If the odds were good, you know, there's probably one Member of the Leadership that doesn't smoke. Ah..... since the Majority of the People in the United States don't smoke anymore. Anybody sitting back where you are, you and Bill Kempiners, for instance, both who do not smoke, you can.... if you can take it, God bless you, sit back there. Ah..... but, you know, don't let somebody who does smoke sit up here."



Shea: "The Gentleman from..... I'm sorry, the Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I'm sympathetic with what he's trying to do, but I think this gets a little absurd. I think the Speaker's tried to accommodate those People who want to sit in their own section, but what about the person who is in the last row of the nonsmoking section, do you eliminate the next row, the guy that wants to smoke. What are you going to do in Committee rooms? What are you going to do about a guy carrying a cigarette down front. I don't smoke and so it's not anything for me, but I think you're getting absurd. I think the Speaker has tried to accommodate those people who want to sit in nonsmoking sections."

Shea: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Cal, I presume you will yield to a question."

Shea: "He indicates he will."

Kosinski: "I certainly have sympathy with the nonsmokers and I remember my good friend who passed away behind me in this section and his problems with respiration. At the same time historically, not only politically but geographically, we've had a kind of line of demarcation, Republicans to ah.... Democrats, and with recent years, more people, or fewer people are smoking. Don't you feel that this might ah.... violate that aisle situation tremendously over a period of time?"

Sinner: "Well, no more than having all those Democrats on our side of the aisle does now. I mean, I'm sorry, perhaps I'm being jocular when I shouldn't be, but the.... I don't see a problem. You know, if you don't want to have a no smoking section on the Democratic side, fine."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't wish to prolong this, but I was just wondering how the Sponsor feels in the event that there would be more from one side of the aisle than the other side of the aisle, who did not smoke. What would happen to those who might not have a seat in the nonsmoking section on either side of the aisle?"

Skinner: "My intention was that there be a no smoking section on both sides of the aisle. You know....."

Williams: "What if there were more, for examples, Democrats as there are now, who did not want to smoke and yet there were only 10 seats assigned



to the nonsmoking area. There were say 20 who didn't want to smoke, where would you put them?"

Skinner: "Well, it is my intent that everyone that would ask the Speaker to be in a nonsmoking section would receive a seat in a nonsmoking section. All right, so there's got to be some boundaries. Well fine. Tough. The last person to ask is the last person, you know, that loses. You do that on seniority. I don't really see that as a problem."

Williams: "Actually, I can understand the reason for the Sponsor wanting this, but I think it's something that just won't work."

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

Matijevich: "To clear the smoke, I move the previous question."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All those in favor, say 'aye'. Those opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. Now back to Mr. Skinner to close. Mr. Epton has one comment."

Epton: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, just a Point of Order. I think because the media always looks at us with a jaundice eye, because of the conflict of interest, I think that all smokers and all nonsmokers should refrain from voting on this question."

Shea: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, moves for the adoption of Amendment #32. Those in favor will vote 'aye'. Those opposed will vote 'nay'. Mr. Maragos to explain his vote."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, although I agree in principle with what Mr. Skinner is trying to do here, I think the House should adopt Rules to prevent any smoking on the Floor of the House and no eating on the Floor of the House, like many other Legislatures do. However, right now the Speaker presently is doing, out of the circumstances on a voluntarily basis, I don't think we need this Amendment."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the Record. On this there are..... Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, this is an extremely serious matter with some of us, oh, shut up yourself."

Shea: "Now, hold on. We'll run the House with some decorum, Mr. Skinner. You know the Rules."

Shea: "Well, Mr. Speaker, then you should be chastising some of the Members, perhaps elsewhere on the Floor, who were yelling to me to shut up. Now I don't intend to sit on this Floor as long as Representative Arrigo



did and stand up in the organization of the House and plead for my very life."

Shea: "Mr. Schlickman, on a Point of Order."

Schlickman: "I simply suggest the Gentleman is out of Order by speaking to the merits of this Amendments."

Shea: "All right. Now, do you have a Point of Order, Mr. Skinner?"

Skinner: "I have no point of order. I wish to call the absentees."

Shea: "The Gentleman's entitled to that under the Rules. Poll the absentees. I think there's been a request to dump this Roll Call and take a new one. All those..... Dump the Roll Call, Mr. Clerk. All those in favor will vote 'aye'. Those opposed 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Take the Record. Now on this question, there are 66 'ayes', and 71 'nays' and Mr. Skinner wishes to poll the absentees. Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, in the present Rules, there's a provision that if a Member of this House pushes another Member's button, he is subject to sanction. I just noticed the Sponsor of this Amendment pushing the button of his absent Member's button, and I move that he be sanctioned and I leave to your discretion that sanction."

Shea: "Thanks a lot Gene. And Roscoe pleads mercy. Poll the absentees, Sir."

Jack O'Brien: "Arnell. Bluthardt. Borchers. Caldwell. Campbell. Chapman. Choate. Collins."

Shea: "Miss Chapman wants 'aye'."

Jack O'Brien: "D'Arco. Darrow. Deavers. John Dunn. Ralph Dunn. Dyer. Ewell. Hirschfeld. Dan Houlihan. Kelly. Lauer. Lechowicz. Leinenweber. Lucco. McAvoy. McCourt. McGrew. Neff. Randall. Reed. Rose. Schisler. Simms. Stearney. C. M. Stiehl. Teclser. Waddell. Wall. Yourell."

Shea: "On this question, there are 67 'ayes' and 71 'nays' and the Motion fails."

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #33. Cunningham, Stone. Amends House Resolution 237 on Page 32 by inserting after line 21 the following and so forth."

Shea: "Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let me do a little arithmetic with you just a moment or so. If you've



examined the records, you find that it costs far in excess of ten million dollars a year to run this House, but just round it off to ten million, because there's many expenditures there that would have to go anyhow. The very aimiable man, who sits regularly in the Chair, Mr. Speaker, keeps us in session 100 days a year, 8 hours a day, sort of a slave driver, and in that length of time, you take the minutes times the hours times the day and divide it into the amount that we, I told you we would round it off to, the ten million, and you'll find that it costs \$208.33 a minute to run this House of Representatives. Now I do this to show you how important time is, both to you and to the taxpayers throughout the State. In face of that reality of life, and in face of the fact that we have a machine on the wall that costs one hundred thousand dollars to buy. It costs thousands of dollars a year to run, it's a totalizer board, we have the spectacle, the incredible act that time and time again people jump up and demand a verification when their issue loses by 10, 12, 15 votes. They say they want a verification. They apparently want to check to see if there has been a short circuiting in the mechanism that's on the wall. Not unsurprisingly, they never, never find that there's been any short circuit. All that happens there is the taxpayers of the State of Illinois are short changed by their right that the present archaic rules permit a person to demand with impunity a verification. Now I submit to you that is not adult. It is not responsible. It is not the way things should be. You should recognize the technology that is involved here. Give the taxpayers a break. There's a second reason almost as persuasive as the first, you should vote for this good Amendment and that is the Co-sponsor. Twelve years ago, a clean-cut, fine upstanding young man came from Moultrie County and he came to this House and he served here with distinction. He is leaving on his own accord now in a few days. Loved, admired and respected by all that know him. It's time to win one for Paul Stone and this is the way you do it, by voting 'aye' for this fine resolution. I know of no opposition. I implore all of you to vote affirmative. Win this one for Paul and for the taxpayers in your District."

Shea: "Representative Stone would like to be vindicated."



Stone: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I have no idea of how I became a Sponsor of this Bill, but I just want to say one thing. I've been keeping time on the Gentleman that just spoke and his last speech cost the State of Illinois in his own figures the sum of \$4,867 and I resent paying my part of it. I don't think it was worth it."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, wishes to Table his Motion?"

Cunningham: "No, but I do not demand a roll call vote on it. You pawn to this thing and we'll renew it again next year."

Shea: "All in favor, say 'aye'. Those opposed say 'no'. In the Opinion of the Chair..... the 'nays' have it. The hour having reached one o'clock, we'll return to the regular Order of Calendar business. On total..... well, let's see, we start Second Reading. Is Mr. Boyle in the Chambers? Mr. Boyle. Senate Bills, Second Reading. Mr. Boyle. Total Veto Motions. Senate Bill 279. Mr. McPartlin."

McPartlin: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 279....."

Shea: "Mr. LaFleur said we'd get to 32 in a few minutes."

McPartlin "Amends the Downstate Firemen's Pension Fund Article of the Pension Code. It provides for the removal of the requirement of adoption at least one year prior to the Fireman's death, and I would ask for the favorable support of the House."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McPartlin, has moved that the House or that Senate Bill 279 become law, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Is there any debate? All those in favor will vote 'aye'. Those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Geo-Karis. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there are 99 'aye' and 14 'no', and the Motion fails. The Bill is declared lost. Oh, pardon me. The Gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees. The Clerk will..... Representative Stiehl 'aye'. Garmisa 'aye'. Representative Duff 'aye'. Representative Cunningham 'aye'. I guess we better dump this one and have a new Roll Call. What do you want? New Roll Call. Question is, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "I simply want to explain my vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, we'll reach you. Question is, shall Senate Bill 279 pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All in



favor indicate by voting 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished?"

Schlickman: "May I explain my vote Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz? I'll be back to you."

Katz: "Yes, I wanted to explain my vote, and I would want to say that we are in a time of great fiscal problems for the State of Illinois. I think that...ah...we do have to follow the recommendation of the Pensions Laws Commission if we are going to maintain the solvency of the State of Illinois. This, as I understand it, the Pension Laws Commission opposed this particular matter, because once it is done, it is not just done for this fund. It has a leap frog effect, and it's going to result in making our Pension Funds that are already very shakey, even more shakey and more insolvent. There's lots of complaints about the fact that we don't adequately fund these already everytime we pass this kind of Bill, we add to the fiscal insolvency of our Pension Funds, and I would urge in support of the Governor's Veto and of the Pension Laws Commission."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would add to what the Gentleman from Cook said in opposition to the Motion. This Bill would extend to Downstate Firemen a benefit no other public employee pension system has. It's against pension policy as the Pension Laws Study Commission pointed out to expand coverage of benefits after an employee has left public service, and I would encourage a 'no' vote."

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

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Chairman. I can see some wavering because the comments made by the previous speakers, but this particular Bill like all legislation follows your laws, there has to be some way to take care of small discrepancies or unjust rulings because of some time, dates. That's what our job is. To my best knowledge, after hearing this Bill, and listening to the Senate review it, and seeing their Report, it affects one family that was caught between some very tight regulations and I'm sure that's why the Pension Commission made those regulations



and filed them on recommendations. To my knowledge this takes care of some children of a retired firefighter that was caught in between a couple of vague regulations and I would hope that we would not penalize him for our deficiency in giving our regulations enough easement to take care of it, so I'd ask your favorable vote, and I'm sure that it's just one particular instance."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPartlin."

McPartlin: "Ah...Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. It is my understanding that the Governor removed his objections to the Bill, and for that reason, I'll ask for a Poll of the Absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has requested a Poll of the Absentees. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. The Gentleman has requested a Poll of the Absentees. The Clerk will Poll the Absentees."

Jack O'Brien: "Arnell, Berman, Borchers."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Berman 'aye'. Representative Sharp 'aye'."

Jack O'Brien: "Capuzi, Catania."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Boyle 'aye'."

Jack O'Brien: "Already recorded as voting 'aye'. Capuzi, Catania, Choate, D'Arco, Darrow, Dyer, Ebbesen, Flinn, Friedrich, Gaines, Geo-Karis, Griesheimer, Grotberg, Hirschfeld, Jaffe, Kane, Kucharski, Lechowicz, Londrigan, Lundy, Mann, McAuliffe, McAvoy, McCourt, Molloy, Neff, Peters, Reed, Schisler, Schneider, Stearney, E. G. Steele, Waddell, Wall, Younge, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is the Lady recorded?"

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

Geo-Karis: "Would you please record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, would you change my vote to 'aye', please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman to 'aye'. Fleck?"

Fleck: "Vote me 'aye', please."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the Gentleman 'aye'. Macdonald? 'Aye'. Mahar?"



"Aye'. Madison? 'Aye'. Sangmeister? 'Aye'. James Houlihan? Representative James Houlihan?"

Houlihan, J.: "Mr. Speaker, we're getting back into the same situation where we don't know where the Roll Call is. I suggest you dump it, because I'm going to request a Verification of this Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty? 'Aye'. Dyer? 'Aye'. Younge? 'Aye'. Caldwell? 'Aye'. What's the score now? Representative Waddell? 'Aye'. Waddell, 'aye'. Grotberg? 'Aye'. I understand the elevator in the back has been broken and that there's some problem with some of the Members in the Rathskeller getting up here, so I do think it's advisable to dump this Roll Call and do it over again. I see three or four more coming in, and it's... Why don't we dump it and take it over again? Have all voted...those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Simms? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Kucharski 'aye'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. Representative James Houlihan."

Houlihan, J.: "Mr. Speaker, I think there's been some confusion about this Bill. It has been represented on the Floor of the House that this Bill doesn't have opposition from the Executive Department. I think that's inaccurate. It has opposition from the Pension Laws Commission, and I think there are a lot of mistaken votes up there, and I'm going to respectfully ask for a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the Record. The Gentleman has requested a Verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Proceed with the Verification, Mr. Clerk."

Jack O'Brien: "E. M. Barnes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer?"

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, would you record me as 'aye' on that please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Representative Rigney, 'aye'. Let's get on the Verification."



Jack O'Brien: "E. M. Barnes, J. M. Barnes, Beatty, Beaupre, Berman, Birchler, Bluthardt, Boyle, Brandt, Brinkmeier, Brummet, Byers, Caldwell, Campbell, Carroll, Catania, Chapman, Collins, Craig, Cunningham, Darrow, Davis, Deavers, DiPrima, Duff, John Dunn, Ralph Dunn, Dyer, Ewell, Farley, Fennessey, Fleck, Flinn, Friedland, Gaines, Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Getty, Giglio, Giorgi, Griesheimer, Grotberg, Hanahan, Hill, R. K. Hoffman, D. L. Houlihan, Huff, Jacobs, Emil Jones, J. D. Jones, Keller, Kelly, Kempiners, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Kucharski, LaFleur, Lauer, Laurino, Leinenweber, Leon, Leverenz, Lucco, Luft, Macdonald, Madigan, Madison, Mahar, Maragos, Marovitz, Matijevich, Mautino, McClain, McGrew, McLendon, McMaster, McPartlin, Merlo, Molloy, Mudd, Mulcahey, Nardulli, O'Daniel, Patrick, Pierce, Polk, Porter, Pouncey, Richmond, Rigney, Ryan, Sangmeister, Schoeberlein, Sevcik, Sharp, Shea, Simms, C. M. Stiehl, Stone, Stubblefield, Taylor, Telcser, Tip sword, VanDuyne, Vitek, Washburn, Washington, White, Williams, Winchester, Wolf, Younge, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Downs 'aye'. Representative Skinner wishes to be recorded 'no'. Representative Jaffe desires to be recorded 'yes'. Representative Miller 'yes'. Representative Waddell, 'aye'. McCourt, 'no'. Ebbesen, 'no'. Lundy, 'aye'. Mann, 'aye'. Any questions of the...Craig? How do you vote Craig? "Aye' for Craig. I've been advised you already are recorded as 'aye', so we can only do it once. Representative McPartlin."

McPartlin: "I would like to have a Poll of the Absentees, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the score now? 121. How many? 16.

Representative J. M. Houlihan."

Houlihan, J.: "Ah...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

I don't think a Poll of the Absentees is in order and I also don't think it's necessary on this third Roll Call Mr. Speaker.

I think it's very unfortunate that you would extend this Bill the three different Roll Calls because we couldn't get our signals straight. It seems to me there's something going on that should be addressed publicly and I really reject and oppose the



kind of conversations that have been going on, but I would, because of the time of the House, withdraw my request for a Verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Take the Record. What was the count, Mr.

Clerk? On this Question, 121 'aye', 26 'nay'. The Motion prevails, and Senate Bill 279 is declared passed, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. At the request of the Sponsor, we'll pass over Senate Bill 944 and 946. Senate Bill 1175. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1175 is one of the more important efforts to come out of the Senate, and the Governor vetoed it. I'm not sure that the veto was necessary. Briefly, 1175 amended the Game Code to prevent the Department of Conservation from discontinuing or significantly reducing the operation of the various State Game Farms, unless it is done with the consent of the Legislature. This is one of their more popular programs. They just happen to have one in Will County and they have them in several other areas in the state, and apparently there are some rumors that despite the popularity the programs might be significantly reduced, 1175 seeks to prevent that. The Bill zipped out of the House last Spring, and the Governor vetoed it for reasons which I guess he deemed to be good. However, I would hate to see the Game Farms significantly reduced after four birds, and I guess you would vote 'aye'. If you're not, I suppose you would vote with the Governor, but I would ask an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The Question is shall Senate Bill 1175.... Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Matijevich: "Representative Leinenweber, as I read the Governor's Message, how do you respond to the matter mentioned that the Department may from time to time be required to reduce such operations promptly because of disease or some other factor. to protect wildlife? In other words...ah...you're taking away



some flexibility we're not always in Session...ah..to...ah...give that approval. How do respond to that, because it just seems to me that made some sense but if you make some better sense, I'll go along with you."

Leinenweber: "Ah...I'm glad you asked that question...The, I was happily watching T.V. this morning and they had a special on turkey operations and the way they protect...they can quarantine...ah...and it can be done administratively in my opinion without being, certainly being in violation of Senate Bill 1175...ah...which talks about the operation of game farms. This would be a matter of regulation within the game farm and I...I can't conceive that...ah...such a temporary operation to protect...ah...in effect protect the operation of a game farm would...ah...would be...ah...in violation of what this Bill provides."

Matijevich: "Well I think you spoke around it. You didn't tell me yet Harry."

Leinenweber: "All right, the answer is that the Department would not be prevented from...ah...weeding out the ill ones."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Waddell: "Could you tell me the relative cost of what it...ah...would take to raise a bird under our present system in the Department of Conservation compared to that of buying a bird from the commercial bird producers on the outside."

Leinenweber: "I haven't any idea but I would assume it's cheaper to raise them that ...ah...to buy them from outside because of the profit margin and so on."

Waddell: "I think that your assumption is incorrect."

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

Collins: "Well yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I merely wanted to comment that I...I think we should all get behind this very fine Bill because I do believe that everyone in this Chamber will agree that the House Sponsor is for the birds."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich demands equal time. Any further discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1175 pass?"



The veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. It takes 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Representative Maragos 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 47 'aye' and 60 'no' the motion fails and the Bill is declared lost. Senate Bill 1460. Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1460 amends the Illinois Public Aid code by requiring the Legislative Advisory Committee on Public Aid to provide the public prompt and complete access to records of the Committee and the whole meeting's open to the public except where closed Session is authorized by two-thirds vote of the House and the Senate. Nothing however, shall preclude the exercise of the highest authority of confidentiality commensurate with the degree of confidentiality placed upon matters by the appropriate agencies of local, state and Federal Government. Originally the Bill contained a detailed listing of certain exceptions for safeguarding confidentiality. That list was stricken because it would be necessary to amend the Bill each time other related laws were passed, whether they be local, Federal or state. Senate Bill 1460 passed the House 150 to nothing to 8 'present'. The Governor's veto was overridden in the Senate by 42 to 9 and I would like at this time to move that the House concur with the Senate in the passage of Senate Bill 1460, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the Bill that ought to be defeated for the reason that it duplicates bureaucracy. At the present time the Department, the Department of Public Health makes a survey of...of skilled care facilities. The Federal Government has decreed that by sometime next year there has to be an all over...ah...review of these matters, so if you limit it only to the Public Aid Institutions... ah...this was attempted through the Governor's effort here, if you sweep aside that restriction, you'll have two groups going around making...ah...this inspection, you'll double the cost of



bureaucracy is by twice. So reluctantly I must vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Ah...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

Ah...I'll take care of you later sir. Ah...I think we better keep in mind that already we have approximately four hundred million dollars drained a year with welfare fraud. I think it could be...it's incumbent upon us to protect the public tax payers money as much as we can and I'd like to speak in favor of this Bill and I think it would be a good step in the right direction to find out what's really going on."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I think the last two speak...ah...the last two speakers with a small 's', both were referring to the wrong Bill. Now I oppose the override but I oppose it for what's in the... the Bill and not another Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann."

Mann: "Well the question I have is...ah...What is the...ah...what are the provisions for confidentiality with regards to recipients."

Campbell: "The only thing I can tell you in regarding this Bill Bob, is that in, on line 14, it says 'Nothing in this Section however, shall preclude the exercise of the highest order of confidentiality commensurate with that degree of confidentiality placed upon these matters by the appropriate agencies of local, state and Federal Government.' It says that and nothing more. In line 19, it says, 'Nothing in this Section however, shall serve as authority to withhold information from the Committee or the General Assembly.' In other words, we must treat any matter of confidentiality by the Committee regarding the same regulations that any other agency ...ah...is obligated to do."

Mann: "Well can you tell me this. What are the present regulations with regard to confidentiality of the people who are on public assistance?"

Campbell: "No Bob, you know that I'm not an Attorney and..."

Mann: "No...I'm not, I'm just asking. I'm not trying to...ah...to put you in the middle here."

Campbell: "The thing...the thing is that, regarding the freedom of



information Act and so forth, that we are all in compliance with that Federally and so forth and you know that many people ...ah...that are on...ah...Public Aid are confidentially kept, that you can not get the record. But we have, we would be in the same position as any Department or local agency under those restrictions. That's all that it does."

Mann: "Well Mr. Speaker, until this point is clarified, I could not support the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

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

I would ask you to oppose the override of this Bill...ah...for a couple reasons. One of them mentioned by Representative Mann. This Bill actually provides a double standard. The Department of Public Aid...ah...would have to turn over those matters that are nonconfidential. But the...ah...Committee could on it own, use the nonconfidential material and use it confidentially and I really think this flies in the face of those of us who believe strongly in open meetings and open records. Ah...I think it's a very dangerous Bill...ah...There's nothing that the...the Legislative Advisory to Public Aid can do in the Public interest if they're going to do it secretly. So I would ask you to oppose this...this ...ah...veto motion by Representative Campbell."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Campbell to close."

Campbell: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In response to Representative Cunningham and as it's been suggested he was talking on the wrong Bill. Ah...In answer to Representative Mann and Matijevich. One of the purposes of this Legislation is so that we can get into this Welfare Fraud Investigation in the State of Illinois so far as this Committee is concerned and one of the reasons for having closed meetings and this is only in compliance with all of the regulations that are now held pertaining to privacy, but supposing that we were discussing a Doctor, not a recipient or any vendor of services to the Department of Public Aid and supposing a name were suggested before that man goes to court and he is actually accused of



something and without being in closed sessions this gets to the newspaper and you've had character assassination and we certainly don't want to be a part of that. So it's absolutely necessary and essential once the case goes to court and once that that person has been indicted or...ah..proven guilty then of course all records would be made available and I don't think there is any position here that the Legislative Advisory Committee is trying in any way to snoop into any records, we're trying to protect innocent people and I would certainly appreciate your vote in overriding the Governor."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Mr. Speaker, I think Representative Campbell was closing and I was seeking recognition to explain my vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1460 pass? The Veto of the Governor notwithstanding? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed voting 'no. Representative Kempiners to explain his vote."

Kempiners: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I think that this Body ought to be aware that recently at a Legislative Advisory Committee on Public Aid meeting, we heard a tape recording of a provider from the City of Chicago who voluntarily come forward and explained how a particular operation was ripping off the people of the State of Illinois. These were providers, a clinic in Chicago. A clinic in which two deaths have already occurred during a proceeding or ongoing investigation. I think that Representative Campbell hit the nail on the head. We are trying to protect people who are decent, who are willing to come forward and provide information and protect them from something that's serious enough so that there have already been two deaths on . I think you'd better take a closer look at this Bill and...ah...vote 'aye'."

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

Cunningham: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You note that I am voting somewhat differently than I spoke. I'm humble, I'm contrite, I apologize. I knew that he had a good Bill and a bad Bill and I thought better just to vote for all of them so I'd be sure to get the bad one out. The good...this is a good Bill and I want you to vote green on that."



Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 100 'aye' 20 'no'. Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to Poll the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees. The Clerk will proceed. You sure you want the poll of the absentees Representative? He's caught with his jaw down."

Jack O'Brien: "Arnell. E. M....."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1460 pass? The veto of the Governor not withstanding. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 111 'ayes' and 23 'no'. The motion prevails and Seante Bill 1460 is declared passed. The veto of the Governor not withstanding. Representative Marovitz. Change Marovitz from 'present' to 'no'."



Speaker Redmond: "Veto motion. Senate Bill 32...32...Representative LaFleur."

LaFleur: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 32 is coming to us from the Senate after a successful override of the Governor's veto. Senate Bill 32 creates a Criminal and Juvenile Justice Commission by statute and require Legislative advice and consent. The purpose of the Act is to evaluate State and Local programs associated with the prevention, detection and solution of crimes. To encourage the preparation and adoption of comprehensive plans for the improvement and coordination of all aspects of law enforcement and criminal justice, to stimulate research in development of new methods for the prevention and reduction of crimes and to establish the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Commission, by statute. The establishment of this Commission, by statute, provides permanency to the Commission. This Commission is essential for the control of crime and should be a permanent Executive Commission. The Membership of the Commission shall be twenty-two Members. The Governor appoints thirteen Members directly. With the advice and consent of the Senate. These shall include one person representing the Governor who shall serve as Chairman of the Commission. One State's Attorney, three Mayors, one Public Defender, one Sheriff, one Chief of Police and five public members. The remaining nine Members of the Commission shall be four Circuit Court Judges, designated by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, the Attorney General or his designated representative, the Director of Children and Family Services, or his designated representative, the State Appellate Defender or his delegated representative, the Director of Corrections or his designated representative and a Director of Law Enforcement or his designated Representative. Sixteen out of the twenty-two Members are directly appointed by the Governor. Mr. Speaker, could we have some order?"

Speaker Redmond: "Will you give the Gentleman order."

LaFleur: "The function of this agency is to act as a central clearing house for Federal programs, including developing and defining a comprehensive state plan for law enforcement. This Commission



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

would have the responsibility of applying for, receiving and dispersing Federal Grants. The Commission may enter into an agreement with the United States Government, units of Local Government and nongovernmental units or combinations of such units to carry out its duties. This Commission shall also establish priorities for the improvement of law enforcement throughout the State. The Commission has the responsibility for improving all areas of law enforcement, criminal justice, juvenile justice, this includes....this includes the court, police departments, juvenile justice systems, penal institutions. The Grants may be used for Police equipment or training, Court Psychiatrists, Juvenile home, Parole Officer or other bonafide uses to improve the Criminal Justice System. There are procedures for providing accountability to this Commission. The advice and consent of the Senate allows for the questioning of Commission appointees and individual appointed Executive Director. The Executive Director performs the day to day functions of the Commission and the appointee shall be held accountable to the Legislature for his actions. Also, the Commission is required to report to the Governor, the General Assembly and other interested State and Local Agencies on the progress of its work by September 15th of each year. The Act provides for a Legislative Advisory Committee composed of four Members of the Senate and four of the House. These Members shall be appointed in equal numbers by their respective party leaders from the House of origin. They are required to be from either Appropriations or Judiciary Committee. The Advisory Committee has no statutory powers, it shall meet jointly with the Commission quarterly and shall advise the Commission on all matters pertaining to policy and the administration of Criminal and Juvenile Justice. The main function of the Committee is to follow the actions of the Commission and to keep the Legislature informed of such actions. The advisory Committee is to be informed prior to all regular and emergency Commission meetings and may attend such meetings. There is a provision that no award of State Funds shall



be made which has not been approved by the appropriate regional planning unit or units. This would have a Local Government input in the establishment of priorities for expenditure of funds. It would enable a more coordinated use of the funds for Criminal Justice Programs and insure against unnecessary duplication. A formula for the distributions of funds is based upon population and volume of indexed crime in the five judicial districts throughout the State. It insures a reasonable distribution based on need as indicated by crime and population, assuring a minimum to all districts. This Act takes effect upon its becoming law. There is a severability clause in the Act which provides that if any provision of the...or application thereof, is held invalid the provision of...is severable from the Act. There are presently eighteen states that have the Planning Commission, established by statutes. They are receiving Federal money also, New York which is the most comparable State to Illinois, has established its Commission by statutes and provides for Senate confirmation of the Commission Members and has suffered no loss of Federal Funds. The Governor will control the com...ah...Commission but the Legislature will have an input and will receive information in a speedy manner. Mr. Chairman... ah...Mr. Speaker, I move that the Governors veto be over...ah... overridden."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Ah...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ah... I rise...ah...briefly to speak in opposition to the override of the Governors veto. In 1968 Congress passed a Safe Streets Act in Illinois here, Governor Ogilvie established an Executive Commission, which Executive Commission remains in effect today. This is a proposal by Senator Graham and others to set up a State Statutory Authority for the purpose of expending very large sums of Federal money in the field of law enforcement and crime prevention. I believe it to be desirable to set up such an agency by statute. But the question involved in this override



is whether this particular Bill ought to be enacted, whether this statutory scheme is one that ought to be adopted. Now we have received lots of material around here that deal with a lot of other subjects that have been brought in to the consideration of this issue. But I would urge that we direct our attention simply to the issue as to whether or not the passage of this Bill may result in the imperiling of Federal Funds that will be coming here...ah...and also whether or not it makes desirable or undesirable changes with regard to the existence of the Commission here in Illinois. Now, one of the major problems with regard to the Bill was an Amendment that was added which Amendment states, as follows; 'No award of State funds shall be made by the Commission which has not been approved by each appropriate Regional Planning Unit or Units or Regional Coordinating Council or councils.' What that means, Ladies and Gentlemen is a disbandment of state programs and policies. It would be as if the General Assembly were to pass a law that said that our enactments or our programs do not apply in particular areas if the local area does not approve that particular matter. Let us say that the Law Enforcement Commission adopts a policy of some sort of crime prevention program that will be applicable in Illinois. Under this Amendment parts of Illinois could opt out of the program. Parts of Illinois could choose to ignore the policy and so there would be no effective vehicle that would....state policy could be implemented. Now I would very much urge that we take a long view of what we do here. It is a situation in which the processes of Democracy are at work. The citizens can decide whether the present Governor or the next Governor or some other Governor is the one that they want to run the Executive Branch and to set out and set forth the policies of the state and if they do not like Governor Walker, they can select Governor Howlett or they can select Governor Thompson. But I would very much urge against a policy that will tie the hands of other Governors who come along in Illinois. We are dealing with major problems of affecting



state policy and we should not cast our vote on this kind of matter based on what we may feel about the present incumbent or any other incumbent of this office. I would very much favor a proposal where the different parts of the state can be heard with reference to applications for grants. That is desirable and the Bill that contained that provision I would support. But the notion that the State of Illinois or its arm in the law enforcement field can not act to make a grant without the approval of everyone of the areas that may be touched by that is a bad policy from every point of view. All of us, I think know, that we are not making all the strides we want in law enforcement. There may be deadwood and dead weights. We need new ideas everywhere and if the status quo prevails, if no policy can be effectuated or no study made that may step on a single toe, we will have a totally sterile program. Accordingly, I would urge this House to support the veto of the Governor and to take appropriate steps if they want to have a statutory authority to have one that will carry out effective state policy all over the state, without the limiting and debilitating provisions that are contained in Senate Bill 32."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is an extremely important measure that we will be voting on in a few minutes, as it deals with the very heart of crime prevention and crime fighting in our state. Those of us that live in the so called crescent region around the Chicago area and the suburban area have been faced with many problems with regard to the operation of this particular...ah... fund to this dole of Government money ever since the creation of this particular fund in the State of Illinois. There is really nothing worse in government than when you take a legitimate program and turn it over into political hands where the dole is given out based upon politics and who you know rather than what's the best program and what the need is. This is exactly the problem we face today. As I have not been



directly associated with this particular fund, I...ah... contacted those people in our County, in Lake County, that have been working with this particular fund since its inception. They all agreed that at its optimum, these funds should be handled by the Chief Executive of the State. Regardless of whether he's a Republican or Democrat and I would say to the prior speaker that sound of Governor Thompson sounds very good today. But, the fact of the matter is that the Governors that have gone before the present Governor has utilized these funds in a political manner and thus those people that are supporting this type of operation in Lake County, the people that are working for these Federal Funds, feel they have no alternative but to turn this over to a Commission, hoping that the Commission will be less political, more realistic and more down to earth about the dispersal of these funds. No one here can...can better state the problem that has been faced by a number of people who will be voting on it today than one of the local newspapers did only a short time ago. It was indicated that if certain Legislators voted for the override, that there areas would be losing some of the Federal Funds that would be doled out. By any standard this is a form of a bribery. If it was on a man to man basis between police officer and a party under arrest or suspect this man would be prosecuted for bribery. But today we're faced with the political reality of someone, somehow, someone in that Chief Executive position making certain threats to people concerning their vote. I don't think this is a matter that should be overlooked. I think this is an important function of Government to handle these Federal Funds. We must continue all of our efforts in our crime fighting. I think we must vote to override this veto and try to take the politics out of this existing situation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"



Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Mulcahey: "Ah...Representative, we've heard a lot of pro's and con's on this particular Bill. Senate Bill 32. Just let me...let me ask you a couple of questions. First of all, does indeed Senate Bill 32 violate any Federal Statute?"

LaFleur: "Not to my knowledge...We have researched this...ah...fairly exhaustedly...ah...Representative."

Mulcahey: "Well, let me draw you attention to...ah...Section 203(a) of the Federal Statute of this Agency. It says that this Agency shall be created or designated by the Chief Executive of the State and shall...and shall be...ah...shall be select to his jurisdiction. Now let me ask you this, would indeed Senate Bill remove the Commission from the Governor's jurisdiction?"

LaFleur: "No, if you go back to my original presentation...ah...the Membership of the Commission would be reduced from twenty-nine to twenty-two. The...Under the direct, under the direct appointment of the Governor, sixteen out of the twenty-two would be appointed by the Governor. If you go back to the second paragraph of my original presentation it says the Commission is essential for the control of crime and should be a permanent Executive Commission. This has been very carefully done to allow this to continue as an Executive Commission with sixteen out of the twenty-two Commission Members as Governor appointees and it has the parallel in the closing of my presentation where we have the exact parallel in New York State that is...ah...a Statutory Commission and an Executive Commission and meets the Federal Guidelines."

Mulcahey: "Then you are saying in essence that the State of Illinois will not lose from thirty to forty million dollars in Federal Funds if this Bill is overridden."

LaFleur: "In our...In our estimation...I think we have conclusive information both in research of the law in direct conversation with L.E.A.A. that there would be no stoppage, no delay from the Federal end of funds...of...ah...Federal Funds."

Mulcahey: "Could you give me a 'yes', 'no' answer on that please?"

LaFleur: "There would be no stoppage of Federal Funds."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speakers...Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Will... Will the Sponsor yield to a question? Ah...Leo there is a concern in this area that some present projects funded by I.L.E.C. would be in jeopardy if this change is made in its administration. The...ah...memo that you circulated states that S.B. 32 will not affect such programs and I would appreciate you ascer...reassurance to the local officials that this Legislation does not jeopardize any of their grants."

LaFleur: "May...May I read to you a ... a copy of the answers to that question that I have prepared before and as to the effect on present grants, in Section 13 of the Bill, page, line...ah...page 7, line 25, provides that this Commission supersedes I.L.E.C. The Commission shall be appointed by the Governor with thirty days, Section 12, line 17, page 7 and that the Commission may hold meeting pending Senate confirmation. The Bill specifically provides that this Commission accept all assets and liabilities of the I.L.E.C. and this includes grants which are outstanding. Thus, the Bill will not effect money previously committed."

Jones: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan...Dan."

Houlihan: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the motion to override the Governor's veto of Senate Bill 32. Since 1969, when the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission was created by an Executive order of Governor Ogilvie, as the State Planning Agency, required by the provisions of the Federal omnibus Crime Control and Safety's Act of 1968, this State Agency has distributed more than eighty-two million dollars in State and Federal Funds without the benefit of any formal Legislative input. Frequently I.L.E.C. has been involved in the creation of new State Agencies or new projects or programs within existing State and Local Agencies. When the initial Federal Funding runs out usually after two or three years these Agencies have come to this Legislature seeking our continuing support from the General Revenue Fund and we are thus called upon to pay for programs and projects which were created without our knowledge and



without our advice with respect to long range planning in the ordering of priorities to state government. Senate Bill 32 provides for a percentage distribution of State Funds among the five judicial districts. Distribution is based generally upon population and crime index statistics. I look at the new functions under the Executive order has no specific guidelines for requirement with regard to the manner in which these funds shall be distributed. It would appear to me that the statutory distributions scheme advised in Senate Bill 32 is far superior to the present haphazard arrangement and that every area of this state will now be guaranteed that it will receive a fair share of the money which will be expended. It has been claimed that this override of the Governor's veto, Senate Bill 32, will or could cause L.E.A.A. to suspend payments to the State of Illinois. I submit that that is a statement which is unfounded in fact and I would like to quote as Representative LaFleur alluded to what the actual L.E.A.A. guideline is and I am quoting. 'These requirements can be met whether the Agency is established by Legislative enactment, Executive order or a combination of two. It is not inconsistent with the Gubernatorial creation or designation for the State Legislature to prescribe the size, composition or other characteristics of the agency provided the State Governors responsibility for establishing the agency and its jurisdiction over it are clear and the agency board meets the Representative character requirements as set out.' I submit to you that is exactly what this Bill does and that it is consistent with what is existing Legislation in some eighteen states which have created Legislative Commissions. The Law Enforcement Commission is presently made up of an unspecified number of Commissioners appointed by the Governor who serve at his pleasure and...and who need not represent any particular segment of the population. Statutory scheme contained in Senate Bill 32 however, contemplates the Commission which represents various geographic areas of the



state and various agencies and offices involved in the Criminal Justice System. And, finally, in...ah...what should be, I feel, of particular importance to the Members of this Legislature is the fact that I.L.E.C. represents a Forty Two Million Dollar Fund which is available to the Governor, totally beyond the control of this Legislature. I suggest that that potential for abuse by an unscrupulous Governor presents a situation that demands some legislative control if we are to fulfill our obligation as an equal branch of government, and I ask for your support of this Override Motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Getty has been seeking attention. I would defer to him momentarily."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "Thank you Representative...ah...Schlickman. Ah...would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Getty: "Representative LaFleur."

LaFleur: "Yes."

Getty: "Senate Bill 32 been submitted to the L.E.A.A. for an opinion by their General Counsel."

LaFleur: "No,...ah.... In our dealing with L.E.A.A. they will not give any opinion until Senate Bill 32 becomes law."

Getty: "Ah...Representative LaFleur are you familiar with the L.E.A.A. Opinion Number 75-59 relative to the North Carolina proposed Statute where L.E.A.A. General Counsel did give an opinion on a proposed Statute which would have twenty-six members where the Governor made some of the appointments but did not make other appointments?"

LaFleur: "Yes, I think it's the same thing we had here in the State of Illinois somewhat with our Board of Elections. In that case I think the Governor picked from a list of people that were submitted to him by associations, and I think that kind of has a parallel to it."

Getty: "And in that opinion did not the L.E.A.A. in the General Counsel's



opinion state that the Grant Funds, if that proposed Bill should become law, Grant Funds should not be made available under the establishing of this new committee as it's conformed unless it is conformed to the provisions of the Crime Control Act of '73."

LaFleur: "We have been very careful in the drafting of Senate Bill 32 that we do not create that jeopardy that they found in that case in Carolina."

Getty: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to address the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Getty: "The Governor's veto of Senate Bill 32 should be sustained. The defects of this Bill, including those provisions that clearly violate Federal law have been thoroughly discussed in the Governor's Veto Message and in the materials which I sent to each Member three days ago. Simply stated an Override of Senate Bill 32 will threaten the continuity of this important Anti-crime Program in Illinois. Like it or not, there are many Federal Regulations and Rules which the state must comply with to receive these Federal dollars. Senate Bill 32 contains a number of items which clearly could be in violation of the Federal Act--The Safe Street Act. Section 203A of the Crime Control Act of 1973 requires that the State Planning Agency quote 'shall be created or designated by the Chief Executive of the State'. In those states where the State Planning Agency has been created by Statute, the Federal requirement has been met by virtue of the fact that the Governor in signing the enabling legislation has thereby designated the legislatively created agency as the State Planning Agency. But should Senate Bill 32 become law by an Override of the Governor's veto, however, crucial factor the gubernatorial designation will not be present and therefore, lacking that designation, I don't believe that the Commission can qualify as a State Planning Agency. We therefore are put in the position of taking a chance on interrupting the flow of these Federal dollars to our sheriffs, police chiefs, and in my district, my police chiefs have all been



calling me, prosecutors and other units of Local Government. I know, and I join with the majority of this House in urging that an effective measure of legislative oversight over the affairs of I.L.E.C. be created. I've talked with the Governor and he agrees with this, and I've talked with the Chairman of I.L.E.C. and in the letter that I distributed to you, he could, he agrees with this. I suggest that we should sustain the veto and quickly prepare a Bill that would achieve the legitimate goal of having a Legislative Commission without the flaws of Senate Bill 32."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Ah...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

In response to some of the opponents of this Override, I would like to call the attention to this Assembly that twenty states have statutorily created commissions with many like New York, requiring that the Legislature advise and consent to the nominations of commission members. They have not lost a single penny in Federal money nor has this specific point caused the Federal Government any concern. As a matter of fact, the guideline manual for State Planning Agencies Grants and I'm quoting from M4100.1B of the Federal Government specifically states under Chapter 1, Section 1, Paragraph 12, that quote 'it is not inconsistent. It is not inconsistent for gubernatorial creation or designation for the State Legislature to prescribe the size, composition or other characteristics of the agency'. And I might say, in this case, in House Bill... Senate Bill 32, the Governor would not only appoint all but the judicial members of the Commission, but as an Executive Agency, he through the Department of Finance would have total control over appointments, vouchers, and who the Department of Personnel employs. It's absolutely definite that this will be an Executive Agency in every sense of the word. But what we're trying to do is have some legislative input, and we're entitled to it when we consider that Forty-Two Million Dollars of Federal funds represents your tax money and mine. It also seems to me very definite that we do have to have some safeguards.



I would like to call the attention of this Assembly to an article that appeared in Mike Royko's column, July 23, 1975 where one of the gubernatorial aides said about Federal monies. Quote. 'The State presently distributes millions of dollars in both State and Federal Grant funds to governmental and nongovernmental organizations through Illinois.' And this aide further said 'The ^{adds} letter ^a category, meaning Federal funds, The ^a letter category of funds provides a great potential for the Administration to assist programs which support the Administration's programatic and political efforts, I repeat political efforts'. End of quote. It seems to me if we want to get some cleanup around here and have some real accountability to the taxpayer, we could support the override of this Bill and in further support, I would like to tell everyone here that scare tactics have been used by the I.L.E.C. to some of the police departments in my area in their letter of November 10, 1975, which I have a copy in my hand in which they say 'you may not get your grant if this Override succeeds'. May I point out something else. I have a letter here, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a serious Bill."

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

Hudson: "Point of Order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "State your Point."

Hudson: "Now this rarely happens when my good colleague Geo is speaking, but the noise level and inattention has gotten to the point where I can hardly hear what she is saying."

Speaker Redmond: "Your Point is well taken."

Geo-Karis: "I hold a letter in my hand, dated November 14, 1975 from the Chief of Police of the Village of Villa Park, and I believe that's in DuPage County Illinois, not even in my own county. He tells me in this letter and I quote from his letter. 'In case there is any doubt in your mind, let me unqualifiedly state that I am in favor most strongly of Senate Bill 32 which takes the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission out of the Governor's Office and places it with accountability to the Illinois Legislature



by the establishment of Adult and Juvenile Justice Commission. He further states I think it is high time the Local Government was properly represented in the apportioning of Federal Crime Fighting Funds which are our own local tax dollars returned to us'. Now Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I hold in my other hand an editorial put out by a certain T.V. station with no one's name sponsoring it here in the House, except there's a stamp on it and says 'received November 17, 1975. I.L.E.C. Executive Director.' Now this of course, editorial is for the I.L.E.C.'s position. I am not. I think it's high time we demand accountability in the Executive Branch as well as the Legislative Branch and I urge an Override of the veto."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have to view this Bill as being one of the most devastating pieces of legislation to Downstate Illinois, that has come out of this Legislative Session. And I consider it, the effect of it will be completely disruptive to the Law Enforcement Program throughout 101 of the 102 states in Illinois, counties in Illinois. It actually may be a good approach, but it's going to completely disrupt the programs and plans of Downstate, Illinois which are in progress and which hope to be continued, and I would urge Representative Jones from Sangamon County to listen a little bit about one point that I'd like to make. I think the Sponsor of the Bill answered the question that you asked correctly. But I think the next question is what about the programs that are planned for next year? What will it do to them? And I think the answer has to be that many of them will be in jeopardy because the funding program will be rearranged to be...to divide up the money according to judicial districts, and according to the crime ratio. And I have to look at that as being really a grab for money from this program, because there will only be one judicial district in the State of Illinois that will get more money for these programs than it did last year, and the ones that would lose are the other four, in-



cluding the one that you live in and the one that I live in. The way I understand the funding that will be...the way it will be distributed in the future under this program, it will jeopardize every program that exists in Downstate Illinois for Law Enforcement and planning for Law Enforcement. We have...ah... we have incorporated standards for conduct and for are jails and for our other Law Enforcement agencies throughout the state which will no longer be able to be funded from these programs, and so we'll either have to get them out of local taxes or we're going to have to come to the Legislature for help. And I think...I think that if we were going to change the system as is suggested in this Bill that there should have been given to Law Enforcement Agencies in the cities, in the counties of Southern Illinois and Downstate Illinois, enough time so that they could have gotten ready for it. Ah...this Bill will become effective if the Governor's veto is overridden it will become effective immediately, and many of the programs that are planned and many of the Law Enforcement Agencies that are in existence will not be lon...will not be any able...will not be able to continue unless funding from other sources than this, and the only other sources that could provide those monies are local taxes or state taxes. So I urge every...everyone from Downstate Illinois, before you vote to override the Governor's veto to ask your mayor of your cities, the mayors of your cities and your districts how they feel about it. Ask your sheriffs how they feel about it. Ask your police chiefs how they feel about it. Ask your county Board how they feel about it. And if you want to vote to support those people, and the programs that those people have put into place for Law Enforcement in Downstate Illinois, you should vote 'no' on the override of the Governor's veto of Senate Bill 32."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question or two? Bill.

Speaker sir? Yes. You've got to say yes. Thank you. If the veto's overridden, Mr. LaFleur, would the Governor have the choice of selecting the agency this Bill would create as the agency to distribute the Safe Street Act Bloc Grants?"



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

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

Hoffman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I was waiting for him to close."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner, proceed."

Skinner: "My question to repeat it Mr. LaFleur is could the Governor choose the agency that this Bill would create if the Veto were overridden? Could he designate it as the agency to distribute the Bloc Grants from the Safe Streets Act?"

LaFleur: "Why, I would imagine that could be, but you cannot really speak for that, because really they can...he could do that now. It is an Executive Commission, and it would stay an Executive Commission. So he could form what he felt was what he needed. But I think in all practicality that if Senate Bill 32 becomes law there is an orderly transfer of power from the present to the new Criminal Justice Commission, and through that he would still be the Executive that would head this Commission and I see no benefit to it, and I think that if he did negate or try to negate legislative intent. Of course, the appropriation part could always take part in that as to the appropriation of any parallel or by-play that goes on."

Skinner: "I guess I'm looking like Representative Mulcahey for a more direct answer. The allegation has been made on this Floor that the Governor, since he has vetoed this legislation, would not...this legislation...this Agency would not have his approval if we overrode the veto. Now what I'm asking is, after having overridden the veto, if we do so, could the Governor then designate this Agency to be the Executive Agency, the designated agency to distribute the Federal money? Would he have that choice?"

LaFleur: "You know I can't speak for the Governor, but I guess under law, yes, he could do what he wished."

Skinner: "Okay. Then he could also choose the Bureau of the Budget if he wanted to, right?"

LaFleur: "I will go along with your assumption."

Skinner: "All right. In the earmarking...the earmarking and veto power of the local planning agencies...there's been much contention on



this Floor and throughout the hallways of this General Assembly for the past week. I was asking what I thought was some fairly top questions, and one of the questions was, how much of the money is specifically earmarked? How much have to go to the various Appellate Court District... Districts?"

LaFleur: "Well, that part, I'm glad you asked. Ah...on the answer to people who have alluded to this in the past on the Floor today, if they read the Bill carefully they'd see that there's only a formulization of the state money. And I re...the state monies. Now this is about Three Million Dollars a year or about ten percent of the total amount of money that is used by I.L.E.C. So this leaves ninety percent."

Skinner: "All right. I have been told by one Member on the Floor whom I respect that the ninety percent Federal funds would automatically have to follow the ten percent state funds, so the veto of that ten percent safe funds would be an effective veto of an entire grant. That is, it would result in an absolute veto of...for the local planning agency, even if the State Board wanted to give a grant. Is that correct or incorrect?"

LaFleur: "That is incorrect."

Skinner: "That is incorrect. As I said, I still can be swayed by arguments on this Bill. The type of questions and the type of issues I've been looking at are...should it be a Statutory Agency? And I think, virtually everybody agrees that it should including the Governor at this point. The second question I address myself to, is should there be a minimum guaranteed amount to each part of the state? Well ten percent is pretty minimum, and it seems to me, if anything, it ought to be higher. But apparently we can't earmark Federal funds or at least that is what I've been led to believe thus far. All right now. What about an appropriate Regional Planning Agency? It must give approval. Well, since it's only the State, we don't worry about that, but even if it were State funds, an appropriate



agency according to the Counsel for the Senate Sponsor of this Bill, an appropriate agency would be a State Agency. Ah...I asked whether my planning agency, Crescent, would disappear, if this Bill were passed, and the answer was, we'd have nothing to do with your local planning agency. It doesn't even address your local planning agency. Ah... I asked a question about citizen input. As you may know on the Health Service Area...ah...Health Service Agencies which are the regional agencies that are going to pass out all the medicare money, and determine whether hospitals is increased or not, a majority of it has to be consumers. And I was told, well, you know, maybe you have a legitimate complaint, but it's the Federal Guideline you have the complaint with, not this. On Monday, I went to a meeting of the United States Advisory Commission on Inter-governmental Cooperation. Now all of you know about this Agency one way or another. You've seen the publications, and the topic of the afternoon was the Bloc Grants of the Safe Streets Act, and they passed out the summary of questionnaires that had been sent to every state agency, some of which...some of the results of which I'd like to share with you, because I think they direct themselves to some issues that we've been discussing. A direct quote from page 6 is 'only a handful of SPA;s, and that means ILEC and groups like that, have developed close working relationships with the Governor and the Legislature in Safe Streets Planning, formulate, policy-formulation, budget making , and programs implementation. It goes on to point out that in thirty-two states the Governor sets up the State Agency. In twenty-three the Legislature does by Statute and in five, and this I think is particularly relevant to what would happen in the State of Illinois were this veto overridden, is a combination of Statute and Executive Order. It would seem to me that the Governor would have to use an Executive Order to designate this Agency as the Agency to pass it out, but assuming that he wants the money that we have appropriated to ILEC, I see no choice that he would have. One other statement



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

I think ought to be made known, and that is thirteen state agencies characterized the supervisory boards relationship with the Governor as very independent. Twenty-four as occasional communication and consultation. Nine as regular communication and consultation, and please listen to this, and only one as strong direction from the Governor. Having seen the pressure that's been put forth on this Bill, I wonder if that only one is from Illinois."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, it's high time someone moved the Previous Question, which I now do."

Shea: "The question is shall the main question be put? All those in favor will say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the vote has...the Motion has the requisite two-thirds vote. Now back to the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. LaFleur to close. Might I remind our guests that are not Members of the House of Representatives that they are our guest and would they please refrain from being on the Floor of the House if they're not entitled to it. I'm sorry Mr. LaFleur, proceed please."

LaFleur: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'll try to be very brief in closing, but I would like to touch on a few points that have been brought up in debate, and I would especially like to answer Mr. Hart, because Mr. Hart raised some questions without the opportunity to answer, and I think that he should be aware that through ILEC's own figures, that if Senate Bill 32 becomes law that Districts Two and Five will gain from the Bill as well as one using their own figures, and even under ILEC figures only eight percent of twenty-one Downstate regions lose money, and the highest loss will be two point five percent. Now I think the thing in relationship to money is to understand one thing. That on the formulization of distribution of funds, the formulization of distribution of funds that we are talking about, only applies to State money. It does not apply to Federal money. Now if it only applies to State monies that amount of dollars is about Three Million Dollars



or less than ten percent of the total amount of money in the ILEC program. So I don't think that this could ever be construed as a loss of money. The distribution of funds under a formula would only assure each district of receiving funds. I don't know how to answer Mr. Katz and Mr. Getty. They are very skillful in debate and they're very skillful with their words. I did not hear them make one statement in their presentations. I only heard them alluding to a lot of shadows that might exist if this becomes law. I think we have tried to be very meaningful and factual in this presentation that if this is created. What the Bill will do, will make a Statutory Commission of the Criminal and Juvenile Justice in Illinois. It will have the advice and consent of the Senate. It has a legislative committee of four Representatives..."

Shea: "Mr. LaFleur, would you hold on for one minute sir. Could we have some order in the Chamber? Would those Members not entitled to the Floor of the House of Representatives please remove themselves from the Floor. Proceed Mr. LaFleur."

LaFleur: "If Senate Bill 32 is created, these are the things it will do positive. The positive things of 32. It makes a Statutory Commission of an Executive Commission. It creates the Criminal and Juvenile Justice Commission. It replaces the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission. It remains an Executive Commission. It has the Advice and Consent of the Senate. It has a Legislative Committee of four Representatives and four Senators. It provides for each regional planning agency to approve funding for the program and it formulizes distribution of the state monies. It does not stop present Federal funding. It does not stop programs in transit, and it would not effect the future. It remains the same, an Executive Commission. I would request a green light."

Shea: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 32 become law, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Brinkmeier, to explain his vote."



Brinkmeier: "Ah...Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Just very briefly. I have in my hand a letter from a sheriff of a small county in the...of the Thirty-Fifth Legislative District, and I will just read to you one paragraph from this and I would direct attention of all of the Downstate Legislators who do represent small counties. He states in this letter 'The Bill would in my estimation force the small rural counties into competition for funding with the larger ones. I'm sure that our counties chances of any further funding and also our pending grant application will be lost to the big counties as they will have thethe muscle needed. Whether or not what he fears is correct, it is something for all of us who represent the small counties, to consider and that is why I'm voting red."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms to explain his vote."

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

This is a Bill that has given me a great deal of problems. Back in my district and researching the legislation. I personally believe that the way the Illinois Commission is being operated is not to my standards and I personally don't care for Mr. Fogel. But the same time, I think there are many issues here that cannot be answered with...ah...clear decisive answers and I think there's a great many of grants and other funds that are building various safety buildings throughout the state and other types of worthwhile programs. And for these reasons that I don't have the definitive answers for and I don't necessarily feel that they're going to be solved by a creation of a new commission because of the change of the player. I have to vote a reluctant 'no'."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Grotberg to explain his vote."

Grotberg: "Well, thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think one look at that Board will tell you that this actually turns out to be a very political Bill. This turns out to be a Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, that has as its thrust, either we let one man take Thirty Million Dollars and



use it as he almost sees fit and in many cases has used it wisely or unwisely, as the case may be. Or does this State Legislature say when the price gets that high with taxpayers money, that you should have representation from this Body, from other bodies in the state, to lend some input from the people as to the distribution, the administering of this fund, and I would certainly say that green lights are not a bad place to be at on this Bill and I want to encourage all we can."

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

Stearney: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I support this Bill and I shall give you my reasons. But first let me preface it by saying the question of the legality can perhaps be decided by the courts at a later time and let's not get into that. The important question here is the person who is running this particular agency, Mr. Fogel. And let me say to you that just the other day the FBI said, and there's statistics, that there has been a sixteen percent increase in crime in the State of Illinois. Now what is Mr. Fogel doing about it. Let me tell you. He has taken...he has got a project in mind for Seven Hundred Thousand Dollars. Now this Seven Hundred Thousand Dollars is not to create any Police Communication System, to fight crime, but he is going to create storefront lawyers. He is going to put a lawyer in every police station to represent every thief and criminal the moments he arrested. That's what's being done with the money. Now why should we change a system to change a system where one man direct and can appropriate Seven Hundred Thousand Dollars and not...and a very unreasonable manner. So I'm saying we should change this system for the reason that we could remove a capricious individual; we can restore a bit of sanity to this agency and restore a bit of reasonableness, and that's the reason we should change it, because if the individual who is running it who is compromised it to such a point that it has no effectiveness and we should fighting crime and not aiding and abetting it. And for that reason I'm asking we should vote



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

green on this particular measure."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Grundy, the Assistant Minority Leader."

Washburn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. All of what the other speaker's have been very true. The political implications of this...ah...Agency. But I think the main question in both our minds are, does it meet the Federal Regulations and will the Federal Funds be cutoff...cutoff if we override this veto. I would like to read you a statement by Mr. Ted Favor, the Federal L.E.A.A. Representative of Illinois, who says that even if the veto is overridden, probably would not cutoff the funds but that the Federal Government would continue to supply their funds and wait until the next General Assembly meets and give the Legislature time to amend the Statute to conform with Federal Regulations. Now I think that's the best promise that we can have that the funds will be available whether or not this Bill does meet Federal Regulations in every letter of the word, so I would ask for green votes also."

Shea: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the Record Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 68 'aye' votes, 83 'nay' votes and the Gentleman's Motion fails."



Shea: "On veto motions appears Senate Bill 944. The Gentleman from Vermillion, Mr. Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 944 is a Bill that was proposed by the Legislative Advisory Committee on Public Aid. It passed this Body on the Conference Committee Report 135 to nothing. The override in the Senate was 41 to 7. As amended, the Bill mandates the Departments of Public Health, Labor, Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities, Children and Family Services and the Dangerous Drug Commission to meet with the Legislative Advisory Committee on Public Aid for advice on policy matters and all matters having a fiscal impact upon the Department of Public Aid. I think the Members of this House are aware that the Department of Public is the Single State Agency or administrate...for administering social services of Federal Funds. These other Departments in one way or another have an effect on the budget of the Department of Public Aid. The Legislative Advisor Committee and The Director of the Department of Public Aid would like to know what other Code Directors are doing and planning which may have effect upon the Public Aid Budget. This Bill will not cost the state any additional money. There could be a substantial savings realized if the Department and the Committee knew in advance how some of these millions of dollars were going to be spent by the different Departments and Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur with the Senate in passage of Senate Bill 944, the veto of the Governor not withstanding."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further questions? The question is shall Senate Bill 944 pass...Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker...ah...I'm sorry to rise to oppose the Gentleman's motion. The Legislative Advisory Committee's intent is to deal in those areas relating to Public Aid. Yet we...we have a Bill which appears to extend...ah...their authority to include not only Public Aid, which is where we look to them for counsel and guidance but also to Public Health, Labor, Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities, Children and Family Services and the Dangerous Drugs Commission. I'd like to point out that we have



standing Committees in our House and Senate that are doing a... a good job in...ah..interim activities and I believe the Human Resources Committee to be one of those Committees. Ah...The Human Resources Committee is involved with every single one of these Departments which are included in this Bill. We believe that Senate Bill 944 actually is a duplication, we think that Committees like the Human Resources Committee's...ah...a better vehicle for drawing together the various programs and policies of all of these Departments such as Health...ah...Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities, Children and Family Services and the Department of Public Aid. We have four standing Sub-Committees that have been actively meeting all summer and fall. These standing Sub-committees have made reports..ah..they wrote repair...reports back to the full Committee. Ah...I would ask that you do not support the Gentleman's motion...ah...which extends the influence of the Legislative Advisor Commission beyond their Legislative intent that has been set up for it and I believe duplicates the activity of standing House Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your calling me right after the previous speaker, because I think what she said represents why this Bill is necessary. As the Chairperson of the Human Resources Committee she has a very significant Legislative proposal now pending in Sub-committee called, Rape Review. Now if this proposal, which will impact upon Public Aid...ah...came before the Legislative Advisory Committee we'd find that if it passed there would be a tremendous...tremendous appropriation or increase in appropriation for coming fiscal year after it went into law. However, that hasn't been before the Legislative Advisory Committee on Public Aid and the Director of that Department is unusually silent about the impact that that Legislation might have upon his Department. Now why was this Bill put in? Well let me tell you why. Senator Moore happens to serve on the Senate Committee on Public Health, Welfare and Corrections and the Department of Mental came to that



Committee one day with a bold new program and he asked a simple question, 'How much is this going to cost?' and they said, 'It's not going to cost anything.' he said, 'What do you mean it's not going to cost anything, it's a whole new program with all kinds of bureaueracy needs.' and they said, 'Well it's not going to come out of our budget.', 'Well, who's going to pay for it?', 'The Department of Public Aid.' They don't think about these things, we have all kinds of deficiency appropriations and supplemental appropriations coming to this General Assembly because other Departments don't care, it's not coming from their budget, it's coming from the Department of Public Aid. Somebody ought to know about this and approve it or disapprove it so that we know in this General Assembly when we're voting, what's going on. We don't know because somebody isn't coming to the Legislative Advisory Committee on Public Aid. What we're trying to do is to coordinate all the programs in this state that have a fiscal and other type of impact upon this one Department. I would urge you very strongly to override the Governor's veto. I think that this type of thing is needed."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Mugalian: "I think the last speaker indicated that the Department of Public Aid....does that Department support this Bill? Well I would like to just comment briefly on this Bill. I...I think it adds another bureaucratic burden to some very important Code Departments and is unnecessary for two reasons. One is that the Legislative Advisory Committee already has subpoena power and can obtain whatever information it feels it is not getting by use of that power and that I believe that House Bill 612 passed from the previous Session of this Legislation requires three year service plans by all the Departments affected by this Bill. So I think that for two reasons this motion should be...ah... opposed. One is that it's unnecessary and two is that it's probably mischievous and will cause more confusion than it will...ah... ah



do otherwise."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell to close."

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

First of all I want to make it perfectly clear that we are not in any way attempting to infringe upon any other Legislative Committee. The Legislative Advisory Committee to the Department does have the responsibility of helping establish budgets and we simply feel that it is needed if we are ever going to get control of the budget of Public Aid that those other Departments who establish policy and effect the budget of Public Aid, should simply come before the Legislative Advisory Committee and tell us when they attempt to do that so we know what the budget is going to be. In the first place...ah...the middle of the year after the budget is already established and you have change. Where are you going to get the money? I think in all of the twelve years that I've been here, we've come in almost every year with a deficiency in Public Aid and we simply need the knowledge to establish the budget in Public Aid. We're not interested...could I have a little order Mr. Speaker? We are not interested in what those other Departments in and of themselves are doing, but remember that the Department of Public Aid is a single administering agency for social services of Federal Funds. So we simply need to know what they are doing and while I'm at this, I might add one other thing. I... I don't know of any Bill which has been lobbied more against than this Bill in the last week and you know it is strange to me, all of the various people that have been lobbying from the various agencies indicated to me that they would cooperate with the Legislative Advisory Committee. Well if they willing to cooperate then why in the world should they be lobbying against this Bill? What do they have to hide and this simply is very important to every individual Member on this House Floor. Finally as I say, in order to get hold of the budget of the Public Aid Department of the State of Illinois we do need this Legislation and I'd simply appreciate your support."



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

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, I had my light on, I suppose you didn't see it.

I wanted to say a word."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Davis: "I simply wanted to say to you that, after listening to some of the arguments, I want to say to you that the Department of Public Health, Mental Health, Children and Family Services and Dangerous Drugs Commission does have a fiscal impact on the Illinois Department of Public Aid. I don't think any of you will stand on this Floor and say that those Departments do not have a fiscal impact. Now Senator Don Moore is trying to do a good job. What's wrong with us sitting down with those Departments to see just what is needed, how the money is being spent since they come to us for the money. Now when we come in with ah...deficiency appropriations you're going to want to know all about this thing and yet you're saying the Department of Mental Health, Dangerous Drugs and those Departments should not sit down with the Advisory Committee on Public Aid. How can we get the information if they don't? I think it's very unreasonable for us to oppose this. There's nothing wrong with it absolutely. I solicit your vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 944 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding? All in favor indicate by voting 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Macdonald 'no'. Representative Grotberg, for what purpose do you rise?"

Grotberg: "Well I think it's worthy if someone could take a little time to explain a vote here besides the Sponsor of the Bill and a couple of others getting involved here but for heaven sakes, the bureaucracy of the State of Illinois and the four Departments that are taking money are adding to the Public Aids budget, all have one thing in common. They have about four hundred to five hundred personnel each, two for every one of us working full time to make sure that we never know what is happening and this is the only opportunity to put a funnel on the thing and get it all to run in to at least this Commission. The Public Aid Commission which has



Legislative input, has done a good watchdog job for Public Aid and old Chuck Campbell comes in every year for a hundred to two hundred million dollars beyond that billion dollars that he comes in in the Spring of the year and everybody votes 'aye' and goes home and it's the biggest single part of the state budget outside of the school budget and I would think for heavens sake that we could give the courtesy of this Legislative Body and it's legislative counsel on Public Aid, the courtesy of meeting that giant bureaucracy half way with the best that we can. Because they've got us outvoted, outnumbered, outmaneuvered everytime you cough and if you don't think so just take a look at about the last three Roll Calls in this House this afternoon and about the last four Roll Calls two weeks ago who was out here struggling for her life to try to correct a couple of inequities and bad management of state government. This could be your only chance. For God sake, vote green."

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

Friedrich: "I'd ask to poll the absentees."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners. The Gentleman has requested a poll of the absentees. Representative Shea."

Shea: "Well I had my light on. I wanted to explain my vote. I for..."

Speaker Redmond: "Explain the absentees. Proceed. Go ahead."

Shea: "I for the life of me can't understand how we can be voting against this. I certainly don't understand the Public Aid Budget any well, near as well as those Members of the Public Aid Advisory Committee. But you've heard our colleagues, Corneal Davis. Bob Mann, Mr. Campbell, the people that we've put on that Commission tell you that this is one of the tools and devices they need to help save us some money. Now we are getting to the point where with this Department in Public Aid they're now talking about a hundred and twenty million dollars, in deficiency appropriations. I think that if possible, we ought to .



give them every tool they can to save us those dollars."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, would you vote me 'aye' please?"

Speaker Redmond: "How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Record him 'aye'. Continue with the....absentees."

Jack O'Brien: "Arnell, Boyle, Bradley..."

Speaker Redmond: "Bradley 'no'."

Jack O'Brien: "Capuzi, Catania, Choate, DiPrima..."

Speaker Redmond: "Catania 'aye'."

Jack O'Brien: "Greiman, Hirschfeld, Katz, Londrigen, McAuliffe,
McGrew, Meyer, Mudd, Rayson, Rose, Sangmeister, Schisler, Stearney,
VanDuyne, VonBoeckman, Waddell, Washington, White, Yourell."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the total? 108 'ayes', 39 'nay'. Representative
Byers....Representative Byers."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker...I request a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has requested a verification of the
affirmative Roll Call. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Change my vote from 'nay' to 'aye', would you please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Please change the Gentleman from 'no' to 'aye'.
Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "Mr. Speaker, change my vote from 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "'No' to 'aye'. Proceed with the verification of the
affirmative Roll Call."

Jack O'Brien: "Anderson..."

Speaker Redmond: "You're recorded as 'aye'."

Jack O'Brien: "J. M. Barnes. Beatty. Berman, Bluthardt, Brandt,
Campbell, Capparell, Carroll, Catania, Coffey, Collins, Craig,
Cunningham."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman to 'aye'."

Jack O'Brien: "Daniels, D'Arco, Darrow, Davis, Deavers, Deuster, Duff,
Ralph Dunn, Dyer, Ebbesen, Epton, Ewing, Farley, Fleck, Flinn,
Friedland, Friedrich, Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Getty, Giglio, Griesheimer



Grotberg, Hart, Gene Hoffman, Ron Hoffman, Dan Houlihan, Hudson, Huff, Emil Jones, J. D. Jones, Keller, Kelly, Kempiners, Kent, Klosak, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Kucharski, LaFleur, Lauer, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leinenweber, Leon, Leverenz, Lucco, Macdonald, Madigan, Madison, Mahar..."

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

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be verified at this time..."

Jack O'Brien: "Mahar, Mann, Maragos, Marovitz, McAvoy,..."

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

White: "Ah...Mr. Speaker...ah...I'd like to be recorded as 'yes' on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Vote the Gentleman as 'aye'."

Jack O'Brien: "McCourt, McLendon, McMaster, McPartlin, Merlo, Miller, Malloy, Mulcahey, Nardulli, Neff, Palmer, Patrick, Polk, Porter, Pouncey, Randolph, Reed, Richmond, Rigney, Ryan, Schlickman, Schoeberlein, Schuneman, Sevcik, Shea, Simms, Skinner, E. G. Steele, C. M. Stiehl, Taylor, Telcser, Terzich, Totten, Tuerk, Vitek, Wall, Washburn, White, Williams, Winchester, Wolf and Younge."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions of the affirmative Roll Call. Representative Byers."

Byers: "Representative Coffey..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Coffey is here."

Byers: "Representative Craig."

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

Byers: "Representative Duff."

Speaker Redmond: "Duff is here."

Byers: "Representative D'Arco."

Speaker Redmond: "D'Arco. Is the Gentleman here? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Take him off."

Byers: "Representative Everett Steele."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Steele? Representative Steele here? No, the other one. How is he recorded?"



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

Speaker Redmond: "Take him off."

Byers: "Representative Deavers."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Byers: "Deavers."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deavers is here."

Byers: "I'm sorry. Representative Flinn."

Speaker Redmond: "Flinn here? Flinn here? Flinn here? Take him off.

Representative Caldwell, you seek recognition?"

Byers: "DiPrima."

Speaker Redmond: "DiPrima."

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

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

DiPrima: "Vote me 'aye' please."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Randolph. Randolph desires to be recorded as 'aye'. Representative Caldwell...Proceed with the verification."

Byers: "Representative Kelly."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Randolph, 'present', pardon me."

Jack O'Brien: "From 'aye' to 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly..."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, did you remove Representative Flinn from the Roll Call?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes, I did."

Byers: "Okay, thank you. Representative Klosak."

Speaker Redmond: "Klosak? He's here."

Byers: "Kucharski? Representative Kucharski."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Byers: "Representative Lauer."

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Byers: "Lauer."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Lauer here? Remove him."

Byers: "Representative Neff."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Neff here? Remove Representative Neff."

Byers: "Who?"

Speaker Redmond: "Neff...Neff is off."



Byers: "Take him off?"

Speaker Redmond: "We did."

Byers: "Representative Polk."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk is down front here."

Byers: "Representative White."

Speaker Redmond: "White? He's here."

Byers: "Representative Skinner."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner? Oh yeah, there he is."

Byers: "Okay, thank you. Representative Tuerk."

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

Byers: "Representative Winchester."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here."

Byers: "Representative. Oh, I can see him over there, Representative Epton's here. Representative Darrow."

Speaker Redmond: "Right now. Who was that?"

Byers: "Darrow."

Speaker Redmond: "I saw him a minute ago someplace.. Representative Darrow. He's...Wait a minute. Representative Lauer's returned. Put him back on. Representative Darrow. He's here."

Byers: "Representative Giglio."

Speaker Redmond: "Giglio's back, put him back on."

Byers: "Representative Emil Jones."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Emil Jones. Emil Jones here? Take him off. Representative Caldwell do you seek recognition? Record him as 'aye'."

Byers: "Representative..."

Speaker Redmond: "Jones comes off. Caldwell 'aye'. Jones is back put him back."

Byers: "Representative Wall."

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

Byers: "Where? Representative McAvoy."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell, you...'aye'."

Byers: "McAvoy."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McAvoy, is he here? Remove him."

Byers: "Representative McCourt."



Speaker Redmond: "McCourt's here."

Byers: "Okay. Representative Leverenz."

Speaker Redmond: "Who? He's here."

Byers: "He's here, I see him now. Representative Sevcik."

Speaker Redmond: "He's here. Is that all?"

Byers: "We removed Representative D'Arco, is that correct and Representative Telcser was the last one?"

Speaker Redmond: "Who?"

Byers: "Telcser."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser here? Remove him. Representative Katz. Here comes Telcser. Representative Katz. Representative Katz 'no'. Anything further?"

Byers: "No sir."

Speaker Redmond: "What's the total. 109 'ayes' and 38 'nays'. The motion prevails and Senate Bill 944 is declared passed. The veto of the Governor notwithstanding. The order of business Total Veto Motions ...Amendatory Veto Motions. Pardon me. On Amendatory Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 37. Representative Sevcik... Representative Sevcik has to catch a 3:45 plane so he can get to see his daughter."

Sevcik: Mr. Speaker Senate Bill 37 is the new Illinois Racing Act of 1975 and I therefore...ah...accept the Governor's specific recommendation include about twenty three recommendations. It passed the Senate 46 to 1. It incorporated almost the Amendments that we had beaten in the House but we figure it's a better Bill than the present Racing Laws and I ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The question is sha....Representative Pierce."

Sevcik: "Yes it puts back the...ah...tribution."

Pierce: "Are you saying it puts back the prohibition on plural contributions by persons with racing interests, is that correct?"

Sevcik: "That's correct Dan."

Pierce: "I would just like to know...ah...why the heck we had to fight on my Amendment so hard in this House, it was defeated by one vote. All we do by accepting that bad provision in the Senate Bill allowing professional gamblers to contribute to local campaigns and by professional



gamblers I mean the people that line their pockets in gambling, people who own race track stock and own the racing business who may... whom have corrupted State Government in this State in past years why we couldn't have adopted my Amendment knocking that right to, of them to contribute the local candidates out because certainly now the Governor's done it and all we've done here is make the Governor a hero and all those of you did who opposed my Amendment in the House was to make the Governor a hero because he put it on by Amendatory Veto and now Senator Rock and the House Sponsor can't wait to accept that change which they fought so hard when I proposed it. But at any rate we've done it and I will go along with you...ah...Representative to accept the Amendatory Veto here and put this Bill into law. There's many fine things in it and I think it has some good things in it and we should go along with it."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the House concur with the Senate in acceptance of the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 37 by the adoption of the Amendment? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 121 'aye', 8 'no' and the motion prevails. Marovitz 'aye'. The Motion prevails and the House does concur with the Senate in acceptance of the Governor's specific recommendation for change regarding Senate Bill 37. Return to the Order of Total Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 946. Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 846. By the way Rosco, this is the one you've been looking for. It was also recommended by the Legislative Advisory Committee on Public Aid. The Bill passed the House last Spring 150 to nothing. The override in the Senate was 39, 8 and 1. The Bill declares Nursing Homes, Sheltered Care Homes and Homes for the Aged receiving public funds administered by the Department of Public Aid to file with the Department of Public Aid an annual financial Statement with uniform cost information. The Governor has no objection to the concept of this Bill. However, he does feel that the



Department of Public Health is a proper agency to administer this. Under Federal Law as of July the 1st of next year, we have to establish a cost related basis for paying these institutions. In as much as Public has the responsibility for making these payments and dispersing these monies, the Department of Public Aid should be the agency to receive the necessary information for determining a cost related payment. Mr. Speaker, I move to...I move that the House concur with the Senate in the passage of Senate Bill 946. The veto of the Governor not withstanding."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He indicates he will."

Cunningham: "Representative Campbell. Is it true that the Federal Government under H.E.W. will require the Department of Public Health to make a survey of all the Skill Care Facilities throughout the State within the next 18 months?"

Campbell: "I understand that it is."

Cunningham: "And if that be true, does it not follow that there is a duplication between what is being sought to be done here and what will be sought to be done there in that both the Department of Public Health and the Department of Public Aid will be...ah... running from the same track?"

Campbell: "We're...We're back to the same argument that we had in relation to the last Bill that...ah...it's still the Department of Public Aid that must pay the money."

Cunningham: "If I may...Thank you very much. If I may Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I told you a few days ago that there are times that twice the Governor's right and this is the second time. This is the issue where you ought to be voting 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is, shall Senate Bill 946 pass? The veto of the Governor not withstanding? All in favor indicate...Representative Lundy."

Lundy: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.. I rise to oppose this override motion as one who Sponsored a Bill which passed this House to require financial disclosure by



long-term care facilities and is one who has served since June of this year as the Chairman of a subcommittee of this House, dealing specifically with the problems of long-term care facilities. My opposition is based on three factors. First, that disclosure, while it is necessary, should not be made to the Department of Public Aid but to the Department of Public Health and there is a very good reason for that. Every other segment of the health care industry, hospitals, ambulatory, surgical treatment centers and others make financial disclosure and they make it to the Office of Health Finance in the Department of Public Health. There is no reason that long-term health facilities, meaning primarily nursing homes should be treated any differently. In fact, it would be irrational to have them reporting to one department, while the rest of the health care industry reports to the Department of Public Health. Secondly, there are severe questions whether, if this information goes to IDPA, the confidentiality problems or restrictions on that Department may not prevent the information from being publicly disseminated, might not make it unavailable, for example, to the Members of the General Assembly and might not make it unavailable to the Department of Public Health, which is where it ought to go anyway. Finally, I would say that the most important as Representative Campbell has pointed out, that the State must develop a cost related system of reimbursement by July 1 of 1976, but there's no requirement that IDPA developed that system. True, IDPA will be making the payments, but the better place where that system will be developed is in the Office of Health Finance in the Department of Public Health. Indeed, that is why that office exists. Ah.... now, for all of those reasons, I would urge you to vote 'no' on this Motion to override and when we come back in the Spring of 76, we will pass a financial disclosure bill that will require disclosure not just by those homes that receive Public Aid payment, but for all homes, which will provide that the disclosure goes to the Department where it ought to go, where it can be used as a basis for monitoring quality of care, which ought to be our primary concern, that of Department of Public Health. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell to close."



Campbell: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and in argument against the previous Speaker, I just want to say it is true that the Department of Public Health is the licensing agency, but what is wrong when it comes right down to the real nitty-gritty, why shouldn't the People that have to pay out the money to collect this information. Why should they not be able to get the information, and this is our whole argument, is the things that relate to Public Aid where we're paying out the monies and we simply think that information should go there and let them make the determination before the money is paid out, and I simply ask of you before that I would appreciate your support in the override of the Governor on Senate Bill 946."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall Senate Bill 946 pass? The Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All in favor, signify by voting 'aye'. Opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wish? Representative Lechowicz 'aye', I guess. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there are 75 'ayes' and 60 'no'. The Motion fails. Senate Bill 946 is declared lost. Representative Shea, do you seek recognition?"

Shea: "The hour having reached Three, I move that the House now stand in recess for the call of the First Special Session."

Speaker Redmond: "All in favor, indicate by saying 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. This Session's in recess. Representative Shea."

Shea: "In the First Special Session, has the Clerk a Resolution on his desk?"

Speaker Redmond: "First Special Session is now in Order."

Shea: "You got the Adjournment Resolutions up there yet?"

Speaker Redmond: "Introductions, First Readings."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill #8..... House Bill #6, that is for Special Session. Schraeder. A Bill for an Act providing for the transfer of monies from the Motor Fuel Tax Fund to the Common School Fund. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 7, First Special Session. Schraeder. Bill for an Act providing for the transfer of monies from Motor Fuel Tax Fund to the General Revenue Fund. First Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Shea is recognized."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the First Special Session stand in Recess, that we get back in the Regular Session until the Adjournment Resolutions get over."

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? All in favor, indicate by saying 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. Carried. The House is in Regular Session. On the Order of Business, House Bills, Second Reading, appears House Bill 3148. Representative Boyle."

Boyle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Clerk read the Bill a Second time, please."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3148. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the State Board of Education. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Boyle: "No Amendments from the Floor, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Boyle."

Boyle: "No Amendments from the Floor."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading."

Boyle: "Mr. Speaker, now that this Bill has been advanced to the Order of Third Reading, I would move that the Bill be carried over to the January Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "You heard the Motion. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion's carried. Senate Bills, Second Reading, First Legislative Day. Senate Bill 1508. Representative Boyle."

Boyle: "Will the Clerk read the Bill a Second Time, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Read the Bill. Second Time, First Legislative Day. You have to make a Motion, I guess, to get it on to Second Legislative Day."

Boyle: "Well, I would move to suspend the appropriate Rule to move 1508 to Second Reading, Second Legislative Day."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the Motion. All in favor, vote 'aye'. Opposed vote 'no'. 89 votes. Have all voted who wish? Clerk take the Record. On this question, there are 100 'aye', 1 'no'. The Motion carries. Senate Bill 1508 is advanced to Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Representative Boyle."

Boyle: "Yes,..... go ahead, read the Bill."



Jack O'Brien: "1508. A Bill for an Act making supplemental.... making appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of certain agencies. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the Floor?"

Jack O'Brien: "Amendment #1. Boyle. Amends Senate Bill 1508 as amended by deleting Lines 1, 2 and 3 and inserting in lieu thereof the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Boyle."

Boyle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 to 1508 provides for the six months funding for the Illinois Racing Board. It takes it back to the way the Bill was originally introduced.... ah..... in the Senate. The Bill as it came out of the Senate, the funding was cut to four months. It is my intention to adopt this Amendment and then carry the Bill over to the January Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion on the Amendment. Gentleman has moved the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor, indicate by saying 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Representative Boyle."

Boyle: "All right, now that the Bill's been advanced to Third Reading, as amended, I would move that Senate Bill 1508, as amended, be placed on the January Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman's moves that Senate Bill 1508 be placed on the January Calendar. All in favor, indicate by saying 'aye'. Opposed 'no' and the 'ayes' have it on the January Calendar. House Joint Resolutions Constitutional Amendments appears #32. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "The Motion that the Gentleman just made requires a 107 votes and the suspension of the Rules, Rule 31 something. I suggest that maybe we hold those things, and put all Bills with a single Motion, that might be in the Regular Session on the January Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "Having a clash, the Parliamentarian here momentarily. Messages from the Senate until the Parliamentarians agree."

Jack O'Brien: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed a Bill with the following title, passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representative, to



wit: Senate Bill 1520, passed by the Senate November 21, 1975 by three-fifths vote. 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 in the passage of a Bill with the following title, to wit: House Bill 3179, passed by the Senate November 21, 1975 by three-fifths vote. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurred with the House in the passage of the Bill with the following title, to wit: The Veto of the Governor the contrary notwithstanding - House Bill 1659, passed by the Senate November 20, 1975 by three-fifths vote, Veto of the Governor notwithstanding, the contrary notwithstanding. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Maragos."

Maragos: "Mr. Speaker, while the Parliamentarians are still debating, I'll proceed on another set of business if I may. We have, Mr. Speaker, a Motion which has been filed by Representative Totten, regarding House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #32, which deals with a restrictive matter of the financing by the State and Revenue of the State. Due to an inadvertence, that Constitutional Amendment Resolution died in Committee last spring when it should have been put on the Interim Study Calendar and now it is really lying on the Table. If the..... At this time, Mr. Speaker, I move on behalf of Representative Totten, ah..... to place Constitutional..... ah.... House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #32 on the Spring Calendar. I mean take it out of the Table first and have it put on the Calendar, please."

Shea: "The Resolution is..... I move that House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #32 be taken from the Table and be assigned to the House Revenue Committee on the Interim Study Calendar. The Gentleman asks leave to use the attendance roll call to do that. Is there objection? Hearing none, House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #32 is taken from the Table and placed in the Committee on Revenue on the Interim Study Calendar."



Maragos: "I have an inquiry for you now, Mr. Speaker. I have a series of Constitutional Amendments that are on the Interim Study Calendar of the Revenue Committee and would like to notify anybody who's interested in the Constitutional Amendments that have been on the Interim Study Calendar of the Revenue Committee that on January 7 we have having a hearing on those Amendments in Chicago and the Sponsors will be notified to put it on their Calendars, January 7 of 1976 in Chicago."

Shea: "All right, total Veto Motions, Consideration Postponed."

Maragos: "Point of Order, Mr..... The date, with the Assistant Minority Leader and the Speaker as to the Constitutional Amendments that are presently on the....."

Shea: "No."

Maragos: "Are you intending to?"

Shea: "I don't know."

Maragos: "Thank you."

Shea: "Senate Bill 16. Mr. Lucco. Do you want to call that again?"

Lucco: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I want to express my thanks and appreciation for your courtesy. I want to ask leave to ah..... Table the Motion."

Shea: "The Gentleman asks leave to Table the Motion with regards to Senate Bill 16. Is there objection? Hearing none, that Motion is Tabled. Senate Bill 55. Mr. Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on occasion, we hit a bad climate in the House and I'm afraid that occurred yesterday. It was necessary for me to put Senate Bill 5 on Postponed Consideration, despite the fact that it passed the Senate, I believe, 44 to 6 on the Veto Motion and despite the fact that this House, with an overwhelming majority, after hearing the identical debates that we heard yesterday passed this Bill into the Senate. This is the first time in my three legislative terms that I've taken a piece of legislation, which is essentially defense oriented. I do so, because I'm sorry for the honest little guy who always gets it in the neck. Review Boards in local areas have been used as an argument against this. I feel they are department oriented and only a value in technical error. Reasonable recourse for the farmer or businessman has ultimately



to be by Court action. And I resent these honest farmers and businessmen being yo-yo'ed back and forth from their small town into Sangamon County. It's much more simple actually and less costly to these People and their taxes to use that tax money to send department expertise to their County's prosecution. This request for override is nonpolitical. The Department of Revenue is actually democratic, yet I take exception to certain procedures. If I may call to your attention my legislation of last year which became law, gave Illinois its plea of nolo contendere or no contest to impart assist to the department in some cases. I solicit your considered 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Shea: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of a Motion with regards to Senate Bill 55. If this Bill becomes Law, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Is there debate? On that question, the Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, and I rush to hurry the business through today, I wouldn't want the Members to forget the debate on Senate Bill 55 that occurred yesterday. The previous Speaker, whom I have great respect and in most instances have supported him on every piece of legislation he's spoken on behalf of, in this case happens to be wrong with his facts. These individuals have filed fraudulent claims. They failed to file claims when required to do so and many other fraudulent matters have been involved here, but that's yesterday's debate. Let's get on to the facts at hand so everyone understands. These are the facts for 1975. There were 113 ROT prosecutions in the State of Illinois and 95 of those were in Cook County. That remains only 18 left that were not prosecuted in the County of Cook. Of those, only four were held outside their own County seat by the States Attorney in that County. Of those, there were three fraud cases that were tried in Springfield and those were tried there only because the States Attorney in the County didn't want to prosecute those people themselves. So it fell upon the Attorneys for the Department of Revenue to prosecute them in the City of Springfield, so the facts that have been given are completely erroneous and the predominant of cases filed and prosecuted, they've been prosecuted within the only area where they came from and the



.... that's the County in which the applicant failed to file resided. So let's have the facts clear. These cases have been prosecuted here in their own county, not in Springfield, and so this case is absolutely wrong. We should have all the reds lights we had yesterday."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In listening to the last Speaker, it seems that the Department of Revenue and the Attorney General have apparently adopted as a Policy what this Bill, in fact, seeks to do. They have taken the venue of the local county, wherein the defendant resides and they have said let that be the venue. Now all this is really going to do, then, is to make a law out of what is presently the policy of the Department, in any event. It is a sensible Bill, as the Sponsor in the House has pointed out. It will help the little guy who is not able to come to Springfield and defend himself or go to Cook County and defend himself and I believe that we should support the Motion to override."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I strongly agree with the previous Speaker. He was as right as he could be. It has been determined that Representative Garmisa was correct yesterday in his assertion that the Assistant Attorney General is available to handle these cases. I talked to the same man that Representative Schraeder talked to about the figures. He correctly quoted them, but there's no reason to leave future accused to the whims of the Department of Revenue. The fairness of the system should be obvious. The question is whether it is better to inconvenience the small merchant by making him come into Springfield or to inconvenience the Assistant Attorney General by having him drive to the County where the offense is alleged to have occurred. There is absolutely no other precedent in any procedure, whatever, where the venue is different, then is sought to be established for this Bill. It is entitled to a green vote."

Shea: "The Minority Leader, the Gentleman from Grundy, Mr. Washburn."

Washburn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's certainly been the practice of the General Assembly for the last many years to entangle the small businessmen in red



tape and ah..... ah.... mandate the completion of so many forms that he no longer has time to even wait on his customers, because of the burdens that we have placed upon him. Certainly, he doesn't have time to take off work and come down to Springfield. I think it's only fair to him that we override this Veto on House Bill 55 and let's give the small businessman a break for a change. Let his hearing be held at his hometown and make it easy on him. Thank you."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I feel somewhat incumbent upon myself to clear up what may have.... may be some confusion as a result of the remarks I made yesterday on this Bill. I think we should very clearly define that we are not talking about in this Bill the situation where a deficiency assessment has been made by the Department of Revenue. We are not talking in this Bill about a situation where an assessment of tax liability hasn't been made by the Department of Revenue and the taxpayer requires a hearing. This Bill has absolutely nothing to do with that situation. That's the administrative procedure that I discussed with you yesterday. This Bill deals precisely with prosecution where there has indeed been an allegation of fraud on the part of the taxpayer. I hope you listened very carefully to what Representative Schraeder said, because he pointed out to you that the State of Illinois and the Department of Revenue last year only prosecuted 113 people for fraud. Now, one can make a mistake in their tax return and have an assessment levied against them, ask for a hearing. That hearing is normally conducted at a county very close to the taxpayer's home. This Bill deals only with those cases involving fraud, where there is indeed a criminal prosecution. Last year there were 113 of those cases in Illinois, where there was a prosecution. 109 of those cases were from Cook County and they were tried in Cook County. The other four were in downstate and they were tried at the Capitol."

Shea: "Mr. Hudson, are you raising a Point of Order? Pardon me, Mr. Beaupre. Proceed, Sir."

Beaupre: "The other four were from downstate, were situations where downstate taxpayers were being prosecuted for a fraudulent return, and they were tried in the State Capitol. Now, there's nothing wrong



with having a taxpayer come to the State Capitol in a case that's as serious as a fraud charge to respond to those charges because when you get into auditing tax returns and presenting evidence in regard to fraud on tax returns, you indeed have a sophisticated prosecution problem, and all we're suggesting in those cases of where fraud exists and fraud is being charged is that we have expert prosecutors operating on behalf of the state, in either Sangamon County or Cook County and I would urge you to defeat this attempt to override this Bill."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. The previous speaker and the one from Peoria prior to him have indicated that it has been the practice and the policy of the Department that prosecute these cases in the County in which the violations have occurred. Now if that be the policy of the Department, why not make it... why not make the rule the law. The fact that the Department does have this weapon that they can use and hold over the head of the small businessman would give another weapon to the Department to hammer the small businessman and have him bring his lawyer and himself out of his county, down to Springfield at a great expense that he couldn't possibly afford. And Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a good Bill. It should be overrode. I am asking for a green vote of every Member of this General Assembly, on this Motion to Override."

Shea: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson."

Hudson: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I move the Previous Question."

Shea: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hudson, moves the Previous Question. All those in favor will say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the Motion has the requisite Two-thirds vote, and now back to the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski to close."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Statistics have been given which show the Department of Revenue in essence follows the dictates of this Legislature. So be it, I'm delighted with them, but those statistics are for a period in



the past, and I want to insure that the small businessmen prosecuted for one reason or another, still has the requirements of law to support him in having his prosecution in his county rather than add to his burden and to the possibility of his going under, add to his problems of life. Four of these people, four last year, but possibly forty next year.

I request an override for Senate Bill 55. Thank you."

Shea: "The Question is shall Senate Bill 55 become law, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding? All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay', and the Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis to explain her vote."

Geo-Karis: "Ah...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

In reading the Governor's Veto Analysis, he says that he is fearful that many local states attorneys do not have the resources for this type of case. First of all, many small business people don't have the resources to leave their business behind and leave, let's say, from Waukegan, Illinois or from Carbondale, Illinois, and come to Springfield to have their cases tried. The expense and the unfair burden on any defendant in any case like this is much too insurmountable. Number two, one speaker said that all this applies to is fraud cases. In other words, I take it from the speaker, in favor of defeating the Veto, that anyone involved, anybody called in for fraud is automatically guilty. That is not fair. I think it's...a person under the Constitution is entitled to have a fair defense. A fair defense is one where he can reasonably get to the trial without doing...undue hardship or expense and I vote 'aye'."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Sangmeister."

Sangmeister: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ah...for those of you who are concerned, which you may be doing to your local states attorney on this, there is no question that this will be an additional burden for him to handle, but in my opinion not one that he cannot properly handle. It will also mean that the Department is going to have to come up into the counties with their records, which is going to be more difficult for



them. But you have to weigh here what everybody has been telling you, and that is, you know all of these merchants are not exactly in the classification of hardcore criminals. They deserve to have their case properly presented. There's good reasons why some of these people may not have been paid. And if you are concerned about what you're doing to your local state's attorney, it's not going to be all that tough for them, and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Shea: "Have all voted who wished? Mr. Porter to explain his vote.

Have all voted who wished? Mr. Deuster to explain his vote."

Deuster: "Well, briefly, Mr. Speaker. We all hear the slogan that government is supposed to be the servant of the people, and certainly it's a small imposition to really require the government to come into a county where a businessman is functioning to prove their case. Ah...we many times seem to be killing the goose that lays the golden egg, or there wouldn't be any government at all, if there weren't some businessmen and people out there earning livings and producing income and paying their taxes, and the least we ought to have is some respect for the hard working businessman, instead of harassing him, making him come down to Springfield...ah...and then have the case continued, and then go back home, and then come back a couple of weeks later to have the case heard again, and maybe continued again. This will drive a man out of business and in many cases, I have had businessmen in my district where the Revenue Department came in last July and told him he should have been keeping books in a different way. So he's reformed and even though he's reformed, they've gone back two years prior and told him he should have been keeping books that way two prior years, even though they never gave him any notice at all. That's just one small part of the harassment we all know about and certainly we ought to be fair to the taxpayer and the business producing person and allow him to have a local trial."

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

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In this bureaucratic age, when we are imposed on so much by our own



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

bureaucracy, I'm pleased to vote 'yes', as a plea to the people who will suffer under this yoke."

Shea: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished?"

Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski, requests a Poll of the Absentees. Randolph 'aye'. Washington 'aye'. You're too late Schlickman. Mr. Beaupre was there already. Mr. Beaupre requests a Poll of the Absentees, and then a Verification of the Affirmative Vote."

Jack O'Brien: "Arnell, Brinkmeier, Caldwell, Carroll, Choate, Collins, Deavers, Ewell, Fleck, Garmisa, Hart, Hirschfeld, Ron Hoffman, Dan Houlihan, Jim Houlihan, Huff, Keller, Klosak, LaFleur, Madison, McAuliffe, McAvoy, McGrew, Meyer, Palmer, Rose, Schisler, Sevcik, Wall, Wolf, Winchester, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Shea: "Representative Garmisa wishes to be voted 'aye'.

Representative Rigney votes 'aye'. Representative Anderson votes 'aye'. Read the Affirmative Vote."

Jack O'Brien: "Anderson, E. M. Barnes, J. M. Barnes, Beatty, Birchler, Bluthardt, Brandt, Brummet, Byers, Campbell, Capparelli, Capuzi, Catania, Coffey, Craig, Cunningham, D'Arco, Darrow, Davis, Deuster, DiPrima, Duff, John Dunn, Ralph Dunn, Dyer, Ebbesen, Epton, Farley, Fennessey, Friedland, Friedrich, Gaines, Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Getty, Giglio, Giorgi, Greiman, Griesheimer, Grotberg."

Shea: "Mr. Huff wishes to be recorded 'aye'."

Jack O'Brien: "Hanahan, Huff, Jacobs, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Katz, Kelly, Kempiners, Kent, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Kucharski, Lauer, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leinenweber, Leon."

Shea: "Change Miss Reed from 'present' to 'aye'. Mr. Luft? Proceed Sir."

Jack O'Brien: "Londrigan, Lucco, Macdonald, Madigan, Mahar, Mann, Marovitz, McCourt, McLendon, McMaster, McPartlin, Merlo, Miller, Molloy, Mudd, Mulcahey, Nardulli, Neff, Patrick, Peters, Pierce, Polk, Porter, Pouncey, Randolph, Reed, Richmond, Rigney, Ryan, Sangmeister, Schoeberlein, Schuneman, Shea, Simms, Stearney, E. G. Steele, C. M. Stiehl, Stubblefield, Taylor, Telcser, Terzich,



Tipsword, Totten, Tuerk, VanDuyne, Vitek, VonBoeckman,
Waddell, Washburn, Washington, White, Williams, Wolf,
and Younge."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Beaupre."

Beaupre: "Representative Anderson."

Shea: "Representative Anderson? Is Representative Anderson on
the Floor? He's in his seat Sir."

Beaupre: "Representative Barnes."

Shea: "Representative Barnes? E. M. Barnes, is he on the Floor?
How is he recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Shea: "Take him off the Roll Call."

Beaupre: "Representative Beatty."

Shea: "Representative Beatty? Representative Beatty on the Floor?
How is he recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Shea: "Take him off the Roll Call."

Beaupre: "Representative Byers."

Shea: "Representative Byers? Is on the Roll Call, right here."

Beaupre: "Representative Capparelli."

Shea: "Representative Capparelli? How is he recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Shea: "Take him off the Roll sir."

Beaupre: "Representative Capuzi."

Shea: "Representative Capuzi? How is he recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Shea: "Take him off the Roll Call."

Beaupre: "Representative Catania. I see her. That's all right.
I withdraw that. Representative Coffey."

Shea: "He's by his seat Sir."

Beaupre: "Representative D'Arco."

Shea: "Representative D'Arco? Is Representative D'Arco on the
Floor? How's he recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Shea: "Take him off the Roll Call."

Beaupre: "Representative DiPrima."



Shea: "Representative DiPrima, is he on the Floor? How's he recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Shea: "Take him off the Roll."

Beaupre: "Representative John Dunn."

Shea: "Representative John Dunn? Is he here? He's right in the aisle, Sir."

Beaupre: "Representative Ebbesen."

Shea: "Representative Ebbesen is in the back Sir."

Beaupre: "Representative Friedland."

Shea: "Representative Friedland, is he in his seat? I see a hand waving back there, it tells me he's here."

Beaupre: "Representative Friedrich."

Shea: "Representative Friedrich is in his seat Sir."

Beaupre: "Representative Gaines."

Shea: "Representative Gaines is in his seat Sir."

Beaupre: "Representative Giglio."

Shea: "Representative Giglio is by Representative Laurino."

Beaupre: "Representative Giorgi."

Shea: "Giorgi is right here."

Beaupre: "Representative Huff."

Shea: "Representative Huff is right behind you Sir."

Beaupre: "Representative Emil Jones."

Shea: "Is in his seat Sir."

Beaupre: "Representative Kempiners."

Shea: "Representative Kempiners? Is Representative Kempiners... he's right here in the Well Sir."

Beaupre: "Representative Kornowicz."

Shea: "He's in his seat Sir."

Beaupre: "Representative Kozubowski."

Shea: "Representative Kornowicz is in his seat. Representative Kozubowski is in his seat."

Beaupre: "Representative Lauer."

Shea: "Lauer is in his seat."

Beaupre: "Representative Leon."

Shea: "Representative Leon? Representative Leon is back by McPartlin."



Beaupre: "Representative Macdonald."

Shea: "Representative Virginia Macdonald is in her seat Sir, or his seat...in her seat Sir."

Beaupre: "Representative Madigan."

Shea: "Representative Madigan is not on the Floor, he's in his office, he'll be right out."

Beaupre: "It's not necessary for him to come out, we'll accept him.. Representative Maragos."

Shea: "Madigan is here. Maragos...Is Maragos...?"

Beaupre: "Marovitz. Marovitz."

Shea: "Marovitz is by his seat Sir."

Beaupre: "Representative McCourt."

Shea: "Mr. McCourt? Is Mr. McCourt here? Representative McCourt, I don't see him. How is he recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Shea: "Take him off the Roll."

Beaupre: "Representative Miller."

Shea: "He's in his seat Sir."

Beaupre: "Representative Molloy."

Shea: "Representative Molloy is in his seat Sir."

Beaupre: "Representative Nardulli."

Shea: "Representative Nardulli, is he on the Floor? Take him off... oh, how is he recorded?"

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

Shea: "Take him off the Roll."

Beaupre: "Representative Patrick."

Shea: "Representative Patrick, is in his seat Sir."

Beaupre: "Representative Polk."

Shea: "Representative Polk? Is Representative Polk on the Floor? He's standing in the back Sir."

Beaupre: "Representative Randolph."

Shea: "He's in his seat Sir."

Beaupre: "Representative Sangmeister."

Shea: "He's in is seat Sir."

Beaupre: "Representative Schuneman."

Shea: "Representative Schuneman? He's in his seat Sir."



Beaupre: "Representative C. M. Stiehl."

Shea: "The Assistant Minority Leader, Mrs. Stiehl is in her seat."

Beaupre: "Representative Telcser."

Shea: "I'm sorry, I did not hear you."

Beaupre: "Representative Telcser. Mr. Speaker, apparently some of the Members of this House are very upset with the fact that we are verifying Roll Call. Now I would submit to you that this is...."

Shea: "Sir, just proceed. Nobody's upset. Mr. Telcser's in his seat."

Beaupre: "Representative Terzich."

Shea: "Representative Terzich is on the Floor Sir."

Beaupre: "Representative Tipsword."

Shea: "Representative Tipsword is right here Sir."

Beaupre: "Representative Totten."

Shea: "Representative Totten is in his seat Sir."

Beaupre: "Representative Vitek."

Shea: "Representative Vitek is in his seat Sir."

Beaupre: "Representative White."

Shea: "Representative White is standing in the rear of the room Sir."

Beaupre: "Representative Williams."

Shea: "Representative Williams is in his seat Sir."

Beaupre: "Representative Wolf."

Shea: "Representative Wolf is in his seat Sir."

Beaupre: "Representative Grotberg."

Shea: "Representative Grotberg? Is Representative Grotberg on the Floor? How is he recorded?"

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

Shea: "Take him off the Roll."

Beaupre: "Representative McMaster."

Shea: "Representative McMaster? He's right by the aisle there Sir."

Beaupre: "No further questions."

Shea: "Representative Barnes do you wish to be recognized Sir?
Turn Representative Barnes, E. M. on."

Barnes: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. How am I recorded?"

Shea: "You were taken off the Roll Call Sir."



Barnes: "Vote me 'aye', please."

Shea: "All right. Representative Lundy, do you seek recognition Sir?"

Lundy: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. How am I recorded?"

Shea: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Lundy: "Please change that to 'aye'."

Shea: "Change Representative Lundy to 'aye'. Representative Luft are you seeking recognition? Representative Jones, Representative Jones."

Jones, J.D.: "How am I recorded Mr. Speaker?"

Shea: "How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'present'."

Jones, J.D.: "Vote me 'aye'."

Shea: "Vote him 'aye'. Mr. Grotberg, do you seek recognition Sir? How is Mr. Grotberg recorded?"

Jack O'Brien: "The Gentleman was removed from the Roll Call."

Shea: "How do you wish to be recorded Sir? He wishes to be recorded 'aye'. Could I have the Record Mr. Clerk?"

Jack O'Brien: "107 'ayes', 28 'nays'."

Shea: "On the Question there are 107 'ayes', and 28 'nays'. Senate Bill 55...Senate Bill 55 becomes law, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Senate Bill 103, Mr. Glass...ah...Representative Porter."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ah... this Bill received 102 votes yesterday, and I don't want to take a lot of time and I will be brief, if you'll only listen to me, because it's a highly technical Bill. Today in Illinois the only pensions...pensioners who have paid income tax on Pension Fund Distributions are those who received them in the Calendar Year 1971. Those who received Distributions in '72, '73, '74, '75, etc., will pay no tax on them by virtue of legislation passed by the General Assembly. Those who paid tax on Pension Fund Distributions made in 1969 when the income tax came into effect in 1970 have had that tax refunded to them by virtue of a court decision, and so what we have right now is



an island that is the 1971 people surrounded by those of all other years who have not paid tax or who have had their tax refunded. Now it seems to me that those pensioners who...ah...received their distributions in 1971 ought to be treated exactly like those who received them in all the other years in which the taxes come into effect. The Governor's veto message on this Bill was in error and he has tacitly admitted that I think, by having no one here speaking in favor of it on his behalf. It...ah...simply did not take into account the court decision for 1969 and 1970. The Bill passed originally 153 votes to 1, it passed the Senate 41 to 1 and the Senate overrode it 44 to nothing. It has a very small fiscal impact, namely twenty thousand dollars is a practical matter and I can see no reason and there's really no know opposition to the Bill. So I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter moves that...the Motion is that Senate Bill 103 become law, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. On that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. As I indicated briefly yesterday, there is opposition to this Bill and people from the Governor's Office have indicated to me that they agree there should be opposition to this Bill. Ah...I think it's important, I have indicated to the Sponsor that I have not disagreed with any of his Bills. I think that I can recall in the last three years, but I think this is a bad Bill. Now three years ago a Gentleman from Woodly Rhode and ^{Road in} Winnetka came over to my house, I don't know how many of you know Woodly Road, but it's probably the wealthiest road in the State of Illinois and he expressed to me that he had received a large lump sum distribution in 1971 and that if he could get a piece of Legislation passed to take care of it, he would receive something in excess of I think twelve hundred dollars back. Now, I indicated to the Gentleman the Bill that was passed by the Illinois General Assembly in 1971 was prospective Legislation which exempted...ah... Pensions for three basic reasons. First, there were no serious Revenue implications, it was costing the State more to collect it than it was getting in return, it would help the elderly on the Pensions



that they were getting in future years and it was costing the employers of Illinois a great deal of money to do the complicated actual calculation which were required to make the refund. Now this Bill is quite different. This is a refund of monies legitimately paid under a legitimate tax at a legitimate point in time. The Bill that is proposed is retroactive and as a principal of Revenue Collection is not an appropriate piece of Legislation. This Bill will in fact benefit only the very wealthy who have received lump sum distributions. An actuary from the Wyatt Company has told me recently of an individual who received a lump sum distribution in that year, for example, of a million dollars. That gentleman will receive thousands of dollars back under this Bill. Now of course these gentlemen and these wealthy people want to get back that money which they paid legitimately. Now unhappily, this morning I received a phone call from the the one who had received a phone call last night telling him of my feelings....House Floor..."

Shea: "Mr. Duff, would you bring your remarks to a close sir."

Duff: "Yes sir. I told him that I really felt the Bill was bad in principle. It does not help the little people, it does not help the State of Illinois. It only helps a very few, very wealthy people under a principal of Revenue Collection which is a bad precedence. In this House the principla of the Income Tax is not being a special interest vehicle, has been protected almost consistently without exception since 195...69. I see no reason why this kind of Special Legislation should be introduced to benefit a very few people."

Shea: "Mr. Porter to close."

Porter: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This ...ah...certainly is not Special Legislation in the sense that Mr. Duff seems to indicate. I put on the desk of each Member a copy of the last two pages of DePaul University Law Review article dealing with this exact subject. It ... the article was ten pages long and if this matter is of concern to only the wealthy few it seems to me that the author of that article in the DePaul University Law Review would not have bothered with it. It's a matter



simply of equity. Is 1971 are the distributions made in that year going to be treated entirely differently than those in the year before or the year after or any other year? It seems to me that simply as a matter of equity everybody ought to be treated exactly alike whether they're wealthy or poor or otherwise, the question is simply a matter of fair treatment. I would urge every Member to vote 'aye'."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter moves that Senate Bill 103 become law, the Governor...the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All those in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. to you..."

Shea: "The Assistant Minority Leader....I'll call your brother."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have had mixed feelings on this Bill and I think probably because I didn't understand it yesterday and it was moved by the argument that we are with this Bill benefitting a very few rich people and therefore we should...ah...ah...save the money for the state, the twenty to a hundred thousand dollars that are involved here for the state and not give it back to these so called rich people. Well first of all there's no guarantee that that indeed is what they are, as a matter of fact if they thought they were rich in 1971 they may have changed their views considerably now. There just is no reason, Mr. Speaker, whether the people are rich or poor, that should not enter into our arguments, but there simply is no reason why Pension payments distributions in 1971 which may have been for certain people and again whether rich or poor exceedingly high in that year, there's no reason why they should be taxed on those benefits when everyone else who received benefits in every other year since the Income Tax has been enforced has not been taxed. So it seems to me Mr. Speaker...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House that it is simply justice to support this Bill and give us the required 107 votes and I submit really again as the Sponsor of the motion has suggested that the Governor was not



aware of the court cases which returned the money to the people who had paid from the same type funds, Pension Funds in 1969 and 1970. So I urge an 'aye' vote."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Porter."

Porter: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I can't really understand in my own mind how a Bill can have 153 'aye' votes here previously when the same arguments were made. This is a matter of simple equity, I don't know how the State can stand aside and say 'Yes, you paid tax in 1971, if you happen to get a distribution then, if you happen to get a...a payment if you're on a Government Pension you happen to get your payment in that year that you...you're going to be stuck with a tax if you got it in 1970 or 1972 or 73 or some other year...ah...you're going to go home scott free.' It seems to me that if you want to treat people fairly and the allocation of the system is simply for wealthy people is totally unsupported. I don't know where he gets that idea it's for all the people who paid the tax in 1971, wealthy, poor or otherwise, there's a lot of Government Pension who are involved too. It seems to me that...ah...this state ought to stand for fair treatment of everybody and that this Bill ought to pass."

Shea: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 86 'ayes' 42 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Now in order to facilitate the fact that some Members have 5:00 or 5:15 commitments out of Springfield and I think we can make it, I recognize the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Ah Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, because the Members of the House did such a exemplary job in going through the controversial...ah...Amendments to the Rules and because also it has been a very long week, from both sides of the aisle there has been that insistent clamor that I move the adoption of House Resolution 237 as amended by all of the Amendments that we have considered and adopted today as the permanent Rules of this House, with the assurance that when we come back in January that the remaining



Amendments that appear on the Calendar will be considered as Amendments then for the permanent House Rules. I have never had such a feeling Mr. Speaker as speaking for all of the Members of this House and it is a pleasure to make it possible to facilitate the orderly printing of the Rules which is what we needed to do in order to meet a printing deadline and still to assure the Members of the House that those remaining proposals would be considered in January. Now I do want to say to you Mr. Speaker, that I'm staying in Springfield anyway and I'm perfectly agreeable if the majority of the Members of this House prefer to complete the task to stay here and do it but it does seem to me that this proposal to adopt the Rules as they now are in the form that they ended when left our debate and consideration earlier today is a very reasonable one and I would be agreeable to that and accordingly I will so move that House Resolution 237 as reported out by the Rules Committee in the form in which it now stands as amended by the various votes taken earlier today be adopted as the Permanent Rules of the Illinois House of Representatives."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword on the question?"

Tipsword: "Would the Gentleman yield to a question please?"

Katz: "Yes."

Tipsword: "I...I'm very much in agreement with what you're proposing to do Mr. Katz. The only...only thing I would like to ask and I...I don't recall now, what is required to amend these Rules at... what vote is required and what procedure after they've been adopted?"

Katz: "I believe that the vote would be 89. Is that correct? The Parliamentarian will have to confer there with the Speaker that is...ah...ah...a determination that the Parliamentarian would have to make but my understanding is that it would require 89 votes to amend the Rules once they have been adopted."

Tipsword: "Is...Is there any way we could provide that it would..."

Shea: "I...I have been. I've had an inquiry, it will take 89 votes after they are on the desk but 89 votes, well I read the Rules too John, it takes 89 votes because they've been on the



desk more than one day. Now if this House...All right, Point of Order, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "It takes 89 except those Rules that specifically specify 107. So you can't suspend all the Rules with 89."

Shea: "He's not talking suspension, he's talking Amendments."

Matijevich: "Didn't I hear you say suspension?"

Shea: "No, he said Amendments."

Matijevich: "OH."

Tipsword: "So, Mr. Speaker..."

Shea: "It would take 89 to amend, but by an appropriate number of votes we could go back to a procedure of getting a majority of those voting on the question on the number of Rules that are still waiting and we could determine what's the last one today."

Tipsword: "Could we do this. Could I suggest that perhaps they might adopt all the Rules except that Rule that requires the 89 votes? What would that do to it?"

Shea: "I'm assured by Mr. Katz and the Minority Leader that the votes would be forthcoming to vote on the additional Amendment by a Majority vote, sir. Would that satisfy you Mr. Tipsword?"

Tipsword: "Sure, I just think everybody ought to get the same treatment..."

Shea: "They will. Now is there any further questions? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank...Thank you Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor of the motion would indicate to us exactly what the printing problem is. I'm wondering why it can't be printed in January."

Shea: "Mr. Katz..."

Katz: "I'm sorry. The Senate has had the...ah...material ready for quite some time and as I understand it have been pressing to have some printing of it. We are a bicameral Legislature and it is for the Seventy-ninth General Assembly. We are at the end of the first year of that General Assembly and I do understand that because the Senate has been urging that it be printed that there was...ah...an understanding reached with regard to promising them that we would not hold up printing any longer because everyone wants their books and all I could tell you is that that would be a matter of accommodation between the Speaker and also between the President and we would



certainly try to accommodate the House in their regard if it could be done because January is not very far off and I would ...ah...urge that to the Speaker, that if it could be done that we wait until we have acted when we come back early in January."

Mugalian: "Well Mr. Speaker, thank you. I...I think that the truthful answer of the...ah...Representative Katz...ah...I appreciate his truthfulness, indicates there's really no reason at all. Ah...the accommodation is only a very slight one. We don't have a fiscal year problem, we don't have a budgetary mandate it's just a matter of putting this off another 30 days and I think it's far more important to us to have Rules in final form before we vote on them than to accommodate the Senate who hasn't been very accommodating to us for a long time."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As I understood the permanent Speaker, earlier today, he wasn't too concerned about the quality of the Rules or what might, they might contain, he was more concerned about the fact that they be printed in a hand book. Now if that's the only concern we have here I don't understand why...ah...we can't put the whole thing off until January because we're not going to have a complete printing of...of the Rules. So I would suggest that we just leave them...leave the Rules go until January, totally, everything."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Hill."

Hill: "Ah...Mr. Speaker, I'd like to get this straight. Are they talking about January of 1977? I think that would be more proper. We've gotten along very well under the Rules that we've had and I don't see why we can't go another year under those particular Rules with the exception of the ones that have been adopted. It seems to me that we've been spinning our wheels on these Rules for a long time and they should have been adopted a long time ago. We've gotten along all right. Let's just forget it."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman."



Schuneman: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the maker of the motion."

Shea: "He'll yield."

Schuneman: "Ah...Representative Katz...ah...you indicated earlier that ...ah...the minute...er...the Rules rather would be considered when we return in January. Now it's been our experience that the Rules are constantly put off for other more pressing...ah...Orders of Business and I'd be curious...ah...to know sir, if...if you have any assurance as to a date in January or an Order of Business when the Rules really will be considered."

Katz: "I'm...to be...I'm told by the Speaker so that there is no misunderstanding on this, that the printing of the handbook is not under the control of the House and that the printing of the Handbook is going to proceed. Now if you want to print a Handbook that does not have House Rules, that, as I understand from the Speaker, is what will take place. I'm perfectly agreeable to staying here. It will not take that long, in my views, to complete the task. But the alternative, in my view is that, as I understand the facts to be, the printing is going to be taking place and that accordingly a choice will be to have House Rules in it in it's present form or to stay and complete them. As to when we will be back in Session, that is something that the Temporary Speaker there would be able to answer the question. I am not familiar with the answer to that though I think I know the answer I would prefer to have the authentic answer from the Temporary Speaker."

Shea: "Well Mr. Katz, the Adjournment Resolutions that are on the desks are for January the 14th, at 1:00. It was my understanding that...ah...we were going to try to do this to help the Membership so that they could get out today, but I can see that most of the Members would just asoon here and stay and vote them up or down so...The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The assumption upon the Chairman of this Committee that all of a sudden there are 89 votes for these Rule changes on the Floor of the House at this hour is



...is almost laughable. We haven't even started to discuss the changes of the Bill. We haven't discussed any of the items and there's three or four pages of synopsis of changes. Forget about the Motions on Amendments, I'm talking about the Motion on the Bill, such as limiting the Governor's Office to two Members can even be on the Floor of the House. Nobody discussed this. I don't think you have 89 votes and I'll stay here until Sunday if you want to debate on this. There's enough changes in his Rules to make it controversial enough to put it off till we have the proper time to debate these Rule changes and I say to the Senate, they can go straight to hell as far as I'm concerned about their printing of any Handbook because they haven't helped us pass any Joint Session Rules, have they? And as far as when the Rules are printed in any Handbook, I recall year after year when we didn't adopt the Rules until almost the last business of the last day of the last month of the biennium. So what the hell you talking about we got to adopt these all of sudden tonight. I'll stay here and debate them, I don't like all the Rules in here and I want to discuss it and they don't have to print the damn Rules."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hoffman, R."

Hoffman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. It's obvious that the Chair's attempting to facilitate an accommodation for the Members and it's obvious that the Members are not appreciative of the offer. I will say at this point here the obvious thing is take a Roll Call and see if we're going to hang in here and decide on these Rules now or defer the question and a simple Roll Call would get you out of the box."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Caldwell. Do you want to talk Mr. Caldwell?"

Caldwell: "Well I've been waiting quite a while Mr. Speaker and...and to be very frank with you what...what I was going to say, Representative Hanahan put it very well. I...I don't understand how come we have to have some Rules adopted here all of a sudden and we've been functioning throughout this year without them. Now, I...I would suggest that we either complete the task when we get back



in January 14 or whenever or forget it because we've done very well so far."

Shea: "Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I move we proceed to consider the Amendments to the Rules."

Shea: "Well the...the First Motion that's on the Floor now is Mr. Katz's Motion that we adopt the Rules as amended, House Resolution 237 as amended at this point. That's the Motion. Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Point of Order Mr. Speaker. Has the Gentleman placed this in...in writing, the Motion in writing as he agreed? I'd like the Clerk to testify of whether or not this Motion is in writing as he agreed number 1 and I'd like the debate on the total House Resolution 237. We haven't even started the first moment of debate on the..on the House Resolution 237. I'd like an explanation of it and I'd like to know all the details of changes."

Shea: "Well I assure you Mr. Hanahan when I tell you the written Motion is here, no Clerk will have to testify to it, you'll have my word."

Hanahan: "I'd just like to have it read. I'd like to know what we agreed...agreed to here."

Shea: "Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I...I hope that maybe I can make a comment that might outline what our options are and I think this is a fair appraisal. We have three options. One, we've been operating all this time with some existing Rules, we could, of course, simply by 89 votes make those existing Temporary Rules our Permanent Rules. That's one option. The Second option...ah..is to stay here as long as we have to to consider all the Amendment to the new Rules and I don't think anybody wants to do that, very few. The Third option is what Representative Katz is suggesting, that we take the new Rules that have been worked over by the Rules Committee with half the Amendments that have been considered and run with them. Now I think...ah...that either of the options are...are reasonable so that at least we take some action and all we need is one Roll Call. I'm going to support Representative Katz's suggestion that we take the new Rules with half the Amendments because that's better than staying here all night. On the other hand if that



fails I have a Motion at the desk to simply adopt our Temporary Rules as Permanent Rules and to try that. So I think we'd have two viable alternatives that are not going to take more than ten minutes and I urge us to get on with considering Representative Katz's suggestion for resolving the dilemma."

Shea: "Mr. Ewing. Turn Mr. Ewing on, the Gentleman from Livingston."

Ewing: "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'. All right now read Mr. Katz's please Mr. Clerk so everybody knows what they're voting on."

Jack O'Brien: "I move to adopt House Resolution 237 as amended as the Permanent Rules of the House. Harold Katz."

Shea: "You heard the Motion. The Gentleman's motion is, shall House Bill...er...House Resolution 237 as amended be adopted? Now that was the debate we just had. Now Mr. Hanahan what is your Point of Order sir?"

Hanahan: "My Point of Order is there was an Amendment verbally offered and the transcript will clearly show that that would be amended to include any of the Amendments that have not been heard could be adopted by simple majorities instead of the 89 votes and it should be included in that Motion."

Shea: "Do you want to so amend the Motion."

Hanahan: "And it would be the first thing discussed in the January Session."

Shea: "Do you want to amend that? It's so amended."

Hanahan: "Well Mr. Speaker that's exactly why I asked for it in writing for the Clerk to read in the transcript."

Shea: "It will be amended the way you just stated it Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "I'd like the Clerk to read it."

Shea: "Mr. Hoffman, do you rise on a Point of Order?"

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, I raise a Point of Personal Privilege. I think it's a little unfair for certain Members of this House at this stage of the game who haven't been here at all today while we've been working on the people's business to come in here and slow us down when we're trying to do our own business. That's not



fair and he ought to realize that."

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

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, the...the Gentleman's question with respect to the number of votes required to adopt an Amendment to the Permanent Rules assuming Mr. Katz's motion carries...ah...does that pertain only to those Amendments that have been filed?"

Shea: "Yes sir."

Walsh: "As of this moment?"

Shea: "Yes sir."

Walsh: "All right, thank you."

Shea: "All right now Mr. Washington."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker, I'm a bit confused The motion reads adopt 237 as amended."

Shea: "Yes sir."

Washington: "That does not apply, am I correct, to those Amendments which were filed but not adopted?"

Shea: "Sir those Amendments are still to be considered. The Amend...the Mr. Katz's Motion is now being amended to read further that those Amendments that are presently on the desk to 237 will be considered upon our return in January. That those Amendments presently sitting on the desk will be considered as part to the Rules and that they will require only a majority of those voting on the question to amend the Rules. That is so that each person who has filed an Amendment will be treated exactly alike. Yes Mr. Porter."

Porter: "It seems to me that...ah..those Amendments that are now part of this Resolution are requiring 89 votes to become part of the Rules. So how can you say that's treating them the same?"

Shea: "Because they were adopted by a simple majority sir."

Porter: "I realize that but now in order to adopt the Rules as a whole we have to have 89 votes do we not."

Shea: "Yes sir, that's always true."

Porter: "So..So why do the other Amendments require less than 89 to be adopted also?"

Shea: "Because they're Amendments sir and if we would stay here I'm sure we could work on them tonight until we get there. Now Mr. Clerk do you want to read the second part of Mr. Katz's Motion?"



Fred Selcke: "I move to adopt House Resolution 237 as amended as the Permanent Rules of the House and that the other proposed Amendment now sitting on the desk to House Resolution 237 be considered immediately when the House reconvenes on January 14, 1976 and that such Amendments may be adopted by a vote of the Majority of those voting. Harold Katz."

Shea: "You all heard the Motion. Mr. Matijevich on a Point of Order."

Matijevich: "I'd like a Point of Order or a Clarification. I think there are some who think that voting for Amend...by a simple Majority on those Amendments when we come back in January that they will become a part of the Rules. That can't be, can't be because we are now going to adopt Permanent Rules and you can only amend Permanent Rules by 89 votes. We can adopt those Amendments but they can't be a part of the Permanent Rules and I think there's been a misunderstanding about this."

Shea: "Well the Rules as adopted now will contain this Motion or subject to that Motion Mr. Matijevich.

All right, now the question is, all in favor will vote 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. This takes 89 votes. The Gentleman from Cook, or from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, it's almost an insult for the Membership of this General Assembly to be asked to vote for a Permanent Rules to this House without one word of the Permanent Rules being asked to be voted on. There are three pages of substantive changes in the old Rules that you are now being asked to vote on blindly without one single word of explanation by the Chairman of the Rules Committee or any Member of the Rules Committee. There are changed that are significant, there are changes that should not be adopted lightly without debate and full participation of this House. I think it's an insult to us to be asked to vote at this time easily and that when this Roll Call is over I expect...I hope to be recognized for verification of this Roll Call."

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



Matijevich: "Well Mr. Speaker, as many of you know, I...I try to watch the Rules as closely as anybody on the Floor of the House and I think that something should be said in behalf of the Rules Committee. I think they've done a good job. I think they've... they've noted the frustrations of this House and tried to relate the Rules to those frustrations. I think in...ah...in Sessions to come you will see that there will be flexibility of the Speaker yet the minority whichever party it will be...ah...will have protection. So I'd like to commend the Rules Committee because they have, I think, have done a good job. Now we've had these Rules in our hands for some time. I think we have all been the fools because we haven't adopted them yet. But I don't think we should continue to be fools and not adopt permanent Rules. I think the time has finally come that we as a House say, 'Let's get on with it and let's adopt permanent Rules.' The best part of this motion as far as I'm concerned is the fact that we're coming back in January and not next week or December. So I...I think that we ought to..ah...wholeheartedly support the Motion."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Rules have been sitting on Members desks since, oh I think at least for, since the spring of this year. There was distributed to the Members yesterday again another set, a duplicate set of the Rules. There has been distributed a summary. I'm sure the Members of the House...ah... have had that available and have been studying it. There was distributed a cross index to the Rules the matter was extensively heard this morning in a series of Amendments. I had indicated my willingness if the House so desired to proceed ahead and finish the task today but it does seem to me that it comes with ill grace for anyone to criticize the Rules Committee. I know that...Mr. Walsh and Mr. Washburn and all the Leadership and the Members of the Rules Committee have been engaged for many, many hours on this. Hearings held in Chicago, hearings held in Springfield, we have continually post-poned this matter to put urgent state business and the desire of other Members, for example yesterday we heard Mr. Hanahan who does manage to take as much of the time as most Members



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

do. We have always let him and his Bills and his taking the Floor time, proceed ahead of the Rules, but we've now reached the point where the Rules were up to date. They were extensively heard this morning and I adopted Mr. Hanahan's motion exactly in the form in which he wanted it. You heard him dictate exactly what he wanted. In order to accomodate him and the other Members, I made my motion, modified motion to conform exactly to the form in which he wanted the motion and so I am really unable to understand why he would hold up the House. Now if we want to stay the rest of the night I'm frankly going to be in Springfield the rest of the evening. I'm perfectly agreeable to staying here and taking the rest of these Amendments. But we do have to recognize the reality that it's been a long week and I would propose that we try to adopt in the present for but if it's the will of the House, I'm more than happy to stay and we will take the rest of the Amendments."

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

Walsh: "Well Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House...ah... I'd like to confirm what the Chairman or Vice-chairman as I guess he is, of the Rules Committee has just said. The Rules Committee did work hard on the Rules and on House Resolution 237 and I think they are fair. There have been many, many suggestions many of you have appeared before the Rules Committee and offered Amendments, some of which have been adopted and included in...ah... in House Resolution 237, others have been considered this morning. Now it's unreasonable for us to stay here for the rest of the evening and I mean until 10:30 or 11:00 tonight and consider the remaining fifty Amendments to these Rules now. Now while that is unreasonable, it's irresponsible to continue this Session without Permanent Rules. Someone said we have gone longer than this without Permanent Rules. I defy them to tell me when since 1818 this House has operated longer than we have without permanent Rules. So to vote anything but 'yes' on this motion is totally irresponsible. We ought to have



Permanent Rules and we ought to be out of here and we have protected everyone who has offered an Amendment to the Rules and I might say that I have two or three of them in there that are included in this bunch that have not been considered. So I would urge you to vote 'yes' on this motion."

Shea: "The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Well thank you Mr. Speaker, Mr. Shea and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In explaining my 'yes' vote I would like to tell the Members that, who have some apprehension regarding the...ah... returning in January and addressing ourselves immediately to the ...to the Rules and I walked back to talk with Speaker Redmond and received his assurance because I was concerned...ah...and I know I took up an hour of the time this morning with one particular Amendment and I wanted to make sure that every Member would have the same opportunity when we came back...ah...in January. He assured me the First Order of Business when this House comes back in January 14th will be to take up the Rules of the House and I think it's a...a good opportunity for us to have Permanent Rules now with the assurance of the Speaker that we will address ourselves to those further Amendments when...on January 14th and I urge that we go ahead and adopt this motion and get on with the Order of Business of the House. Thank you."

Shea: "Do you want to speak to the question Ms. Geo-Karis or do you have a point...All right, what's your Point of Order Ms. Geo-Karis?"

Geo-Karis: "If I understand correctly Mr. Speaker, if we adopt these Rules tonight for that Motion then we won't be able to take the other Rules up in January because we will have adopted these. Am I correct or not?"

Shea: "No, you're incorrect Ms. Geo-Karis. The Motion is couched very carefully to adopt 237 as amended today. But 237 can be further amended on our return in January and each Member will have the same courtesy as those that had their motions or Amendments heard today. Now you wish to speak to the Bill?"

Geo-Karis: "Your eloquence stops me."

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

Totten: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. A Point of Order please. Ah...It's rather



ironic that while we sit here at this hour and debate the Rules and those Rules contain a section regarding Members pushing other Members buttons, that there is a Member here today who I see voting on this who has been verified off every Roll Call today, because of his absence. It is also my understanding that there is a request for a verification and I think we would save a lot of time if we would obey the Rules, and also make sure that those Members who are not here are not being voted on this Motion."

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

Friedrich: "I can't help but believe, Mr. Speaker, that the Members don't understand yet, and I'm reluctant to say that because it's been explained a number of times, but if there's anyone who went to great lengths to see that every Member had an opportunity to be heard on the Question of Rules, it was Harold Katz, sometimes to the point where I was bored to death listening to all the explanations. But every Member that had...that wanted to say anything about Rules was invited over and over again, they were heard down to the last paragraph. Many of those things were already incorporated in 237 and certainly a number of them have been today, and those who have not, will have an opportunity in January. Now I don't know how fair you can get, in trying to be fair in this Body."

Shea: "The Gentleman from Logan, Mr. Lauer, please."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, with due respect to the Gentleman who is Chairman of the Rules Committee, and I think he is known as probably one of the two or three most fair men in the House. I really think we ought to get with it because I recall a statement when I first came down here of what was known as Mr. Granata's Rules. With 89 votes you can do everything but suspend the Constitution and with 107 you can suspend it. Let's go ahead and take a Roll Call and get on with it."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, the Majority Leader, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I thought that perhaps by this Motion we could get people on their way and



facilitate the movement of this House. Now the Motion as Mr. Katz put it insures that every Member will receive fair treatment with the Amendments that are now being offered. I would appreciate it if my colleagues would give us the votes to pass this so that we could finish our business today and get out of Springfield and return after the Holidays in January."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff, to explain his vote."

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

Many of us have been frustrated this year with the lack of Rules. Many of us have spoken to the problem repeatedly. You know there comes a time, it seems to me, when there are difficulties that individual people want to express. There are those occasions where I think it's fair to listen as we have today. Not only to Representative Katz, who has spoken, and I think most fairly to the point, but every Member of the Rules Committee that I've heard, including those who are not Members of the Leadership on both sides of the aisle from Cook County, Chicago, and Downstate have all suggested to you that this is an appropriate thing for us to do at this time. Now every Member of the Leadership in both parties is asking you if you wouldn't please go on with letting this happen now."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Washington, to explain his vote."

Washington: "Mr. Speaker. The reason given for pressing for the passage of the Rules today is so that we could make the deadline for the printing of the Handbook. I've a very simple solution and I don't know whether it's acceptable or not, maybe it's not timely, but I would suggest that we defeat this Motion, print in the Handbook the Temporary Rules, defer this action to January 14, come back and pass our House Rules. It's just that simple, because as a matter of fact, if you put these Rules in the Handbook, they're not complete. Those are not the House Rules because you have a pending promise to the Members that you will go and consider the other forty Amendments that are now pending. I repeat, defeat this Motion, print the Temporary



Rules, come back January 14 and complete the job."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms. I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Grundy, Mr. Washburn, the Minority Leader."

Washburn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think one thing in our favor of getting a new Rule book regardless of what it contains will be the fact that we'll have something in print and perhaps we won't any longer have to go by Redmond's Rules of Order as we have for the past eleven months. I would certainly hope that we could get some more green lights up there, so that we could have a Rule book in hand when we come back in January and March and April and May and June, so that some of the decisions that are made by the Chair that we have disagreed with so violently in the past, at least, we'll have something that is in print with the Speaker's name on it, so that we can take it up and show it to him the Rules that were passed."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the Record. On this Question there are 94 'ayes', 33 'nays', 23 voting 'present'. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Request a Verification of Roll Call and if you want five names to take off right now, I'll give you them real fast, if you want to get under 89. That five names, ten names are on that Board that aren't here right now. I'll give them to you real fast, if you want to go through them, and quit this foolishness."

Bradley: "Does the Gentleman wish to Poll the Absentees? Poll the Absentees."

Fred Selcke: "Arnell, Borchers, Brinkmeier, Capuzi, Choate, Cunningham, DiPrima, Fleck, Griesheimer, Hart, Hirschfeld, Keller, Klosak, LaFleur, Madison, McAvoy, Meyer, Mulcahey, Nardulli, Rose, Schisler, Skinner, Stone, VonBoeckman, Wall, Winchester, Yourell. Okay."

Bradley: "Call the Affirmative Roll Sir."



Fred Selcke: "Beatty, Berman, Bluthardt, Boyle, Bradley, Brandt, Brummet, Byers, Caldwell, Campbell, Capparelli, Coffey, Darrow, Davis, Deavers, Downs, Duff, John Dunn."

Bradley: "Mr. Hanahan, the Gentleman from McHenry."

Hanahan: "Yes, would the Clerk be instructed to go a little slower. There's so many people standing up and looking around. It's very difficult to...ah...after all we are now adopting Rules and the Rules call for orderly decorum and everyone in their seats, and all this, and all I'm trying to do is make sure they're here."

Bradley: "Will everybody please be in their seats...will the Members please be in their seats and the Clerk will slow down a shade on his calling of the Affirmative Roll."

Hanahan: "After Coffey, I couldn't catch another thing. Do you remember..."

Fred Selcke: "Okay, I'll go back. Darrow, Davis, Deavers, Downs, Duff, John Dunn, Ralph Dunn, Ebbesen, Ewell, Ewing, Farley, Fennessey, Flinn, Friedrich, Garmisa, Giorgi, Greiman, Grotberg, Hill, Gene Hoffman, Holewinski, Hudson, Huff, Dave Jones, Katz, Kelly, Kempiners, Kent, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Lauer, Laurino, Leinenweber, Leon, Londrigan, Lucco, Lundy, Macdonald, Madigan, Mann, Maragos, Marovitz, Matijevich, McClain, McGrew, McLendon, McMaster, McPartlin, Merlo, Miller, Molloy, O'Daniel, Palmer, Patrick, Porter, Pouncey, Randolph, Reed, Rigney, Satterthwaite, Schneider, Schoeberlein, Schuneman, Sharp, Shea, Simms, E. G. Steele, Sissy Stiehl, Taylor, Terzich, Tip sword, Tuerk, Vitek, Walsh, Washburn, White, Willer, Williams, Wolf, Younge, and Mr. Speaker." What you want? 'Aye'. Yourell, 'aye'."

Bradley: "Pardon me. Yourell wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Mulcahey wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Holewinski 'no'. I'm sorry if.... Mr. Ewing, for what purpose do you rise Sir?"

Ewing: "Yes Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Bradley: "You're recorded...how's he recorded?"

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



Ewing: "Thank you."

Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Barnes, wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Change her from 'no' to 'aye'. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster from 'present' to 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz, for what purpose do you rise Sir? Mr. Lechowicz. Turn Mr. Lechowicz on."

Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Change me from 'no' to 'aye'."

Bradley: "Change Mr. Lechowicz from 'no' to 'aye'. Mr. Hanahan, we are starting with 98 'ayes', 33 'nays', question of the Affirmative vote. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. White arise?"

White: "Mr. Speaker, may I be verified now?"

Bradley: "Mr. Hanahan, could Mr. White be verified now, he's.... Fine. Mr. Caldwell, you wish to be verified now? May Mr. Caldwell be verified now Mr. Hanahan?"

Hanahan: "Does anyone else...I have no objection if those who want to leave and catch a train want to leave now. Go ahead and just get verified. I'll go right down the line on the others."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Hoffman, Ron."

Hoffman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Change my vote from 'no' to 'aye'."

Bradley: "Mr. Hoffman wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Willer, for what purpose do you rise?"

Willer: "Just...may I be verified please?"

Bradley: "Mr. Hanahan, may Mrs. Willer be verified? Mr. Merlo would like to be verified."

Hanahan: "I have no objection. Jim Taylor wants to be verified."

Bradley: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels...Mr. Daniels would like to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Now I think that Mr. Hanahan has been very fair in accepting the fact that some Members want to be verified, and I don't think we can go much further with that than we have. I would suggest that the Members stay for the Verification. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes from 'present'. Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. Mr. Barnes...Emil Barnes. Pardon? Gene Barnes from 'present' to 'aye'. Mr. Washington for what



purpose do you rise Sir."

Washington: "Aye...change it to 'aye'."

Bradley: "From 'present' to 'aye' for Washington. For what purpose does Mr. Lucco rise? The Gentleman from Madison."

Lucco: "Mr. Speaker, a Point of Personal Privilege. I have what I think is a very very important piece of legislation to come up after this, and I resent very much any Member of this House excusing anyone to leave. I think that's up to the individual Members."

Bradley: "It's been the policy in the past Mr. Lucco, if Members have to step off the Floor that they ask for permission and..."

Hanahan: "They're voting with you Lucco."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd. The Gentleman wishes to be recorded from 'no', change it to 'aye'. All right now, if we'll hold it for just a second. 103 'ayes', 30 'nays', Mr. Hanahan on the question of the Affirmative Vote."

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, especially because of the importance of it, I don't want to hear some Member later on complain about the Rules we're operating under, I want to make sure those who are voting for these Rules are here, so I'd like to start off with Representative Beatty."

Bradley: "Representative Beatty? How is he recorded?"

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

Bradley: "Take him off. Is the Gentleman...he's not in his seat. Is the Gentleman in the Chambers? Take him off the Roll."

Hanahan: "Representative Boyle?"

Bradley: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "Yes."

Bradley: "Is the Gentleman...he's not in his seat. Is the Gentleman in the Chambers? Is Mr. Boyle here? Take him off the Roll."

Hanahan: "Laurino?"

Bradley: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "Aye."

Bradley: "Mr. Laurino is not in his seat. Is he in the Chambers? Take him off the Roll. Just one minute Sir. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rayson rise?"



Rayson: "Change my vote from 'no' to 'aye', please."

Bradley: "Mr. Rayson wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'.

Questions Mr....Mr. Hanahan? Further Questions?"

Hanahan: "Yes, many Questions. D'Arco?"

Bradley: "Mr. D'Arco? How is he recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "Present."

Hanahan: "Is he here?"

Bradley: "He's voted as 'present' Sir."

Hanahan: "Is he here Sir?"

Bradley: "We're not verifying the Present Roll Sir."

Hanahan: "But I still object to these people being voted when they're not present. Flinn?"

Bradley: "Representative Flinn? How is he recorded?"

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

Bradley: "Is Mr. Flinn...he's not in his seat. Is Mr. Flinn on the Floor? Mr. Flinn? Take him off the Roll."

Hanahan: "O'Daniel."

Fred Selcke: "Flinn off."

Bradley: "Mr. O'Daniel? How is Mr. O'Daniel's recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "Aye."

Bradley: "Is Mr. O'Daniel's in the Chambers? He's not in his seat. Take him off the Roll. For what purpose does the Lady from St. Claire, Mrs. Younge arise?"

Younge: "I'd like to be verified right now."

Bradley: "Mr. Hanahan can Mrs. Younge be...?"

Hanahan: "I have no objections."

Bradley: "He has no objections. Continue with the Questions of the Affirmative, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Ralph Dunn?"

Bradley: "How is the Gentleman recorded? The Gentleman's right here in the aisle Sir."

Hanahan: "Byers?"

Bradley: "Mr. Byers is in his...standing at his chair."

Hanahan: "Representative Coffey?"

Bradley: "Representative Coffey? Representative Coffey is sitting on the windowsill."



Hanahan: "Representative Capparelli?"

Bradley: "Representative Capparelli? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "Aye."

Bradley: "He's not in his chair, is he in the Chambers? Take him off the Roll."

Hanahan: "Terzich?"

Bradley: "How's the Gentleman recorded? Oh, there's...Mr. Terzich's right here Sir, with Mr. Lechowicz. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Emil Jones arise?"

Jones,: "Change my vote from 'present' to 'aye'."

Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as having voted 'aye'."

Hanahan: "Representative Londrigan?"

Bradley: "Representative Londrigan is in his.... The Gentleman's not in his chair. Is he in the Chambers? How's he recorded Sir?"

Fred Selcke: "Aye."

Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Hanahan: "Representative Mann?"

Bradley: "Representative Mann, how's the Gentleman recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "Aye."

Bradley: "He's not in his chair. Is he in the Chambers? Take him off the Roll."

Hanahan: "Representative Ebbesen?"

Bradley: "Representative Ebbesen is in the aisle on the Republican side."

Hanahan: "Representative Raymond Ewell?"

Bradley: "Raymond Ewell? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "Aye."

Bradley: "The Gentleman is not in his seat. Is he in the Chambers? Take him off the Roll."

Hanahan: "Representative Garmisa?"

Bradley: "Representative Garmisa? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

Fred Selcke: "Aye."

Bradley: "The Gentleman's not in his chair. I don't see him. Take him off the Roll."

Hanahan: "Representative McClain?"

Bradley: "Representative McClain is in the Chamber Sir."



Hanahan: "Representative Miller?"

Bradley: "Representative Miller is right in front of the Clerk's desk."

Hanahan: "Representative McMaster's?"

Bradley: "He's in the aisle."

Hanahan: "Representative E. G. Steele?"

Bradley: "Senator...he's in his chair."

Hanahan: "Representative Schoeberlein?"

Bradley: "Representative Schoeberlein is in his chair. Further questions Sir?"

Hanahan: "That is all the Questions I..."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Downs."

Downs: "Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to go home, but I think to make the point certainly that this Assembly has been criticized not altogether fairly for rushing at the last minute."

Bradley: "You're Out of Order Sir. I didn't recognize you for an explanation of vote, and change the Gentleman from 'yes' to 'no', Mr. Downs. On this question we have 94 'ayes', 30 'nays', and the Motion is adopted. Messages from the Senate."

Fred Selcke: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright. I'm directed to inform the House, the Senate has concurred with the House to pass a Bill of the following title, House Bill 233, together with the following Amendments of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House. Passed Senate as amended November 21, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Lucco."

Lucco: "Mr. Speaker."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I noticed we just adopted new Rules and now according to the new Rules, I'd like the permanent Speaker or maybe if you'd like to rule, one the Point of Order of how many Governor's Aides are allowed on the Floor, and I'd like you to rule whether or not there is allowed more than two aides and if there are more than two aides, I'd like for you to order them off the Floor. Under Rule 53A."

Bradley: "Points well taken Sir, and we'll ask the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."



Matijevich: "I understand that you can give authority to any person to be on this House Floor, under the new Rules."

Bradley: "Under the new Rules then, we will allow...ah..."

Matijevich: "The Speaker may cause any person other than the Member to...No, the Speaker may grant other persons the privilege of access to the House Floor or to the Speaker's Gallery or Speaker's Corridor. Let's not be too silly Tom."

Bradley: "Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Under Rule 53A it says without exception. Only the following persons are entitled to the Floor of the House, the Speaker's Corridor and the Speaker's Gallery during Sessions of the House. Members and Officers of the General Assembly. Legislative Staff Assistants, and Leaderships of the House and Senate. Employees of the House and Senate Officers. Legislative Reference Bureau. Legislative Council. Former Speakers. Elective Officers of the Executive Branch and Auditor Branch. Two Administrative Assistants of the Governor and one Administrative Assistant of every other elected State Officer. This Rule will be prominently displayed. There's no place under this Rule that we have just adopted without debate to allow you to allow anyone else but what says in these Permanent Rules. And the silliness of the House is going to start right now with these Rules that were adopted without debate, and I ask you to make the Ruling."

Bradley: "Mr. Hanahan, under Subsection B, I quote Sir. 'Only the Speaker may grant other persons the privilege of access to the House Floor or to the Speaker's Gallery or to the Speaker's Corridor.' And he is so indicating that they will be entitled to the Floor."

Hanahan: "Then I appeal the Ruling of the Chair. We're going to start this right. Point of Order. I'd like to appeal the Ruling of the Chair, because there's no place for the exemption on a specific allowance."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Lucco."

Lucco: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm very very sorry really to continue with this, but this is an emergency



action that we must have. This is Amendment #1 and #2, which the Senate just passed this afternoon to House Bill 233, which we passed way back about February. This appropriated \$850,000.00 for the T.V....Educational T. V. at SIU, Edwardsville. This afternoon, the Senate passed Amendment #1 which increases the appropriation to One and a Half Million Dollars for the Educational T. V. This was recommended and approved by the Board of Higher Education Master Plan. This also, this afternoon, by the way, they also passed House Bill 766 and 767, which allots the money to the T. V....Educational T. V. at Western University. So this is to make this comparable to that. The funds do not come from the General Revenue Fund. The funds will come from the Capital Development Bond Fund. Amendment #2, the original Bill, had an effective date of July, 1976. Amendment #2 makes it effective immediately in order for us to get the federal matching fund from the federal government and in order to do that the application must be in by December 12. So...this year, right. So I ask a affirmative vote to accept or concur with Amendments #1 and #2 from the Senate of House Bill 767, please. 233, I'm sorry."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House does concur with the Senate on..."

Lucco: "We need 107 votes because it does change the effective date."

Bradley: "Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 233. All those in favor...discussion. The Gentleman from Perry, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I thought it might be well that I speak on this Bill. As you know, Representative Lucco and I were on different sides yesterday on a particular Bill involving SIU Edwardsville, but as a Member of the Higher Education Committee, the Committee has been working...I was a Chairman of a Sub-committee last year to study the Educational Television at Edwardsville, and I certainly endorse this and would urge an 'aye' vote on concurrence with this Senate Bill 233. Thank you."

Bradley: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise



in opposition to these...ah...to this concurrence. There is no bigger rip-off in state government than Educational Television. If we haven't learned anything during the 1960's when we poured billions of federal dollars and millions of state dollars into these types of efforts...ah...we should have learned that it doesn't work. We had airplanes flying around over the Midwest out of Purdue University beaming pictures down to schools and it's a waste of money. It's an absolute boondoggle. There's nothing worse going on at our state universities than the efforts in these areas, and therefore, I'm surprised that a man with the background that the Sponsor of this concurrence has would be as strong as he is for this program. It doesn't work and you can ask any of us who spent our life in education...ah...what this type of thing does and doesn't do, and therefore I would encourage a 'no' vote on this concurrence."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor."

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

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the Previous Question. The Question is shall the main Question be put? All those in favor will say 'aye', opposed 'nay', the 'ayes', have it. The Gentleman wish to close?"

Lucco: "Just briefly. I want to emphasize, the money does not come from the General Revenue Fund. It comes from the Capital Development Bond Fund and I want to solicit an 'aye' vote so that you can get going, if we're through."

Bradley: "All right. You've heard the Gentleman's Motion that the House does concur in the Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 233. It needs 107 votes. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Bradley: "Mr. McGrew?"

McGrew: "If I could have a little Order here to my right."

Bradley: "Give the Gentleman some Order."

McGrew: "Mr. Speaker, as the ...as the Chairman of the Higher Education,



Sub-Committee on Educational Television, I simply could not let the remarks of the previous speaker go by unanswered. I think that he is totally ironical...excuse me, let me try that again. I think he is totally wrong and the ironic part of it is that he and himself has been employed in a school district that has tried to use many new innovative procedures. Many took...Many to which could end up saving dollars by using the resources of the Public Television Station. We have had hearings all over this summer, there's no question. There is no question but in the long run it will save it money. Why do you think the State of Mississippi is willing to spend over three million dollars annually in a state with nowhere near the population as Illinois has. I think the value of Educational Television Station has definetly been proven, it can be used in the classroom. It can be used to, for those who are seeking High School Education Degrees that do not have time nor the money to get back to the...ah...High Schools to try to complete that. It can be used for programs that they end up with conferring degrees as major universities as well as the cultural significance of the various programs we're putting on the air. S.I.U...ah...When we toured the campus, has an extremely well equipped studio. They are ready to go on the air. All they need is an antenna and from the remarks of the previous speaker I suggest that he stand like the Statue of Liberty and maybe that would be solved. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would like to refer you to the fact that this Bill was originally introduced as a one million dollar appropriation during our deliberations here in the House. It was cut back to eight hundred and fifty million dollars. Eight hundred and fifty thousand dollars. I support the concept of this Bill, I supported it when it was before us in Higher Education because I feel that it is the necessary ingredient to our Educational T. V. Systems throughout the State to be able to provide this at the Edwardsville Campus. However, I can not approve of suddenly having this Bill before us at the 11th



hour with an increase of Appropriation to one and one-half million dollars. I have no idea where the money, the difference between eight hundred and fifty thousand and one and a half million is going to be spent on this project when back this spring it was determined that only eight hundred and fifty thousand dollars would be needed and so in spite of the fact that I strongly support the concept of building this facility I can not support it now in this form and will vote 'no'."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. On a point of Order again. There are still Members who have been verified off Roll Calls all day long today, who are voting green again. We just got through debating the Rules and passing them. I think we ought to abide by them and they..they're green and I think they should be present."

Bradley: "Have...Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this questin there are 82 'ayes' 41 'nays', 6 voting 'present' the Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Lucco."

Lucco: "I would like for it to be placed on Post-Poned Consideration."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves for it to be placed on Post-Poned Consideration and that's ... so be it."

Lucco: "And I don't want it brought up at 6:00 next time."

Bradley: "All right. Now we have a few things to clean up so...the Gentleman...on the order of Motions, the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd move that H.J.R.C.A. 35 be placed on the Spring Calendar."

Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection we'll so move. The Constitutional Amendment #35 will be placed on the Spring Calendar. Mr. Porter for a Motion. Are there...Mr. Porter do you want to Table that? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly on a Motion."

Kelly: "Yes Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'd like to move for the suspension of Rule 41 (a) to permit House Resolution 566 to by-pass Committee and I would also move for the immediate adoption of this Resolution. This adopt..this particular Resolution calls upon Congress to...ah...urges Congress to reject the composit



price plan on any energy program that does not stimulate domestic energy production and promote energy conservation. As you may know, in Washington, there has presently been a move by the Congressional Energy Conference Committee to adopt the composite price plan to continue controls on crude oil and this would be an...adverse effect it would place upon these domestic oil producers and I might ask for your adopt...favorable adoption."

Bradley: "Mr. Kelly we're checking to see if 41 (a) is the appropriate Rule. Is that the old rule or the new rule?"

Kelly: "Old Rule."

Bradley: "You want to move the appropriate rule to suspend the appropriate rule to move this to...ah...by-pass...by-pass Committee and to immediately consider Resolution 566 and it is 41 (a). This will take 107 votes. The Clerk will take the...The Gentleman has moved and those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. It takes 107 votes. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane on the Gentleman's Motion."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think this is a very complicated...ah...question and, and it's been debated in Congress for a long time and for us to by-pass Committee and ask Congress to do or not do something in this very complicated economic area, I think, is the height of folly and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Bradley: "The Gentleman wishes now to withdraw his motion and we'll put it on assigned...We'll assign it to the Committee on Assignment of Bills. Message from...Messages from the Senate."

Fred Selcke: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House the Senate has refused to concur with the House restoration of items reduced by the Governor in a Bill of the following title. House Bill 2989. Action taken by the Senate, November 21, 1975. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House the Senate has refused to concur with the House in restoration of an item reduced by the Governor in House Bill 2971. Action taken by the Senate, November 21, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform



NOV 21 1975

180.

House the Senate has refused to concur with the House in a Bill of the following title...in Bills of the following title, the veto of the Governor to the contrary notwithstanding. House Bill 342, 751, 2825, ...huh? Okay... ah...Mr. Speaker. I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House. Senate Joint Resolution #59. Resolved by the Senate of the Seventy-ninth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring herein, that when the two Houses adjourn on Friday, November 21, 1975, they stand adjourned until Wednesday, January 14, 1976 at 1:00 P.M. Adopted by the Senate November 21, 1975. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Mr...Mr. Speaker I move that the Senate Resolution be adopted."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the Senate Resolution be adopted. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The motion is adopted. The Resolution is adopted. Agreed Resolutions."

Fred Selcke: "House Resolution 594. Kelly. House Resolution 595. Anderson. House Resolution 596. Anderson. House Resolution 597. Brummet. House Resolution 599..ah... Schoeberlein et al. House Resolution 600. Emil Jones. House Resolution 601. Ralph Dunn. House Resolution 602. McGrew. House Resolution 603. Maragos. House Resolution 604. Tipsword."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich to explain all those Resolutions."

Matijevich: "House Resolution 594 commends and congratulates the 1975 Hillcrest High School Football Team. House Resolution 594 congratulates Coach Younge and his Deer Creek, Mackinaw High School Chiefs. 596 congratulates the LaSalle Peru Cavaliers upon their successful year. House Resolution 597



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

congratulates National Commander Joseph J. Plyer and Third Vice Commander Harold H. Pack, election to their high office in the Catholic War Veterans. 599...ah...commends Helen Copley, Chairman and Chief Executive of the Copley Newspaper for many contributions in Journalism. House Resolution 600 gives our humble thanks to Miss Josephine Eniss for long and continued service to the betterment of Chicago's youth through music. House Resolution 601 congratulates Mrs. Margie Hemphill on the occasion of her retirement from the position of Medical Librarian. House Resolution 602 congratulates theMapleleafs on their successful year. House Resolution 603 commends Mr. Murraray Jolsen for a job well done with the Illinois Commission on Atomic Energy after retirement after 15 years. House Resolution 604 commends the St. Theresa High School for having won the Class Two A State Football Championship today. 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', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolutions are adopted. Further Resolutions."

Fred Selcke: "House Resolution 586, Shea, et al. House Resolution 605, Skinner."

Bradley: "Committee on Assignments. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Is there a Death Resolution there?"

Bradley: "Yes Sir."

Fred Selcke: "House Resolution 589, Tipsword, et al. With respect to the memory of Represen...Ex-Representative George P. Johns."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of the Death Resolution. All those in favor will say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Resolution is adopted. Further Resolutions, Fred? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea, to recess the Regular Session until after the...."

Shea: "I now move that the Regular Session stand in recess until after.



the Third Special Session."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to recess the Regular Session until after the Third Special Session, and at that time then we will adjourn. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Regular Session is in recess. We're now in the First Special Session. Messages from the Senate. Pardon me. Mr. Duff, the Gentleman from Cook."

Duff: "Well, Mr. Speaker, nothing very, I guess, earthshaking, but I was just a little taken aback when we passed over, I thought, rather quickly, the Death Resolution and no offense to the Chair, but I felt that I would like to say something about a dear friend. Ah...who has passed away."

Bradley: "Proceed...proceed Sir. Let's have some Order. I did hit the gavel and I think we should have some Order. In fact, if you wish Mr. Duff, we will ask that the Clerk read the Resolution, I think that will be the proper thing to do."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, I'd appreciate it."

Bradley: "The Clerk will read the Resolution, and the Members will be in their seats please."

Fred Selcke: "House Resolution 589, Tipsword, et al. Whereas the Members of this Body have learned with deep sorrow, the recent passing of Mr. George P. Johns, who was for many years the leading citizen of his community and the state, and a successful businessman, and a former Member of both this House and the Senate. And Whereas Mr. Johns became manager of the Credit Bureau of Decatur in 1959, and subsequently held important posts in the Credit Bureau field including that of the President of the Associated Credit Bureaus of Illinois; President of the Associated Credit Bureaus of America; Chairman of the Board of the Credit Bureau of Decatur, and was named to the Hall of Fame in the Associated Credit Bureau of America in September of this year. And Whereas Mr. Johns' political service over the past thirty years included one term in the Senate to which he was elected in 1956, two single terms in the House of Representatives having been elected in 1962 and 1966; Committeeman for the Sixth Precinct and Treasurer of the Macon County Republican Central



Committee, a post he held from 1950 until his death. And Whereas he was a 32nd Degree Mason, and also active in numerous patriotic, civic and charitable endeavors providing leadership and support to many organizations. Devoted to assisting the less fortunate and to helping the community. And Whereas he leaves the proud heritage to mourn his passing in the persons of his beloved wife Betsy, three sons Peter of Mount Zion, Tom of Lexington, Kentucky, Christopher of Decatur, a brother Paul of Omaha, Nebraska, two sisters Mrs. Clara Lutsa and Sister Blanda Johns, both of Omaha, Nebraska, and two grandchildren, and he will be sincerely missed by his friends and associates throughout the State of Illinois. Therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives, Seventy-Nineth General Assembly, State of Illinois, that we express our deep regret and sorrow upon the death of Mr. George P. Johns. That his life of service to his community and state will be long remembered and serve as an inspiration to others and that we extend our heartfelt sympathy to the family and friends of Mr. George P. Johns in their time of sorrow. And be it further resolved that a suitable copy of this Preamble and Resolution be presented to Mrs. George P. Johns, 156 Oakdale Boulevard, Decatur, Illinois."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Duff."

Duff: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I didn't know that George Johns had passed away until I heard that notice on the Floor. But I think that at a time like that and this, those of us who serve in these Houses know what those kinds of people go through, what we go through. I think it's appropriate that we stop for a minute. Probably a lot of you knew George better than I did, but he said to me, about twelve years ago. 'Brian you can make a friend in politics in twenty minutes that will last a lifetime,' and that was the case with me. Ah...George was a man that loved life very very much. The thing many of us on this side of the aisle will remember that for some twenty or thirty years, George Johns was a man who could always sneak you into the National Convention. He could get you in there, one way



or the other and he did it for me in 1964 at the Cow Palace, and he did it again for me again down in Miami in 1968 and he was that kind of man. A full Republican, a person that loves life and loved his friends. And right now, I hope somebody's sneaking him into the Big Convention, and thank you Mr. Speaker for letting me say a few words about him."

Bradley: "Mr. Duff, we appreciate you calling it to the attention of the Chair that we were moving along to rapidly and not recognizing the...giving the proper attention to this Resolution. The Resolution has been adopted, so we'll go ahead with the Order of Business. We're in the First Special Session. Messages from the Senate."

Jack O'Brien: "Message from the Senate from Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following Preamble and Joint Resolution. The adoption of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to-wit: Senate Joint Resolution #2. Resolve by the Senate of the Seventy-Ninth General Assembly, State of Illinois, the First Special Session thereof. House of Representatives concurring therein, that when the two Houses adjourn on Friday, November 21, 1975, the Senate stands adjourned until Wednesday, January 14, 1976 at 1:30 O'Clock P.M., and the House of Representatives stand adjourned until Wednesday, January 14, 1976 at 1:15 O'Clock P.M.. Adopted by the Senate November 21, 1975, First Special Session. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we adopt the Resolution."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that we adopt the Resolution. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The Resolution is adopted."

Shea: "Now I move Mr. Speaker that the First Special Session of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-Ninth General Assembly stand adjourned."

Bradley: "Now the Gentleman moves that the First Special Session of the Seventy-Ninth General Assembly stands adjourned. All those in



favor will say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The First Special Session is adjourned. Second Special Session. Messages from the Senate."

Jack O'Brien: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the the Senate has adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution, the adoption of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to-wit: Senate Joint Resolution #2. Resolved by the Senate of the Seventy-Ninth General Assembly, State of Illinois, Second Special Session thereof. The House of Representatives concurring therein, that when the two Houses adjourn on Friday, November 21, 1975, the Senate stands adjourned until Wednesday, January 14, 1976 at 2:00 P.M. and the House of Representatives stand adjourned until Wednesday, January 14, 1976 at 1:30 O'Clock P.M.. Adopted by the Senate November 21, 1975, Second Special Session. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook...Pardon...The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, before we adjourn this Mr. Speaker, there's some Rule suspensions or a Rule suspension for, at least, some Bills that are on the Calendar...ah...in the Second Special Session in.... So I would suggest that we don't overlook that."

Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "I move for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor will say 'aye', opposed will say 'no', and the Second Special Session of the Seventy-Ninth ah...I'm sorry."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution."

Bradley: "The Gentleman's moved the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All in favor will say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted."

Shea: "All right now, I would like to suspend the appropriate Rule and use the attendance Roll Call so that those Bills on the Calendar in the Second Special Session can...may remain...may remain on the Calendar."



Bradley: "The Gentleman...you've heard the Gentleman's Motion.

All in favor of the Motion will signify by saying 'aye',
opposed 'no'."

Shea: "Is there objection?"

Bradley: "Is there objection? No objections being heard, the
Gentleman's Motion prevails."

Shea: "All right now, Mr. Speaker. I would move that the Second
Special Session of the House of Representatives of the Seventy-
Ninth General Assembly stand adjourn."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the Second Special Session of the
Seventy-Ninth General Assembly to stand adjourned. All in favor
will say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Adjourned.
Third Special Session. Messages from the Senate. Introduction
of First Reading."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill #8, Schraeder. A Bill for an Act to pro-
vide for the transfer of monies from the Motor Fuel Tax Fund
of the General Revenue Fund. First Reading of the Bill. House
Bill #9, Third Special Session, Schraeder. A Bill for an Act
to provide the transfers of monies from the Motor Fuel Tax Fund."

Bradley: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "The Second is adjourned. Are we in the Third?"

Bradley: "We're in the Third Special Session."

Shea: "I don't think these Bills are for the Third Special Session."

Bradley: "Mr. Schraeder?"

Shea: "Are they? You want them in the Third? I would suggest that
perhaps you'd want to put them in the First...ah...I mean not
the First, but in the Regular Session. You've got them in the
First. Do you wish to..."

Bradley: "He has, I understand, the same."

Shea: "Read the Bills."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill #9, Third Special Session, Schraeder. A
Bill for an Act to provide the transfers of monies from the Motor
Fuel Tax Fund to the Common School Fund, First Reading of the
Bill."

Bradley: "Messages from the Senate."

Jack O'Brien: "A Message from the Senate, by Mr. Wright, Secretary.



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

709. Action taken by the Senate, November 21, 1975, Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate concurred with the House in the adoption of the Governor's Amendment to a Bill of the following title. House Bill 574. House Bill 2204. House Bill 3024.

Concurred in by the Senate November 21, 1975, Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has refused to concur with the House on the passage of an Item Veto in a Bill of the following title. House Bill 1302. Action taken by the Senate, November 21, 1975, Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House."

Bradley: "Mr....The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Shea."

Shea: "Mr. Speaker, I understand that the only reason we are now in Session is to receive Messages with regard to the Vetos from the Senate. Is that correct?"

Bradley: "And Introduction and First Reading of a Constitutional Amendments."

Shea: "All right, so that after the reading of the Messages from the Senate, Introduction and First Readings of Bills or Constitutional Amendments, we will then be adjourned. Is that right Sir?"

Bradley: "Yes Sir, that's the intention of the Chair."

Shea: "All right, thank you."

Bradley: "So...proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Jack O'Brien: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate concurred with the House in the adoption of the Governor's Amendment to a Bill of the following title. House Bill 2058, concurred in the Senate, November 21, 1975, Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate concurred with the House in passage of Bills of the following titles. Amendatory Veto of the Contrary notwithstanding



House Bill 2692, passed by the Senate, November 21, 1975 by Three-fifths Vote. Amendatory Veto of the Governor Contrary notwithstanding, Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate concurred with the House in the passage of of Bills of the following title. The Veto of the Governor Contrary notwithstanding, House Bill 2693, passed by the Senate November 21, 1975 by Three-fifths Vote, the Veto of the Governor Contrary notwithstanding. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate concurred with the House in passage of House Bills of the following titles to-wit: House Bill 766, 767, 3131, 3169, and 3203, passed by the Senate, November 21, 1975 by Three-fifths Vote, Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Bradley: "Introduction, First Reading."

Jack O'Brien: "House Bill 3218, Merlo, Lundy, et al. A Bill for an Act to amend Section of an Act to require payment of interest to lessors or residential real property and security deposits made by lessee's, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3219, Merlo, Lundy, et al. A Bill for an Act to amend Section of an Act to require payment of interest to leasors on real...ah...residential real property on security deposits by the leasees, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3202, Merlo, Lundy, et al. A Bill for an Act to amend Section of an Act requires payment of interest by leasors of residential real property on security deposits made by lessees, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3221, Dan Houlihan, et al. A Bill for an Act authorizing establishment of School Food Service Training Center by amending certain Act in connection therewith, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3222, Grotberg, et al. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act creating the Department of Children and Family Services, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3223, McCourt. A Bill for an Act to regulate the advertising in a gasoline crisis, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3224, Griesheimer, et al. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Motor Fuel Code, First Reading



of the Bill. House Bill 3225, McClain, DiPrima. A Bill for an Act in relation to the Illinois Veterans Home at Quincy, First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3226, Cunningham. A Bill for an Act providing for the full amount of the salary of the Circuit Court Judges and Associate Judges to be paid by the State, First Reading of the Bill."

Bradley: "Introduction of Constitutional Amendments."

Jack O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #37, Giglio. Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Seventy-Ninth General Assembly, the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that there should be submitted to the electors of the State for adoption or rejection...rejection at the General Election next occurring at least six months after the adoption of this Resolution. A proposition to amend Section 2 of Article 4 of the Illinois Constitution to read as follows: 'Article 4 of the Legislature, Section 2, Legislative Composition. A. One Senator shall be elected from each Legislative District immediately following his redistricting, the General Assembly by law shall divide the Legislative Districts as equal as possible into three groups. Senators from one group shall be elected for terms of four years, four years, and two years. Senators from the second group, for terms of four years, two years, and four years, and Senators from a third group, for terms of two years, four years, and four years. The Legislative Districts in each group shall be distributed substantially equal over the state. B. The two Representatives shall be elected from each Legislative District for terms of two years. No political party shall limit its nominees to less than two candidates for Representatives in each Legislative District. In elections for Representatives, including those for nominations, each elector may cast votes for no more than two candidates. The two candidates highest in votes shall be declared elected. C. To be eligible to serve as a Member of the General Assembly, a person must be a United States citizen, at least 21 years old, and for the two years preceding his election or appointment, a resident of the district which he is to represent. In the General Election following



a redistricting, the candidate for the General Assembly may be elected from any district which contains a part of the district in which he resided at the time of redistricting. And re-elected, if a resident of the new district he represents for eighteen months prior to re-elections. D. Within thirty days after a vacancy occurs, it shall be filled by appointment as provided by law. If the vacancy is in a Senatorial office with more than twenty-eight months remaining in the term, the appointed Senator shall serve until the next General Election at which time a Senator shall be elected to serve the remainder of the term. If the vacancy is a Representative's office or in any way, or any other Senatorial office, the appointment shall be for the remainder of the term. An appointee to fill a vacancy shall be a Member of the same political party as the person he succeeds. E. No Member of the General Assembly shall receive compensation as a public officer or employee from any other governmental entity for time during which he is in attendance as a Member of the General Assembly. No Member of the General Assembly during the term for which he was elected or appointed shall be appointed to a public office which shall have been created for the composition for which shall have been increased by the General Assembly during the term, First Reading of the Constitutional Amendment."

Bradley: "Mr. Lechowicz, would you move that we adjourn please?"

Turn Mr. Lechowicz on."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I now move that this House do stand adjourned."

Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House stand adjourned. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The House is adjourned."



HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

INDEX

NOVEMBER 21, 1975

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
1	9:00	Speaker	House to Order
		Rev. Krueger	
		O'Brien	Agreed resolutions
		Giorgi	HR
2		O'Brien	
	9:05	Speaker	Com. on assign.
	9:06	Giorgi	
		Shea	
		Speaker	
3		Shea	
		Speaker	
		Katz	HR 237
4		Speaker (Shea in Chair)	
		Katz	
		Speaker	
5		Katz	Explain rules of HR 237
		Speaker	
		O'Brien	Amend
		Ryan	Request a quorum
		Speaker	
		Friedrich	
		Speaker	
		Katz	
		Speaker	House at ease
6		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker	
		Duester	
		O'Brien	HR 237
	9:36	Kane	HR 237, AM#1

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
7		Shea	
	9:37	Katz	
		Shea	
	9:39	Cunningham	
8		Shea	
		Kane	To close
		Shea	Am. lost
		O'Brien	Am #2
		Shea	
	9:42	Kane	
9		Shea	
		Katz	
		Shea	
	9:43	Hart	
10		Shea	
		Kane	
11		Shea	Am. lost
		Kane	To close
		Leinenweber	Table 41 & 57
		Shea	
		Kane	Am #3
		Shea	
		Katz	
12		Shea	Am lost
	9:52	Kane	Am #4
		Shea	
		Yourell	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
13		Shea	
	9:54	Kane	To close
		Shea	Am lost
		O'Brien	
14		Kane	Am #5
		Speaker	
		Katz	
		Speaker	
		Friedrich	
		Speaker	Vote aye
		Kane	Am #6
15	9:59	Katz	
		Shea	
	10:00	Mugalian	
16		Shea	
		Kane	To close
		Shea	
		Friedrich	
	10:01	Shea	Am lost
		O'Brien	Am #7
		Shea	
		Kane	Move to table
		Shea	Tabled
		O'Brien	Am #8
17		Kane	Move to table
		Shea	Tabled
		O'Brien	Am #9
		Shea	
	10:02	Lundy	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
18		Shea	
	10:08	Katz	
19		Shea	
	10:09	Yourell	
		Shea)	
		Hudson)	Yield
20	10:10	Lundy	
		Friedrich	
	10:12	Shea	
21		Bradley	
		Shea	Recess until after 3rd Special Session
		Bradley	Move attendance roll call be used
	10:14	Shea	
		Bradley	Move 1st Sp. session be recessed till 3
		Shea	2nd Special Session in session
22		Bradley	Move attendance roll call be used
		Shea	
		Bradley	Move 2nd Special session recess
		Shea	
		Bradley	3rd Special Session, att roll call, etc
		Shea	
		Bradley	Move 2nd Sp. session in recess
		Shea	
		Grotberg	Point of personal privilege
23		Bradley	Renews motion
		Shea	Regular session in session
		Cunningham	
		Shea	
		Kosinski	
	10:20	Shea	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
		Lundy	Am #7 (cont)
		Shea	
24		Friedrich	Oppose
		Shea	
	10:21	Lundy	To close
25		Shea	Am fails
		O'Brien	Am #10
		Shea	
	10:26	Lundy	
26		Shea	
	10:29	Katz	
27		Shea	
		Washington	
28		Shea	
	10:32	Greiman	
		Shea	
		Skinner	
29		Shea	
	10:35	Fleck	Move previous question
		Shea	Ayes have it
		Lundy	To close
		Shea	Am 10 adopted
		Fred	Am #11
		Shea	
	10:37	Lundy	Leave to table 11
30		Shea	Tabled
		Fred	
	10:38	Lundy	
		Katz	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
31		Shea	
	10:40	Lundy	To close
		Shea	Amendment adopted
		Fred	Am #13
	10:42	Katz	
		Shea	Amendment adopted
32		Fred	Am #14
		Shea	
	10:42	Berman	
		Shea	
		Katz	
		Shea	
	10:43	Schlickman)	Yield?
33		Berman)	
		Shea	
		Kosinski	
		Shea	
	10:46	Duff	
34		Shea	
	10:47	Berman	To close
		Shea	Motion carries
		Fred	Am #15
		Shea	
	10:49	Berman	
35		Shea	
		Geo-Karis	
		Shea	
	10:50	Hudson)	Yield?

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
36		Berman	
		Shea	
	10:51	Greiman	
		Shea	
	10:52	Duester)	Yield
		Berman)	
		Shea	
		Schlickman	
37		Shea	
	10:54	Berman	
		Shea	Am lost
		Fred	Am #16
		Shea	
	10:55	Mudd	
38		Shea	
	10:57	Geo-Karis	
		Shea	
		Katz	
		Shea	
39	10:59	Mudd	To close
		Shea	Am #16 lost
		Fred	Am #17
		Shea	
40		Downs	
		Shea	
	11:04	Cunningham	
41		Shea	
		Hanahan	
		Shea	
		Simms	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
41		Shea	
		Hanahan	
		Shea	
		Simms	
42		Shea	
	11:08	Berman	
		Shea	
	11:10	Greiman	
		Shea	
	11:12	Walsh	
44		Shea	
		Downs	To close
45		Speaker	Vote fails
		Matijevich	Amend 19
		Speaker	
		Katz	
		Speaker	Vote, adopted
		Fred	Am 20
		Bradley	
46		Speaker	
		Hudson	
		Speaker	
		Katz	
47		Speaker	
		Duester	
		Speaker	
		Washington	
		Speaker	
48		Geo-Karis	
		Bradley	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
49		Speaker	
		Hart	
		Bradley	
50		Speaker	
		Schlickman	
51		Speaker	
		Lundy	
52		Speaker	
		Yourell	Move?
		Speaker	
		Macdonald	
		Speaker	
		Bradley	
53		Speaker	Vote
		Friedrich	
54		Willer	
		Speaker	
		Duester	
		Bradley	
55		Duester	
		Speaker	
		Porter	
56		Speaker	
		Walsh	
		Speaker	
57		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker	
		Fleck	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
58		Speaker	
		Caldwell	Move previous question
		Speaker	Vote
			Poll absentees
		Fred	
		Darrow	Vote aye
		Fred	Continue poll
		Speaker	Vote
			verification of affirmative vote
		Fred	
		Speaker	
59		Houlihan	Aye
		Fred	Continue affirmative roll
		Speaker	
		Kozubowski	Aye
		Speaker	
		Chapman	
		Speaker	
		Stubblefield	NO
60,61		Speaker)	
		Chapman)	
		Speaker	Vote, fails
			House at ease for 5 minutes
62		Walsh	
	12:10	Speaker	House in session
		Fred	HR 237
		Duester	Am 21
63		Speaker	
		Katz	
	12:15	Speaker Lundy	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
64		Speaker	
		Hoffman	
		Speaker	
	12:17	Duester	Close
65		Speaker	Vote, aye
			Roll call, fails
		Jack	Am. 22
		Duester	
		Speaker	
	12:20	Katz	
66		Speaker	
		Duester	To close
		Speaker	Vote, fails
		Jack	Am. 23
		Duester	Table #23
67		Jack	Am. 24
	12:22	Duester	
		Speaker	
		Matijevich	
		Duester	
		Katz	
68		Speaker	
		Greiman	
	12:25	Duester	To close
		Speaker	Vote
			Roll call, fails

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
69		Jack	Amendment 25
		Skinner	Table 37/38
		Speaker	
		Katz	
		Speaker	
		Cunningham	
		Speaker	Vote, aye
		Speaker	Amend 26, table
		Jack	Amend 27
	12:28	Fennessey	Election code
70		Speaker	
		Mahar	
		Fennessey	
		Speaker	Vote, aye
		Jack	Amendment 28
71		Duester	Adjourn at 10:00
		Speaker	
		Katz	
72		Speaker	Vote, fails
			Roll call
	12:35	Geo-Karis	
			Vote fails
		Jack	Amend. 29
		Maragos	
		Hoffman	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
73		Speaker	
		Katz	
		Speaker	
		Porter	
		Speaker	
		Hoffman	Close
		Speaker	Vote
		Matijevich	
74		Speaker	Vote, adopted
		Grotberg	35/61 table
		Jack	Am 30
		Hoffman	
		Speaker	
		Madison	
		Speaker	
	12:40	Katz	
75		Speaker	
		Hoffman	Close
		Speaker	Vote
	12:43	Lundy	
		Speaker	
		Katz	
		Speaker	Vote, fails
76		Jack	Amend. 31
		Skinner	
		Katz	
		Speaker	
		Skinner	Close
		Speaker	Vote - roll call

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
77	12:46	Matijevich	Explain vote
		Speaker	Vote, fails
		Jack	Am. 32
		Skinner	
		Speaker	
		Katz	
		Speaker	
78		Hudson	
		Speaker	
		Skinner	
79		Speaker	
		Friedrich	
		Speaker	
	12:50	Kosinzski	
		Shea	
		Williams	
80		Skinner	
		Shea	
		Matijevich	Move previous question
		Shea	Ayes have it
		Epton	Point of order
		Maragos	
		Shea	
		Skinner	
81		Shea	
		Schlickman	
		Shea	
		Skinner	Poll the absentees
	12:55	Shea	Dump the roll call

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
		Schlickman	
		Shea	Poll the absentees
		O'Brien	
		Shea	Motion fails
		O'Brien	Am #33
		Shea	
82	12:59	Cunningham	
		Shea	
83		Stone	
		Shea	
		Cunningham	
		Shea	
		McPartlin	SB 279
		Speaker	
		McPartlin	Poll the absentees
84		Speaker	Dump the roll call
		Katz	Explain vote
		Speaker	
	1:08	Schlickman	
		Speaker	
		Mudd	
85		Speaker	
	1:10	McPartlin	
		Speaker	
		Getty	
		Speaker	
86		Houlihan, J.M.	
		Speaker	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
87		O'Brien Speaker	Affirmative roll call
	1:27	McPartlin Speaker	Poll absentees
		Houlihan, JM Speaker	Withdraw request
88		Leinenweber Speaker	SB 279 out of record
		Matijevich Speaker	SB 1175
		Matijevich	Question
89	1:32	Leinenweber Speaker	
		Waddell	Question
		Leinenweber Speaker	
	1:33	Collins Speaker	SB 1175, motion fails, not out of record
90	1:35	Campbell	SB 1460
91		Geo-Karis Speaker	
	1:39	Schlickman Speaker	
	1:39	Mann Campbell	Yield
92		Speaker	
	1:42	Matijevich Speaker	
		Campbell	To close
93	1:44	Speaker Campbell O'Brien	Poll the absentees

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
94		Speaker	
		Campbell	Poll the absentees.
		O'Brien	
95,96	1:48	Speaker	SB 1460, motion prevails, out of record
		LaFleur	SB 32
97,98		Speaker	
	1:55	Katz	
99		Speaker	
	2:00	Greisheimer	
		Speaker	
100	2:03	Mulcahey	Yield
101		LaFleur	
102		Speaker	
	2:06	Jones, J.D.	Yield
		LaFleur	
		Speaker	
103	2:07	Houlihan, Dan	Support
104,105		Speaker	
	2:12	Getty	Yield?
		LaFleur	
106		Speaker	
	2:15	Geo-Karis	
107		Speaker	
	2:19	Hudson	
		Geo-Karis	
108		Speaker	
	2:20	Hart	
109		Speaker	
	2:25	Skinner	
110,111,112		LaFleur	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
113		Shea	
	2:32	Matijevich	Move previous question
		Shea	Ayes have it
	2:32	LaFleur	To close
114		Shea	
		LaFleur	
		Shea	
115	2:37	Brinkmeyer	Explain vote
		Shea	
		Sims	
		Shea	
		Grotberg	
116		Stearney	
117	2:42	Washburn	
118		Shea	Motion fails
		Campbell	SB 944
		Speaker	
	2:45	Chapman	
119		Speaker	
		Kempiners	
120		Speaker	
		Mugalian	
		Speaker	
		Mugalian	
121		Speaker	
		Campbell	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
122		Speaker	
	2:53	Davis	
		Speaker	
		Grotberg	Explain vote
123		Speaker	
	2:55	Friedrich	Poll absentees
		Speaker	
		Shea	Explain vote
124		Speaker	
		Madison	
		Speaker	
		O'Brien	Polls absentees
		Speaker	
	3:00	Byers	Requests verification
		Schlickman	Change to aye
		Speaker	
		Anderson	Aye
	3:00	Duester	Change to aye
		O'Brien	Continues affirmative roll call
125		Speaker	
		Madison	
		O'Brien	Continues
		Speaker	
		White	Recorded as yes
		Speaker	
	3:05	O'Brien	Continues
		Byers	Questions affirmative roll call

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
126		Speaker	
		O'Brien	
		DiPrima	How am I recorded?
		Speaker	
127		O'Brien	
		Byers	
128		Speaker	
		Byers	
	3:12	Sevick	SB 37
		Speaker	
		Pierce	
129	3:16	Speaker	Motion prevails, house concurs
	3:17	Campbell	SB 946, Move house concurs
130		Speaker	
	3:18	Cunningham	
		Speaker	
131	3:20	Lundy	
132		Speaker:	
	3:22	Campbell	To close
		Speaker	Motion fails, SB 946 lost
		Shea	House in recess
		Shea	1st Special Session in order
		O'Brien	HB, 1st reading
		Shea	Move 1st Special Session recess
133		Speaker	Regular session
		O'Brien	HB 3148, 2nd reading, no CA, 3rd reading
		Boyle	Move carried over to Jan. calendar
	3:30	Speaker	HB 508
		Boyle	
		Speaker	
		Boyle	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
134		O'Brien	SB 1508, 2nd reading, am #1
	3:31	Boyle	
		Speaker	Am adopted
		Boyle	Move SB 1508, placed on Jan. calendar
		Speaker	
	3:33	Walsh	
		Speaker	
	2:35	O'Brien	Message from Senate
135		Speaker	
	3:35	Maragos	Move to place HJR cons am#32, taken from table and placed on Spring calendar
	3:37	Shea	Attendance roll call used
136		Maragos	Point of order
		Shea	
		Lucco	SB 16, leave to table
		Shea	Leave
		Kosinski	SB 55
137	3:40	Shea	
		Schroeder	
138		Shea	
	3:43	Greiman	
		Speaker	
	3:44	Cunningham	
		Shea	
		Washburn	
139		Shea	
	3:45	Beaupre	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
140		Shea	
		Garmisa	
	3:50	Shea	
		Hudson	Move previous question
		Shea	Ayes have it
	3:50	Kosinski	To close
141		Shea	
	3:51	Geo-Karis	Explain vote
		Shea	
		Sangmeister	
142		Shea	
		Duester	Explain vote
		Shea	
	3:55	Kosinski	To close
143		Shea	Poll absentees
144		O'Brien	
45,146		Shea	Read off vote
147	3:59	O'Brien	Vote adopted
148		Shea	SB 55 becomes law, out of record
		Porter	SB 103, sponsor
149		Shea	
	4:18	Duff	
150		Shea	
		Porter	To close
151		Shea	
	4:23	Walsh	
152		Shea	
	4:25	Porter	Explain vote
		Shea	Gentlemen's motion fails?
		Katz	Rules

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
153		Shea	
	4:28	Tipsword	Yield
		Katz	
		Shea	
154		Matijevich	
		Shea	
		Tipsword	
		Mugalian	
		Shea	
		Katz	
155		Mugalian	
		Shea	
		Ryan	
		Shea	
		Hill	
156		Shea	
		Schuneman	
		Shea	
		Schuneman	
		Katz	
		Shea	Jan 14th adjournment resolution
		Hanahan	
157		Shea	
	4:40	Hoffman, R	
		Shea	
	4:40	Caldwell	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
158		Shea	
	4:40	Friedrich	
		Shea	
		Hanahan	Point of order
	4:41	Shea	
		Duester	
159		Shea	
	4:43	Ewing	Moves previous question
		O'Brien	Reads Katz motion
		Shea	HR 237 as amended be adopted
	4:44	Hanahan	
		Shea	
	4:45	Hoffman, G	
160		Shea	
		Walsh	Question
		Shea	
		Porter	
161		Fred	Reads Katz motion
		Shea	
		Matijevich	Point of order
	4:50	Shea	
		Hanahan	
		Speaker	
162		Matijevich	
		Speaker	
		Katz	
163		Speaker	
		Walsh	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
164		Speaker	
		Bradley	
		Speaker	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker	
		Totten	
165		Speaker	
		Friedrich	
		Speaker	
		Lauer	
		Speaker	
		Shea	
166		Speaker	
		Duff	
		Speaker	
		Washington	
167		Speaker	
		Washturn	
		Speaker	Vote
		Hanahan	Verification of roll
		Fred	Poll absentees
		Speaker	
168		Fred	Affirmative roll
		Speaker	
		Coffey	
		Fred	Continue roll
		Speaker	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
169		Ewing	
		Speaker	
		Lechowicz	
		Spekaer	
		White	
		Speaker	
		Hanahan	
		Speaker	
		Hoffman, R	
		Speaker	
		Willer	
170		Speaker	
		Lucco	
		Speaker	
		Hanahan	
		Speaker	
171		Rayson	
		Speaker	
		Fred	Continue verification of roll
		Speaker	
		Younge	
172		Speaker	
		Fred	
		Jones, E	
173		Speaker	
		Fred	
		Downs	
		Speaker	Vote, adopted
		Fred	Messages from Senate
		Hanahan	Gov. aides off floor
		Speaker	

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
174		Matijevich	
		Speaker	
		Hanahan	
175		Speaker	
		Lucco	Does concur with SA1 & 2 to HB 233
		Speaker	
		Dunn	
		Speaker	
		Hoffman	
176		Speaker	
		Taylor	Move?
		Speaker	Vote, aye
		Downs	
		Speaker	
		McGrew	
177		Speaker	
		Satterwaithe	
178		Speaker	
		Totten	
		Speaker	Vote
		Lucco	Postponed consideration
		Speaker	
		Kane	Motion, com am 35, sp cal
		Speaker	
		Kelly	Susp. HB 41A

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
179		Speaker	Vote
		Kane	Withdraw motion
		O'Brien	Messages from Senage, Adjourn 1-14-76
		Speaker	SR adopted, HR 5,6,7,9
180		Fred	Agreed resolutions
181		Speaker	Adopted
		Fred	HR
182		Speaker	Adopted
			Reg. session recess, 1st Sp session
		Duff	
		Fred	HR 589
183		Speaker	
		Duff	
184		Speaker	Lst
		O'Brien	Messages from Senate
		Shea	Move adopt resolutions
			Adjourn 1st special session
		O'Brien	Messages from Senate, 2nd Special Session
185		Speaker	
		Walsh	
		Shea	Adjourn, resolution for 2nd special session
186		Speaker	3rd special session
		O'Brien	Messages from Senate
		Shea	
187		O'Brien	
		Shea	Move adoption resolution
			3rd special session adjourn, vote aye
		Madigan	
		Speaker	Regular session
		O'Brien	Messages from Senate

<u>PAGE</u>	<u>TIME</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
189,190		O'Brien	HB 3218, 1st reading 3219 3220, 1-2-3 3224 3225 3226
191		O'Brien	Intro const. amend.
		Lechowicz	Move adjourn
		Speaker	House adjourned.