

1.

Doorkeeper Koehler: "Attention, Members of the House of Representatives, the House will convene in fifteen minutes.

All persons not entitled to the House floor please retire to the gallery. Attention, Members of the House, the House will convene in five minutes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis is in the chambers. Krueger on the rail. It's closing fast. House will come to order. Members please be in their seats. Be led in prayer by the Reverend Krueger, the House Chaplain."

Reverend Krueger: "In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost. Amen. O LORD, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen.

Chester A. Pennington observed: 'No amount of good deeds can make us good persons. We must be good before we can do good'. Let us pray. HEAVENLY FATHER, Almighty and Everliving God, the Source of all power and might, we come to Thee this day, guidance and direction in our work as members of this House of Representatives. Cleanse our bodies, minds and wills of all that keeps us from Thee. Open our hearts to receive Thy most gracious gift of love. Empower us with the character of goodness so that all that we may do may exemplify our dependence upon Thee. And, thus strengthened and armed, may we only do that which is for the good of the people of this State of Illinois and well-pleasing to Thee; through Christ our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Consent Calendar, Third Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Consent Calendar, Third Reading, Second Day. Senate Bill 40. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 41. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 42. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 43. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 44. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.



Senate Bill 45. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 46. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 47. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 48. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 49. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 50. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 51. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 53. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 54. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 56. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 57. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 58. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 59. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 60. A Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 142. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to Ejectment Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

Senate 682. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 756. A Bill for an Act to amend the Minimum Wage Law. Third Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 907. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning public utilities. Third Reading of the Bill.



3.

Senate Bill 984. A Bill for an Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act and the Workers' Occupational Disease Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1094. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act to create and establish state agencies for federal surplus property. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Senate Bills, Second Reading. Senate Bills, Second Reading appears Senate Bill 96. Representative Terzich. Terzich."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 96."

Speaker Redmond: "Take...how about through 159? Out of the record. Senate Bill 205, Representative Stanley? Out of the record. Senate Bill 286, McPike, out of the record. Senate Bill 305, McClain...out of the record. Senate Bill 310, Deavers...out of the record. Senate Bill 322, Abramson...out of the record. Senate Bill 346, Ebbesen...out of the record. Senate Bill 433, Brady...out of the record. Senate Bill 550, McPike."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 550, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Air Carriers Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion or floor Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 550, Representative McPike."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPike."

McPike: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, the Senate Sponsor, Senator Wooten, was with me in Committee and we agreed to Amendment #1 that was offered. However, we were...we did not fully understand the implications of the Amendment and after discussing it with the Aeronautics Division we have objected to it and in fact it really destroys the intent of the entire Bill; so we would move to table the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, the Bill would not have gotten out of Committee without this Amendment because it's blatantly



4.

unconstitutional without this Amendment. The Amendment stops a potential court fight between the State of Illinois and the Federal Government by taking out the word 'or interstate'. What the Bill purports to do, with it Constitutionally may not do, is regulate interstate air traffic. Now the suggestion is so absurd to anybody that has taken an elementary course in American Government in high school that I'm amazed that the Director of Aeronautics recently fired by the Governor would have the audacity to make such a suggestion. I, as the Republican Spokesman on this Committee, I would certainly argue strenuously against tabling the Amendment and it, the Bill may be so bad with the Amendment that it ought to be killed."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McPike."

McPike: "We are attempting to regulate those air carriers in Illinois that are presently not regulated. That was the intent of the Bill. We are... we are seeking Legislature approval so that we can move into a court test and determine whether or not the State of Illinois can regulate carriers that operate within the state. That was the entire intent of this Bill. By adopting this Amendment... the Bill becomes worthless and we therefore, strongly oppose the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Maybe we better take this one out of the record until...out of the record. 639. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I call for a quorum, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Didn't recognize you for that purpose. We'll be back to this one, Mr. Skinner. 639."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 639, a Bill for an Act to authorize the Department of Transportation to make and execute agreements to develop order supply storage. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Has the fiscal note been furnished?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No, the fiscal note is not furnished."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 686."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 686, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion or floor Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 686 by Representative Dyer."

Speaker Redmond: "Will you please...don't interfere with the Representative Dyer's movement to the front. Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "That is correct. Committee Amendment #1 had just a... really, a typographical technical error which, Mr. Lee Schwartz very kindly called to my attention. Rather than try and have it amended on its face, I would like to table it, Amendment #1 and present Amendment #2 which makes the correction."

Speaker Redmond: "Question on the Lady's motion to table Amendment #1. Those who favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and motion carries. Any floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Dyer. Amends Senate Bill 686 on page 10, by deleting lines 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "As I indicated, Amendment #2 simply makes the technical correction which is simply to strike 'a' in parenthesis. I move for the passage of Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Question on the Lady's motion for the adoption of Amendment #2. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading."

Dyer: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "689."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 689."

Speaker Redmond: "Has the fiscal note been furnished on this?"



Clerk O'Brien: "No, it has not."

Speaker Redmond: "Take this one out of the record. 693."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 693, a Bill for an Act to permit the issuance of revenue debt bonds by units of local government which are not home rule units. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Agreed Resolutions. Agreed Resolutions. Representative Madigan."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 354, Redmond. House Resolution 355, DiPrima."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is the Resolution which commends Mayor Bilandic upon his election as the Mayor of Chicago, which is sponsored jointly by yourself and Representative Ryan. Mr. Clerk, is that correct?"

Clerk O'Brien: "That's correct."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move for the adoption of that Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Question on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye', oppose 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I request leave that all Members of the House be added as Cosponsors of that Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objections? Hearing none, all Members will be added. Except Skinner. Okay? Representative Skinner. I don't think I declared that the motion carried and the Resolution is adopted. 735. Representative Lechowicz."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill.."

Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of Representative DiPrima's Agreed Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "What was that?"

Lechowicz: "I move the adoption of Representative DiPrima's Agreed Resolution."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Lechowicz: "There were two Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "I thought that we had adopted both of the...
Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 355..."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute, now, we better get back on that
order of business. Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 355, DiPrima."

Speaker Redmond: "Now Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Representative DiPrima honors the Oak Leaves Newspaper
of Oak Park, Illinois and its hundred years of service to
the community in House Resolution 355, and I move the adoption
of the Agreed Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Question on the motion to the adoption to the
Agreed Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'.
The 'ayes' have it, motion carries and the Agreed Resolution
is adopted. Senate Bills, Second Reading. 735."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 735, a Bill for an Act to amend
Sections of the Prosecutor's Advisory Council Act. Second
Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motions or Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment 1, Senate Bill 735
by Representative Kempiners."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners. Representative
Stearney, will you please sit down? Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think Mr. Stearney will
be on his feet again soon. This Amendment was offered in
Committee by Mr. Stearney, I believe, and what it does is
reduce the Executive Director's salary to \$5,000 per year.
The Bill itself, among other things, reduces the salary from
\$42.5 per year down to \$30,000. And I think that the
justification for keeping it at \$30,000 is that, in addition
to the duties which the Executive Director has under the
existing Act, if this Bill is passed he will also have
responsibility for supervising the Appellate Program for



8.

Prosecutors. And along with this jurisdiction will come the supervisory task of assigning work for twenty-one attorneys and thirteen secretaries. And I believe that the \$30,000 salary in here is an adequate salary for this task. And I really wonder if the salary is reduced to \$5,000, which this Amendment does, who in his right mind is going to want this job if this Bill passes. I think it's a bad Amendment and I would urge the adoption of my motion to take it off the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House it's unfortunate that this matter comes up so early in the morning when...when there isn't too many people here. But let me just brief the Members. This here Amendment was adopted in Executive Committee cutting the salary of the Executive Director of the Prosecutor's Advisory Council from \$42,500 down to \$5,000. And, Ladies and Gentlemen, the reason that occurred is because, it was aware to everybody, since last Session that the Executive Director of this Commission does nothing. Mind you, the Director of Transportation earns only \$36,000 a year and supervises over 2,000 employees. It was found that this here Commission, this agency has five employees only, four girls and one administrative assistant. And so the Committee found it was intolerable for this individual to get that sum of money. Now let me just point out in rebuttal to Representative Kempiners. He says that this Director is going to supervise the Prosecutor's Appellate Service. Well, that is not so, because if you read the Bill you would find that there's going to be an appropriation of \$600,000 to finance this new agency that has been financed by ILEC for the last three years. They already have an administrative bureaucratic setup in which the directors are being paid. That agency, the Prosecutor's Appellate Service, has nothing to do with the



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Prosecutor's Advisory Council. And mind you, let me point out, that last Session it was discovered that these same individuals, the prosecutors, were the first to abuse the law. They exceeded the state guidelines on what you could charge for hotel expenses while in Chicago. The hotel expenses were \$17 a day. These individuals, including the Executive Director, were charging the state for \$35 to \$40 a day. They were in violation of the law but no one there got prosecuted. And they have the audacity to say to us that they want \$288,000. And it's been pointed out that they have done nothing. They have merely traveled around the country, charged off big bills, hustled the taxpayers. It's been the biggest rip-off agency we have. And the Executive Committee found that this is the only way to handle it, the only way to get rid of a bureaucracy is cut the salary of the Executive Director and the Executive Committee did that and I ask that the Amendment stay on there. And it's the only way we're going to cut down and pare expenses. And let me say to you, the Prosecutor's Appellate Service will continue to live. They got \$600,000 going in there. This is a \$288,000 separate appropriation. And I say the only way we're going to get rid of this, and at least restore a bit of sanity to government, is start cutting the salaries of directors that do nothing, have never accomplished anything except to rip-off the taxpayers. And I ask you to support me in this because it will be the first time we've ever done anything to cut a bureaucracy down. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan. There'll be no demonstrations on the floor or in the gallery. Doorkeepers will enforce the order. Representative Dan Houlihan.

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of Representative Kempiner's motion to table Representative Stearney's Amendment. I think Representative Stearney has made his point but the abuses



10.

that he seeks to criticize are already addressed in the Bill itself without the Amendment. There has been a reduction for the salary of the Executive Director of this Commission in the Bill as drafted from \$42,5000, I believe the salary was, down to \$30,000. What the Amendment will do would be to reduce that salary down to a level of \$5,000 and frankly it's not responsible at all. If you don't like the Prosecutor's Advisory Council, then vote the Bill down. But the fact is that to set up this kind of a council which has the duties and the responsibilities which are delegated to it under law, to have an Executive Director you cannot simply pay him at a level of \$5,000. It is not responsible and I ask you to join with me and Representative Kempiners in moving to table this Amendment.



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Yes, I would like to ask a question of the Sponsor of the Amendment. I believe that's Representative Stearney. Would he yield for a question? Representative Stearney mentioned, I believe, that four girls are hired by this office. I wonder if he'd tell us how many boys are hired by this office and do we assume that this is run by children?"

Stearney: "Well, I'll tell you, Representative. There are, I believe, four girls there and there's one boy, but he's the administrative assistant over the girls. And he makes something like eighteen thousand a year and then the Executive Director has been getting forty-two thousand, five hundred. The same salary as the State's Attorneys in any county over a hundred thousand throughout this state for supervising a mere five employees."

Dyer: "Mr. Stearney, I'm interested in ages. I'm concerned about our breaking the child labor laws. Are all of these employees at least age sixteen or over?"

Stearney: "Well, Representative, I presume so."

Dyer: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, one fact has been left out of this debate and that is that under Representative Stearney's Amendment, the Gentleman in question would be allowed to practice law. And it seems to me that we'll probably get another double dipper out of it if we pass this Amendment. Whereas if we don't, we'll probably end up with a single dipper. And for thirty thousand dollars, you can probably get a Master's Degree person from the University of Chicago who should be fully competent to manage five people or four people. And under the Bill as it exists, the gentleman would be guaranteed thirty thousand dollars and also be able to practice law. Now it seems to me that there's no reason we should put a thirty thousand dollar guarantee into someone's base salary and allow them to practice law on the side. For thirty thousand dollars, we should be getting a full-time person and that is not the case. If the Sponsor of the Bill really wants this to be a part-timer, I think we should give the Gentleman incentive to do



some part-time work."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is an opportunity to do the taxpayers a favor. This Prosecutor's Advisory Council wastes \$40,000 a year on a director, or \$42,000 a year. Now you ask yourself, we're getting paid \$20,000 a year. We have to work all the time back in our districts, we have to come down here and work twelve and fourteen hours a day. This fellow's getting forty-two or forty-four thousand dollars, whatever it is, for nothing, almost nothing, for advising the State's Attorneys of the downstate counties on a procedure to sue their county boards. Now this ought to be interesting for the people from downstate. He sent a newsletter out telling the State's Attorneys how they could go about suing their own County Boards to get more funds. Now this is the kind of nonsense and the kind of garbage that we don't need. If we haven't got money for mental health and we haven't got enough money for full funding of education, we don't have enough money to waste on this kind of an operation. It's a total waste of time and a total waste of money."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff."

Huff: "Thank...thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support this Amendment. In my opinion the Prosecutor's Advisory Council, I'm sure, has the title...of the feeling that everyone is equal but I get the feeling that they feel that some are more equal than others. Therefore, I support this Amendment so there will be a lesson in humility if not mercy."

Speaker Redmond: "Ready for the questions? Representative Kempiners to close."

Kempiners: "I think there's some inaccuracies that have been stated here. If the Sponsor of this Amendment would read the Bill he'd find out that we're giving substantial duties. We are transferring the total Appellate Prosecutor's duties from the State's Attorneys Association to this Appellate Program within the Illinois Prosecutor's Advisory Council. The job is worth \$30,000 a year. We are reducing it in this Bill from \$42.5 to \$30,000 per year. The person who presently supervises five individuals will be supervising those five plus an additional thirty-four people. And I think that some of the statements



here have been a little irresponsible and I would urge your support for this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Mr. Speaker, can you advise the House how we're to vote on this matter? What a 'yes' vote would mean?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners has moved that Amendment #1 be tabled. And a 'yes' vote would be in support of Representative Kempiners motion to table Amendment #1...."

Stearney: "And a 'no' vote would be...."

Speaker Redmond: "...A 'no' vote would be against it and retain the Amendment."

Stearney: "A 'no' vote would be in favor of my position to...."

Speaker Redmond: "That's correct."

Stearney: "...The Amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion to table Amendment #1. Those in favor say 'aye', let's have a....those in favor say 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. Roll Call for attendance. Are all 'present' who wish? Okay, take the record on this one. Have you taken the record, Mr. Clerk? Question's on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor of the motion to table Amendment #1 vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's so...so rare that I can support Ron Stearney's position on anything that I just have to get up and tell everybody about it. I think he's got a terrific idea here in that this motion....if this Amendment does happen to get taken off, I plan to vote to kill the whole Bill outright. I think this is terrific. Maybe we should do both."

Speaker Redmond: "...All voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 38...39 'aye' and 61 'no' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2 failed in Committee. Floor Amendment #3. Stearney. Amends Senate Bill 735 on page 4 by inserting immediately after line 31 the following and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe that's the Amendment that would locate the principal office of the Prosecutor's Advisory Council in Cairo, Illinois. Am I right, Mr. Clerk?"



Clerk O'Brien: "Section 9. Principal office, principal office for the Illinois Prosecutor's Advisory Council shall be in Cicero, Illinois."

Stearney: "I move to table that Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Cairo, Illinois."

Speaker Redmond: "Has that been..."

Stearney: "There's one other Amendment. There's one other Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "That Amendment #3. Was that Amendment #3, Mr. Clerk?"

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I object to the..."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute. Wait a minute. That was Floor Amendment #3. Has that ever been offered and voted upon, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No. it's..."

Speaker Redmond: "And who was the Sponsor of the Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Stearney..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney withdraws the Amendment. Are there any...well, I don't...I think you're out of order. He can withdraw his own Amendment. He doesn't have to present his Amendment if he doesn't desire, it's his Amendment. Any further...no, that's Floor Amendment by Mr. Stearney. Now if you want to get the Amendment and put Ryan on it then that's a different matter. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4. Stearney. Amends Senate Bill 735 on page 4 by inserting immediately after line 31, the following."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask your careful consideration of this Amendment. I think it's the most important Amendment that has been brought forth in the House in the entire Session because it's going to demonstrate once and for all that we are able to rid ourselves of a bureaucracy that has existed for no reason..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative..."

Stearney: "...This Amendment would locate the principal office of the..."

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

Stearney: "Prosecutor's Advisory Council..."

Speaker Redmond: "Dan Houlihan, for what purpose do you arise?"

Houlihan, D: "Is the Amendment printed and distributed?"

Stearney: "Yes."



Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Page, do...has the Amendment...."

Houlihan, D: "...Does the Amendment...."

Speaker Redmond: "No, it has not."

Stearney: "What hasn't?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Amendment has not been printed and distributed."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I filed this Amendment last week. No, I filed this Amendment last week now there's no reason that it hasn't been distributed on that side, I've seen it over here."

Speaker Redmond: "Let me see it over there."

Stearney: "I don't have it right now but I know it by memory what it is.

Mr. Speaker, you know this....when I...I filed it a week ago."

Speaker Redmond: "Where did you file it?"

Stearney: "With the...with the Gentleman sitting next to the Clerk. Yes,

Mr. Speaker, I...."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, that's the wrong place. That's the wrong place."

Houlihan, D: "Mr. Speaker, may we have the Amendment ruled out of order?"

Stearney: "Well, no, Mr. Speaker, it's been filed as of last week."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we can't...we can't consider an Amendment that has not been printed and circulated."

Stearney: "Wait one moment. This here Amendment is of very crucial importance to me, Mr. Speaker, and I...and I don't want this Bill to move ahead just because someone has made an error somewhere along the line. I filed it. I don't think this Bill should move without a hearing on this Amendment. This Amendment would locate the principal office in Angelo's Towhead, Illinois."

Houlihan, D: "Mr. Speaker, I object. The Amendment is not printed and distributed. The Amendment is out of order and we'd like a ruling."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, until it's been printed and distributed we can't consider the adoption of the Amendment, no question about that."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, what I'm asking is that this Bill not move to Third Reading. I filed it last week. Now, if it's been filed last week, it...."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, when was the Amendment filed? The Assistant Clerk advises that it was filed last week and that...and if that be true it would seem inappropriate to me to move it to Third Reading when it obviously is some breakdown on the Republican side of the



Republican side of the Clerk's Office."

Stearney: "Mea culpa. Mea culpa. Mea culpa. But I would appreciate holding it on Third...on Second Reading, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave of the House to consider this Amendment without its being distributed, if it has indeed not been distributed. I have no desire to keep this Bill on Second Reading forever."

Houlihan, D: "I withdraw my objection, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Will you read the Amendment? Representative James Houlihan."

Houlihan, J: "Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Houlihan, J: "Are you going to read the Amendment first, I think?"

Speaker Redmond: "Read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4 amends Senate Bill 735 on page 4 by inserting immediately after line 31 the following, 'Section 9, Principal Office. The principal office of the Illinois Prosecutor's Advisory Council shall be on Angelo Towhead, Illinois, striking, 'by the Council'."

Houlihan, J: "Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Yes."

Houlihan, J: "This...this agency has clearly demonstrated its lack of respect for the legislative process. This agency has been killed time and time again and yet it has been brought back to life by those individuals who have no respect for law and order. And I...I'm just curious as to how you're proposing that this bureaucracy, which seems to have more lives than your clients have appeals, this agency seems to have unfounded resources that every time we kill it and we take a vote on the floor of the House it pops up in some other place in the Omnibus Bill, in another Bill. And is there any way that you can assure me that this Amendment is going to do away with the bureaucracy of this agency?"

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Houlihan and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe this Amendment will answer that very problem because Angelo Towhead is an island in the Mississippi River just off of Cairo, Illinois. And I have been assured and guaranteed by Representative

Dick Hart who represents that district, that this island will flood once a year and we can rest assured that the wind and waves and the water will wash away this bureaucracy that costs us \$288,000 a year. And I'm going to say this, we, by this Amendment, we are going to demonstrate to the people of Illinois that we are defying the laws of nature, like defying Newton's law of gravity, Copernicus' law that the earth revolves around the sun, because there is a law, a natural law, that once you create a bureaucracy, a bureaucrat, you can never eliminate it. But by this Amendment we will drown them, we will rid the state of them. Adopt this Amendment and we're going to defy the laws of nature. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Sponsor, you've been going on to great detail about the floods and so forth, would you kindly tell me what your Amendment does?"

Stearney: "Well, the Amendment locates the principal office of the Prosecutor's Advisory Council on Angelo's Towhead which is the island in the Mississippi River south of Cairo and that as I have told you, Representative Dick Hart has assured me it floods once a year without fail."

Geo-Karis: "Are you moving the...the seat of operations, is that correct?"

Stearney: "Hopefully. Hopefully."

Geo-Karis: "What did you call that island?"

Stearney: "Angelo's Towhead."

Geo-Karis: "What is it? A bar?"

Stearney: "Well, it's a small island."

Geo-Karis: "Do you have an interest in that island?"

Stearney: "Representative Dick Hart can answer that...."

Geo-Karis: "Is there any conflict of interest there? I'm beginning to think there's a conflict of interest in this place, Angelo's Towhead. What does she look like?"

Stearney: "Representative Hart can answer that one."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, I...oh, Representative Hart."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart. Who wants the gavel out there?"

Hart: "There are no bars on Angelo's Towhead and the pronunciation of the town which it is south of is 'Cay-ro'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've been assured that an Environmental Impact Statement has been filed on this, this is washed away in the Mississippi River, there will be no adverse environmental effects."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "Question, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Stearney to close."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've ...we've heard the reasons for moving this principal office to this island and we know that this agency is a do-nothing agency, it's merely a rip-off of the middle-class taxpayer in this state by causing us to expend something over \$288,000 a year. But prior to last year's cutting of the budget it was over \$360,000. So I think it's appropriate that we eliminate it once and for all, all together and...and demonstrate to the public that we can eliminate a bureaucratic agency. We're going to defy the laws of nature by this Amendment but nevertheless we're going to demonstrate that it can be accomplished. I ask for a favorable Roll Call on this particular Amendment. And I'm serious, too, about it."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #4. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 54 'aye' and 52 'no'. Gentleman's motion prevails and the Amendment #4 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading, I think. 762. It's not on the Calendar, but it should be...It was returned yesterday from the order third to second and then moved back again. Representative Ebbesen."



Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First of all I have to...I would like leave of the House to table Committee Amendment #1, which was my own Amendment which will be encompassed in Amendment #2 that I'm going to present. Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave of the House to table Committee Amendment #1 which is encompassed in Amendment #2 that I'll present."

Speaker Redmond: "Would you read Amendment #1, Mr. Clerk. It's a Committee Amendment?"

Ebbesen: "Yes."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1. This has been adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, I know that. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee. Is there any motion with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motion filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, are there any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen, what did you desire?"

Ebbesen: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to....leave of the House to table Amendment #1 and Amendment #1 will be included in Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to table #1 to Senate Bill 762? Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Ebbesen. Amends Senate Bill 762 on page 1, line 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Amendment #2 which does include the basic thrust of Amendment #1 is at the request of the Committee in working with the Department of Registration and Education and this Amendment is, has the...is the end result of myself and the Department of Registration and Education working together at the request of the Committee and"



I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Ebbesen: "Yes."

Waddell: "Would you mind telling us what the Amendment actually does and what the difference is between Amendment #1 and Amendment #2?"

Ebbesen: "Well, yes the Bill itself addresses itself to the examining...and now as proposed by the Amendment, the examining and disciplinary of Board of the optometric profession and it's a situation where the Board of Examiners are appointed and they are just on there til someone decides that they should be reappointed. This Bill now gives them five year terms, no more than there two consecutive five year term and also that the...you know last Session we had the continuing education law for optometry and the penalty for not following through with this involves the possibility of revocation of the license and the Amendment #2 will include an increase in the fees to be paid by optometrists for renewing their license to take care of the added cost to implement the continuing education."

Waddell: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "A question of the speaker if he will yield? Or the Sponsor of the Bill, excuse me. Is the effect of this Amendment to delete the Disiplinary Board which was provided for in the Bill?"

Ebbesen: "Yes. The Examining Committee and the Disciplinary Board are now one and the same and work out of the same pattern. The idea with having the Disciplinary Board is that the Department would then based on the continuing education which they are now developing the program for the rules and regulations which will control that, they just have a new title. Examining and Disiplinary Board."

Houlihan: "Well, do you delete those certain powers that the



Disciplinary Board was given under the Bill? Specifically the power of expulsion and...."

Ebbesen: "Well that is in the law already, that the Department of Registration and Education can already do this."

Houlihan: "Is a second part of your Amendment then, I'm wondering if this is correct. What the rationale of it is, you provided in Amendment #1, which you tabled, that all ordinary and contingent expenses incurred..."

Ebbesen: "That's no longer in the Bill."

Houlihan: "And what is the reason for that?"

Ebbesen: "What's the reason for what?"

Houlihan: "What's the reason for deleting it?"

Ebbesen: "Well the increased fees, of course, as far as all the way through on page 3, of Amendment #2...is that the additional money is definitely going to be used for that because its going to cost them x number of dollars to implement the continuing Education Act which was put on the books in the 79th General Assembly."

Houlihan: "But you don't specify any increased fees in Amendment #2, what those fees are going to be used for and you did in Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further?"

Ebbesen: "I just answered your question, I thought, Representative."

Houlihan: "I have nothing further."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any further questions? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #2. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 862. Request has been filed for a fiscal note. Has the fiscal note been furnished?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Fiscal note is not furnished."

Speaker Redmond: "878."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 878, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to the furnishing of insurance and retirement benefi



for officers, employees of local government units. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Terzich."

Speaker Redmond; "Is that the right number up there? It's 878 not 78, Representative Terzich."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amends Senate Bill 878 on page 1, line 31 and so forth."

Terzich: "Yes; Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What this does, is amends the Bill rather than having a contribution rate of 100%, it limits you at 30% and I would move its adoption. Mr. Speaker, I understand from Lee Schwartz that the Amendment does have an error in it and therefore, I would move that we withdraw or hold this Bill on Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Question? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for adoption of Amendment #1."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, I've been informed that there is a technical error in the Amendment and I would...."

Speaker Redmond: "Withdraw the Amendment?"

Terzich: "Yes, thank you."



Speaker Redmond: "Leave it on Second? 881. Fiscal note has not yet been furnished. 917."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 917. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning public utilities. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2 and 4... this Bill has been read a second time previously and Amendments 1, 2 and 4 were adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments? Any motions or Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, D.L. Houlihan. Amends Senate Bill 917 as amended by deleting Section 7A and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan."

D. Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 917 would delete the funds from going to General Revenue. They would stay... they would be available for reduction of the utility rates. That's the rationale of the Amendment and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, as Sponsor of the Bill, I would speak strongly against this Amendment. This money that is paid by the public utilities is not spent by the Illinois Commerce Commission and the Institution for Environmental Quality, goes back to the utilities. Now in this year where we're looking for every dime to be able to increase state aid to education, it seems to me totally logical and consistent to change the law as we, as this House previously has done in House Bill 34 sponsored by Representative Cunningham and have that excess money that is not needed to finance the Illinois Commerce Commission go to the state's General Fund. For that reason, I would ask the defeat of this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, I must also reluctantly rise to oppose this Amendment. The existing situation is that any monies that are unspent from the Public Utilities Fund, go back to the utilities. If a utility passed those savings on to the consumer, I would have no objection to this Amendment at all. Unfortunately, that is not the case. Money is not passed through. And the result is, under the existing situation, that money simply goes to the utility."



It does not in any way, shape or form in terms of the accounting that is used by the utilities benefit the customers. The Bill itself, 917, eliminates the ceiling, the \$... five million dollar spending ceiling on the Illinois Commerce Commission in terms of the amount of money from the Public Utility Fund that could be spent each year. Over a two-year period, approximately ten to twelve million dollars is collected in that fund. With the amount that has been appropriated, and is likely to be appropriated next year, virtually the entire amount of this twelve million dollars of the two-year period will be spent. So we're talking about much less than a million dollars. And I think that that money belongs in the General Revenue Fund. If it were going to benefit the consumer, I would have no objection to the Amendment; but it does not."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that there is providential force that looks over the un- wary and the unfortunate. In this instance, that providential force was Representative Levin. I'm grateful that he saw that House Bill 34 got caught in the starting gates in the Senate and never reached the completion that it might aid the people of Illinois. If you'll look back in the records, you'll see that H.B. 34 was adopted overwhelmingly in this House with only six dis- senting votes. It does precisely what the Amendment that was at- tached here by what Representative Levin seeks to do. It transfers the public funds at the end of the year at the discretion of the Governor into the General Revenue Fund. It is absolutely un- thinkable that it would be eliminated at this point. It's tongue in cheek for the Sponsor of this motion to say that somehow it helps the consumer, that the rates would be reflective. It does just the opposite. As pointed out here by Representative Skinner, if you do not put this money in the General Revenue Fund, it goes to the big, bad public utilities. This is an opportunity to strike a helpful, decisive lick on behalf of the General Revenue Fund and it hurts not a single one of your constituents. I urge you to overwhelmingly reject this motion to delete progressive legislation



designed for the benefit of every one of your constituents.

Vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Dan Houlihan."

D. Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In closing, I would simply point out that I feel that the objection to the Amendment is ill-founded. as far as mandating that this be returned not only to the utilities but back to the consumer. This is really what we have the Commerce Commission for. If the effect of the Amendment would be to provide there will be a rate reduction where there is excess, then this will benefit all of the people of this state. It is a tax-relief Amendment, in effect; and I ask for your support."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #5. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 48 'aye' and 82 'no'. And the Gentleman's motion fails.. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Has the fiscal note been furnished?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Fiscal note is not filed."

Speaker Redmond: "It'll have to stay on the Order of Second Reading. 963."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 963."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. 1023. Well, I didn't want to take that one yet. 1023."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1023. A Bill for an Act in relation to the Electronic Funds Transfer System Study Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion or floor Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1023 by Representative Telcser."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Amendment #1 to 1023 as I understand gave a couple extra public appointments to the Majority Leader in the... the Majority Party in both the House and the Senate. I talked with the House Sponsor about this question.



Is that right, Ralph am I right? I move to table Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1023 so I could also table Amendment #2. I also want to point out to the Members that it was just brought to my attention, just a moment ago that Amendment #2 which I will offer also includes another provision which is apparently a problem which I was unaware of. It seems that some Members who serve on this Commission want to put into the existing Act, into Senate Bill 1023 the assurance that they would remain on the Commission and remain officers. I was not aware of this until my staff aid just told me that a moment ago. That will be another issue apparently in Amendment #2. But for now, I'm tabling...moving to table Amendment #1. My principal concern in this matter was that both the Majority and Minority Party had equal number of appointments. I did not realize I was becoming involved in another issue...a calateral issue, but I am and that's where I'll stay."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I do agree that we table Amendment #1. Is that right, Art? And we're going to put on Amendment #2 that you and I had?"

Telcser: "Right."

Speaker Redmond: "If you have no objection of the motion to table. The question is on the Gentleman's motion to table Amendment #1. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carried. Amendment #1 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Telcser. Amends Senate Bill 1023 in the Senate on page 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1023, by the way this Bill deals with Electronic Fund Transfer System Study Commission. Says there will be four Members from the House, two each appointed by the Speaker and the Minority Leader, four Members of the Senate, two each



appointed by the President and Minority Leader and eight public members. Two each appointed by each of the four Leaders, specify that each leader will appoint from the public at least one individual engaged in the field of banking and financial institutions. In other words at least four of the public members shall be from the field of banking and financial institutions, the other four could be public members. The Amendment would also delete the language which specifically states that the existing members of the Commission shall be reappointed. That is Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #2. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion carried and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments? Adopted two, correct. Tabled #1, adopted #2."

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1068."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1068, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act concerning conveyances. Second Reading of the Bill, no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor? The older Walsh brother's on the floor. Former Representative, now Senator, Walsh...the older of the two. Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, on Senate Bill 1068, Representative Leinenweber has agreed to an Amendment, which is still being prepared and I would ask that we would hold this bill on..."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 1092."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1092, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Weight and Measurements Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any floor Amendments? Representative Daniels?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #1 by Representative Dan Houlihan."

Speaker Redmond: "Dan Houlihan, the motion to table."



Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, the motion to table Amendment #1 is to delete the home rule unit. All right, Amendment #1, excuse me motion to table Amendment #1 is to change the home rule unit provision and then with Amendment #2 which is to be filed next, it would be to delete the home rule unit provision. The Bill is inapplicable to home rule unit and the consequence is unnecessary and I don't think the Sponsor opposes this motion to table Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels, is he putting words in your mouth?"

Daniels: "He always does and I usually agree with him."

Speaker Redmond: "What's your feeling on this motion?"

Daniels: "I'll go along with it."

Speaker Redmond: "The question on the Gentleman's motion to table Amendment #1. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries. Amendment #1 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Dan Houlihan. Amends Senate Bill 1092 on page 3, by deleting lines 17 and 18."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, now Amendment #2 would delete the Home-rule unit provision language. It's unnecessary because the Bill is inapplicable to home rule units. And I would ask for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for adoption of Amendment #2. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries. Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1142. The Calendar is in error, the Sponsor of this Bill is Representative Lucco."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1142, a Bill for an Act to create the Division of Energy. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any motion with respect to Amendment



#1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motion filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Better take it out of the record because Representative Lucco isn't here. 1149."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1149, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motion or floor Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed. Floor Amendment #2, Collins, Yourell. Amends Senate Bill 1149 on page one."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 to House... Senate Bill 1149 would put the Bill in exactly the same shape as House Bill 1978 which this House passed out of here by an overwhelming margin and I would solicit the support of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for adoption of the Amendment #2 to Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, I just want to remind you this is the Bill that I was concerned about. This is the consolidation of elections. This is the Amendment. It's another vehicle that already has flown out of this House without too much consideration and it will just...we hope that the Governor will have two Bills to veto instead of one."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Would the Gentleman yield for a question? Would you explain to me the differences between the House version of consolidation elections and this one? Without your Amendment."

Collins: "In the Senate version there would be two more elections than there are in the House version."

Bluthardt: "What are those two elections?"



Collins: "They add a pair of elections, one primary and one general election in the fall. This is to accommodate the Commission counties."

Bluthardt: "This is what?"

Collins: "To accommodate the Commission counties."

Bluthardt: "There would be a separate election for Commission counties?"

Collins: "Yes, under the Bill unamended. The Amendment would take that out."

Bluthardt: "Are there any other significant changes differences between the two Bills?"

Collins: "There is a different spring schedule too, school elections would be in the spring. So this would really run contrary to what we're trying to do. You would have three elections within two months."

Bluthardt: "What other elections would be held in conjunction or at the same time as school elections?"

Collins: "As amended or unamended?"

Bluthardt: "In its present form."

Collins: "It's the same as the amended from, its just at a different time."

Bluthardt: "Well what are the times? The point is I want know what elections are being held on the same day that school elections are? Cause I want to indicate that there is some politics here..."

Collins: "Other, elections that do not run on partisan label such as park districts, junior colleges, etc."

Bluthardt: "Now under this Bill, would it also be true that any referendum of school districts, park districts, special districts would have to be held on the same day?"

Collins: "As it is now, I believe that's true. As amended the referendum could be held at any one of the five elections over the two year period."

Bluthardt: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the Sponsor's a bit confused with not only this Bill, but with the previous Bill



we sent over to the Senate. I don't deny that I'm confused and I have served on that Commission for a number of years and I'm not satisfied, while I support consolidation of elections, I don't think that either Bill that we have had before us answers the question or solves the problem of consolidation of elections. Both Bills in my opinion go much too far. The Senate Bill perhaps not quite as bad as the House Bill. I would suggest you reject this Amendment because in that way, at least, you will give the Governor, if this Bill passes on Third Reading an option as to what would be the better of the two Bills and I would hope he would veto both because, in my opinion, they're both unworkable. There's no way in the world that you're going to be able to have consolidation of elections with overlapping precinct districts. We're going to go to the computer and try to work it out like we did reapportionment. You know what a mess that was and it's just going to create one heck of a confusion and I would ask that you defeat this Amendment and also defeat the Bill when it comes up on Third Reading."

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

Collin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The last speaker referred to confusion around this Bill and unfortunately I think that is what he and some of the other opponents of this Bill are trying to create in the minds of the Membership. The main thrust of this Bill, as amended, will be to take confusion out of the minds of the voter. He will know where he votes, he'll vote in the same place every time he goes to the polling place. He won't be going to the polling place every other week as it sometimes the case now. This Bill will not only alleviate the cost, the tremendous cost of elections by probably millions of dollars but will...to the convenience of the voter. There will be no confusion left, though he will be able to vote at five



specific times over a two year period. This is something that is long overdue. The only confusion is being created by one organized group and its attempt to kill this Bill, but this is a Bill that the people of the State of Illinois have expected for many many years and to which they have and are long overdue and deserving. This Bill will alleviate cost, millions of dollars by most estimates, but most importantly it will encourage voter participation because the voter will not only will be able to vote conveniently, he will know when and where to vote. The House has already spoken on this matter. House Bill 1978 came out of here by an overwhelming margin and I would solicit the support of this Amendment so that we may put this Bill in the same shape and assure the lawyers of the State of Illinois in 1978 and thereafter will have the convenient and economical way of voting. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "The question on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #2. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no': Representative Bluthardt request a Roll Call. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Conti."

Conti: "The most important thing that I'd like to call to everybody attention to, is that its going to...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins, its been called to my attention that....to the fact you spoke in debate, so therefore, you're not entitled....for the first time Representative Collins is right. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 68 'ayes' and 48 'no' and the motion prevails and the Amendment is adopted. Any furhter Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. 1177. Representative Lynn Martin. 1177."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1177, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1



was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any motions or floor Amendments with respect to Senate Bill 1177. Representative Martin. Lynn Martin."

Clerk O'Brien: "There are no motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Martin. Lynn Martin."

Martin: "Could we keep it on Second Reading? The Amendment is not ready."

Speaker Redmond: "We'll leave it on Second Reading. 1203. Out of the record. 1281. G.L. Hoffman. Is Representative Gene Hoffman on the floor? Out of the record. 1308. Representative Campbell, do you want that one called? 1308. Out of the record. 1358."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1358, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "1358. Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, I would like leave of the House to table Committee Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1358."

Speaker Redmond: "Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee. Representative Mudd has moved that we table Amendment #1, those in favor say 'aye'. Representative Kane."

Kane: "Would Representative Mudd inform us as to what the Amendment is?"

Mudd: "Amendment #1 was an Amendment that we put on in Committee, Representative Kane, to resolve a problem with that we had with appointments on County Board vacancies. It was technically incorrect and I have an Amendment #3 which is offered on the floor which will place back the language, but clear up the technical problem we had with Amendment #1."

Kane: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion to table Amendment #1. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and motion carries. Amendment #1 is tabled. Is there a motion with respect to Amendment #2? Are there any Amendments from the floor?"



Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Mudd. Amends Senate Bill 1358 on page 1, lines 1 through 3 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Amendment #3 is the same Amendment adopted in Committee with the exception that it takes care of the technical problems that we had in the Amendment and its...technically it's the same but it takes care of some problems we had in the language and I move...in the drafting of it...and I would move that Amendment #3 be adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion? Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Could the Gentleman explain the Amendment again?"

Mudd: "Yeab...Amendment #3 provides that when a vacancy occurs, that the appointment will be made by the County Board Chairman with the concurrence of the County Board. And it will be from the same party as the vacancy occurs."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "No. No problem in your area, sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McBroom?"

McBroom: "Would Representative Mudd yield for a quick question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

McBroom: "Representative Mudd, did you say that the County Board Chairman makes the appointment from the same political party? He has the responsibility for it?"

Mudd: "He makes the...no the vacancy, whatever party the vacancy occurs in, the County Board Chairman makes the appointment from someone from that party with the advice and consent of the County Board."

McBroom: "He in effect is the catalyst that makes, he doesn't make the appointment then, is that why you're saying?"

Mudd: "Yes, Sir."

McBroom: "It would be rather sticky if you...."

Mudd: "Let me give you an example. It might be a little better, Representative McBroom. Supposing that you vacated the County



Board seat and the County Board Chairman was a Democrat. You would probably go into him and say, 'Mr. Chariman, I have two or three people, alternatives, that I would like you to pick from to fill my vacancy.' And then he would chose some-one and then it would be made with the advice and consent of the members of the County Board."

McBroom: "Thank you."

Mudd: "You're welcome."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the speaker yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Darrow: "Representative Mudd, is the language in this section in compliance with the recent Supreme Court decision, that necessitate it?"

Mudd: "Yes, sir, what it does it avoids that test because it leaves the appointment with election officials. Before we left it with the Central Committee and they ruled that one down. But by leaving it with the elected officials, we feel it will be Constitutional, this was."

Darrow: "Even though it requires that they be from the same political party?"

Mudd: "Yes, Sir."

Darrow: "I have no further questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker, that was my question. I was really going to just ask Mr. Mudd what was the necessity for this, other than just really cleaning this up, because the court had ruled previous to this....the County Board Chairman took the recommendation from the caucus. For example in my district my caucus district picked my Chairman, I mean, my replacement on the County Board and the County Board Chairman accepted that recommendation of our caucus. But the Supreme Court has ruled that the County Board cannot delegate authority to any other political entity or quaspolitical entity and so I presume, Joe, that's the reason for this and it's just a



technical thing."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMaster."

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

Mudd: "Yes, Sir."

McMaster: "Joe, I don't know whether you know some of the background on the County Board up at Knox County. But several years ago a Republican resigned from a Republican controlled County Board. The County Board replaced that Republican with a Democrat which I think was rather foolish, but they did. All right, now just this summer that Democrat who since then had ran for re-election and everything was a member of the Knox County Board. That Democrat resigned. Now we still have a Republican controlled County Board. As I would understand the law at least previous to the passage of this Bill if it should be passed and signed that Republican County Board can replace that Democrat by someone from the same district although it could be a Republican. There is nothing to prevent them from appointing a Republican is there? Under current law."

Mudd: "No, Sir."

McMaster: "If this Bill is successful then that County Board would be mandated by our law to replace that Democrat individual with another Democrat from the same district and eligible to serve."

Mudd: "No, Sir. It says at the time of his election."

McMaster: "No, no, now you're not talking about filling vacancies by appointment then?"

Mudd: "Yes, Sir. We are."

McMaster: "All right now that's exactly what I said. We have a Democrat who has resigned. Without this law then that position can be, that vacancy can be filled by a Republican. Under this legislation if it is successful and signed that replacement would have to be a Democrat, a member of the same political party."

Mudd: "That's correct. Was he elected as a Democrat?"



McMaster: "Well the individual who was a member, it happened to be a lady, and a sister to Jim Andrew who is the Speaker's assistant, she is the Democrat who resigned just recently "

Mudd: "Was she elected as a Democrat?"

McMaster: "Yes."

Mudd: "Okay."

McMaster: "And that vacancy would have to be filled by another Democrat?"

Mudd: "Yes, Sir."

McMaster: "Yeah, that's what I thought the thrust of the Bill was. Presently in the law there is nothing that requires the appointee to be a member of the same political party as was represented by the vacated seat."

Mudd: "That's correct."

McMaster: "Thank you, Joe."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Peters? Questions on Representative Mudd's motion to adopt Amendment #3. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills. Third Reading appears Senate Bill 325. Representative Deuster is recognized."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would as leave to return Senate Bill 325 from the Order of Third Reading to the Order of Second Reading, for the purpose of considering two Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Does the Gentleman have leave to return 325 to the Order of Second Reading? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. Representative Beatty, for what purpose do you rise?"

Beatty: "Well, I have the two Amendment on this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, will you read the Amendments? Leave was granted to return it to the Order of Second Reading."



Now are there any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Beatty. Amends Senate Bill 325 on page 1, line 6 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "This Amendment was erroneously prepared, I would like to table it."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman withdraws...wait a minute now. Was this Amendment put on in Committee?"

Beatty: "No."

Speaker Redmond: "It was a floor Amendment. Gentleman withdraws Amendment #1. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Deuster. Amends Senate Bill 325 on page 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 makes two changes in Senate Bill 325 which is the appropriation Bill for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Court of Claims. First change is a technical Amendment. Inadvertantly the original Bill did not refer to the Court of Claims and indicate that this legislation was to appropriate money for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Court of Claims. Amendment #2 corrects that technical error. The second Amendment, or the second part of this Amendment eliminates the Court of Claims Fund to bring this legislation into conformity with a Bill that the House has already passed. House Bill 334, sponsored by Representative Beatty which is over on Third Reading in the Senate. The Court of Claims Fund is eliminated so that instead of paying money from the Road Fund into the General Revenue Fund and into the Court of Claims Fund and then out again, why we eliminate that duplication so that the money is appropriated directly. That's what Amendment #2 does. Be happy to answer any question and I would urge your support in adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Waddell."



Waddell: "Will the Sponsor yield? When you said directly, what you mean? From what fund? And again back from the Road Fund?"

Deuster: "Yes, as it is now I understand it, we appropriate money from the General Revenue Fund and from the Road Fund into the Court of Claims Fund. And then the money comes out of the Court of Claims Fund. What we would eliminate is the Court of Claims Fund so that the General Assembly by appropriation would directly appropriate from those two funds to the Court of Claims. And as I say that conforms this legislation with the Bill which we already passed over in the Senate in Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is on....any further discussion? Representative McClain. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Don, these are probably not very clear questions but would this be such that then it would be your intention that will increase the amount of money that we are now appropriating from the Road Fund?"

Deuster: "No, this is just a....changes the route by which the money travels. It has nothing to do with increasing the amount of funds. Instead of funneling it through a certain fund the Court of Claims has recommended eliminating that fund and as I say the House has already took action to affirm that and so this is just conforming this Bill with the other legislation."

McClain: "You know, I think it's almost a very appropriate Amendment because then I think the Membership would see more clearly how much we're spending from the Road Fund to the Court of Claims and it wouldn't be under that umbrella Court of Claims Fund and I think it's a good Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for adoption of Amendment #2. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, motion carried. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Beatty. Amends Senate Bill



325 on page 1, line 6 and so forth."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This Amendment increases the appropriation to the Court of Claims by \$52,000. Covering an increase in salary for the eight Commissioners from \$13,200 to \$18,500 and it increases their secretaries' allowance by the amount of \$560 for each of the Commissioners. This money helps them to...not only salary wise but it helps them to take care of the expenses of their office, which because they don't have, my understanding, they don't have an office allowance and this also will help them with the fact that their duties will have increased by 58% for the last pay raise by the end of the next year."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I support this Amendment. The workload has increased quite dramatically. I think the increase for the secretaries and also the Commissioners is justified and I would urge support for Amendment #3."

Speaker Redmond: "Questions? Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Waddell: "Yes, just saying their duties increase doesn't mean anything because it could be from one day to two days and have a 50% increase that way, but how many days are we talking about that they actually serve and is this a full-time job?"

Beatty: "Well, their caseload will have increased by the next year by 50 something per cent. This is a part-time job. The one Commissioner that I know from the area where I live works about three days a week and he has a very broad Calendar and they are extremely busy. But it's part time."

Waddell: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Questions on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #3. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries. The



Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. On Senate Bills, Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1023. Representative Telcser is recognized Representative Ryan will you please sit down....says you have to. Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Representative Capparelli wants to take it back:"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Capparelli has requested leave to return Senate Bill 1023 to the Order of Second Reading. Does he have leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. To the Order of Second Reading. Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we adopted Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1023 and my principal concern on that Amendment was the appointment of the Majority and Minority Parties to that Commission. As I said in my explanation I hadn't realized that there were other provisions of the Amendment and, Mr. Speaker, I talked to the principal Sponsor. I'd like to move now to table Amendment #2 to House Bill 1023. With the Sponsor's permission."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion on the Gentleman's motion to table Amendment #2? Question on the motion. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries. The Amendment #2 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "You desire to move that back to Third or leave it on Second? Leave it on Second Reading, is that correct? Consent Calendar, Third REading. They have previously been read. The question is, shall these Bills pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 135 'aye', no 'nays'. These Bills having received the Constitutional Majority are hereby declared passed. House Bills, Third Reading. The Senate



is anxious to receive our appropriation Bills. House Bills,
Third Reading. House Bill 362."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 362, a Bill for an Act to make appropriations to the Department of Local Government Affairs. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Martin."

Martin: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 362 you've heard a few times before. What it does is appropriates one million dollars for going to the Chicago Park District for field house in Lindblom Park. As you probably know from our previous testimony that we have some 20,000 young people and 25,000 adults in the Lindblom Park area. Presently, there's a two-room shanty measuring 20 x 40 and this shanty sits on 17 acres of land. From the measurement alone and the number of people that I just stated, we can nowhere near, in the Lindblom Park shanty, accommodate the many people who are in that area. You will recall in the 78th General Assembly I introduced this same legislation and I tacked this Amendment onto a Senate Bill which passed this House overwhelmingly, however, it went to a Conference Committee and in going to the Conference Committee which I'm sorry to say was attended by only Republican....all Republican Members only. They did not concur to the detriment of those persons who live in the Lindblom Park area. We do need a field house for young people. The appropriation, asking for one million dollars, is far worth much more than the millions of dollars that it would cost the citizens of that area in crime that could be prevented should these young people have something to do, as well as meeting rooms for the aged, or club rooms for the many organizations that are in that district. I certainly appeal to you once again by Bill, House Bill 362, to grant us the million dollars to build a field house that will serve over forty thousand people. By this time, we would think that you would certainly be tired of hearing about Lindblom



Park. It has been written up many times in our news media because it is so desperately needed. I would ask of you just this once more to please give an overwhelming 'aye' vote for House Bill 362. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I wonder what would happen in this body if each Legislator of the 177 in their own districts, or at least in the 59 districts, had some particular project that would be of benefit, and I'm sure this would be of some benefit, and you multiply this around the state, and I'm sure that each district has a need that's just as, as pressing as this particular need and this particular district is. And I'm just saying simply that if we have any sort of fiscal responsibility to us at all, and I realize that's kind of loosely-used term, then this project and similar projects ought to be resoundingly defeated if we're gonna prevent the State of Illinois from going bankrupt. There's certainly not a necessity item this year. It's not in the Governor's budget, and it's something that we just don't need and can't afford in fiscal year 1978."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative O'Daniel."

O'Daniel: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Peggy Smith Martin, to close."

Martin: "Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. Because this issue has been so well debated on so many previous occasions, and I'm sure that most of you in the House of Representatives already know what our needs are, you also, I'm sure, read on last Saturday where the Mayor was also trying to get five million dollars for someplace...for the park district, so you know we don't have the money. I'm sure that you would rather...spend one million dollars now as...many pounds of prevention, to give our young people in that area something to do to occupy their time. And I ask you, please, for an 'aye' vote in this



measure."

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

Bluthardt: "Well, explain my vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, let me put the question, then get back to you. The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Bluthardt to explain his vote."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the reason for my voting 'no' is that in my experience down here, in almost every Session, the Chicago Park District comes in here and asks for an increase of its tax rate and gets it. They ask for increases in their bonding power and they usually get it. There's hardly a Session in which their rate has not been increased. And what's the purpose of the Chicago Park District? What is one of the mottoes of Chicago? Chicago, the City of Parks. Well, then, if they're the City of Parks and they want to brag about it, why don't these people go to the Chicago Parks District and show them the urgency of this...this project? They're the proper agency for taking care of this, not the State of Illinois. We set up the machinery for taking care of recreation and park districts, park facilities, go through that channel, because if you begin raiding the Treasury of this state, then I could see Jack Williams and myself coming in here and asking for a million dollars to build a park in Schiller Park, Franklin Park, because we have a population of close to forty thousand, and so it would go throughout the state. I think it's a bad policy to follow and I urge you to defeat this Bill...."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 69 'ayes', 69 'no'. The Bill having failed to receive a Constitutional...Representative Peggy Smith Martin."

Martin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like a poll of the absentees, please."



Speaker Redmond: "The Lady has requested a poll of the absentees.

Representative Mautino, for what purpose do you rise?"

Mautino: "I'm not recorded, Sir. Would you please vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Record Representative Mautino as 'aye'. Poll

the absentees, Mr. Clerk. Representative Stearney, for what purpose do you rise? Record Representative Stearney as 'no'. Representative Brummer. Record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Representative Martin."

Martin: "Mr. Speaker, may I place this on Postponed Consideration?"

Speaker Redmond: "Postponed Consideration."

Martin: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "973. Postpone 71."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 973, a Bill for an Act to make appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense for the Fair Employment Practice Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gaines."

Gaines: We discussed this yesterday when it was on Second, and it's the budget for the Fair Employment Practice Commission, and it's very necessary to help the persons, including women and senior citizens, get an equal shake when they go out and apply for a job. So I ask its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 138 'aye', 2 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1033."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1033, a Bill for an Act to make appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of General Services. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "1033. Representative Winchester. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the ordinary and



contingent appropriation for the Department of Administrative Services. I don't have my notes with me but I believe it's around 93 or 94 million dollars."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Darrow: "Representative Winchester, does this include the appropriation for the Illinois Information Service?"

Winchester: "I'm not sure, but I believe it does, Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "And how much is that?"

Winchester: "For the Illinois Information Service? I'd say around roughly 360,000 dollars."

Darrow: "And is it correct that this is a 33% increase over last year?"

Winchester: "Well I'm not sure if that's true or not, Representative Darrow, but the 100,000 dollars that was mentioned yesterday in debate additional money is that was requested to pay to take those ghost payrollers from the Walker administration who were working in IIS to put them where they properly belong and that's in the Illinois Informational Service and that 100,000 dollars is to cover their salaries, that's 100,000 dollars less that DOT has, 100,000 dollars extra that IIS now has. And this will also afford the Legislators an opportunity to see themselves on TV, if a Legislature wants to utilize IIS, he may do so. To my knowledge only about three or four are actually using the services provided to Illinois Information Service, but if you want to use it the opportunity is there. You have to pay for it."

Darrow: "I have no further questions."

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

Giorgi: "I'd like to ask a couple questions of the Sponsor. Is it true there's contracts in this IIS with WGN and WBBM and WMAQ



and NBC, ABC, CBS and some radio stations to vaunt the Governor's image? The question is who has the most luscious contract, which one of those media?"

Winchester: "Well, Representative Giorgi, I am not aware of any of those contracts that you mentioned, I don't think there are any. If you think there are, if you will provide me with some information, I will certainly check into it and get back to you."

Giorgi: "Well, then tell us where the largest expenditure is going to occur to."

Winchester: "In the IIS?"

Giorgi: "Yes. Film, radio, paper, what?"

Winchester: "Payroll, probably."

Giorgi: "Payroll? Aren't you sure?"

Winchester: "No I'm not, Representative Giorgi, I'm sorry."

Giorgi: "Well you ought to be more sure than this when..."

Winchester: "I just didn't think that someone of your stature was going to ask such good questions or I would have been more prepared."

Giorgi: "Well I think you ought to be able to tell us which is the greatest expenditure out of the IIS."

Winchester: "I would imagine probably other than payroll it would be film..."

Giorgi: "The contractual services? How much is contractual services? Look at your portofio, you must have it there."

Winchester: "I'm sorry, I don't. I didn't think the Bill was being called, I left it over in the office. What's your question again, Mr. Giorgi?"

Giorgi: "What's the item for contractual services?"

Winchester: "\$29,400 dollars."

Giorgi: "And who's going to get the largest percentage of that \$29,000, WBBM?"

Winchester: "I have no idea."

Giorgi: "I'd really like to know. I think you ought to take it out of the record, so you could tell us more about it."



Winchester: "No. I have no idea, Representative Giorgi, if there any contract with WBBM, I wouldn't have even asked that question of the Department of Administrative Services or IIS, however, I will check into it if there is any problems, then I will be more than happy to work with you over in the Senate on this matter. If you have that much concern, Representative Giorgi, I'm also concerned, but I do not have that information now. I do not wish to take it out of the record now."

Giorgi: "Good enough."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 1349. Representative Shumpert. Out of the record. Wait a minute. Wait a minute. 1033 is in the record then."

Winchester: "I didn't ask to have this out of the record. We were still discussing it."

Speaker Redmond: "I was misled by somebody on the Republican payroll. Who had the floor? Who had the floor? Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but I just wanted to alert the House when I was a freshman here, they passed the Governor's Safety and Traffic Coordinating Committee and there were all kinds of juicy contracts in there with ABC, CBS, NBC, WBM, WGN, Chicago Daily News, Sun Times and I thought you're pulling a fast one on us again, I think you are, I'm not on the Appropriation Committee like I used to be so I'm not... to dome of the stuff."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything furhher? Representative Winchester to close."

Winchester: "WELL, I think that we've debated the subject quite enough, Mr. Speaker, I move for the passage of House Bill 1033."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 119



'aye' and 30 'no'. Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. Representative Shumpert, do you want 1349 out of the record? Or do you want to call it? What's that mean? Out? 1349 out of the record. 1044. I received a call from the President of the Senate yesterday exhorting us to get our House Appropriation Bills over there. We may run out of time. They're about ready to go home. Like they did one time when one of the Senators had something about expenses for an election. I don't remember who it was now, but I think he's with us now on the House side. 1044. Representative Kent."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1044, a Bill for an Act to make appropriation to the Department of Registration and Education. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #3, 5 and 6 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any motion with respect to Amendment 3, 5 and 6?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #7, Stearney. Amends House Bill 1044 on page 2, line 1 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney, proponent of the Amendment."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe there's two Amendments. Amendment #7 and Amendment #8, filed by me. Am I right Mr. Clerk?" Well then I move to table Amendment #7." X

Speaker Redmond: "Has that been adopted yet?"

Stearney: "As being technically incorrect."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney withdraws Amendment #7. Is there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8, Stearney. Amends House Bill 1044 as amended on page 2, line 1 and so forth."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House Amendment #8 to House Bill 1044 which is the appropriation of Registration and Education. Now this Amendment would



reduce that appropriation by \$293,215. Now let me explain exactly what it does. First of all it eliminates, it reduces personal services by \$139,000. Now as it is in R & E, these positions have gone unfilled for sometime and they are presently unfilled. For that reason there is no justification for allowing \$139,000 to remain in that budget. It also... that includes and reduces retirement and social security by \$15,000. The second point is, the contractual services is reduced by \$52,000. However, now mind you this Bill allows an increase of over fiscal year '77 of 24% which is \$101,000. They asked originally for \$153,000, so I'm cutting it, asking to cut it by \$52,000. Point number 3, contractual services in the electronic data processing division is reduced by \$10,000. Now mind you, this here is an Amendment that conforms with a Committee Amendment adopted. So really it does nothing. And point number 4 is that \$75,000 is reduced from the electronic data processing and the medical disciplinary board. And the reason, I've asked to reduce this by \$75,000 is that the Federal Court, the Federal District Court in New York and it has been upheld by the United States Supreme Court in the case of John Rowe vs. the Health Commissionere of New York. The court there said it was an invasion of patient privacy to require certain records on these computers, namely the drugs that are administered to the patient. So for that reason I ask the support of the Members of the General Assembly here in adopting Amendment #8 to the R & E appropriation which would reduce it by a total of \$293,215. If there's any questions I'd be glad to answer them."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kent. Representative Kent, do you have a reaction to Amendment #8?"

Kent: "Yes, I wondered if I could question Mr. Stearney's remark about the Supreme Court. I think they reversed that, and said it was perfectly allowable. Would you please restate what you said there?"



Stearney: "Yes, the Supreme Court did reverse the District Court but it required the Federal District Court to issue an order to the particular department, agency of government in New York to scrub that....to scrub to eliminate that provision that would require the documentation of the drugs administered to particular patients. Under the theory that it was an invasion of patients right for privacy not to have to divulge to the general public what is being administered to them. But, nevertheless that holding....that Supreme Court holding is germane...is relevant and is relevant to Illinois as well. So for that reason I've asked to eliminate \$75,000 since it would be utterly useless and futile to appropriate it to R & E."

Kent: "I believe that the Supreme Court cited Illinois as the ideal program and that they said that it was the one to use."

Stearney: "But it didn't consider this very same point in which you are asking \$75,000 to be appropriated."

Kent: "It said that this was allowable for those patients to be so designated."

Stearney: "No, the Supreme Court was addressing a situation in Illinois that was existent prior to the time that this matter was being considered."

Kent: "How do we know that? I think you better recheck the citation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Will the Sponsor yield? Representative Stearney?"

Stearney: "Yes."

Johnson: "Does your cut in the appropriation have any effect on the State Geological Water and Natural History survey?"

Stearney: "Absolutely not. Because that's a line item."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to oppose this Amendment for the reasons that Representative Kent so ably discussed. I think that we would be doing great harm to Department of Registration



and Education which is the most difficult department, if we did adopt this Amendment. I urge your opposition to it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevidch."

Matijevidch: "Will the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Matijevidch: "Representative Stearney, Ron, you're not listening again."

Stearney: "I'm listening."

Matijevidch: "Representative Stearney, would you be amenable, rather than all these Amendments you're coming out with, with an Amendment that would deport Joan Anderson on that island of yours to run that Prosecutor's Advisory Council. Would that suit you?"

Stearney: "Fill it if you wish, Mr. Matijevidch."

Matijevidch: "Mr. Speaker, I'm going to pull this Amendment, I think that Representative Stearney's offering some Amendments mainly because he has some problems with the Director and I think that's the wrong route to go."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kent."

Kent: "Mr. Speaker, I think that was uncalled for. I think that we do not need remarks that are derogatory to the Director."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Parliamentary Enquiry, Mr. Speaker. On the Amendment #8 that is being offered I would like the Parliamentarian to take a look at line 10 on page 2. According to this Amendment it would delete, by deleting line 26, in fact, it would delete all of contractual services and I'm not sure that, that's what was intended here. It's supposed to be a reduction of \$10,000, and I would suggest that this is perhaps technically incorrect, because what this will do is delete all of contractual services on that line and not reduce it by \$10,000, but reduce it by thirty."

Stearney: "Mr. Speaker, I think the Gentleman is addressing himself to the Amendment I tabled."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker....Representative, you tabled #7, I have #8 in



my hand and I'm addressing myself to line 10 of Amendment #8 where you say on page 2 by deleting line 26 and inserting in lieu thereof, \$20,000, but if you delete line 26, you're taking it all out and you're not reducing it by \$10,000, you're reducing it by everything. I believe you tabled #7 and the way that this...."

Speaker Redmond: "#7 was withdrawn."

Barnes: "The Amendment was withdrawn and the way that this Amendment is drafted you'd be taking out everything."

Speaker Redmond: "No. No. Representative Barnes' point is well taken."

Stearney: "Well do you have the Bill, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "It has, Amendment #8 has the effect of deleting everything."

Barnes: "Amendment #8 would delete everything on that line, everything, all of it."

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Only to clear the record. I talked to May Lou Kent and my remarks were not derogatory against Joan Anderson she is a very good friend of mine and I would never dare say anything against her."

Speaker Redmond: "You would never say anything derogatory about anybody, John. Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think that objection raised by Mr. Barnes can be very easily corrected. You see because what I'm doing on page 2, line 26, I want to delete the word 'thirty thousand' the number \$30,000 and insert in lieu thereof, '\$20,000'. Which would mean a \$10,000 cut. And still it would allow for contractual services in the amount of \$20,000. Which is just a \$10,000 cut."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, in all due respect to the Representative. What you're doing in effect in Amendment #8 is making a \$30,000 reduction, you withdrew Amendment #7. In fact Amendment #7 would do what you're talking about. But you withdrew



it an now you are moving on Amendment #8. Amendment #8 in the fashion that is drafted would in fact reduce the total line. Take all \$30,000. That's all I'm trying to point out to you. You do not reduce \$10,000 you reduce \$30,000."

Stearney: "Mr. Barnes, you would have no objection then to having the Amendment amended on it's fact to read 'by deleting, on page 2, line 26, by deleting \$30,000 and inserting in lieu \$20,000."

Barnes: "I would raise the same question I raised before. In fact this Amendment is technically incorrect. If you want to move with the Amendment, that's your decision. I, for one, would oppose this Amendment in the form that it is in and your decision on how you want to handle it is up to you. I won't make that decision for you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney, what do you desire with respect to Amendment #8?"

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Bill is going to Third Reading it would be impossible for me to file another Amendment. To correct that purely technical objection, I'm setting forth the figures \$20,000 which would mean only a \$10,000 cut in contractual services. I think that can be amended on it's face, but since I couldn't refile in time to keep this matter from going to Third, I'm just confronted with a serious situation. I'll just have to move with it as it is."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion to move for the adoption of Amendment #...."

Stearney: "May I close?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stearney to close."

Stearney: "Well, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as to that objection it's only a \$10,000 reduction I do set forth the figures \$20,000, so it would be on that particular line item. But I think the Amendment altogether is appropriate and should be adopted because it calls for an elimination of \$293,000 and an agency which has not justified the expenditure of that money, namely \$139,000 for personal services for positions



which have not been filled for a long time and are not filled at this time. And for that reason there should, that \$139,000 should be deleted. As to the contractual services for which I've asked for, a reduction of \$52,000 is that the agency is still getting an increase of \$100,000 over last fiscal year, so they are not hurting. Furthermore, I've asked for a cut of \$10,000 in the contractual services, and the last point, I've asked for a reduction of \$75,000 in electronic data processing because the Supreme Court has ruled and that was in 1975, however, this is a fiscal '78 appropriation. I think it is entirely appropriate. I think the Amendment should be adopted and I think this is a way of paring down the expenses of all the bureaucratic agencies which have a tendency to grow ever and ever more so. I ask for a favorable Roll Call on this particular Amendment. Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen."

Speaker Redmond: "The question on the Gentleman's motion for adoption of Amendment #8. Those in favor of the motion vote 'aye' those opposed 'no'. Representative Barnes to explain his vote Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I see the vote is going the right way because if we take out this money at this level, we will be impairing this department's ability to carry out the function given to it by the General Assembly in terms of tracking down illegal prescriptions performed by some medical providers. So, I see we're going in the right direction. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 14 'ayes' and 116 'no'. The Gentleman's motion fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #9, McBroom. Amends House Bill 10..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McBroom desires to withdraw the Amendment, is that correct? McBroom."

McBroom: "Yes. I move to table Amendment #9."

Speaker Redmond: "Gentleman has withdrawn Amendment #8. Any further Amendment? #9."



Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #10, Keats. Amends House Bill 1044 as amended on page 2 by deleting line 5."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keats, do you want to address us from the back of the chamber or do you want to be in your chair? Gentleman withdraws Amendment #10. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #11, Kane. Amends House Bill 1044 on page 2, line 33 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is an Amendment that increases the line items in the State Museum, personal services, retirement, social security by some \$24,000. What it would do is provide some equity in the pay grades for the professional curators who are now falling far behind their professional colleagues in other areas. And I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While we all know that these people do a very good job in the museums and probably no doubt desire this pay raise. We all know that the money is just not there. And so I would urge you to vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane to close. Representative Barnses, pardon me."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, very briefly the amount of money that we're talking about in this Amendment is only \$24,600. We work with the people over at the museum and this is a moderate approach. This is a half year. These people are far below, far below their contemporaries in this area. This will simply bring, move them toward parity, will not bring them up to parity, and the amount that's involved in this Amendment is a very small amount. \$24,000. They do a hard, these are hard working people over in our museum and they deserve this small recognition for the work that they're doing. The amount of money here is not staggering



and I don't see why, how we could not afford this very small recognition of the hard people in the museum. I solicit your support for this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question on the Gentleman's motion. Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, to close. These are professional people in the museum with advanced degrees. Masters Degrees and Ph.D.'s, and because they are professionals they're exempt from the code and step increases are not mandatory as they are for people under the Personnel Code. And step increases have been granted these individuals only once in the past five years, and its caused the museum professional personnel to leave and the difference between people working for the museum and people working for the state universities and other with the same kinds of qualifications are now something in the order of \$4,000 a year. What this Amendment would do if it was passed is reduce that differential from \$4,000 a year to \$2,000 cutting it in half. They would still not be receiving the same kind of pay level that their education and training is entitled to, but as Representative Barnes said, 'this is a moderate approach' and I would urge the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The question on the Gentleman's motion on the adoption of Amendment #11. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 77 'ayes' and 59 'no'. Motion prevails and Amendment #11 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #12."

Speaker Redmond: "I wonder if you just might wait a minute. Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, a few days ago you will recall that we adopted an Amendment to the rules that permitted the Short Debate Calendar and the expanded Consent Calendar concepts that worked so well on



House Bills to be applied to Senate Bills. There has been distributed to each Committee Chairman, each Committee Vice-Chairman, each Minority Spokesman and to the additional persons appointed by the Minority Leader on each Committee, a....copies of the Bills that are pending on the Calendar. It is urged that those persons immediately get together and see what kinds of matters may be taken from the General Call to be placed on the Short Debate Call and to be placed on the Consent Calendar, with that we'll be able, we hope to move matters a long so that the expeditious way in which the Speaker has been keeping us moving along with be continued and we'll be able to leave this House on time. So the Members who received those, the Committee Chairman, the Vice Chairmen, the Minority Spokesman, please immediately confer and get that moving and on to the Clerk's desk. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, this is on a bit of another subject, if it's at the proper time. I've had a number of inquiries relative to the Appropriation Committee from Members. So if it's at the proper time I'll go into it."

Speaker Redmond: "I'm about ready to turn the Chair over to Representative Lechowicz. Representative Kent for what purpose do you rise?"

Kent: "I was hoping that we could finish 1044 and get it on Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "We will finish 1044. There's just this one...."

Kent: "They sort of lose their train of thought if we do this to them."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Katz, this is the same procedure that we've used for House Bills, is that correct?"

Katz: "Yes, that's correct, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Thank you."



Speaker Redmond: "Just one more comment. The Appropriations Committee has to meet this afternoon, so we'll adjourn at 2:00 o'clock to permit the Appropriation Committee to meet, we will be back on the floor tonight at six. Representative. Amendment #12. Who's the Sponsor of that Bill?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #12, Representative McClain. Amends House Bill 1044 by deleting the last Section of the Bill and inserting in lieu thereof, Section 5 and so forth. Representative Lechowicz in the Chair."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #12 is an Amendment we've discussed before. It's a similar kind of philosophy as the Amendment you just adopted now, Amendment #11. What Amendment #12, is, is the 2% pay increase for those employees in R & E, in the Department of R & E that make \$14,000 or less. What we have done continually in the Appropriation Committee is given a 2½% pay raise, a step in merit raise for state employees. What happens continually is we give the employees that \$15,000 or \$20,000 or above substantial increases, whereas, the lower income people don't get the appropriate pay hikes. This Amendment I think is consistent with the kind of philosophy we ought to have in the House and that is a 2% pay raise for those people making \$14,000 or less. The total amount of money for this would be \$80,000 and I move its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't want to repeat what I said yesterday in regard to a similar Amendment which was proposed to another Bill, however, I would just like to paraphrase my comment of yesterday. Number one, this isn't fair because we're just, he just developed the idea last Friday. This



isn't fair in terms of other Appropriation Bills that we passed. Secondly, we have a process, we have a process for doing this and we want to address the steps in the schedule, we want to address the pay raises that are presently in the schedule and that's what we should do. We should not do it on this basis, and for the same reasons that a majority of you opposed this on another Bill, yesterday. I trust that the result will be the same."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Adams, Mrs. Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wonder if all of you are adding up these little numbers that you're putting in. The last one that was for the pay raises for the museum, the Speaker said was just a matter of a few dollars and therefore, we could put it in. And now here again comes another Amendment just a few dollars, but do you know that we also have to look at totals and I think what we're doing to the taxpayers with adding these little items, that sound so small, and yet add up to a great big number is disastrous. I would hope that you would all hold the line and vote 'no' on this, even though we know we would like to have our state employees receive a much greater salary."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain, to close."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what I'm proposing in this Amendment is the poorest employees we have to receive a 2% pay raise. The cost is \$80,000. Certainly it is not extravagant, and any sort of terminology you can dream up and I think it's fair for those employees that are making \$14,000 or less. 2% is a very very minimum and I move its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #12 be adopted. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'nay'. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters, to explain his vote."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, not to take up too much time. We have discussed this Amendment on



previous Bills. It has been defeated in the past. Hopefully the House will maintain its consistent posture and vote 'no' on this Amendment and the same Amendment as it might be applied to any other Bills."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 56 'ayes' and 76 'nays'. This Amendment is not adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 2361, Representative Hanahan."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2361, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the administration of the State Board of Education. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendments #1, 2, 3, 7, 9, 11 and 13 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #9, by Representative Levin."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin, on a motion to table Amendment #9. We'll take this Bill out of the record temporarily until the Gentleman gets situated. We'll get right back to it. House Bill 689. That Gentleman is not on the floor. Representative Levin are you ready? Levin. Back to 2361. Amendment #9. A motion to table by Representative Levin. Hanahan. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This motion to table is offered by myself and Representative Marovitz and what it would simply do is to restore a half million dollars in bilingual money from Chicago. Thus, making the cuts in the bilingual consent with the Amendment #3. That was a Democratic Amendment offered in Committee. Which would be the amounts bilingual for the City of Chicago would be \$9,750,000. Amendment #9 cut that additional half a million dollars which is below what the level was for last year. We have a situation in



Chicago whether or not you believe in bilingual education where there was a court decision which is mandating that twice as many kids...receive bilingual education in this coming year as were required to receive in the previous year. Previously, well they're called categories one two and three...were receiving bilingual education in Chicago. There's a court decision, I'm told, by Art Laney of the Chicago Board of Education that category number four, which has an equal number of kids, have been ordered to receive the money, and so what we're doing here is simply to restore a half million dollars in order to deal with what really is twice the load of students that are in need of bilingual education so as I said, whether or not you believe in the concept, and I understand it is a controversial area, we're going to need the money in Chicago because the number of children that are going to be required to be educated under this program is going to be doubling. I urge the adoption....I urge that this motion to table be adopted."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman seeks to table a motion which I introduced in the Appropriations Committee and which was adopted by that Committee on a 15 to 10 vote. What Representative Levin and Marovitz's motion would do in fact would be to restore an additional \$500,000 in spending to the bilingual line in the Bill dealing with the various grants of education. All of you know and are quite well aware of the very delicate balancing act which really both sides of the aisle have attempted to engage in in order to bring a Bill to this House floor that in a sense probably would not satisfy everybody. But in a sense also was a Bill that we could all live with. We've got the Senate to go through yet and we've got the Conference Committees for the final product in this regard. The bottom line on the whole business is really, I think, an attempt on both sides of the aisle



I would hope to achieve that kind of a balance that will satisfy or at least to the best satisfy all of us. I would as that Representative Levin's motion to restore an additional \$500,500,000 to this line item be defeated."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In regard to this motion as well as other motions or Amendments that will be filed, let me point out to you that what we're attempting to do or what it was attempted to be done by the Appropriation Committee and what we'll attempt to be done by Amendment, which our other Amendment which are appearing on the floor, is to move as much of the money that we have available into the General Distributive Fund. Now all students special ed, bilingual, all students, regular students which make up the majority of our school population, they all qualify and are counted in the General Distributive Formula. But when you get into these specialized categories you're only counting those individuals. Now the more money that we put into the General Distributive Formula and hold away from the categoricals because of the lack of resources if we had plenty of money, fine but we don't. The more we put in the General Distributive Formula the more control we give to local school districts. And they are the ones who know where they need this money and in Chicago if they need the money in the bilingual program they can put it in the bilingual program. In Elgin if they need the money in the Special Ed. program they can put it in the Special Ed. In my own school district if they need it in the Common School Fund in terms of the general regular program they can put it there. If they want to put it in transportation they can put it there. But all you do when add on to the categoricals as opposed to the General Distributive Formula you take away the authority of your local school district to do the job as they see fit. And that is one of the basic questions that we



have to look at, underline all of these motions and all of these Amendments and for this reason I would urge you to defeat the motion of Representative Levin's...its well intentioned motives."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. At a time in Chicago when the necessity for this money is increasing and the problems in this area are increasing, my friend from the other side of the aisle chooses to cut \$500,000 from a very important area that the Chicago schools need. This is a problem area for us. The money that was requested for bilingual education in Chicago was cut substantially. There is no increase as you will note in this fiscal year for bilingual education, but by this we're cutting it substantially in an area that, I repeat, we need additional funds in. Now it's true that we're trying to channel all the money into the General Distributive Formula. But where does the Representative get the \$500,000 figure? We can take money from every area. This is an area that is an area of need, immediate need in Chicago. We cannot afford to lose any more money for bilingual education. We ask for an increase. We didn't get the increase. All right, we accept that. But we can't afford to lose any more money than we had last year because we have more obligations this coming year than we had last year. Please vote to table this, restore the \$500,000 for bilingual education, Chicago needs that money."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I stand in support of this Amendment. Amendment #9 to House Bill 2361. I stand in support because there's a fallacy in the Gentleman from DuPage's argument and that fallacy is that we're dealing with an exact figure, for an exact known revenue estimate that we could afford to contribute back to our local school



districts a certain given sum for education. Now he should know and I certainly know that that's a fallacy.. That there is no Member of this House, there no Members of the Government that's going to stand before any tribunal and say, we know how much money is available for education next year. That's strictly poppycock, its good rhetoric in a campaign or good rhetoric to put in the newspaper, but the fact remains no one person in this state or in this nation outside of God could say how much money we're going to have available. The real issue is priorities. Whether or not the priority of bilingual education should be met with a substantial amount of money and we talk about substantial amount of money, a grand total of \$500,000 putting back into the programs of bilingual education. Now \$500,000 represents not a grain of sand on the beach in Lake Michigan in comparison to our revenue estimates as far as whether or not it will break the bank. But it will curtail and it will certainly, if this Amendment is not adopted, it will curtail the momentum that we have created in trying to solve the problem that many of your forefathers and foremothers had when they came to this country and that is the question of bilingual education. Now I have a conflict of interest because I happen to be related to Mexican and Puerto Rican people in my immediate family and they do have a need. Especially the Spanish-speaking people have a great need for having an understanding and being educated with the understanding of a bilingual education. Now, I'm for everyone to speak the English Language, but you can't speak the English language if there's no program to take their native tongue and translate and educate back into their minds what they need to know to become an American citizen. If we're going to chop programs just remember this, that when crime is rampant and when there is revolutions on the street by people who do not understand what the work 'ahalt' means and you yourself who cut these programs have only one



person to blame. Now please be reasonable, the Gentleman's request is for \$500,000 put back into the program. This \$500,000 represents dividends of untold value in the future for some person who may be able to get an education in his native tongue and I support Amendment #9."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I reluctantly I stand in opposition to Representative Levin. Having served on the Spanish Speaking Problems Commission, I know the problems. Having about 7% Spanish speaking in my community, I'm very cognizant of the problems that we have in Rock Island County in relation to education. However, the mandate from the Federal Courts, the mandate from the Supreme Court, the mandate that has come down from the Illinois Office of Education has indicated to our very fine school system that we must dissent, so since we are no longer to need a bilingual school since all of the bilingual children will be going to schools throughout our community. We no longer have that basic necessity and therefore, I must stand in opposition to Representative Levin's motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin to close."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Several weeks ago there was a riot in the City of Chicago in the Pilton community. And what that riot represented was a frustration on the part of the Latino community that the Latino community in the City of Chicago, in the state of Illinois was listened to, to the degree that they show it. We have the opportunity here through restoration of this money to say that the Members of this House are receptive, are sensitive to the concerns and needs of Latino communities in the State of Illinois. The Board of Education of the City of Chicago did a census last year which show that in levels one through three there were 21,255 children. These were children who received bilingual



education in the City of Chicago. They also, in that census found in level four there were 25,581. Last year these children did not receive bilingual education, however, as a result of the recent court decision, they're going to have to receive bilingual education. However, if this Amendment is not tabled there will not only be as much money available to educate twice the number of children for this year, but there will be less money available. So, I urge that this Amendment be tabled so that we can send a message to the Latino community in the State of Illinois that says we care, we're listening to your problems and we want to deal with them. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #9 be tabled? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'nay'. The motion is to table Amendment #9. If you support Representative Levin, you vote 'aye', and if you support the removal of the money vote 'no'. You want to record me as 'aye' please. The Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain to explain his vote."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there's some confusion. This is not a motion to table. This is an Amendment to place the money back in, just for those people who are voting 'no'. that think that they are voting against the motion to table this Amendment is to place the money back in, not a motion to table."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, the statement of the last speaker was not correct. Amendment #9 which was adopted in Committee deletes a half a million dollars for the bilingual program in the City of Chicago. That was Representative Peters Amendment which was adopted, so that the reduction of the half of million dollars more that was in Amendment #3, which was Representative Barnes' Amendment. This is my motion and Representative Marovitz's motion to table that Amendment #9 and thus to restore the half a million dollars. The board I don't believe is accurate, the board is wrong. Can we dump it and clarify



the....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the Clerk...is this Amendment #9 or not?"

Levin: "It's the motion to table Amendment #9."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Chair has repeated it three times. Would you correct the Board, please, Mr. Clerk. Have all voted who wished? Johnny. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 58 'ayes' and 100 'nays' and 1 voted 'present' The motion fails. The Gentleman from McHenry, Hanahan."

Hanahan: "May I have leave to take the Bill out of the record at this time?"



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has leave. The Bill is taken out out of the record. House Bill 2402."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2402. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the State Board of Elections. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would first of all like to ask the Chair for a ruling as to the germaneness of Amendment #1 which was adopted in Committee. And I submit to the Chair that under Article IV, Section 8(d) of the Constitution..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "One moment, Mr. Walsh. Would the Parliamentarian, Mr. Epstein, return back to the podium? All right, now would you kindly restate your objection to Amendment #1?"

Walsh: "Yes, Sir. Under Article IV, Section 8(d) of the Constitution appropriation Bills shall be confined to the subject of appropriations. Amendment #1 provided for an appropriation to an office for the State Board of Elections that is not provided in the statutes. There is nothing in the statutes to provide for an office at Marion, Illinois; and I submit to you the appropriation, that the Amendment is not germane because of that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Chair will rule that it's an appropriation Bill and in turn, it's appropriating money for a designed office and it is germane."

Walsh: "That's too bad, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "But it's right. Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh, on House Bill 2402. You got a motion? Are there any motions on file?"

Walsh: "There are a couple of Amendments, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2 was tabled in Committee. Amendment #3 was withdrawn. Floor Amendment #4, Walsh, amends House Bill 2402 on page 1, line 10 and so forth."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I move to table Amendment #4."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks to table Amendment #4. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, it's withdrawn."



Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, Walsh. Amends House Bill 2402 as amended on page 3 by deleting all of Section 1.01."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh, on Amendment #5."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Parliamentarian having found that my objection was not well-taken, I seek to eliminate the office at Marion, Illinois, with Amendment #5. And to reduce the appropriation to the State Board of Elections by seventeen thousand dollars. Now, I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that it is truly absurd and that this Bill cannot possibly go all the way with the provision that there be an office at Marion, Illinois, in it. It is clear, I think to everyone on this floor, that we should not here in the Legislature, tell the State Board of Elections where they should have offices. I urge your support for Amendment #5."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment was placed on 2402, the State Board of Elections, for service for thirty counties in the south part of the state. There are four people presently living in a south part of the state employed with the State Board of Elections working out of their homes. This Amendment for seventeen thousand dollars doesn't hire additional personnel. It's the same personnel. They possibly will need a secretary. Travel back and forth from Springfield down to as far as Cairo and the roads required in that area, the travel expense is approximately ten thousand dollars. The Amendment in total and the total amount is seventeen thousand to place these people outside of their homes into an office giving service to constituents, those who want to be candidates, those who are candidates on information of elections for uniformity, information for campaign disclosure where he can have ready accessibility. We have an office in Chicago and, yes, it is needed. There's an office in Springfield; yes, it is needed. There needs to be an office in the south part of the state to serve those thirty counties. The population in that part of the state, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, is eight hundred and fifty-three thousand people. The square miles covered for these four people would be twelve thousand, seven hundred and twenty-seven



square miles. Service for honest and free elections would be two cents per person. Two cents per person on this Amendment for free and honest and uniform elections, you're talking about two cents per person."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Perry, Representative Ralph Dunn."

R. Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would like to urge that we defeat Amendment #5 because it would take away Amendment #1 that would allow us, as Representative Harris said, to have a State Board of Elections office, their secretary in the Regional Office Building. We already have an office building in Marion, Illinois. And certainly southern Illinois deserves to be served without all the expense of driving back and forth from Springfield to... from Chicago. This is only a seventeen thousand dollar item and I'd urge that we defeat Amendment #5."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Amendment by Representative Walsh. Representative Harris and his colleagues from the southern portion of the state are simply trying to provide that there would be a regional office located in that area to serve the people living in that area far more conveniently than they are served now by the office located in Springfield. In my opinion, they are pursuing a very legitimate objective. They are attempting to bring government closer to the people, to make it easier for people in that area of the state to run for public office and, for the life of me, I can't understand why Representative Walsh is opposed to a proposal which would bring government closer to people which would provide for more participation in the Democratic process of our state. And for that reason, I oppose the Amendment."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as much as I hate to disagree with the mover of this motion, I disagree with him because it seems to me it's far cheaper to put seventeen thousand dollars for an office of the State Board of Elections at Marion, Illinois, than it is to have them travelling back and forth from there to Springfield. That's far more costly to us and I urge



defeat of this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Taylor."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed?

The previous question's been moved. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh, to close."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the biggest clash I've ever seen in this Legislature in all the time I've been here. Adeline getting together with the Majority Leader openly. I've seen them together secretly, but not openly."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly address yourself to the Amendment please."

Walsh: "Now, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment adopted by the Appropriation Committee is absolutely absurd, totally absurd. We have talked about this at some length and I ask you, I ask you and plead with you to do away with it. The Sponsor of the House put his finger exactly on the reason for the Amendment which at the time it was adopted by the Appropriations Committee, I did not know. The purpose of it is, is to save four jobs. There are four people working down there who are working out of their homes and I dare say those four people have been put on the payroll by the person, the former Board member of the State Board of Elections. I submit that they are his patronage employees. Now if those people should remain working, then the State Board ought to keep them on and provide for an office or have them move to Springfield or to something. We have no business being involved in it. I urge you, Mr. Speaker, to vote 'yes' for this Amendment #5 and do away with this absurdity."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #5 be adopted?"

All those in favor of Representative Walsh's thinking, vote 'aye'; all opposed, and voting with Mr. Harris, vote 'no'. The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis. Her name was mentioned in debate."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, since my name was surreptitiously mentioned in debate, I'd like to remind the prior speaker that Friday we needed a very important vote from him and he... I couldn't get him to vote no matter how I tried."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 38 'ayes', 108 'nos', 5 recorded as 'present'. The Amendment is defeated. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "The Lady mentioned my name in debate and touched..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I don't believe she did."

Walsh: "And I rise on a point of personal privilege just very briefly."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right, briefly."

Walsh: "For the Lady's information, I voted my conscience. She would not understand that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady... Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, all I want to know is where was his conscience Friday?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 2403."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2403."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gene, do you want that Bill called? Representative Barnes. Is he on the floor? Take it out of the record. On Senate Bills, Second Reading, Senate Bill 963."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 963." A

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Representative Greiman on the floor? Senate Bill 963."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Elections Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions from the floor? Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Bowman. Amends Senate Bill 963 on page 1 by deleting Sections and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Whose Amendment is it; Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Bowman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman."

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

I rise to offer Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 963 which is a Bill



providing for application for absentee ballot in certain instances, now my Amendment takes care of a very serious problem which as many of you know recently was thrown into the public eye in Cook County. The problem is that many many voters are disenfranchised. They are disenfranchised through no fault of their own. They are voters who are serving us in the military, serving abroad. They are among us, those who must be out of town on business and these people want to vote. They want to exercise their franchise and they apply for absentee ballots. And those ballots in many cases are delivered to the office of the election officials on election day and in many instances they can't be counted. They cannot be counted. Now they cannot be counted because they cannot be delivered to the polling places, which the law requires before they can be counted. Now at the present time if they cannot be delivered to the polling places in a timely manner, they must be destroyed. Mr. Speaker, it is not fair to destroy the ballots of people who have through no fault of their own returned them in a timely fashion, they are being disenfranchised. In my opinion they are being treated in unequal fashion before the law and if there's anything this country stands for is equal protection of the laws and I submit that if those ballots are in before the polls close, they ought to be counted. Now what this Bill does is provide that they can be counted by central authority. That is to say in the case of, in the case of the County Clerk. Now this Bill has a lot of protection built in, to make sure that nobody is going to get ripped off around here. There are protections in the form of special judicial panels of bipartisan panels. There are provisions for watchers and challengers. There are provisions for watchers and challengers representing civic groups as well as parties and candidates, and I submit to you that this is only fair. In the interest of fairness I ask that Amendment #1 be adopted.

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten."



Totten: "Will the Sponsor yeild for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Totten: "I'm still not sure whether you were talking to the Bill or to the Amendment. What does the Amendment do to the Bill?"

Bowman: "The Amendment adds new provisions regarding the counting of absentee ballots to the extent that they are delivered to the central authority on election day. That is what the Amendment does and that's what I was speaking to."

Totten: "What does the Bill do without the Amendment? Who are they delivered to?"

Bowman: "The Bill, without the Amendment does not describe the delivery process. It is a Bill pertaining to absentee ballots

Totten: "Where would they be counted? Under the Bill, without the Amendment."

Bowman: "They would be counted in the....perhaps I should yield to Representative Grieman but my understanding is that they would be counted in the usual fashion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Grieman."

Grieman: "The Bill as it originally was sent over to the Senate merely provides for additional class of people who may exercise the absentee right and also changes the form of the absentee ballot application. That's what it does but the Amendment, Amendment #1 as I understand it, amends the same Section and makes additional changes in the Absentee Ballot Law. It's an additional kind of thing. The Amendment is not in conflict with the original Bill, but rather as additional matter."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mahar. Oh, I'm sorry, Representative Totten. You have additional questions?"

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm still not sure of exactly what the Amendment does to the Bill. Does this Amendment then provide that no longer would absentee ballots be counted locally as the Bill may orginally, they're now counted by the County Clerk?"



Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Grieman."

Grieman: "The Amendment provides that absentee ballots would still be counted in the precincts. The Amendment takes care of that narrow problem where the absentee ballots arrive too late for delivery or are undelivered. The ballots would still remain counted in the precinct, if they remain undelivered or arrive too late to be counted then they would be counted in a central counting place as Representative Bowman has suggested with all of the protection of watchers and the challengers and all the rest."

Totten: "Well, Okay. The Amendment doesn't change where undelivered ballots would be counted. Is that correct?"

Grieman: "Where...no it does, it changes. Yes it does. Right now undelivered ballots are not counted anyplace. They're thrown away."

Totten: "Is that what the Bill says? Undelivered ballots will be counted anyplace?"

Grieman: "No, it says that undelivered ballots will be counted in a central counting place."

Totten: "Okay. Then the Amendment doesn't change that."

Grieman: "Right now we don't count them at all, Don. We throw them away."

Totten: "You've got a Bill dealing with absentee ballots and you've got an Amendment...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, at the present time all absentee ballots that are delivered in time to be delivered to the polling places are so delivered and counted in the precinct polling place. If this Amendment were adopted and the Bill were signed into law, that would remain unchanged. The bulk of counting, the bulk of all absentee ballots would continue to be counted in the precinct polling places. We're talking about ninety-five percent of all ballots be counted in precinct polling places yesterday, today and tomorrow with or without this Bill, with or without



this Amendment, however, the Bill addresses itself, the Amendment rather, addresses itself to a very narrow part of the spectrum. Only those people who have delivered their ballots in a timely fashion, that is to say, before the polls close on election day but not necessarily in time for them to be delivered to the proper polling places for counting, those ballots would be able to be counted with this Amendment. At the present time without, if this would not be passed into law those ballots would be destroyed. They have been destroyed. We're talking about not destroying ballots but actually allowing them to be counted. This, I submit, is the most feasible way of doing it. We're talking about maybe only 5% of the ballots, but it's an important 5% because these people now are not being counted."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does that answer your question, Representative Totten?"

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, it does and I would like to speak to the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Proceed."

Totten: "The Amendment is a proposal that we have had before us before, I don't remember if it was in the form of an Amendment or in a form of a Bill which we've defeated. But I'm surprised that the Sponsor's of this after we just heard the State Board of Elections are proposing such a measure, because it was during that debate that was so eloquently stated that we should bring the voting process down near and closer to the people and what we are doing here is abrogating those Deputy Clerks of the County Clerk which exist already in the various townships throughout the state and especially suburban Cook County, who have the ability to count these ballots and do a much more efficient job of delivery than exist with the present staff of a County Clerk. This Amendment which we are talking about, taking all these other undelivered ballots and counting them at a central counting station, rather than doing it at all the local jurisdictions; and I'm really



surprised that the proponents would be for centralization." Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I urge you to defeat this Amendment. It would have the effect of split-leveling the authority on absentee ballot counting so that some ballots would be counted in the precinct polling places by certain Judges and some ballots would be counted downtown by other Judges under someone else's authority. The proper way to handle undelivered ballots is to be sure that they get delivered and the best way to do that is to have the Township Clerks in charge. I urge you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the law presently provides if you want to vote in person you show up at the polling place before it closes. There's also a procedure outlining the law to vote absentee and there's a deadline. Now if we're going to do this, why don't you just say if someone shows up at the polls a half hour late, just let them in cause they're not through counting yet. You're opening up a whole new can of worms here and I think it's a mistake."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It would seem to me that the passage of this Amendment would be retrograde indeed to the orderly process and the effective process of our elections as they were intended to be and the proper counting of ballots as it was intended to be. I think Representative Pullen has put her finger precisely on the problem. It also strikes me that the passage of this Amendment would encourage and might have the effect of stimulating not only the split-level, but perhaps in some cases the deliberate delay of the delivery of these ballots so that they could be counted in a centralized authority place. I hate to feel that this might be the effect, but I do indeed believe that it could be the



effect. Whereas, we should be encouraging stimulating the process to go the other way and that is to get the ballots at the local level where they should be counted there where they should be counted and I would like to...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from....."

Hudson: "...and I would urge defeat of the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor veild?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will. Representative Bowman."

Schlickman: "What would be the political complexion of these panels at the central counting station?"

Bowman: "They would be bipartisan."

Schlickman: "What is the size of the panels?"

Bowman: "Three members."

Schlickman: "Well how would you determine their bipartisanship?"

Bowman: "The bipartisanship would be determined in a manner similar to that which is provided for in the law for providing bipartisanship on other panels."

Schlickman: "Well you'll have, it says in the same manner and with the same division between political parties as provided for other Judges of election, I'm quoting from the Bill, Sir."

Bowman: "Well will the panels be alternating? Will they alternate in terms of majority?"

Bowman: "Well, what you're, when you talk about alternating you're talking about the even and odd number precincts. Of course there are no even and odd numbered precincts here. The language to the Bill or the language to the Amendment, I believe is certainly, clearly would require that half the panel would have an odd, have majority Republican and half would have a majority Democrat. That is the effect of numbering the precincts even and odd and tying the majority and half to have Republican majorities."

Schlickman: "Where that's safeguard provided in your Amendment?"

Bowman: "It says that it shall be appointed in the same manner, with the same division between political parties, as provided for in other cases, where you have the numbered precincts."



That is the effect of numbering the precincts."

Schlickman: "On page eighteen, you say that all absentee voters ballots received by the election authority after 12:00 noon on election day or too late for delivery to the proper polling place before the closing of the polls. Who's to make the determination as to whether it will be after 12:00 or too late to make delivery? Which is in the alternative?"

Bowman: "Well, if you please, the County Clerk to whom they are delivered would make that determination. In other words, if the ballots came in at 2:00 o'clock and they were able to deliver to the polling places, then they would be obliged to do so, however, by putting 12:00 noon in there, there is the guarantee that there will not be anything coming in before 12:00 must be delivered."

Schlickman: "May I speak to the Amendment, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This as a subject matter which we have considered previously, unfortunately to no avail. Here we are in the closing days of the Session presented with a 26 page Amendment, which affects a very sensitive area of the Election Code. An Amendment which is intended, I believe to take somebody off the hook, specifically the Clerk of the County of Cook, which goofed last fall, when he needn't have goofed under the present Election Code. It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if we want reform in this area, if we want improvement then let's have the absentee ballots issued at the local level, at the township level and counted there. Where they won't be lost, where they will be counted. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I somehow kind of like that split level routine. That was pretty good because what the opponents of this Bill are suggesting is that we split the whole process



among thirty separate election officials. Among thirty township officials some of who have a lot of experience in running federal elections, I suppose and some who have no experience in running elections except a township election. The suggestion is that this be defeated because the delivery system is better. Yet this Bill, this Amendment that Representative Bowman has offered has a very important feature in it that it requires within two days. It requires the clerk to send out the ballots within two working days after... three working days, pardon me, after the receipt of the application for a ballot. Which means that if you get it on October 7th, you have to send it out by the 10th, and not at the end of the month. There are safeguards. At this point we have six pages of Election Bills in the index. If we don't pass a Bill, if we don't enact a law that will make sure that people are not disenfranchised, then we have failed in a significant part of our duty. If you leave it to the townships, by the way, there is no afternoon mail in my township and there is no afternoon mail in most suburban townships, which would mean that anybody who's ballot would come in the afternoon of election day would be... they would not be delivered to the Clerk until the next morning. Way too late for delivery. Way too late for anything. And I don't have any control over the post office and neither does anybody in this room have any control over it. So that we are disenfranchising all the people whose ballots would come in on the afternoon of election day. You know those ballots are Republican ballots, most of them. We're talking about suburban Cook County. If I was a Republican, I would want a system that's going to count the ballots, the absentee ballots in suburban Cook County and I would take whether it was the lady from the fourth districts Bill whether it was Representative Bowman's Bill or whoever's Bill it was. I would want to see to it that those Republican votes, most are Republican, are counted when they're cast. That's our duty."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Taylor."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed. The previous question's been moved. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman to close."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, I honestly don't know what these voters have done to deserve the kind of treatment that they are being handed by this General Assembly or at least by the some of the Members of the General Assembly who would literally, literally deny them of their franchise to vote. These people who would be affected by this Amendment have done nothing wrong. They're good honest hardworking citizens, taxpaying citizens, many of them serving in the military abroad and you're going around to those people and tell them if they mail their ballot in a couple of days ahead of time and it happens to be delivered after 12:00 P.M. after 12:00 noon on election day but before the polls close, that ballot can't be counted. Where, if they were in town and had showed up to the polls between 12 and 6, their vote would be counted. Now, what are you going to tell those people when you take away their right to vote? I don't know what you're telling them because you're talking in terms of, you know, splitting the authority and so forth. Let me tell you those Judges of election who aren't responsible for counting most of the ballots whether or not this Amendment is adopted they're under the County Clerk. We're talking about the same jurisdiction. You know all this other talk about the Township Clerks don't work for the County Clerk and we talk about splitting jurisdictions, that's splitting jurisdictions if I ever heard it. So all we're asking for here, Ladies and Gentlemen is a matter of simple justice for treating people equally. If the vote arrives before the polls close no matter whose vote it is, whether it's a absentee voter or a flesh



and blood voter who walks to the polling place. Their vote deserves to be counted and what's at stake here, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I urge an affirmative vote, Amendment #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #1 be adopted? All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Marko. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bluthardt to explain his vote. Timer is on."

Bluthardt: "Am I on? Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm urging you to vote 'no' on this attempt to change the absentee ballot method because Cook County did have a bad experience in the last election especially in the district represented, I think by Representative Greiman. They think it is now necessary to change the entire law. It is not necessary. The machinery is there and it works. It's worked in the past and it'll work this time. You say why should one be disenfranchised? I'll tell you, there are many ways one could be disenfranchised. The biggest one is because of lack of ability. If those people voting absentee would get their applications in on time and get the ballot and return it on time, they wouldn't be disenfranchised. You're disenfranchising the old system of paper ballots when the Judge overlooks putting his initials on that ballot. You're disenfranchised if you're convicted of a felony, there are many ways you lose your privilege of voting and I don't think that we ought to go to the trouble of changing the entire system of absentee balloting because of an error or oversight and the lack of manpower in one district of the County Clerk's office last fall. This Amendment should be defeated."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jaffe, to explain his vote. Have all voted who wished? Representative Jaffe? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 90 'ayes', 76 'nays', 3 recorded as 'present'. The Amendment is



adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #2, Greiman. Amends Senate Bill 963."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You just put it on there. I'm sorry. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #2, Greiman. Amends Senate Bill 963 on page 1, line 18 by deleting the following."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greim

Greiman: "Yeh, there was a typographical error and a misspelling and that's what this Amendment does."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is ther any discussion? The question is, sh Amendment #2 be adopted? All those in favor signify by say 'aye', opposed. Amendment #2 is adopted. Any furhter Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #3, Schneider. Amends House Bill..Senate Bill 963 on page 1, lines 1 through 6 by inserting the following."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider. Can anyone speak in behalf of Amendment #3? Representative Schneider's Amendment. Representative Greiman moves the adoption of Amendment #3. All those in favor...any discussion? Representative Greiman, Amendment

Greiman: "Well, I don't have a copy of it. Is the permanent speaker someplace about?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I believe his Amendment is on 964, if my memo serves me correctly. Why don't we just take Amendment #3 out of the record? Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #4, Porter. Amends Senate Bill 963 on page 1, by deleting lines through 3 and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Porte

Porter: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Bill now contains the Bowman Amendment and I think the Bowman Amendment addressed a real problem, certainly one th we had in Cook County and that is the sanctity of a properl cast ballot. Representative Bowman is absolutely correct t the process is more important than the result, that the



counting of the ballots cast by each voter is more important than the outcome. The question is how can we best assure that the ballots get counted and facilitate the distribution of them? Amendment #4 would strike everything after the enacting clause in the Bill and substitute the proper system for providing the franchise to voters in Cook County and particularly in the suburban areas. It would provide that applications for absentee ballots would be made through the Township Clerks and they are Deputy Clerks in Cook County. They would receive the application; they would distribute the ballots locally and when they had been voted they would distribute them to the precincts where they would be counted as they are today. It would insure that the ballots would be counted in the precincts. That has been part of our law for a long long time, it has been the safest procedure. It has insured iminimum fraud in elections, it's the way we ought to do it. Now, what we ought to be looking at is first, is the convenience of the voter. The voter ought to be able to go somewhere locally to apply for an absentee ballot. Going all the way downtown to do so is inconvenient. Going to the township office and applying there is very convenient and ought to be part of our law. Seems to me that the Judges who work in the precincts also ought to be the ones to count the ballots. This Amendment would provide for that procedure, I think it's a fair one. I think if Representative Bowman really believes if these ballots ought to be properly counted and counted in the precinct this is the way he and the others ought to go and I would urge the adoption of Amendment #4."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman.

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to Amendment #4 for several reasons. Not even in the difference in the philosophy of how they should be counted. Amendment #4 strikes everything after the enacting clause, so that it takes out the original Bill as presented. It takes out for example allowing the



law enforcement officers to vote by absentee, which is in the original Bill. It takes out the change in the whole forum of the application for absentee ballots. Right now we have five separate kinds of applications for absentee ballots and the Bill is designed to make that into a single application with several alternatives. So that this Bill, this Amendment as Representative Porter has suggested is a step backward, because it wipes out the important provisions as sent over from the Senate. As far as the suggestions of the Amendment itself, I renew my comments about dividing among thirty separate township officials not having a requirement that they send out the ballots within a particular day, not having a requirement they send out a public listing as the...as Mr. Bowman's Amendment has. Mr. Bowman's Amendment requires a public listing of every applicant and a public listing of every ballot that has been received so it can be monitored. Now, we can monitor, we can monitor the clerk downtown, but I don't know how the heck we can monitor 30 separate election officials so easily. I think...also I might tell you I'm not sure that everybody knows what township they live in. People in Glenview, Glenview's in four separate townships and if I'm in Korea, if I'm in Europe and I'm a serviceman, I may not know whether I apply to the...to the New Trier township or the...or the Niles township or the Northfield or which one in Glenview I apply to I'm not sure. Perhaps my parents have moved within Glenview and my ballot is lost. No, I think this Amendment should be soundly defeated."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to favor this Amendment just to delete the last sentence in the original Bill, where it says 'delete the requirement of sworn to applications to obtain a permanently disabled voters identification card. I'll guarantee you if this Bill passes there'll be forty disabled people in each precinct



in the City of Chicago and in the suburbs those that play with the ballots....there'll be forty of them in the suburbs. I'm not accusing any party. I'm accusing that there could be more fraud with just that last sentence in this Bill and that's why everything after the enacting clause should be struck and this Amendment should be passed. The answer to Mr. Grieman's question is you've got close to three million people voting in the City of Chicago, you're going to have thirty assistants helping Stanley Cusper count those ballots that he didn't have time to count or get them out to the precincts in time. Let the county, let the township clerks, let the village clerks that they were elected to do their job by statutes. The cities and village provides them to have control of elections and that's the reason why I favor this Amendment. It should be adopted."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't want to labor the obvious, but if you vote for this Amendment you essentially cancel out the Amendment that you already got through adopting, so I think that it would be a colossal waste of our time if we were to adopt an Amendment that effectively cancelled our previous good effort. In addressing myself to however, to a specific point raised by Representative Conti who favors, in fact striking the entire language of the existing Bill. I come from a section of Chicago which is, in fact, has a good many disabled voters. In fact, there are probably as many as 2,000 people living in nursing homes in my district. And let me assure Representative Conti that they all vote anyway. I am satisfied that they do not support me however, but I have no fear that by leaving that language in that we're creating problems, in fact...yes...they are still subject to perjury because they do have to file an affidavit attesting to the fact that they are disabled and if they continue to vote once their disability passes they...a...



they are subject to perjury, and my suggestion is that we extend that right to those individuals who cannot make it to the polls. This is in fact a Bill that will enfranchise people who really deserve to be enfranchised."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Porter to close."

Porter: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think the Members understand the importance of this issue. Seems to me that if we want to serve the convenience of the voter, if we want to make sure that their vote counts and if we want to eliminate any possibility of fraud, that Amendment #4 is the way to do it. In fact we get two shots at eliminating fraud, one that Representative Conti mentioned also. Seems to me that the ballots ought to be counted in the precinct. This has been our system and it's worked well for us. The problem has arisen because the County Clerk could not for some reason get the ballots there. The sensible way is to originate them there and have them delivered by the Township Clerks. Seems to me that it can work well and it would work well. It seems to me that it would eliminate fraud and it seems to me that it would make every ballot count. I would urge you to vote 'aye' on Amendment #4."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #4 be adopted? All in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 77 'ayes', 83 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Porter."

Porter: "Would you poll the absentees, please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "A poll of the absentees have been requested. Gentleman from Logan, Representative Lauer."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded? Lauer. Jack."

Lauer: "Change me to 'aye', please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's not out of the machine yet, Jack."



One moment."

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

Lauer: "Change me to 'aye', please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Change him to 'aye' please. The Gentleman from
Will, Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker, will you cast my vote 'no', please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record the Gentleman as 'no'. Poll
the absentees please."

Clerk O'Brien: "Adams, Breslin..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Wait a minute. Would you kindly record Adams
as 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Breslin, Don Brummet, Farley, Gaines, Hart,
Kornowicz, Madison, McAvoy, Pechous, Rigney, Schisler..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Kindly record Representative
Rigney as 'aye'. Christensen 'no'. Brummet 'no'. Just
wait a minute. Simms, 'aye'. Schisler, 'no'. Stanley, how
do you want to be recorded? Kindly record Representative
Stanley as 'aye'. Schisler. Did you get Schisler as
'no'? Please proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Simms."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Simm's, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Stearney, Von Boeckman.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative
Porter. Pardon me. The Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Breslin."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Lady recorded?"

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

Breslin: "Please record me as 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record her as 'no'. Mr. Porter."

Porter: "I would like a verification of the Negative Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative
Sharp. Kindly change him. Representative Sharp. Kindly
record him from 'aye' to 'no', Sharp. The Lady from St. Clair,
Mrs. Younge."

Younge: "Change my vote 'no', please."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mrs. Younge from 'aye' to 'no'.
The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Farley."

Farley: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded? You're recorded
as not voting."

Farley: "Please vote me 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Representative Farley as 'no'.
The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Gaines."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded? Representative
Gaines."

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Gaines: "Vote me 'aye' please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record him as 'aye'. On this question
there are 80 'ayes' and 90 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook,
Representative Porter."

Porter: "Verification of the Negative Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks for a verification of
the Negative Roll Call. The Clerk will proceed to verify."

Clerk O'Brien: "E.M. Barnes, Beatty, Birchler, Bowman, Bradley,
Brady, Brandt, Breslin, Rich, Brummer, Don Brummet, Byers,
Caldwell, Capparelli..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Jim Houlihan requests to be
verified. Representative Porter. Jim Houlihan wants to be
verified. Okay."

Clerk O'Brien: "Chapman, Christensen, Darrow, Corneal Davis,
Dawson, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, John Dunn, Epton, Ewell,
Farley, Flinn, Garmisa, Getty, Giglio, Giorgi, Greiman,
Hanahan, Harris, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, Jim Houlihan,
Huff."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Porter. Porter. Put Porter
please. Yes, Sir?"

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, could we slow down just a little bit and have
the Members be in their seats and raise their hands?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the Gentleman kindly be in their seats."



All unauthorized personæ kindly remove yourselves from the chamber. Clerk proceed with the verification of the Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Jacobs, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Kane, Katz, Kelly, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leverenz, Levin, Lucco, Luft, Madigan, Mann, Marovitz, Peggy Smith Martin, Matejek, Matijevich, Mautino, McClain, McGrew, McLendon, McPike, Mudd, Mugalian."

Speaker Lechowicz: "One moment please. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I no longer can stand the pressure, I just can't hold out. Would you please switch my vote from...what is it, George? "aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly switch the Gentleman from 'aye' to 'no'. No, I'm sorry, from 'no' to 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mulcahey, Murphy, Nardulli, O'Brien, O'Daniel, Pierce, Pouncey, Richmond, Robinson, Satterwaite, Schisler, Schneider, Sharp, Shumpert, Steczo, Stuffle, Taylor, Terzich, Tipsword, Van Duyn, Vitek, Willer, Williams, Younge, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any question of the affirmative vote? The negative vote? Well on this question there are 89 'aves'. 89 'nays'. 81 'aves'. Is that where we're starting from, Jack?"

Clerk O'Brien: "81 'aves', 89 'nays'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Porter."

Porter: "Representative Bradley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Bradley. Representative Bradley. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "I don't see the Gentleman in his chair. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Take him off the record."

Porter: "Representative Brady?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Brady. How's the Gentleman recorded?"



Clerk O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I don't see the Gentleman in his chair. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Representative Brady. There he is."

Porter: "Representative Brummer?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Brummer. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "I don't see the Gentleman in the chair. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Representative Brummer? Take him off the Roll Call."

Porter: "Representative Brummet?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Brummet? Brummer is here. Put Brummer back on the Roll Call. Representative Mautino wants to be verified now. Leave. So does Representative John Dunn. Put Representative Bradley back on the Roll Call. Bradley's here. Representative Davis requests to be verified as well. Any other question, Representative Porter?"

Porter: "Did we...Brummet I think we had..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Brummet? Well he's in his chair."

Porter: "Representative Domico?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Domico's in his chair."

Porter: "Representative Boyle?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Doyle's in his chair."

Porter: "Representative Garmisa?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Garmisa. Is right over here to the right."

Porter: "Representative Dawson?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Dawson. He's over here."

Porter: "Representative Giorgi?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Giorgi? Right by Tim Simms."

Porter: "Representative Hanahan?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Hanahan? I don't see the Gentleman in the chair. Representative Hanahan in the chamber? Take him off the Roll Call."

Porter: "Representative Kane?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman's in his chair. Kane's in his



chair."

Porter: "Representative Katz?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Katz's in his chair."

Porter: "Representative Mautino?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mautino's in his chair."

Porter: "Representative Madigan?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Madigan. He'll be out here momentarily. Gentleman in the chamber? Representative Madigan? I don't believe he's in the chamber. Here he is Madigan's here."

Porter: "Representative McGrew?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "McGrew? He's in the chamber."

Porter: "Representative Mudd?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mudd? Representative Mudd? I don't see the Gentleman in his chair. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Representative Mudd. He'll be right out. We'll take him off temporarily."

Porter: "Representative Nardulli?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Nardulli? I don't see the Gentleman in his chair. Is Representative Nardulli in the chamber? Nardulli? He'll be right out, he's in the man's room. Take him off the Roll Call."

Porter: "The Speaker? The Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's in his office."

Porter: "Representative Shumpert?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Shumpert in his chair. Kindly put Representative Mudd on the Roll Call."

Porter: "Representative Von Boeckman?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's in his chair. Jimmy? Representative Von Boeckman. How's he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Von Boeckman: "Vote me 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Good. Kindly record him as 'no'. Put Representative Von Boeckman back on the Roll Call. Any further questions?"



Porter: "Representative Capparelli?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Capparelli? Representative Capparelli?"

Better get all those guys out here. I don't see the Gentleman in the chamber. Take him off the record. Put Capparelli back on the record. Any further discussion? What's the count?

Porter: "I don't have any more questions."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On this question there are 82 'ayes', 88 'no', the Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Representative Schneider. All right forget it. Third Reading. The Gentleman from Madison, Representative McPike. On Senate Bill 550. It was withdrawn."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 550, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Air Carriers Act. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #1, to Senate Bill 550 by Representative McPike."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. At the last meeting of the Illinois Aeronautics Board and the Legislative Advisory Committee, we decided to introduce House Bill...I'm sorry Senate Bill 550. The Senate Sponsor, Senator Wooten, appeared with me in Committee, at which time a problem arose as to the legality of the State of Illinois regulating traffic on interstate air transportation. We accepted Amendment #1 thinking that it simply eliminated this provision from the Bill. However, later on after discussing it with the Aeronautics Board we decided that the Amendment in effect gutted the entire Bill and therefore, we would like to table the Amendment and proceed with the Bill as it was introduced."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from McHenry,



Representative Skinner, on the Amendment."

Skinner: "Well, I'm pleased to know that Speaker number 'A' is not in the Chair, in order to take this out of the record at this time when I ask for a Roll Call. As the Republican Spokesman on Transportation I'm thankful that Speaker number 'B' will allow one. This Amendment was accepted in order to make the Bill have a snowball's chance in hell of being Constitutional. Now all of us know that the first course we took that touched on Constitutional law whether it be Civics in ninth grade or American History in eleventh, tenth or eleventh grade, says that state government may not regulate interstate commerce. That is commerce between two states. What we did in the Transportation Committee was take out two words of this Bill. This Bill purported to regulate interstate commerce. We took the two words out 'or interstate'. Now Representative McPike desires to put those two words back in and that is why he has made this motion to table the Amendment. If the Bill is useless without these two words, then the Bill is useless period, because there is no way on earth these two words are going to remain through a Federal Court test. It seems to me that Constitutionality is not always a good reason to kill a Bill or kill an Amendment, but certainly when one knows that a court test is going to come when the proponents say that's what they're looking for and everybody knows which way it comes out. Illinois is losing, we shouldn't waste the money of the State of Illinois in proceeding further. For that reason, I would ask that you vote 'no' on this motion to table, so that Illinois will not be presumptuous enough to declare its independence this year."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative McPike to close."

McPike: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the last speaker was right, it is the intent of the Illinois Aeronautics Board and the Legislative Advisory Committee to



get a court test on this question. Three years ago when the Illinois Aeronautics Board was set up, it was set up with the intention of regulating the safe operation of air carriers in Illinois, and because of some unusual circumstances the Board has not been able to do that. And without going into the Bill itself just to speak to the Amendment. It's absolutely important, it's absolutely essential that these words stay in the Bill so that we can proceed with our original intention. And that is to take this Bill through the House and the Senate, get the legislative intent behind the Illinois Aeronautics Board and then take it to court to decide exactly what we can and cannot do in this state. And the only way to do it is to take the Bill through the House and the Senate and have it signed in its original form. Therefore, I would move that Amendment #1 be tabled."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved that Amendment #1 be tabled. All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 72 'ayes', 66 'nays' 1 recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman's motion prevails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Skinner."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Skinner."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amends Senate Bill 550 on page 1 and so forth."

Skinner: "Well the Bill is certainly worth killing now. It does something which we are constitutionally notable to do, but perhaps we can make it worth passing by putting something in it that would be decent. There are basically four ways to raise money. The most satisfactory of which is the user charge, such as the motor fuel tax which pays for highways. What this Amendment will do is require that the safety inspection of airplanes covered under this Act shall be paid for from fees of those people who are using the airplanes. Now that sounds reasonable



to me; I don't know why we should have to subsidize people who are using airplanes if we don't use airplanes. The Amendment is that simple."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Amendment. I think for those of you on the House floor that are concerned about precedence this is a precedence setting Amendment. Continually in the, and I especially talk to the other side of the aisle, continually the Republican party has opposed Amendments which would make the people that the state regulate and inspect, pay for those inspections and those regulations. I give you an example. Last year Governor Walker had a Bill that would have increased license fees for nursing homes, eight dollars per bed and increase the fee, license fee from fifty dollars to a hundred dollars. Republican party thought that it could not support a Bill that the industry... that was being regulated also should pay for the fee. If you support this kind of Amendment, I think indeed you are setting up a precedent where in the agency which we are regulating will have to pay for its regulation and inspections. I think it's a dangerous precedent and especially the other side of the aisle ought to stand in opposition to it, and I for one stand in opposition to this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I also rise in opposition to this. I find it extremely unusual that this would come from the other side of the aisle. What this would mean, in effect, it would be higher airfares for all third level air carriers in Illinois and like the previous speaker said, 'it would mean that the regulated is paying for the regulator,' so



in effect the Aeronautic Board could hire as many inspectors as they wanted and the regulated, the air carriers would be forced to pay for these. The expenses would be unreasonable and I think that precedent that we are setting here, having to regulate pay for the regulator's duties is certainly a bad precedent. I would urge a 'no' vote on this." t

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Skinner, to close."

Skinner: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I just heard the most incredible line of logic that I think I've heard since I entered here, and that is if those people who are licensed should pay the cost...that it cost to regulate them. The Insurance Department is paid for by fees from the insurance companies, the Illinois Commerce Commission is paid for by a tax from the utilities, the road fund, our highways are built by taxes of motorists who use those roads. The Department of Registration and Education is largely financed by licensing fees and I did vote for forcing nursing homes to pay for licensing of them. So, I think that it's totally consistent with what the State of Illinois has traditionally done and for that reason I ask for this Amendment's adoption. Let the Department of Aeronautics pay it's own way."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #2 be adopted? All those in favor vote or say 'aye', all those opposed. the 'nos' have it and the Amendment is defeated. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Did he ask for a Roll Call, George, is time? All right we'll give him a Roll Call. All those in favor of Amendment #2 vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Gentleman from McHenry to explain his vote, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Well just in case some of my colleagues who believe that people ought to pay their own way..aren't listening. This Bill will require that airline users pay their own way. If



it doesn't pass, this Bill will probably become known as the Legislators and Lobbyists Relief Act. 1977."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 71 'ayes', 79 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'. The Amendment fails. Any further Amendment?"

Clerk Hall: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 881. 878, I'm sorry 881 is next. 878. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 878, a Bill for an Act defining the powers and duties of local government agencies to pay premiums and cost of portions thereof. Third Reading..Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk Hall: "No motions or Floor Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #1, Terzich. Amends House...Senate Bill 878 on page 1, line 31 by deleting 10% and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 30%."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move to table Amendment #1 because of a technical error which will be corrected by Amendment #2. I move to table Amendment #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1. All those in favor signal by saying 'aye', all those opposed. Amendment #1 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #2, Terzich. Amends Senate Bill 878 on page 1, line 31 by inserting 30% immediately before 10%."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Like the Amendment is to read. It simply changes the maximum amount of contribution from 100% reducing it down to 30% and I would move for adoption of Amendment #1...#2."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #2. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all opposed..."



Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 881, Representative Catania."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 881, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act creating the Department of Children and Family Services. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions."

Clerk Hall: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. There was a fiscal note filed.

Now the Order is Priority of Call. First Bill is Senate Bill 967. Representative Giorgi. Thats nice. 967, Zeke "

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 967, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill that came out of the Industry and Labor Committee with a favorable vote and it amends the Illinois Insurance Code. Provides that when an employer's three consecutive policies years of Workmen's Compensation Insurance with no claims filed, under the policy the carrier may not refuse to renew the policy until the end of the first year thereafter, in which a compensable injury occurs and the carrier shall grant that employer a 15% reduction in premium for the first year after his first three injury fee period and I suggest to the Members of the General Assembly that this will help us in this Workmen's Comp. problem and I urge your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 967 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Domico. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 141 'ayes', 9 'nays' and no recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is



hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 968, Representative Getty."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 968, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unified Code of Corrections. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman From Cook, Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, at the request of Representative Katz, I'd like to take this out of the record for a moment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 981, Representative Giorgi."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 981, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker. this Bill allows the Treasurer's Office and the County Clerk's Office to send out revenue...estimated tax bills because of the lateness in overlapping districts of presenting their rates and it passed the Senate and passed the House Revenue Committee and I urge the adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 981 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 152 'aye', 1 'nay', none recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Wolf, what purpose do you seek recognition? Wolf. It's on the left hand side there. Jake Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I inadvertantly pushed the red button on Senate Bill 967. I would ask leave to be recorded as 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has leave? Hearing no objections the Gentleman may be so recorded. Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Mr. Speaker, could I have leave to be recorded as voting 'no' on 967? I missed my duty."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman have leave to record him 'no'? 967. Hearing no such objection the Gentleman is so recorded. Senate Bill 1007. Representative Polk."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 1007, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Unified Code of Corrections. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Polk. It's your Bill, 1007."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Senate Bill 1007 which was sponsored by Senator Knuppel in the Senate, provides that either parent, not just the mother, who has sole custody of a child, when sentenced to prison may arrange for placement through the Department of Family Services. Although it sounds quite controversial apparently it was not. We had no problems in the Committee. It was passed out 9 to nothing. The floor vote in the Senate was 49 to nothing and on behalf of Senator Knuppel and his 69 Bills, that he's handling in the Senate, I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1007 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. ON this question there are 149 'ayes', 4 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Mulcahey for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to be recorded as voting 'aye' on 967, please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman have leave to be recorded as 'aye' on Senate Bill 967? Hearing no objections the Gentleman is so recorded. The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Mautino on Senate Bill 1012. Mautino. Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 1013, Representative Deuster."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1013, a Bill for an Act to amend



Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill "

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill really ought to be on the Consent Calendar, it makes no substantive change in the law but it.... another area of the Criminal Code, it adds feminine terminology in two places 'or her'. I'd ask your favorable support of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1013 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 156 'ayes', 1 'nay', 2 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, it won't change the vote, I'm sure it won't on 1077. I made a mistake and voted 'aye', I'd like to be voted as 'present'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the number?"

Conti: "1077, I'm sorry."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Right. 1007? You want to be recorded as 'no'?"

Conti: "1007, yes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "10, no, we didn't have 1077. 1007."

Conti: "1007, I'm sorry."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You want to be recorded as 'no'?"

Conti: "Yes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Hearing none the Gentleman is so recorded. Senate Bill 1025, Representative Brady. You gonna handle it for him, Dan? Representative Dan Houlihan."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 1025, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act relating to the inspection of hospital records. This Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dan Houlihan."



Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, on Senate Bill 1025 there was an agreed Amendment which I've just discovered has not been offered. At this time I would ask leave to take Senate Bill 1025 back to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment and that Amendment will be offered by Representative Jaffe."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You want to bring it back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment? Does the Gentleman have have leave? Hearing no objections, from Third to Second and the Clerk will read the Amendment."

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #1, Jaffe, Amends Senate Bill 1025 on page 1, line 1 by inserting immediately after 'of' the following."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This merely includes the records of Clinical Psychologists as well as Psychiatrists under the Senate Bill 1025. As indicated by the Sponsor, we did talk about it and it is agreed to."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Would you run that once more? What does it do?"

Jaffe: "It includes Clinical Psycholgists as well as Psychiatrists, because every often those records are really the records of a Clinical Psychologist and not of a Psychiatrist."



Leinenweber: "Did you do anything with line 21 of the Bill?"

Jaffe: "Does it do anything with line 21?"

Leinenweber: "Yes, it appears....."

Jaffe: "No..."

Leinenweber: "The original Bill, it appears that...."

Jaffe: "No, all.... well, just let me read. It says.... no, it doesn't do anything with line 21 as such."

Leinenweber: "Let me ask the Sponsor, Dan, you've got the Bill. Look at line 21, it appears to be a...."

Jaffe: "No, I'm looking at the Amendment, I don't see anything with line 21. What it does is add language after line 30. It also does something on line 8, which is merely technical but nothing on line 21."

Leinenweber: "In other words the Amendment merely adds an additional type of medical person to the provisions of the Bill."

Jaffe: "That's correct."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Would the Sponsor of the Bill, yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will."

Waddell: "In this language am I certain now that the individual rights would be circumvented by merely having somebody appeal to the courts for revealing what a record of psychiatric or psychological record is?"

Houlihan: "Let me if I may, in attempting to put this in a prospective, point out that in the last Session of the General Assembly we enacted as part of our medical malpractice package of legislation, the existing Section of the statute which is before us in this Bill that it allows complete access by a patient or his agent which would include an attorney to the individual patients records. Now, what the Bill provides is an exemption to that as far as psychiatric records are concerned. And in order to secure those records if they are to be denied by the psychiatrist for good cause,



and the only way you could get those would be for the patient or his attorney to apply to the court and have the court order the records to be turned over to the patient or to his agent. What the Amendment does is simply adds psychologist, clinical psychologist to the Bill as well as psychiatrist. So in consequence to answer your question, no this does not loosen in any sense the protection to the patient. What it does is tighten up as far as divulgement of these records to add another exception, clinical psychologist as well as psychologist that the Bill provides."

Leinenweber: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz."

Katz: "I wanted to direct an inquiry if I might to Mr. Houlihan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, Representative Jaffe is offering the Amendment."

Katz: "Well, Mr. Jaffe, then because it seems to me that Mr. Waddell's point has not been answered. And while we have it on Second Reading maybe that's the time to take care of it. Why should we make it so that a court may direct the disclosure of psychiatric or psychological records under any circumstances? That should be a matter that would be privileged and I don't understand why the Amendment isn't broad enough so that it is privileged to even...as to a court."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Jaffe, do you want to respond to that... no, Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Let me refer first of all, Harold, as far as the privilege, this refers to where a patient applies for his own records. Presently he... there is no provision whatever from a patient applying for his own psychiatric record.. What the Bill addresses itself to is that there may be harm in free access by the patient or his agent, his attorney to a patient's psychiatric record. And where the psychiatrists feels that it would not be in the best interest



of the patient to have those records turned over to him. Then the patient may secure those records on application to the court, now the only thing that Representative Jaffe's Amendment does is to add in addition to this protection, if you will referring to psychiatrists, is to add clinical psychologists."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Friedland."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, ... the Gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed. The previous question has been moved. Representative Jaffe to close on the Amendment."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, I think everybody understands on this... all we're doing is adding clinical psychologists. In response to what Representative Katz asked about, and although it has nothing to do with the Amendment here are cases where you might have a paranoid schizophrenic hero and to have him to have access to the record might be really the worse thing in the world for him. And therefore, I think what Representative Houlihan is trying to do, is trying to give that individual some protection. If a paranoid schizophrenic were to take a look at his record, I think he might, you know... really misinterpret all those things and they really have to be interpreted I think for that particular individual. I would just urge an 'aye' vote on my Amendment, just has clinical psychologists and it is an Agreed Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #1 be adopted? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed. Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1027, Representative



Brady. Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Take that one out of the record if you will until Representative Brady gets back."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right. Senate Bill 1037, Representative Pierce. Is the Gentleman on the floor? Pierce. Don't see him. Senate Bill 1043, Representative Greiman."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 1043, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code of Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1043, it seeks to change procedures to insure that a defendant who has been fined receives credit for the time that he serves before getting out. Under the law, if there is a fine imposed in a misdemeanor traffic case, some case like that. That defendant is entitled to five dollars for each day that he served. What's happening now because of the system is that they're not giving credit for time served. A man will serve two or three days then be let out, then get a fine imposed a month later. He doesn't know about this law that he is entitled to. Nobody is checking on it, the clerk doesn't.... in the courtroom doesn't think about it and so he ends up not getting credit for the time served. So that the clerk has come to us and has said, 'we want to give these people credit for the time served', therefore, we want the clerk of the court to make a form to give... to advise that defendant of his rights, that he has it and for the defendant then to in turn sit out the time that he has served. So that he will get appropriate credit against a fine. I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call, the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County has asked for the.... has supported the Bill enthusiastically and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1043 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 140 'ayes', no 'nays', 5 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1053, Representative Telcser. Representative Telcser. Where is he at? Oh, we'll go to 1037, Representative Pierce."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 1037, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act requiring compensation for the causing deaths of wrongful acts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what this Bill does is it amends the Wrong Death Act to make it clear that a minor has two years from the time of reaching his majority in order to bring a Wrongful Death Act ordinary for the death of a parent against the person causing the death. There is some confusion in the law now on that, the Wrongful Death Act requires that action be brought within two years of the death and other statutes of limitations provide that the two years doesn't run in other cases until such time as the minor reaches the majority. Its statutory...in confusion...recently in the Circuit Court of Cook County, Judge Ben Schwartz ruled that the minor had to bring the action within two years of the death even though he may only be four or five years old. And on appeal, Judge Derringer reversed it and ruled what this Bill attempts to establish, the fact that the statute of limitations, two years, is not run until the minor reaches his majority at age eighteen. So all this Bill does is clarify which as Derringer in the Appellate Court says the law is. That is why Senator D'Arco introduced it and I urge the passage of Senate Bill 1037, which clarifies the



law in a way that most of us already thought that it was."
Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Will,
Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I have one question. Representative Pierce,
the person that brings the action is the personal representative
not the next of kin, is that correct? The actual vehicle
is the estate."

Pierce: "On the wrongful death?"

Leinenweber: "Yes."

Pierce: "Ordinarily that's true, yes."

Leinenweber: "What you're saying is that the people who are
actually entitled under the law of dependency or succession
to share in the proceeds of wrongful death settlement are
the ones that you measure the statute of limitation based
upon the age of the youngest, is that what the Bill does?"

Pierce: "On the age of the.... that that person's right will
not be barred by the two year statute of limitations until
they reach their majority and have the two years at that
time."

Leinenweber: "Well, in effect would it not be...."

Pierce: "All the people would be barred."

Leinenweber: "In other words, if no action was brought and
the person left surviving a wife and say three children,
one of whom was say four years old and the others were
eighteen at the time of the death. The wife, of course, being
over eighteen, then the wife and the two children that are
eighteen would have two years; but the portion, if no one
brought any action they apportion allocable just to the four
year old would remain open for sixteen years. Is that
right?"

Pierce: "That's my understanding of the Bill, it only protects
the minor, the widow or anyone at age eighteen would have
to bring the action within two years of the death in order
to recover, however, a minor would not be barred by the fact
that they failed... his fights would not be barred by the



Bill.

fact they failed to bring that action, their rights would be barred. That's my understanding of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will."

Geo-Karis: "In other words, if I understand it correctly, under this Bill what you're doing is eliminating the old rule of the two years after they reach twenty-one years of age in which to sue or have their representative sue, is that correct?"

Pierce: "Eighteen years of age."

Geo-Karis: "You're making it eighteen now, is that right?"

Pierce: "Right now most of us think this is the law anyway because most statutes of limitations don't toll against minors. However, on the Death Act apparently there were some interpretations that it did, including by Judge Schwartz in the Circuit Court which that is not our Schwartz, Lee Schwartz, that's Ben Schwartz. Lee Schwartz isn't there yet. But Judge Derringer in the Appellate Court reversed that and apparently he requested... Senator D'Arco introduced the Bill to make it clear that on a Death Act like every other action a minor is not barred until... the statute doesn't begin to toll against him until he turns eighteen. It puts the law where you and I always thought it always was. Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "I think prior to this... if this Bill is passed prior to this it would be twenty-one, wasn't that up to twenty-one before? I mean, in the present law...."

Pierce: "No, at one time it was when I started in the Legislature but since that time we've lowered all those to eighteen I understand and made that the legal age of majority."

Geo-Karis: "Well, I would like to speak in favor of this Bill because I think this will clean up the unnecessary confusion that has resulted from the application of this Bill by case laws. So I think this is a good Bill and I think



it will help straighten it all out."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Thank you. The question is, shall Senate Bill 1037 pass? All those in favor will vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 132 'ayes', 2 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1053, Representative Telcser. 1053, Art."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 1053, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Antitrust Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, last Session we amended the Illinois Antitrust Act and said that it would be a violation of the Act to take part in any boycotts in Illinois companies. Senate Bill 1053 simply adds that new language which is now Section 5 to the penalty Section to let people who are injured by violation collect trouble damages. I would appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1053 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 130 'ayes', no 'nays', 4 recorded as 'present' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1136, Representative Sharp. Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 1138, Representative Leinenweber."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 1138, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1138, has a



very limited effect, it applies to measures in Cook County school districts. It requires that they have some financial background, related experience or twelve semester hours of credit of college level of accounting. It seeks to make sure that the treasurer of the Cook County School Districts who are responsible in charge of disbursement and investments have some minimum financial background. It's a good Bill and I would urge its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will."

Lucco: "Are we talking about business managers of school districts?"

Leinenweber: "We're talking about treasurers of school districts in Cook County, they are under a separate provision. It doesn't apply...."

Lucco: "It applies only to Cook County?"

Leinenweber: "Yes."

Lucco: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will."

McClain: "Harry, this is only for the county districts?"

Leinenweber: "Well, it only applies to township school treasurers and the only area of the state that has that type of organization is suburban Cook County."

McClain: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Representative Leinenweber, does this apply to the Chicago Board of Education?"

Leinenweber: "It is my understanding that it does not, they are



not under that particular Section, 8-17, of the School Code.
 Houlihan: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1138 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye' all those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 121 'ayes', 13 'nays' and none recorded as 'present', this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1143, Representative Daniels."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1143, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of Unified Code of Corrections and the Code of Criminal Procedures. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "There is an Amendment on that Bill, Mr. Speaker. Has it been distributed? I would like to have leave to drop it back to Second Reading if it has been distributed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to bring this Bill back from Third Reading to Second. Any objections? Hearing none, Second Reading. Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Daniels. Amends Senate Bill 1143 on page 1, line 1 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to table Amendment #1. that was adopted in Committee so that we could adopt Amendment #2, which is the same Amendment with additional language that requires an independent examination by a psychiatrist or psychologist. The Amendment was placed and filed at the request of Senator Hickey and Senator Nimrod. Can we table Amendment #1?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does the Gentleman have leave to table Amendment #1? Leave. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Yes, I have a question of the Sponsor, will he yield?"



Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Houlihan: "Direct your attention to your Amendment, Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "One or two?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Now, he wants to table Amendment #1, Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Well, I think he's telling me though... what he is doing here is tabling #1 and...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Move the adoption of Amendment #2."

Houlihan: "Move the adoption of #2 and he's saying that what was in #1 was included within #2. Is that correct?"

Daniels: "That is my understanding. With an addition, I said there was an addition on #2."

Houlihan: "All right, why don't you go ahead and table #1 and I'll refer my question to Amendment #2."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved to table Amendment #1. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed. Amendment #1 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Daniels. Amends Senate Bill 1143 on page 1, line 1 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Daniels. Amendment #2."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, the difference between #1, we just tabled, and #2 is that in the last Section of Amendment #2 it refers to an independent psychiatric or psychologist examination to be appointed by the court."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "A question of the Sponsor. Directing your attention, Representative Daniels to... starting with line 11... excuse me, line 10 of the Amendment. The definition of the term, defendant of mental treatment. Presently the law does not include within that definition a person who is mentally retarded but the affect, in part at least of your Amendment, is to include a person who is mentally retarded within the



definition of defendant in need of mental treatment.

And what I'm wondering is, what is the justification for that change in the existing definition of the defendant in need of mental treatment?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker and Mr. Houlihan, first of all Amendment #2, that language was in Amendment #1, which was adopted in Judiciary Committee on the motion of Representative Kosinski on the request of Senator Nimrod. It is my understanding that the purpose of that particular phrase is to include those people that are mentally retarded under the provisions of this Bill."

Houlihan: "Well, that's obvious. What I'm asking for is what is the rationale for doing that."

Daniels: "Because in the event as this Bill calls for, provides for procedure according to intervention and approval before a persons is found not guilty by reason of insanity but still in need of mental treatment as relief from confinement by the Department of Mental Health and would include people in that case to fall under the provisions of this Bill if they were found to be mentally retarded."

Houlihan: "Yes, but what I am suggesting is, the term mentally retarded is something which is, you know... well defined in the statutes of this state. Presently the law provides a defendant in need of mental treatment, simply means to any defendant afflicted with a mental disorder. If that... the defendant as a result of such mental disorder, etc; now, that would be more than adequate to handle the problem that you are seeking to address by means of this Amendment. And I am very apprehensive about including within the definition of defendant of mental treatment any person who is mentally retarded. I think you're making this far too broad, I think the same advice applies also to Amendment #1. What I'm wondering, Lee, if you could hold the Bill on Second or if the Sponsor... you are the Sponsor, to hold the Bill on



Second and see if we could work with you in trying to straighten out the Amendment."

Daniels: "I would be happy to hold the Bill on Second if you want to attempt to straighten the language out. I would suggest to you that this Amendment #2 does not change what was adopted in Judiciary Committee. If you desire to work this out it is fine with me."

Houlihan: "Fine, if you will hold it.... take it out of the record and we'll come back to it later and work this out, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Bill will remain on Second Reading and we'll try and get back to it. Senate Bill 1136, Representative Sharp. 1136, Jack."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1136, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Sharp."

Sharp: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 1136 is a piece of legislation that was worked out by the School Board Association, teachers with regard to discontinuance of teachers and when earned compensation has to be paid after a teacher has been dismissed. The Bill was originally introduced two business days after the close of the regular school term. All unpaid compensation had to be paid up, the agreement that was worked out stated that three days after business days, after the close of the school term any teacher who has been terminated due to a discontinuancy of their teacher position had to be paid up in full. The reason for this is, once a person goes into teaching you can elect to either take your salary in nine installments during your contracted term of teacher, nine months or you can elect to have it spread out over twelve months. And if your position is terminated due to a cutback in staff or what have you, if you elect to take it over the twelve months that person would be penalized that they



could not apply for unemployment compensation, whereas, some one who is elected to take it over nine months would be eligible for the unemployment compensation right away. In all groups here involved thought that there was a discrepancy between the nine month election and the twelve month election and so this Bill was the result of the realization of the group that there was an unfair situation here and for those reasons we ask for your support. of House Bill 1136."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill... the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the question of unemployment compensation that this Bill brings up is a very valid one. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that a teaching contract whether the payments are over nine months or over twelve months is a twelve month contract. And the fact of being notified prior to the end of the school term, in June or May, does not change that. So that a teacher should not, in my opinion, be eligible for unemployment compensation until the following September provided that the teacher is not working at that time. Now, there is a tremendous discrepancy here in that a teacher who is notified that their contract will not be renewed in September could collect unemployment compensation and find themselves working either for that district or another school district in September. So I submit to you that there is a substantial amount to this Bill, we are hearing from our school districts, they are telling us that they need a levy without referendum to pay workmen's compensation and unemployment compensation costs. I submit this is a place where teachers could possible get unemployment compensation and not deserve it. So I would urge you to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Lucco."



Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Just for the clarification of Representative Walsh on reputation of something that I'm sure he already knows. The majority of teachers are hired either on a nine month or ten month year basis and when they draw their salary in the summertime on either the tenth or eleventh or twelveth month that's money that they have already earned. They have earned that during the nine months of the teaching year and that money is not something that they earn during the month of July and August for example and so they would be entitled because their contract would have terminated on a nine or ten month basis. I naturally rise in support of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "My button was pushed by mistake."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Sharp, to close."

Sharp: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would just like to point out that the comments that were made by the opponent to this Bill were not correct. These teachers are not on a twelve month contract, they are on a nine month contract and during the summer months when they elect to take their salary in twelve installments they are just simply using a method of budgeting their income so they can make it through the year. And when their position has been terminated and they should be paid up-to-date all their compensation so they can be eligible for the unemployment compensation like anyone else that has had their position terminated. I ask for your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1136 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Lawrence, Representative Cunningham, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

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



House. Of course you should be voting 'aye' on this very good Bill, I don't know why there is such an anti-teacher basis in this House...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished?"

Cunningham: "I'm not done yet, Mr. Speaker. It was pointed out a few minutes ago how wicked it would be to let teachers draw unemployment compensation. They are no more part-time employees than construction workers who work six months a year and draw unemployment for six months...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished?"

Cunningham: "While they reexamine the entire philosophy and let teachers draw too. If you believe in education, vote green. You too, when after you have been dismissed by your electors."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 130 'aye's', 19 'nay' and 2 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1208, Representative Macdonald."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1208, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like permission to bring this Bill back to Second Reading for an Amendment by Representative Levin. It has been agreed to by the Senate Sponsor and me."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady asks leave to bring this Bill back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Any objections? Hearing none, the Bill is on Second Reading. Any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Levin. Amends Senate Bill 1208 on page 1, line 1 and 5 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment is offered actual



by seven individuals. There are only three names that appears on the printed Amendment, myself, Representative Collins, Representative Pierce, Representative Pouncey, Representative Pullen, Stuffle and Gaines. What this Amendment does is to amend the Section on special education for handicapped children. We have had a law which Representative Pierce sponsored back in 1967, which has been a model for the country. It has mandated that all handicapped special education children be guaranteed an opportunity for education to meet their particular needs. And if the public school system does not have the facilities in order to provide the facilities that these children may be educated in the private school, special ed schools. This has been the policy since 1967, we have developed an excellent network of private schools to deal with the situation that the public schools have not been able to. Unfortunately....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #1 be adopted? He's just explaining the Amendment. Oh, I'm sorry. Please explain the Amendment."

Levin: "Okay. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker about a year ago Bill Tilley took over as the Assistant Superintendent for IOE and he has the dogmatic philosophy that whether or not the public schools have the facility to educate these kids they belong in a public school. There have been guidelines and documentation that have come down which have the pressure on the public schools to not place these special handicapped children that are not... they don't have the facilities in the public schools.... to not place them in the private schools. This Amendment simply restates what is existing policy, namely that where a public school system does not have the facilities to deal with the emotionally handicapped, the educationally handicapped and so on that they may be placed in the private schools. This Amendment was adopted unanimously in Committee, unfortunately



the Bill that it was put on, Senate Bill 161, did not receive the requisite vote. I don't think people were aware that this Amendment was on there. So the Amendment was adopted in Committee to a different Bill. It is a statement of policy.... I think that it is extremely cruel for the dogmatic educational philosophy of a few bureaucrats to keep special ed. handicapped kids from receiving the quality education that they need to deal with their problem. I feel that if there are the facilities in the public schools, that's fine. But we just don't have them right now and we do literally... the Office of Education should not deny these kids the right to what Illinois law currently requires that these kids have the opportunity to these special ed. private school facilities they are entitled."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm shocked and chagrined that the Sponsor of this Amendment would make the statement that he's made in regard to the Illinois Office of Education. He's in the tank for a private interest group, private schools who think they are going to lose some pupils and they are not... a they're not. The responsibility by law is with the public schools and the only placement that the public schools make are.... are those which they cannot deal with and handle themselves and that's where they're placed. To make the kind of statements he made was totally irresponsible and I think that kind of statement gives you some idea of the amount of time the individual spent here. I know those schools are concerned and I know they are the ones who are responsible for this Amendment. I would point out to you that this particular Bill deals with the consolidation of school districts. And so what you're faced with here is an Amendment which.... you know, which is in the School Code and he has a perfect right to offer it in that section. However, when this Bill comes



up on Third Reading, if this Amendment is adopted... you know, you're going to feel one way on consolidation, perhaps you might feel another way on this and you're caught in a trick box. Now, what you can decide, to keep the Bill clean so you can vote on one issue, here a chance to put legislation in. He could have done this very same thing and he didn't do it. My suggestion, Ladies and Gentlemen, since this is the policy of the state anyway and all he's trying to do is to block it in or lock it in for these people, it doesn't make any difference anyway, is that we defeat the Amendment so that the issue addressed in 1208 can be addressed singularly.

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative

Pierce."

Pierce: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't know what we're fighting about here. We all agree what the.... what the law says and House Bill 26, certainly one I introduced back in 1968 and what it says is, when a public school system cannot take care of a child because of the nature of his handicap, where there is physical, mental or multiple handicap, then the school district with the approval of the state can place a child in a private institution where the tuition up to a maximum of twenty-five hundred dollars and the transportation will be paid. Unfortunately, we had a new philosophic come into the Office of Education, we had a gentleman from Wisconsin who didn't believe particularly in our law. And therefore, the gentleman found it necessary to offer this Amendment. I think it is a good Amendment, it restates within the law and I don't think the Gentleman from DuPage has any argument with the law, he wasn't particular for it when it passed but it has worked fairly well and I think he will agree that it's worked fairly well. And therefore, I think this is a good Amendment, it should be adopted. What it does is restates this General Assembly position that where a child because of the nature of his handicap cannot



receive an adequate education in the public school, then that public school can approve the placement of a child in a private special education school or facility and receive tuition or transportation reimbursements. It's a good Amendment, I'm not so crazy about the Bill to tell the truth but the Amendment is good, and, therefore, I urge the adoption of House Amendment #1. to Senate Bill 1208."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #1 be adopted? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."

Levin: "Representative Dan Houlihan has asked that this be taken out of the record a moment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay, we'll take it out of the record. The Gentleman from.... the Bill remains on Second Reading then, Mrs. Macdonald. Senate Bill 1208. Senate Bill 1234, Representative Duff.... take it out of the record. Senate Bill 1236, Representative O'Brien."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1236, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Metropolitan Transit Authority Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 1236 amends the Metropolitan Transit Authority Act, Increases the maximum fine for violation of ordinance to three hundred dollars from two hundred dollars. In addition to that it changes the Chairman of the Board from a full-time position to a part-time position and allows outside employment. The Amendment also limits the amount of compensation to be paid if part-time employment net limit is twenty-five thousand.. In addition to that it changes the position of General Manager to that of Executive Director. It received 'no' negative votes in Committee and I would encourage an 'aye' vote on it."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall House Bill 1236 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 122 'ayes', no 'nays', 19 voted as 'present' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins for the purpose of an introduction."

Collins: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. My dear friend, Representative Giddy Dyer, tried to find the most unlikely person in this House of Representatives to do a task for her and she turned to me and asked me to introduce to the Members of the House a hundred pro ERA ladies who are in the gallery after having a rally here earlier. And she asked me to announce their presence and for us to recognize them."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Welcome ladies. Purpose of an announcement Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, announcement for the Appropriation Committee. The Appropriations I will meet ten minutes after the adjournment. Ten minutes after the adjournment today and we should conclude most of our work today and we won't have a meeting tomorrow I'm sure. Thursday we have three Bills which we'll hear and will announce the time of that later. Our meeting is immediately after adjournment, rather ten minutes after adjournment. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further announcements? What about Appropriations II? Representative Matijevich, the same thing, ten minutes after adjournment?"

Matijevich: "Yes, the same thing. Ten minutes after our recess, Gene Barnes is over there right now."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gene. Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, in concurrence with



Appropriations I, Appropriations II, we'll meet ten minutes after adjournment. Ten minutes after adjournment, Room 114."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further announcements? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Porter."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, earlier today we voted on Senate Bill 1007. Neither in the Digest or in the Sponsor's explanation of that Bill was the fact that there was a provision that allowed the mother who is in prison... in the state prison to keep her child up until the child is age one at the discretion of the director. I did not understand that that provision was in the Bill, it is a subject that this House has voted down on at least two occasions and I would like to change my 'aye' vote to 'nay' with leave of the House."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Hearing none, the Gentleman is so recorded. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Deuster. The same request."

Deuster: "The same request, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has the same request. Why don't we address this issue when we get back, I think the entire Membership would like to probably reconsider the vote by which that Bill passed. And in all fairness.... when the Sponsor is here, Representative Porter's seatmate to his left. And let's do it fair and square. The Gentleman... any further announcements? The Clerk has one Committee Report to read, we can do that in Perfunct."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative E. M. Barnes, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations II, to which the following Bills were referred. Action taken June 20, 1977, reported the same back with the following recommendation. Do pass as amended Senate Bill 331 and 487."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move now that the House stand in recess until 6 P.M. this evening. Recess until 6 P.M. this evening."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House stand



in recess until 6 P.M. this evening. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed.... House stands in recess until 6 P.M. this evening. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order and Members please be in their seats. All unauthorized persons leave the floor. Authorized persons come to the floor. Representative Ebbesen, for what purpose do you arise?"

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, if nobody has any objections, would you go to the Order of Second Reading. I have Senate Bill 345, Amendment #1, to the Bill.... puts the Bill and really strikes everything after the enacting clause and puts it in the form that I want it considered on Third Reading. And if we could just take a voice vote and move it up there would be fine with me."

Speaker Redmond: "Did you discuss it with anyone?"

Ebbesen: "No."

Speaker Redmond: "Message from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurred with the House in passage of the Bill with the following title to wit: House Bill 52, together with Amendments, passed by the Senate as amended June 21, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in passage of the Bills with the following title to wit: House Bills 336, 37, 42, 43, 53, 91, 92 and 96....."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh is entering the chambers majestically."

Clerk O'Brien: "Passed by the Senate, June 21, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow. Oh, pardon me. I always get you tall guys mixed up. Representative Mulcahey"



Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, is a move to adjourn in order?"

Speaker Redmond: "No, we reserve that for Representative Skinner."

Mulcahey: "I see, okay. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "That is as expensive as Adeline Geo-Karis's party. Did you ever go to one of those parties up there in the Yacht Club. It must have made a lot of money. Pretty light on the food. Parliamentarian consult with Representative Conti. House will come to order, Members please be in their seats. On the Order of Senate Bill, Third Reading appears Senate Bill 1202. Representative Totten is recognized."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1202, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil and Administrative Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask leave to return Senate Bill 1202 to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of tabling the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. 1202 will be returned to the Order of Second Reading. Representative Totten."

Totten: "Luft."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Luft."

Luft: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like at this time leave of the House to table Committee Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Yes, a question of the Sponsor of the motion to table this. Committee Amendment #2, the same as Committee Amendment #1 or refer to the same Session?"

Luft: "If you will look at line 10 of Committee Amendment #2."

Houlihan: "One says 30 and the other says 10."

Luft: "I spoke with Mr. Madigan and Mr. Totten and it has been approved that we should table this Amendment at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question is on



the Gentleman's motion to table Amendment #2. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries and Amendment #2 is tabled. Representative Geo-Karis. Third Reading on that, Representative Totten? Third Reading. Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I can have Senate Bill 626 go back to Second Reading for the purpose of tabling the Amendment and adding a new one."

Speaker Redmond: "What number?"

Geo-Karis: "Senate Bill 626."

Speaker Redmond: "On the Order of Senate Bill, Third Reading appears Senate Bill 636...."

Geo-Karis: "26."

Speaker Redmond: "626. That Bill is Representative Garmisa's. is that right?"

Geo-Karis: "We're together on this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Garmisa has asked leave to have Senate Bill 626 returned to the Order of Second Reading... is that correct?"

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis says that you and her have a thing on this one."

Geo-Karis: "We sure do. Is that all right with you? Are you on Second Reading now?"

Speaker Redmond: "It is now on Second Reading."

Geo-Karis: "All right, I would like to have leave to table Amendment #4 because I have a new Amendment which covers it more comprehensively and...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis, Amendment #4 was withdrawn it was never attached to the Bill."

Geo-Karis: "Oh, it wasn't."

Speaker Redmond: "Hasn't been offered."

Geo-Karis: "Oh."

Speaker Redmond: "You don't have to table it."

Geo-Karis: "Oh, good. And I would like to have leave to file



the new Amendment and you have an Amendment there..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Well, do we have Amendment #5?"

Geo-Karis: "Has it been distributed yet? All right then, can I just hold the Bill on Second Reading then until it comes?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Garmisa."

Garmisa: "That is perfectly all right, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Be returned to the Order of.... I mean, be... remain on the Order of Second Reading. Any other Members have a Bill on Third Reading that they desire to have returned? Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Mr. Speaker, Senate Bill 401 is on the Order of Third Reading. It is my Bill and I have an Amendment I need to add. I would ask leave to return it to Second Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman asks leave to return Senate Bill 401 to the Order of Second Reading. Does he have leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. 401 will be returned to the Order of Second Reading. Read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Reilly. Amends Senate Bill 401 on page 3, by inserting between lines 29 and 30 the following

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 401 establishes a bureau within the division of vocational rehabilitation. Part of which the job of this bureau will be to loan money to hearing impaired persons for the purchase of TTY equipment. That has always been part of the purpose of the Bill, all the Amendment does is put in language in the Bill that governs the procedure for this. It was left out in the Senate when the Bill was passed there. I would ask a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 401. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries, the Amendment is



adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "You want it moved back to Third Reading;
Mr. Reilly?"

Reilly: "Please."

Speaker Redmond: "Third Reading. Anyone else with a Senate
Bill on Third Reading. Senate Bills, Third Reading, Short
Debate Calendar. It appears on Supplemental Calendar #2,
Senate Bill 23, Representative Ryan. Senate Bill, Third
Reading. Senate Bills, Third Reading appears Senate Bill
1208... order of priority. Mr. Ryan, doesn't want us to
go on the Short Debate today, he thinks that we should
wait until tomorrow. You talk to Mr. Ryan. Representative
Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, why don't you tell the Gentleman
that we had an agreement that these would be on the desk
for one day before they were called. If you're going to
be fair about it, be fair. Don't stand up there and play
games with these people."

Speaker Redmond: "Senate Bill 1208..... okay, 1234,

I understand 1208 is in the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1234, a Bill for an Act to amend
the Chicago Regional Port District Act. Third Reading
of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dawson. Out of the record.
1236."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 12....."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute, I understand that one is
passed."



Speaker Redmond: "1317. Oh, might as well go whenever he....
Representative Lauer."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1317. A Bill for an Act to amend the Municipal Code and the School Code, an Act to prevent fraudulent corruption....corrupt practices by public officials. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lauer."

Lauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1317 was amended in the Cities and Villages Committee where it is now exactly like the House Bill 1714 that passed out of the House about two and a half weeks ago with a 116 or 117 votes. The one difference in the two Bills is that there was a specific section put in that an individual in local government was not in conflict of interest even if he was an employee of a public utilities that was regulated by another unit of government. For example, the ICC. That being the case, Ladies and Gentlemen, I'll answer any questions you might have and I'd like to have the same vote I had on 1714."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Anyone in opposition?"

The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 90....a....100 'aye' and 10 'no'. And the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1364."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1364, a Bill for an Act in relation to the filing of returns by taxpayers having a monthly tax liability for certain occupation use taxes. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bennett."

Bennett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, this is merely a Bill that makes technical changes in the Retailers Occupation Tax and Use Tax Act. Which primarily just makes it clear for the Department of Revenue that a retailer who averages more than five thousand dollars per month but less than ten thousand dollars per month is subject to deposit system which was approved and implemented by the Legislature back in 1975. The Department of Revenue requested these



changes to make sure that there would be no further problems in this area. It passed the Senate 53 to 0, the Bill passed through the House Revenue Committee with not a dissenting vote and we would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anybody in opposition? Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "I have a question of the Sponsor if he will yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Houlihan: "Is the effect of this Bill simply to... or the basic effect of the Bill simply to affect a speed up or acceleration and the collection of this tax."

Bennett: "I think that's one of the basic effects of the legislation. I think additionally there was some problem in some small retailers falling below the five thousand per month figure one month, another month go above it and there was some problems in the way they filed their returns. This Legislation makes it easier for them to do that, makes it clear and I think basically speeds up the process."

Houlihan: "In response to the first reason that you gave, could you tell us how much money this will generate as a result of the acceleration?"

Bennett: "No, it will not generate any additional revenue... at the same time it won't cost anything either."

Houlihan: "Well, how much additional revenue though that it will make immediately available? I realize that it doesn't generate any additional revenue."

Bennett: "I don't believe any immediately available. I think it just makes it easier and more.... and takes out the complexity to the small retailer that has to file his returns. I don't think it will add any immediate revenue if the Department of Revenue requested this minor change in order to help the small retailer, the small businessman."

Houlihan: "Who is this eligible to or who is eligible for this as far as.... you have a threshold amount in here I take it as far as the monthly liability?"



Bennett: "Yes, it is five thousand per month but less than ten thousand dollars per month."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further?"

Houlihan: "No, no further questions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any other discussions? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. In explaining my vote, I think there is a little mistake in the discussion. It is not an accelerated program, it merely implements what was put in effect last year and makes no substantive changes. It is a technical Amendment, I was the Spokesman on the House Revenue Committee when we heard the Bill and I can assure you that it is not a speedup in tax collection. It just clarifies some of the things, I think Representative Bennett would agree with me on that. And so it is not really a speedup. I would like to see it get enough votes to pass it. It is a technical Amendment to put in effect what we voted last year and it doesn't make any substantive changes as I understand it from our analysis."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative.... pardon me. Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill was heard in Revenue Committee and I think was understood by everyone in that Committee. This Bill tries to deal with a problem where a taxpayer may be above the line for the requirement of monthly deposits and or other requirements for sales tax and the next month be under. And it results in a yo-yo effect which just causes a lot of work for the Department and it doesn't do any good for anyone. And it is intended to avoid that yo-yo effect and in no way diminishes the security of the state and it is just a good reform measure. I think it passed Committee almost unanimous, I haven't got my Digest open. I think it is a very routine merely."



Bill which ought to be supported."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan. Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I would like to see those people who are in doubt puts some green lights on because you're not changing the law with this Bill. All you're doing is straightening what we did last Session and, therefore, making it easier for the little fellow to file. That's all you're doing, you're not changing the law one bit."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take.... have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 99 'aye', 41 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1379."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1379, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bluthardt. 1379. Representative Bartulis, for what purpose do you arise? Representative Bartulis, are you seeking recognition? Is Representative Bluthardt in the chambers? Out of the record. 29, Representative Giglio."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 29, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 29 is a Bill that was heard in Elections Committee to have the registration throughout the State of Illinois uniform. Some counties have it thirty-five days, some have it twenty-eight days, some have it forty-five days. What they want to do is make it uniform throughout so that when the registration closes or it's open, it all closes on the same days. There was an Amendment put on in the House... excuse me, in the Senate. The Bill calls for twenty-eight days preceding election, the Amendment in the Senate changes it to thirty-five days. So the cities,



counties, townships, municipals will all close their election day... or the registration day thirty-five days preceding election and I would ask your favorable support.

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins. Representative Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm puzzled here. I thought that we had an agreement.... I didn't think, I know we had an agreement that this Bill would be returned to Second Reading for an Amendment to reduce the thirty-five days down to at least twenty-nine, thirty or thirty-one days. The three figures have been bandied about but there was to be an Amendment offered and it was an Agreed Amendment in Committee, it is the only reason that the Bill got out of Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that is precisely my understanding. I'm the hyphenated Cosponsor of this Bill and at one time we were going to return this to Second Reading to consider an Amendment. It was not done at that time, the Amendment has been filed and distributed. I don't know, maybe we should take this out of the record. I may be mistaken but there was an understanding in the Elections Committee that we had agreed on thirty-one days."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Laurino, Chairman of Elections."

Laurino: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I concur with the Gentleman's remarks. Mr. Collins is absolutely correct, there was an Amendment that was supposed to be offered. It was agreed upon in Committee and I would suggest that the Sponsor does bring it back to Second and allow the Amendment to be put on."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giglio, did you hear the remarks of the Chairman of the Election Committee."

Giglio: "Well, if the Chairman wants to bring it back, we'll bring it back."



Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has asked leave to return Senate Bill 29 to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Does he have leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted and it will be returned to the Order of Second Reading. Do you have the Amendment, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Deuster. Amends Senate Bill 29 on page 1, line 22 and 29 and so forth."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the Amendment to which reference was made. It does change the dates in the Bill so that the registration would close uniformly at thirty-one days. I would urge adoption of Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's.... Representative Schlickman...."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield? Why thirty-one days, why not twenty-eight which is a multiple of seven which would make the cutoff date exactly four weeks before the election? And particularly when it was indicated that now we've got twenty-eight days, we've got thirty-five days and forty-five days, what's magical about thirty-one and why isn't it divisible by seven? Not if you have twenty-eight days."

Deuster: "The answer is that this was the time period that the Committee agreed upon and it represents a compromise between twenty-eight days and thirty-five days."

Schlickman: "Is there anything wrong with having cutoff exactly four weeks before the election which would be twenty-eight days?"

Deuster: "I think the... of course the reason for the Bill is that for people who live along county lines who may be listening to the same radio station, they live in Cook County or they live in Lake County or DuPage or somewhere else, they may learn over the radio that registration shuts down on a certain day and then when they go in to register they find that



they had missed it. So we are trying to have uniform dates for the closing of registration and it was felt that thirty-one days would give enough time to the respective County Clerks, those who felt that they have thirty-five days, thirty-one would be enough. And yet this is, you know, not that close to the election that it would cutoff anybody too early. There may be others, Representative Schlickman, who are more familiar with the Election Code than I who could answer this more fully. But that's my response to your question."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Robinson: "Right now throughout downstate you can register up to twenty-eight days before the election. Am I right in assuming that this will take away three days of registration downstate?"

Deuster: "Yes."

Robinson: "You do not in this Amendment keep the central office open until twenty-eight days before the election?"

Deuster: "No."

Robinson: "Thank you. I would like to speak to the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Robinson: "As I said before, right now downstate, throughout downstate Southern Illinois where we are a long way from Cook County we can register up to twenty-eight days before the election. This Amendment is being put on because of some confusion on the Cook County DuPage line or the Cook County Lake line. But what's happening is.... that to correct that confusion they're taking away days of registration in Alexander County and Sangamon County and Peoria County, all throughout downstate where we're not effected by that confusion. I think that this will lead to fewer people registering.... right now the Bill says thirty-five days, this will take it down to thirty-one. I think that it ought



to stay at twenty-eight, the way that the law is now and we ought to defeat this Bill and I think that those of us who want twenty-eight days prior to cutoff, ought to just vote 'present' on this Amendment and then kill the Bill when it comes to Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Johnson: "Am I correct in saying that with the absence of this Amendment being passed that the Bill will go to Third Reading with a thirty-five day rule in it."

Deuster: "That's correct."

Johnson: "What's wrong with thirty-five days?"

Deuster: "Well, wait a minute. The way that the Bill came over from the Senate, I think it was twenty-eight everywhere. Please correct me if someone else.... I believe that it was twenty-eight days everywhere. And it was felt that was not enough time for Cook County where they have precinct registration day."

Johnson: "Well, my question is, if this Amendment that you've offered is defeated and this Bill goes to Third Reading, will there be a uniform thirty-five day rule or will it be twenty-eight."

Deuster: "I believe that it will be twenty-eight."

Johnson: "Then the synopsis is wrong when they say Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee which made it thirty-five. Is that right? Does somebody know for sure, I would like to know what we're voting on."

Deuster: "Is there anyone in the.... it was my understanding that that Amendment was not adopted in Committee."

Johnson: "Frank, can you answer that for us?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "I wanted to respond to a previous question. That's a lie with thirty-one days and not a multiple of seven. I think the reason for that...."



Johnson: "Mr. Speaker, a point of order."

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

Johnson: "He can respond to that when it is time to do it. I've asked a question and I would like to have an answer by somebody."

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm speaking to....."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giglio has the answer."

Giglio: "The Amendment that was put on in the Senate changes it to thirty-five days. This Amendment brings it to thirty-one, if this Amendment is adopted it will be thirty-one days and if it is not the Bill goes to Third Reading and it will be thirty-five days." Thank

Johnson: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "I think that it was felt that the County Clerk of Cook County, the county in which about half of the voters in the state reside, felt that twenty-eight days was cutting it a little bit too short for him to do the things that he had to do to get ready for the election. Therefore, felt that thirty-one days would be a good compromise and I think that the thirty-first day would be a Saturday. In the Chicago land area where you have twelve basic major T.V. stations and other large electronic media, there is a very confused electorate in a six-county area as to when the time for registration expires. I think that we would all agree that it would be helpful to everyone to have the same kind of day. A uniform date for cutting off registration so this thirty-first day is a compromise with the requirement of the County Clerk of Cook County and those in the surrounding counties who presently, as I understand, have thirty-five days."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, there seems to be to me in listening to this discussion so much confusion about twenty-eight and



thirty-five and forty-five and so forth, perhaps we should take this Bill out of the records and have the Leadership sit down and come up with some kind of compromise that we can all get some intelligent conversation on."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I believe that I understand why they are making it twenty-eight days, the state's statutes specifically states that you must live in the precinct thirty days.... to register in there. Now, if you're making that thirty-five days, you've precluded somebody's in there thirty-one days or thirty-two days you are disenfranchising everybody for six days that lives in the precinct. That's the reason why they have to have the twenty-eight days to completely have the thirty days to live in the precinct. If you make it thirty-five, you're disenfranchising them a whole week."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Deuster to close."

Deuster: "Not to close but if it has the agreement of the Representative Giglio, I would think that it would be in order to leave this on the Order of Second Reading, take it out of the record so we can discuss this a little further. If that's agreeable with Representative Giglio, I think that would be...."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Giglio, do you go along with that?"

Giglio: "Fine, Representative. Maybe we can get some astute minds here in the Assembly and come up with a compromise date. I'll leave it on Second Reading."

Speaker Matijeich: "Leave that Senate Bill 29 be taken out of the record?"

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

Speaker Matijeich: "Senate 1234, we had gone by. Representative Dawson is gone again. Senate Bill 30, Representative Ewell. Is he in the Assembly? Ray Ewell. Senate Bill 119, Terzich.



Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 119, a Bill for an Act to amend Real Estate Broker Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a series of Bills. Senate Bills 95 through 146, most of these Bills have been put on the Consent Calendar and I would like leave of the House to hear Senate Bills 114, 119, 122, 124, 127, 129, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 144, 145 and 146 as a package. If there are any objections to any particular Bill, I would be more than happy than anyone."

Speaker Matijevich: "Does the Gentleman have leave that the enumerated.... objections are raised. All right, the objection.... let's hear this Bill first. Senate Bill 119, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "As a matter of fact, Senate Bill 119 has been placed on the Consent Calendar. But these series of Bills was designed to deal with sex discrimination and statutory language that is discriminatory or it could be interpreted as insurgent sex discrimination. These Bills are...supposedly do not make any substantive change in the Bill other than to eliminate the definition of sex between males and females and I would urge your support."

Speaker Matijevich: "Senate Bill 119..... the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates that he will."

Terzich: "I certainly will."

Schlickman: "All right. Why shouldn't a widow living alone and having a spare bedroom to rent be able to restrict the tenancy to another woman?"

Terzich: "Well, I would.... I don't see why she won't, you know if she wants to rent it to another man or woman, that's entirely up to the person."

Schlickman: "I'm saying...."



Terzich: "I think what you're emphasizing here, Representative Schlickman, if a real estate firm or something of this nature that deals with building complexes that there shouldn't be any discrimination between sex on the rental of property. I think you're mostly referring to some single family dwellings or two or three apartments, and I'm sure that if they wanted to rent it to whatever individual they want it would be their right to."

Schlickman: "Have you looked at page 3, Section 17, line 24?"

Terzich: "I'm looking right now."

Schlickman: "That when soliciting for lease a person cannot discriminate on the account of sex."

Terzich: "There is nothing wrong with that."

Schlickman: "I'm saying, why shouldn't a widow, living alone, who has a spare bedroom restrict the tenancy to another woman?"

Terzich: "Well, you tell me."

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

Terzich: "Well, like I said, I don't believe that is necessarily applicable, but someone is going to be advertising with some real estate firm and if they are advertising through a real estate firm rather than on an individual basis that there shouldn't be any discrimination with regard to sex. They are using a broker and if they want to do it on an individual basis to rent an apartment, that I'm sure they can do without any problem whatsoever. To whoever they want they want to rent that apartment to."

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

Speaker Matijeich: "You may proceed, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is an idea, example of what the Supreme Court has said over the years with respect to what constitutes reasonable classification. Now, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to require a widow who has one bedroom to rent... not to discriminate. But to simply say, she has got a bedroom



available and that she has got to rent it regardless of who applies, whether it be a male or a female. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that the public policy of this state should not require that simply because a male applies that he should be required or the widow should be required to lease it to him even though it is her preference and it is her desire to have as a tenant a member of the same sex, another female. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of this House, this quote 'equality of rights' can go to an extreme and this Bill very well represents that form of extremism. Leaving the law the way that it is, allowing a person to determine on the account of sex whom he or she wants to lease real estate, is reasonable. It should be sustained and this Bill should be defeated. It deserves a 'no' vote."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Matijeich: "He indicates he will."

Waddell: "Representative, would you mind discussing for me what the word 'mental handicapped' means in your Bill 119? Isn't it a judge of mental handicap?"

Terzich: "That is taken from the Illinois Constitution which says that we cannot discriminate against the handicapped."

Waddell: "What happens when that person is in an institution and you cannot sell the property even though it happens to be your wife or vis-a-vis? What does this do to it then?"

Terzich: "That I understand is a question of legal competency which is not addressed in this Bill."

Waddell: "Is this then an escape?"

Terzich: "No."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker and Members, I move the previous question."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Coles moves the previous



question. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay' and the previous question prevails. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House, with regard to the Real Estate Broker's Act, that this only applies that if a person registers with a commercial realtor. It does not apply to single or two family dwellings where they are not placed the listing with a commercial real estate broker. And, therefore, they cannot discriminate on that, but if a person has a two or three flat, this Bill does not apply to her and she can rent it out to anybody she wants. It only applies when they go through a commercial real estate brokers agency. I would urge your support of House or Senate Bill 119."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved that Senate Bill 119 do pass. Those in the affirmative vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all... the Gentleman from... Representative Leinenweber from Will, I think, isn't it?"

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to speak against this Bill. This is a case of the computer run a muck, I believe this Bill is a result of a computer run to see where the word 'man' or where the word 'sex' was omitted or something and they came up with this Bill. This is an attempt to unisex types of legislation, this is going to work hardships. It does not sit among the many Bills, it is a bad Bill. Representative Schlickman pointed out that and I would certainly recommend a 'no'."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Griesheimer, to explain his vote."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, distinguished Mr. Speaker from the 31st District. I guess we're carrying out the rumors here. I would like to speak in opposition to this Bill, as was pointed out by Representative Schlickman, there are inherent problems even to the little old lady in the situation that



she's trying to rent her particular apartment or her second portion of her duplex. If you take Representative Terzich's explanation of this Bill and say that it only applies to realtors, therefore, what we're doing is cutting off the opportunity of little old ladies going to brokers and listing their property. It forces them into the rental business which is just exactly what we don't want. And I think this is a bad precedent and should be voted down."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think if you will look in Section 17 of Article I, of our Illinois Constitution you will find that this is simply complementing our Illinois Constitution. Which says, all persons have the right to be free from discrimination on the basis of race, color, creed, national ancestry and sex in the hiring and promotion practices of any employer or in the sale or rental of property. These rights are enforceable without action by the General Assembly. In other words, this is a basic right the people in Illinois have.... a right, but the General Assembly by law may establish reasonable exemptions relating to these rights and provide additional remedies for their violation. This is simply an implementation of the Illinois Constitution, it's reasonable. In the case of Mr. Schlickman.... in the case of Mr. Schlickman's little old lady, maybe she is heterosexual. Maybe she would rather rent to a man...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Would the Lady bring.... the Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle, to explain his vote."

Stuffle: "Representative Matijevich.... Mr. Speaker and Members, I hate to follow that act on homosexuals, etc.; but let me say that.... I hate to say this but it seems to me that some of the most discriminatory people in Illinois happens to be little old ladies and little old men who holds to the beliefs and the truths that they can exclude whoever



they want to, race, sex or creed or color or length of hair or type of religion. And this Amendment does exactly what... this Bill does exactly what Representative Dyer says it does. It implements in the Illinois Constitution what the people voted for and they ought to be on this Bill. They can talk about the little old ladies all they want. If they believe in discrimination, they ought to vote red. If they believe in getting rid of it, they ought to vote green."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? On this Bill there are.... take the record. On this Bill there are 81 answering 'aye', 6 answering 'no' and 17..... 61 answering 'no', 17 answering 'present' Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, I know.... everyone knows that I wouldn't hurt a little old lady and I would like a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman asks for a poll of the absentees. The Lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Would you change my vote to 'aye' please?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Change Representative Geo-Karis from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Luft."

Luft: "Mr. Speaker, please change my vote from 'present' to 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Change Representative Luft from 'present' to 'aye'. Poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Beatty, Bradley, Daniels, Deavers, Farley, Holewinski, Jim Houlihan, Huskey, Kornowicz, Lynn Martin, McAvoy, Meyer, Miller, Schuneman, Sharp, Stearney, Tuerk, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Betty, for what purpose do you arise?"

Beatty: "Would you vote me 'aye' please?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Record Representative Beatty as voting 'aye'."



Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, there are two other Members who are coming now who are visiting friends. They wanted to vote on this issue and they weren't at their switches so they won't able to vote but they should be here momentarily. I think we might save a little time waiting for....."

Speaker Matijevich: "I think we've got some Members around. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Holewinski, for what purpose do you arise?"

Holewinski: "Mr. Speaker, please record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Record Representative Holewinski as 'aye'. The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Flinn, for what purpose do you arise?"

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, change my 'present' vote to 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Record Representative Flinn from 'present' to 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Mr. Speaker, how are Nardulli and myself voting?"

Speaker Matijevich: "The Italian block wants to be recorded as 'aye', I believe."

DiPrima: "The what? Vote us green. Nardulli will be right down."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative DiPrima wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. What's the count? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Aye."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Telcser wishes to be recorded as 'aye', Mr. Clerk. Representative Anderson, for what purpose do you arise? The Gentleman from LaSalle."

Anderson: "Change me to 'aye' please."

Speaker Matijevich: "Record Representative Anderson to 'aye'. Representative Mulcahey, for what purpose do you arise?"

Mulcahey: "Record me as 'aye' please."

Speaker Matijevich: "Record Representative Mulcahey as 'aye'. Representative Jacobs."

Jacobs: "Will you change my 'present' vote to 'aye'?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Record Representative Jacobs as 'aye'."



The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen, for what purpose do you arise?"

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that we dump this Roll Call and start over."

Speaker Matijevidich: "Well, I don't think there is any need now. Are there any other additions? Could we have the count, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "91 'aye', 59 'nay'."

Speaker Matijevidich: "There are 91 'ayes', 51 nays', this Bill having.... The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman, for what purpose do you arise?"

Schlickman: "I request a verification."

Speaker Matijevidich: "There is a request for a verification and Representative Nardulli wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Will the Clerk..... Representative Conti, the Gentleman from Cook:"

Conti: "Why don't we dump the Roll Call start all over again or otherwise let's get the Hanahan Rules of order here so I know what is going on."

Speaker Matijevidich: "Well, let's dump the Roll Call then and have an honest count here. Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Now, let's..... let's get everybody on so we don't have to go through that again."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, make sure they push their own switches or otherwise we'll dump this one."

Speaker Matijevidich: "There has been a request on this Bill, the vote is 95, 96, 97 voting 'aye', 48 voting 'nay', 12 voting 'present' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority... the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman asks for a verification of the Roll. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "I withdraw that request."

Speaker Matijevidich: "That has been withdrawn. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, there is still a lot of buttons being



pushed on the other side of the aisle, the people are not there. Now, if we're going to play that kind of a game we'll verify it."

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

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I know that the hour is getting late and a lot of people have spent a lot of time and in turn I think the vote calls for itself. We had a second Roll Call on this Bill, it is 100 to 49 and I would hope that the Gentleman would realize that votes are here and accept the consequences."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Friedrich, the Gentleman from Marion."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, what went on here before, of course, it was delaying tactics so.... till you could get the votes on the floor. When it got up to 91, you want to shut it off, then we dumped it and they were still pushing buttons and now you want to take it again. Now, we're going to honest Roll Calls or we're not. Which way are you going to play it?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Has there been a request for a verification? All right, the Gentleman asks for a verification. Verify the Affirmative Roll Call, Mr. Clerk, and everybody in their seats."

Clerk O'Brien: "Anderson, Antonovych, E.M. Barnes, Beatty, Birchler, Bowman, Bradley, Brady, Brandt, Breslin, Rich Brummer, Don Brummet, Byers, Caldwell, Campbell, Capparelli, Catania, Chapman, Darrow, Corneal Davis, Domico, Doyle, John Dunn, Dyer, Ebbesen, Edgar, Epton, Ewell, Ewing, Farley, Flinn, Gaines, Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Giglio, Giorgi, Gréiman, Harris, Hart, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, Jim Houlihan, Huff, Jacobs, Jaffe, Johnson, Emil Jones, Kane, Katz...."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich, for what purpose do you arise?"

Friedrich: "Could we have some of these people sit down, I can't



see whether there is people in the seats or not. Right in this aisle here I can't see.... right there."

Speaker Matijevich: "would the Ladies and Gentlemen please be seated on this verification please? Representative Van Dyrpe there has been a request that you be seated. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Kosinski, Kozubowski, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leverenz, Levin, Lucco, Luft, Macdonald, Madigan, Madison, Mahar, Mann, Marovitz, Peggy Smith Martin, Matejek, Matijevich, Mautino, McGrew, McLendon, McPike, Mudd, Mugalian, Mulcahey, Murphy, O'Brien, O'Daniel, Pierce, Porter, Pouncey, Reilly, Richmond, Robinson, Sandquist, Satterthwaite, Schisler, Schneider, Shumpert, Skinner, Steczo, E.G. Steele, Stuffle, Taylor, Telcser, Terzich, Tipword, Vitek, Von Boeckman, Willer, Younge and Yourell."

Speaker Matijevich: "Questions of the Affirmative vote, Representative Friedrich:"

Friedrich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I apologize for there being so many but I still couldn't see some of these people because of people standing in front of them. I would like to question these names. Antonovych."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Antonovych, I don't see him here. Take Representative Antonovych off the record."

Friedrich: "E.M. Barnes."

Speaker Matijevich: "E. M. Barnes. Gene Barnes is in his seat."

Friedrich: "Beatty."

Speaker Matijevich: "Beatty is standing by his seat."

Friedrich: "I see him. Bradley... I see him."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Bradley is here."

Friedrich: "Brummer."

Speaker Matijevich: "Brummer, is here."

Friedrich: "He's here, okay. Byers."

Speaker Matijevich: "He's in his seat."

Friedrich: "I see him. Caldwell."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Caldwell is in his seat."



Friedrich: "Darrow."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Darrow is in his seat."

Friedrich: "Domico."

Speaker Matijevich: "Munching away."

Friedrich: "Domico."

Speaker Matijevich: "Domico is in his seat."

Friedrich: "Doyle."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Doyle, in his seat."

Friedrich: "Ewell."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ewell, is he in the Assembly?"

Ray Ewell. Take him off the record."

Friedrich: "Farley."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Farley, are you back there?"

I don't see him. Take Representative Farley off the record."

Friedrich: "Flinn."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Brandt...."

Friedrich: "Do they count in the gallery, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Matijevich: "I can't see up there, Representative

Brandt is in the gallery."

Friedrich: "No, Flinn is in the gallery. Garmisa."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Garmisa. Here he is in his seat."

Friedrich: "Brummet."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Brummet. I don't see him back there. Take Representative Brummet off for a second."

Friedrich: "Greiman."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Greiman is in his seat."

Friedrich: "Okay, excuse me. Jim Houlihan."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Houlihan, Jim. Is he in the Assembly? I don't see him, take Representative Houlihan off the Roll."

Friedrich: "Jaffe."

Speaker Matijevich: "Jaffe, is in his seat."

Friedrich: "Kozubowski."

Speaker Matijevich: "Kozubowski. Representative Kozubowski."



Kozubowski, he is not in the Assembly. Take Representative Kozubowski off the Roll."

Friedrich: "Madigan."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Madigan is in his office, take him off momentarily. Representative Madigan."

Friedrich: "Mahar."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Mahar..."

Friedrich: "Oh, he's over in the corner."

Speaker Matijevich: "He's here."

Friedrich: "Mann."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Bob Mann is in his chair."

Friedrich: "Okay. Peggy Martin."

Speaker Matijevich: "Peggy Smith Martin is in her chair."

Friedrich: "Okay. I again apologize because it is hard to see, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative DiPrima, for what purpose do you arise?"

DiPrima: "Mr. Speaker, I must be colorblind tonight, I don't know. How am I recorded?"

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

DiPrima: "Make that 'yes'. A question, I also want to know what state. I have this Amendment on my Bill, my Senate Bill 143 which I discussed with Bob....."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, we are verifying the Roll Call."

DiPrima: "And he okayed it. Vote me 'yes' on this."

Speaker Matijevich: "Record DiPrima 'aye'."

Friedrich: "Matejek."

Speaker Matijevich: "Matejek is in his chair. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty. For what purpose do you arise?"

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, would you change my vote from 'present' to 'yes'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Record Getty as 'aye'."

Friedrich: "McGrew."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McClain, for what purpose do



you arise? Seatmate."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for Ann Willer and Dan Houlihan, I'll vote 'aye'."

Speaker Matijeich: "Record Representative McClain as voting 'aye'. Are there further...."

Friedrich: "Yes."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Tuerk, the Gentleman from Peoria."

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

Speaker Matijeich: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Tuerk: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Matijeich: "Vote Representative Tuerk, 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Pechous."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as not voting."

Pechous: "Please cast me 'nay'."

Speaker Matijeich: "Vote Pechous as 'aye'."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker...."

Pechous: "Nay."

Friedrich: "Return Kozubowski to the Roll Call. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request. Thank you."

Speaker Matijeich: "All right. Give us the count, Mr. Clerk.

Record Nardulli, 'aye'. There are 98 'ayes' and 49 'nays'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen, for what purpose do you arise?"

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, now Representative Terzich in handling these Bills gave us a long list of them. As I look at my Digest and I stand corrected, but it looks to me like in the Senate they came out of the.... the whole series came out of Committee without a dissenting vote they...each one of them had 51 votes on the Senate floor and I would be in hopes that they are all basically the same approach. We're talking about discrimination and I would hope that we



could perhaps use the same Roll Call we just had and get rid of these Bills and save a lot of nonsense out here on the House floor."



Speaker Matijevidich: "For the moment, I'd like to clarify that many of these Bills are on a Supplemental Calendar and... or on a Short Debate Calendar, we are now going to turn to the Order of Second Reading, House Bills and on that reading there is House Bill 689. Representative Brady, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 689, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the State Board of Education. Second Reading of the Bill, Amendments #1 and 2, were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevidich: "Are there any motions, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijevidich: "No motions... the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brady."

Brady: "There is most certainly a motion filed on Amendment #2, is there not, Mr. Clerk?"

Speaker Matijevidich: "State your motion, Representative Brady."

Brady: "I have a xerox copy of the motion that I filed with the Clerk and the motion says that I move to table Amendment #2 to House Bill 689."

Speaker Matijevidich: "Representative Brady has moved to table Amendment #2 to House Bill 689... on the motion, Representative Brady. Representative Brady, on your motion."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Chairman and fellow Members, this motion deals with cuts that came out of this Appropriation Bill in the Appropriation Committee. I do not feel that it reflects the view of the majority of the Members here. I think it is important. This has to do with the funding of education and this Bill will put it back in at the amount that we desired the bottom line to be which is a billion, three hundred and fifty-six million in that category."

Speaker Matijevidich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, I've got a query of the Sponsor of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevidich: "He indicates that he will yield."



Hoffman: "Mr. Brady..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Brady."

Hoffman: "Representative Brady.... is this a calculated... the calling of this Bill before we completed the consideration of the categorical grants... is it a calculation, a plan to call this Bill before we have acted upon the categorical because you know that we've called a number of Amendments to cut the categorical... sponsored by Representative Hanahan who is standing in his place at ease and put the additional money into the General Distributive Formula. Now, by calling this Bill ahead of that you expectantly preclude of doing that because we can't put the Amendments on your Bill unless the categoricals have been cut... you know that isn't the way it ought to be done. Now, are you part of a calculated plan by the Illinois Office of Education to work it this way so that we can't... we are reduced from our options or are you willing to take your Bill out of the record... are you willing to take your Bill out of the record until we get a chance to work on those categoricals?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Brady, I think that was a question. Do you want to answer that?"

Brady: "I guess, Mr. Speaker, that that was addressed at me. If I'm a part of a calculated plan to provide quality education for Illinois, I'm seeking full funding of education and this will do it. I don't think that if we take this Bill out of the record we could keep taking it out of the record til the end of the Session. There is always something that somebody else does that is going to come before us. Numerically it comes up first, it was on the Calendar first. it is on the order of call and I wish to proceed."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if the Representative refuses to take this Bill out of the record, then let me make an observation which ought to be fairly obvious to all. Today we adopted... we defeated a motion to put money back in a Bill sponsored by Representative Hanahan



and has obviously pulled it out of the record to get to this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Just a minute, for what purpose does the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan, rise?"

Hanahan: "A point of order, I believe the Gentleman is not speaking to the Amendment that is before this House for deliberation. He's in all sorts of conjecture and assumptions and allegations. The fact is, that we're on Amendment #2 on House Bill... on motion... on House Bill 689 and I think we should stay to that subject...."

Speaker Matijevich: "The order is well taken... the point of order is well taken, speak to the motion, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, is the motion in writing? Is the motion in writing? If the motion is not in writing, it's not in order."

Speaker Matijevich: "No, but it doesn't have to be in writing, if that's your question."

Hoffman: "Oh, I think it does, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "Well, we haven't ruled...."

Hoffman: "Where is the Parliamentarian, what rule does that apply?"

Speaker Matijevich: "I understand that he has it in writing, it does not have to be pre-filed. It is in writing. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this was brought up when the Clerk read it into the record. I said that I most definitely did file a motion in writing, I xeroxed a copy, the copy was dated. I think if everyone will look at their memories a little bit they will remember that I handed it to them. I had someone help me prepare it and it was done on June 10."

Speaker Matijevich: "The motion is filed in order. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think that remarks of Representative Hoffman are indeed in order because



for many years we've been trying to consider the budget... one of the massive budgets in the State of Illinois, but to consider them separate from the categorical certainly is out of order. I think...."

Speaker Matijevich: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan, rise again."

Hanahan: "I don't like to interrupt the Gentleman but when he alleges that your point is not taken after you make your ruling, I think your ruling has to stand. If he wants to appeal it, that's his prerogative but the talk is if your ruling had no validity it's an error and he should certainly stick to the point of the debate."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Chair has already ruled that the motion is in order. All the debates shall be on the motion, speak to the motion. The.... Representative Winchester, the Gentleman from Hardin."

Winchester: "Well, on motions, Mr. Speaker. I understand on this piece of legislation there is three hyphenate cosponsors and only one of those Sponsors have signed the motion. Doesn't all three of those Sponsors have to sign the motion?"

Speaker Matijevich: "No, any Member can make a motion, Representative Winchester. The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle, what purpose do you rise?"

Stuffle: "I rise to ask a question of Walter, here with regard to this particular motion. Let me ask the Chair, will this motion as it is filed hinder any Amendments that succeeded in terms of line items? In other words the Amendments that follow this particular motion... this motion is to table the Committee Amendment, is that correct?"

Speaker Matijevich: "That's correct."

Stuffle: "If this motion tables the Committee Amendment then in last succeeding Amendments are generally stated to delete whatever is in the general apportionment in this Bill and to substitute for the general apportionment in new amounts. Then is it not true that all of those Amendments would be



out of order because they would cite the wrong dollar amount?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative, the Chair would have to rule that the Chair would have to look at each Amendment as it is posed. I cannot rule on that point of order at this time."

Stuffle: "If a future Amendment cites a dollar amount that is different than the Amendment here, it should be tabled. Would that affect it?"

Speaker Matijevich: "We'll cross that bridge when we come to it, we may never come to it. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support the Gentleman's motion. When we in the General Assembly passed the resource equalizer formula and the Governor signed that formula into law, that became the law of our state. We're a government of laws not of men. It is our obligation to fund the formula that we put in, that we put in the Illinois statute books. The House and the Senate signed into law by the Governor and I was very critical of our prior Governor, even though he was the same party as I am, for not fully funding the school aid formula by cutting the resource equalizer formula in reduction vetoes. And I voted to override his reduction vetoes and restore those funds. And the same goes for this General Assembly, we'd be hypocritical having voted to restore those funds against the prior Governor, not at this time to support the Bill as introduced by the Sponsor which would have fully funded and would fully fund the resource equalizer formula. Therefore, our lives.... because this is a government of laws and not of men to support the motion to table Amendment #2, which breaks our word... breaks our word to the school districts and to school children of this state by not fully funding the resource equalizer formula that we created or the Gentleman from DuPage created and put into the law and supported at that time. It is our obligation to do. Mr. Brady



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

is right in moving to table Committee Amendment #2 and restoring the Bill to the way that it was as introduced, which carries out the word of the Legislature, carries out the law to fully fund the resource equalizer formula and I support the motion to table."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the previous speaker let me just indicate that the adoption of Representative Brady's motion will not restore the Bill the way that it was originally introduced. That's just a matter of information to the previous speaker. As a matter of information to the Members of the House, this motion... or this Amendment was adopted in the Appropriation Committee on a 14 - 12 vote. Also for the information of the Members of the House, let me indicate that last year the distributive formula provided 89% of full funding. 89% of full funding, this fiscal year '77 - '78. Superintendant Cronin, in March of this year, informed the school districts to base their budget on 93% funding. Those school districts have prepared their budgets based on that commitment from the Superintendent that they would receive, in his estimation, at least not less than 93% of funding which would translate to one billion, two hundred and ninety-four million dollars. The budget as it was passed out of the Appropriations Committee took a midway mark between that 93%, which was indicated by the Superintendant, and the 100% of full funding that all of us are committed to. This Amendment brings the funding up to 96%, four percentage points away from full funding. Four percentage points away in a fiscally sound, realistic and attainable manner. Four points away from full funding of education, we can talk all we want about our commitment to education, we can all talk all we want about a rule of law and not of men and the previous speaker knows, as well as I, that in any court in the passage of law the situation



as appears before us at the time must be taken into account in fulfilling any commitments we had. And the situation today is that saying to the school districts of the state that we are giving you full funding is an empty, hollow, naive and deceptive promise at the very very least. I respectfully request the Members who are in fact interested in saying to the people of the educational community that we are giving you what we can't end up affording, more than you were told by your Superintendent that you were going to get, also a full funding. Bare with us another year or two and we will in fact achieve our commitment and our promise to you in a fiscally sound and sincere and up-front manner and I ask your help in defeating Representative Brady's motion to table Amendment #2."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Emil Jones."

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At this point I still don't know where the hyphenated Sponsor is and perhaps the Parliamentarian will explain it to the Speaker and the Speaker would tell this Body. Since this has been debated I move the previous question."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved the previous question. The motion is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor vote 'aye'.... say 'aye', those opposed say 'nay'. The 'nays' have it, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti. All right, Roll Call on the previous question. Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Those who want to go home vote 'aye', those who want to stay vote 'no'. I'm out of order, I admit it. Representative Peters, the Gentleman from Cook, for what purpose do you arise?"

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, from my understand..parliamentary inquiry. This is to whether we're going to close debate or not, not the motion?"

Speaker Matijevich: "That's right."



Peters: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Take the record. On the previous question there are 118 voting 'aye', 26 voting 'nay' and the previous question prevails. On the motion to close, Representative Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members. There were several things that were said here that I think some... better some investigation. It was alleged that if you bear with us a few years we will reach full funding while that wasn't the commitment of this Legislature. The commitment of this Legislature is overdue, we're past the time of reaching full funding. It was alleged that if we were to be economically fiscally responsible we wouldn't delude the educational community. The reports that came out today from the Comptroller, Mike Bakalis, he estimates on his current estimate that there will be eighty million more in revenue that was available by the way of the Governor when he prepared his budget. The Economic and Fiscal Commission estimates that there will eighty-three million dollars more available than the Governor thought there was going to be and even the State Chamber of Commerce in their estimates are higher than the Governor. But in one important category, in the category of how much income tax that will be collected, there is seventy-three million dollars above what the Governor said. Now, we talk about fiscal responsibility, we have to talk about balancing that checkbook in a way that gives a fair amount of money to the people who deserve it. The Governor of this state said, 'Education is top priority.' Well, it is mine too and I think it's a priority of more of the Members here than anything else. The only way that we can show that it is our full priority is by voting in favor of this right now and restoring this to full funding, a realization that we can reach this year at this time and also be responsible. I urge your favorable consideration."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Brady, has moved to table Committee Amendment #1... Committee Amendment #2. Those voting to table shall vote 'aye', those opposed shall vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan, to explain this vote."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, wait another year somebody said, give us a chance somebody else said, let's hold off and let's see what the revenue picture... some people are saying. But let me tell you what's happening in the meantime, Ladies and Gentlemen. The real estate tax bills are coming out and they are going to come out higher because you and I know that what monies that we do not give to the school districts back home through this Bill has to come from real estate taxes. You're not doing one damn thing about stopping all the kinds of curriculum that may not be necessary, you may not agree with, by trying to reduce appropriation measures. If you had the guts you would come in and try to offer reasonable legislation that would reduce the kinds of costs that schools are being innovated with. No... just stop this appropriation Bill and then see the real estate tax bills go up and that's all your doing. This is a simple vote on whether you're for having education funded by real estate or by the state income tax. I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti, to explain his vote."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I certainly appreciate the remarks made from the Gentleman from Lake County, wait until next year, wait until next year and wait until the following year and we'll have a hundred percent funding. Out of the last twenty years, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House... out of the last twenty years, sixteen years of those were held by a Democratic Governor. There was only one that had the intestinal fortitude to come in with a state income tax to come up with something close to a hundred percent funding. Now, I'll be happy to



turn my vote into an 'aye' here tonight if somebody will join me in a Resolution to raise the income tax in the State of Illinois to give the school children of Illinois a 100% funding. For the last sixteen years where were the Democrats for these poor school children? I vote 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jaffe, to explain his vote."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it is quite obvious that on this particular Bill the Governor has finally come out of the woodwork and we now see his priority. I have to tell you that the Governor who is a PR Governor, is feeding the public phony information. He's feeding the public phony figures and he's turning his back on the kids of this state. Let me say... I hear ... from the other side of the aisle. I never see any votes for kids from the other side of the aisle, I'll tell you that. I also heard that the Comptroller has come out with a figure that is just eighty million more dollars that can be spent for education. Let me tell you where the Governor is putting his priority. There is the 25% increase in the Commerce Commission budget. The other day we passed out of Committee a Bill that would give fifty to eighty million dollars more to nursing home operators. Nursing home operators mind you and evidently that has the Governor's support. Well, I've got to tell you, if the Governor wants to know what nursing home operators... he can know....."

Speaker Matijevich: "Bring your remarks to a close, Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, in closing I would just like to say that if the Governor wants to go with nursing home operators, that's where he belongs but the Legislature should remain with kids and I would urge an 'aye' vote on this measure."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Telcser..... the Gentleman from Cook, is going to admonish me, Representative Collins."



Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm truly...."

Speaker Matijevich: "The timer is on, Phil."

Collins: "I'm truly astonished, I would expect this treatment from the regular Speaker, but for you the arbitrator of the rules of this House to so flagrantly violate them, I'm truly shocked and I think you should be ashamed of yourself."

Speaker Matijevich: "I'm ashamed of myself. Representative Telcser, the Gentleman from Cook. The Lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis, to explain her vote."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as one of the few who voted to override Governor Walker's veto three years ago, I am voting 'no' and incidentally I don't believe in calling our Governor names. I never called Walker any names so let's be fair about it. If you don't have the money, for heaven sakes we don't, you know it and I know it."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle, to explain his vote."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise reluctantly to oppose this particular motion. It is obvious that we don't have the money in Illinois to do this and everything else. It is also obvious that most of the people on this side of the aisle don't agree with the Governor despite the fact that he is a Republican. We want to add more money to this particular Bill. We just can't fully fund the formula this year and do everything else we want to. There are alternatives. There can be more money than Governor Thompson wants and there ought to be more money but this particular Bill would simply break the bank and we know that. Let's be reasonable about this thing. If we put a Bill on the Governor's desk that cost too much money, he's going to cut it back... he's going to cut it back to the same level no matter how much we appropriate, And if we don't come up with a realistic level, we're not going to be able to override him and the bottom line is how much money we can put



back in the school districts. Let's be reasonable about this thing."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Polk, to explain his vote."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, I believe it has all been said, let's take a roll."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madison, to explain his vote."

Madison: "Well, Mr. Speaker, not to explain my vote. I was contemplating this would get the requisite number of votes and I wanted to be verified because I have to leave, but I'm afraid I'm wrong."

Speaker Matijeich: "I didn't hear you, Representative Madison."

Madison: "If per chance, Mr. Speaker, this does get the prerequisite number of votes, I would like to be verified. I have to leave."

Speaker Matijeich: "All right, it doesn't look like we'll get to that. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On the motion to table there are 74 voting 'aye'.... Representative Brady, the Gentleman from Cook."

Brady: "Mr. Speaker, I would like a verification of the negative Roll Call, but prior to that I would like a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Matijeich: "All right. The Gentleman is in order, we'll have a poll of the absentees. The Clerk will call the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Kornowicz, McAvoy, Meyer, Richmond."

Speaker Matijeich: "The prevailing side of the negative side, proceed with the verification... the negative vote. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madison, ask leave to be verified. Does the Gentleman have leave?"

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, the negative vote may not end up being the prevailing side and for that reason, I'd like to have leave to be verified."

Speaker Matijeich: "Does the Gentleman have..... there are



objections. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if we're assured that he is going to be gone for the rest of the evening, I don't think there would be any objection of verification."

Madison: "I will be gone for the rest of the evening."

Schlickman: "Oh good, go... bye."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman has leave. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson, Adams, Anderson, Antonovych, Bartulis, Bluthardt, Boucek, Byers, Campbell, Catania, Chapman, Collins, Conti, Cunningham, Daniels, Jack Davis, Deavers, Deuster, Ralph Dunn..."

Speaker Matijeich: "Representative Brady, for what purpose do you rise?"

Brady: "Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for us on this side to look through those bodies and see if they are there and I would please.... I would respectfully request that they get into their seats and if they would raise their hands, it would certainly help."

Speaker Matijeich: "Would the Ladies and Gentlemen please remain in their seats? Let's have an orderly verification. Both sides of the aisle... continue."

Clerk O'Brien: "Dyer, Ebbesen, Edgar, Epton, Ewing, Flinn, Friedland, Friedrich, Gaines, Geo-Karis, Getty, Griesheimer, Hart, Hoffman, Holewinski, Hoxsey, Hudson, Huskey, Dave Jones, Kane, Keats, Kempiners, Kent, Klosak, Kucharski, Lauer, Leinenweber, Macdonald, Mahar, Lynn Martin, McAuliffe, McBroom, McCourt, McMaster, Miller, Molloy, Mugalian, Mulcahey, Neff, O'Daniel, Peters, Polk, Porter, Pullen, Reed, Reilly, Rigney, Robinson, Ryan, Sandquist, Schlickman, Schneider, Schoeberlein, Schuneman, Sevcik, Simms, Skinner, Stanley, Stearney, E.G. Steele, C.M. Stiehl, Stuffle, Sumner, Telcser, Totten, Tuerk, Van Duyn, Waddell, Wall, Walsh, Wikoff, Willer, Winchester, Wolf and Younge."



Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brady, has questions of the negative vote, proceed. Representative Brady. Representative Ryan, for what purpose do you rise? The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, somebody has evidently pushed Representative Huskey's button and Representative Huskey had to leave for the doctor at five o'clock and he's not here and I wish the record would so show."

Speaker Matijevich: "Let the records show that Representative Huskey is not present. Representative Brady, proceed."

Brady: "Representative Stearney."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Stearney, is in the middle aisle."

Brady: "Representative Younge."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Wyvetter Younge is in her seat."

Brady: "Representative Flinn."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Flinn is behind you."

Brady: "Representative Pullen."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Pullen is in her seat."

Brady: "Representative Daniels."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Lee Daniels is by his seat."

Brady: "Representative Getty."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Mike Getty... I don't see him on the floor. How is he recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "He's there, I'm sorry."

Brady: "Was in his seat. Representative Leverenz."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ted Leverenz."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Is Representative Leverenz, in the Assembly? Oh, is voting 'present', I'm sorry."

Brady: "Representative Mahar. Representative Mahar is by his seat. Representative McBroom."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McBroom, he's in the back."



Brady: "Representative O'Daniel."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Bill O'Daniel, he's in his seat."

Brady: "Representative Mugalian."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Mugalian is right up front."

Brady: "Representative Schoeberlein."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Schoeberlein... how is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Take him off."

Brady: "Representative Sevcik."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Sevcik, is in his seat."

Brady: "That's all I have, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "Could the Clerk give me the count? There is 74 'ayes' and 92 'nays' and the motion to table fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3 failed in Committee. Floor Amendment #4, Hoffman, Schneider, amends House Bill 689 on page 1 by deleting line 10 and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, I renew my request to the Sponsor of the Bill because these Amendments are directly related to cuts that we had in the categorical program. I renew my motion to.... or my suggestion to the Gentleman from Cook that he take this Bill out of the record at this point so that Representative Schneider and I might have an opportunity to consider these motions after the House has made a decision in reference to 2641."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brady."

Brady: "Mr. Speaker, as I stated before, I think that responsibly that we could fully fund this Bill and now we're looking at Amendments and measures here that say if we take some money here we can give some there. I think we have the money as it is. I think we should proceed with the Bill. There



are several Amendments that don't relate to what the Gentleman is talking about and I'm prepared to go ahead with the Bill at this time."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hoffman, he didn't take up your offer. Proceed with your Amendment."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House, let's address this question to the Clerk. Is this the Amendment that has the total one billion, three hundred and four million, five hundred thousand?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No, it's Section 18-4.2 of the School Code, zero dollars."

Speaker Matijevich: "Maybe we should have let Schneider handle it."

Hoffman: "That's a flippant remark, Mr. Speaker, whatever that means. I think that that Amendment should go on the other Bill. That Amendment is for 2641. 2361, I'm sorry. That Amendment I don't believe is for this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Hoffman, I understand that the Amendment that you're talking about is Amendment #9. Do you want to proceed with Amendment #4 or do you want to withdraw it?"

Hoffman: "Amendment #4 doesn't even fit.... oh, wait a minute...."

Speaker Matijevich: "No wonder he wanted to take this out of the record."

Hoffman: "One moment, Representative Schneider, from the County of DuPage, is going to handle this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The other half of DuPage County, Representative Schneider. Now, I know why Hoffman wanted to take the Bill out of the record. Proceed, Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I don't like to be tied with his reputation. Basically this is a very simple Amendment: last Session the Legislature and the former Governor reduced the impaction dollars to zero. It was restored this Session to two million, five hundred thousand. I would ask again that we strike that amount



and reduce that figure to zero and I would solicit your support."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in opposition to this Amendment. I don't know if the Body here is familiar with what it does or not. But Amendment #4 does exactly what Amendment #3 did that was defeated even in Committee. It takes out impaction and this is part of the full funding formula Bill, it doesn't affect any of the districts that I come from but it affects certain districts very seriously to the tune of two point five million dollars and I think this should be opposed."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker and Members, so as to not delay this situation, I think we are in a situation where we have to decide how much money is available and Representative Byers and I have filed a motion to table Amendments 4 through 8, we're joined in the support of the Sponsor of this Bill on that. And I would like to have that motion called at this time."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle, has filed and moved that Amendments 4 through 8, is that correct Representative Stuffle?"

Stuffle: "Yes."

Speaker Matijevich: "Inclusive be tabled on that Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Well, I would just question whether or not, Mr. Speaker that that is timely. We are now in the process of doing Amendment #4, should he not have proceeded with that prior to the Amendment?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Yes, the Clerk rules that it is timely, the motion is divisible but if there is no request to divide, the motion is in order."



Schneider: "Well, I would simply... he can't proceed with that?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Yes, he can. It's timely."

Schneider: "Well, I would ask then would we oppose that motion to table Amendments 4 through 8."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Lauer, the Gentleman from Logan."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, I request that the question be divided and that each Amendment be voted on separate."

Speaker Matijevich: "There has been a request for a division of the motion. Representative Stuffle, the Gentleman from Coles."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to move to table the motion to divide the question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "No, that is not in order. He has a right to divide. The Gentleman from Cook; Representative Meyer. Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Have you so ruled on Representative Lauer's motion? Is the question going to be divided?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Hold still for one... All right, I... on Representative Lauer's... Representative Lauer, the Gentleman from Logan."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request for a division."

Speaker Matijevich: "The request for a division has been withdrawn. Representative Meyer, the Gentleman from Cook."

Meyer: "I would ask for a division of the question, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "On that issue, the... the Chair will rule that the Body has the right to vote on the division. If a majority votes that the issue be divided, it shall be divided. If a majority of the Body votes it shall not be divided, it will not be divided."

Meyer: "Is this a debatable issue, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Do you persist in your motion to divide, Representative Meyer?"

Meyer: "Yes, Sir. And I'd like to speak to that motion if I may, Sir."



Speaker Matijeich: "All right. The Gentleman from Kane, from Sangamon, Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, point of parliamentary inquiry. As I understand it, the request to divide a motion is not debatable and also an absolute right of a Member and is not subject to majority rule."

Speaker Matijeich: "That's what I thought, too. I have my right... my right hand here has told me otherwise. All right, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I didn't hear your interpretation to Representative Kane, but I think he's absolutely right."

Speaker Matijeich: "Hold for one minute. The Chair is going to rule that the Rule 60(d) says that a Member may call for a division. However, the Body on that call for a division call vote that there not be the division. All right. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, I think that if a motion... if a Member can ask for a division of a question and the rules of the House are silent on whether or not the House can vote on that is that we have to go to Robert's Rules. And Robert's Rules says specifically, 'Sometimes a series of independent Resolutions dealing with different subjects is offered in one motion. In such a case, one or more of the several Resolutions must receive separate consideration and vote at the request of a single Member and the motion for division of a question is not used.'"

Speaker Matijeich: "The... The Chair will rule that the issue must be divided. Now, Representative Stuffle has moved to table Amendment #4. And that motion is debatable. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, so that we all know what we are doing here again, would the Chair please advise me exactly what we are now about to consider and vote on?"

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider, has moved the adoption of Amendment #4."



Representative Stuffle, from Coles, has moved that that Committee Amendment lie on the table. We are... floor Amendment rather and we are now voting the tabling of the floor Amendment. #4. Are there any other... The Gentleman from Will, Representative Kempiners, do you have... Representative Schneider, from DuPage, your light is on.

Schneider: "Do I get to close on the motion to table my Amendment?"

Speaker Matijevich: "You can speak on it. That's your right."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. After all of the exchanges between us and the Chair, I would like to again oppose this motion. If we're really talking about being fiscally responsible and trying to add money to the appropriate line so that there is money for schools, I would suggest you oppose the motion to table."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Logan, Representative Lauer."

Lauer: "Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question please? Is this floor Amendment 4 or Committee Amendment 4?"

Speaker Matijevich: "This is floor Amendment #4 and the motion is to table that Amendment."

Lauer: "Is this the one that's for two and a half million dollars? Okay, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak in favor... I would like to speak for the retention of Amendment #4. Amendment #4 is an Amendment that is vital to any area of the state that has any public facility. Whether it be a state university, a mental hospital, whether it be the City of Springfield and all of it's public employees. This is of great, great consideration to those areas because you bring in a great many people and it does have to do very much with local funding of schools."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, Representative Lauer has stated his position backwards I'm sorry to say. He's for tabling Amendment #4. Amendment #4 would take



out the impaction aid. Everyone in this General Assembly who's got a Strayer-Hague district, who's impacted by state facilities, ought to vote for my motion to table this Amendment. Last year, they took out every dime of impaction aid for every one of our districts - in Macomb, in Normal, in Charleston, throughout the state that are truly impacted by state facilities. If they had cut that to 90% or 93% like they did the rest of the school aid formula, it would have been fair. If they'd done that this year the same way it may be on the rest of the general resource equalizer, it would have been fair. But this Amendment isn't fair. It robs school districts, in particular my home town, of one-tenth of their state aid besides what may be a 5 to 7% cut. Representative Lauer is opposed to this Amendment. He wants to table and so do we."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, all of us can understand those individuals who rise to bag it for their own communities. Let me make a couple of free points about impaction. Number one, impaction makes no sense. It never really has and that's why it was not included when we went to the resource equalizer formula. The vast majority of the school children and the vast majority of those of you sitting on the floor of the House represent districts that are covered by the resource equalizer. Last year, the Governor cut out the line item for impaction and none of those school districts have gone down the chute. The two and a half million dollars that we are taking from impaction from the line item for impaction in this Amendment are put back into the General Distribution Fund to which all of us, including those school districts that say they're affected by this, get their general distributive aid from. So Amendment #4 takes it from the line item on impaction and Amendment #5



will put into general distributive formula. That is the fair way to distribute the money. The basis of impaction was taken off of a federal program which doesn't really apply because those communities which have state institutions in them like Charleston and Champaign, Ma~~com~~comb or any district. I don't think it affects Champaign because I think they are on a resource equalizer now, those school districts benefit by the increase value of real property in those communities and the viability of the economy in those communities and the money that is spent in those communities by boys and girls and families from other areas of the state that wouldn't be spent there. Can you imagine what Ma~~com~~comb would be like without Western Illinois University? You wouldn't even know that it was on the map. Now I wouldn't say that for Charleston.. well no, maybe I would. You know those state institutions are what makes those communities and there is no reason in the world why they should get an extra break out of this. It applied in the old days, it no longer applies today and I would ask that you vote in opposition to tabling this motion because this makes as much sense as anything else."

Speaker Matijeivch: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I don't know if the hyphenated Sponsor, if he was closing; but if he wasn't, I move the previous question."

Speaker Matijeivch: "The Gentleman from DeKalb has moved the previous question. Shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.... Representative Stuffle, to close."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker, let me simply say that if you... if you vote to table this particular Amendment, you are voting with those people who have historically been on the Strayer-Hague formula as opposed to the resource equalizer formula. These are the very same districts that are having the most trouble of all coping with situations now in terms of school funding. Historically we've supported impaction aid in this



state, last year this General Assembly overwhelmingly did so, the Governor cut it. We should support it if we're going to be fair to these districts. Representative McGrew and I with the help of people from our district attempted to limit impaction (a) to those districts that were truly impacted by state facilities and state personnel. This Body rejected that, therefore, we have no option except support our effort to table this Amendment and keep the money there for those districts that are truly impacted by state facilities. I would urge an affirmative 'yes', green vote to table Amendment #4."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, moves for the adoption of Committee Amendment #4 and the Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle, has moved that that motion lie on the table. Those voting in favor of the motion to table shall vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Representative Sam McGrew to explain his vote."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. May I first point out that this Amendment was heard thoroughly in Committee and was defeated. It went down the tube, it is a bad Amendment. We heard all the testimony there. Let me tell you a thing or two. The Board of Education Subcommittee met with Governor Walker last time and frankly on a very political decision, voted to do away with nearly four million dollars that would have gone to school districts that were still on Strayer-Hague and would have received impaction aids. The City of Macomb had a very balanced budget in our school system, we did not anticipate any warrants, we were at a balanced budget. What happened after this veto was that, in one year's time Macomb went in one full swoop from zero anticipation to the state 75% maximum. That means, Ladies and Gentlemen, you made us as broke as we can get by one Amendment... by one amendatory veto, that has not been discussed, it is not the position of the State Board of Education... it was heard in Committee and was defeated."



Please... please give us an 'aye' vote for the motion to table."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Edgar."

Edgar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Matijevich: "To explain his vote."

Edgar: "I would like to rise in favor of this motion. One of the previous speakers said that those school districts which lack the impact aid last year still have had their doors open, they didn't go down the chute. Well, I'm not that familiar with Macomb or Normal, but I am very familiar with Charleston and for all practical purposes our school district did go down the chute because of the Governor's action last year. Several teachers were let go, several more teachers are going to be let go this year... we had to cut out all extra curriculum activity which was only saved by outside donations. This put a severe hardship on the Charleston school districts, it was something that was done the last minute after money was planned. This coupled with the school aid formula which has caused problems for all downstate school districts... coupled also with the decision a few years ago of this General Assembly and the Board of Higher Education to cut out the lab schools, it has caused a severe hardship on these university communities and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce, to explain his vote."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman, was absolutely right. There is no justification for state impaction anymore... if there ever was. The students in the dormitories, they don't go to local school districts, they don't have children in local school districts. They are not costing the local school districts a dime. They are shopping in the stores, they are living off campus and the apartment buildings that are worth more because there's state employees and



because there's a college in the town. They're not crowding the schools and there's no reason at all... If these towns don't want the state universities, let's take them up our way. If Eastern Illinois is too much of a burden for Charleston, we can...we can move it to Waukegan or to Highland Park. There's no reason at all for state impaction. Unlike the federal impaction, where the Federal Government has large military reservations. They pay no real estate taxes and send the students to local schools. The colleges, it's true, the state buildings don't pay real estate taxes. but neither do they send from the school dormitories or from the school classrooms of our colleges and universities, they're not sending many students to the school. And to the extent that they are they're supporting the business of the community. The retail sales of the community..."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, of all the Amendments to the State Aid Education forms are...the Impaction Aid Amendment probably makes the least sense. Just to give you an example, in the Springfield area districts that have state employees residing in them but no state institution is located within their boundaries get state impaction aid. So there's no money taken off the tax rolls. Nevertheless, they still get this special bonus. In addition, with the resource equalizer those districts with institutions off the tax rolls get compensated because the lower the assessed valuation, the higher the state aid. This type of an Amendment, the Impaction Aid Amendment, just gives a double bonus under the resource equalizer to every special impaction district that has a state institution and that's unfair."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Christian, Representative Tipword, to explain his vote."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm voting 'no' and I would like to urge all of the other Members of the House to do so. Representative Pierce is absolutely right. Impaction Aid was first created by the Federal Government and the theory of Federal Impaction Aid has no relation to impaction aid as it has been known here in the State of Illinois. What impaction aid actually does is take money from all of the rest of the districts of the..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed... Bring your remarks to a close, Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "I just barely started. All that impaction aid does is really take money from the other districts of the State of Illinois. It's a rip-off by the so-called, 'impaction districts' of all of the other districts throughout the State of Illinois. I regret the fact that last year, those of you who had impaction districts found yourselves with some financial difficulty. It just puts you in the same situation of all the other districts in the State of Illinois. There's absolutely no theoretical right for impaction aid. There are huge payrolls that go into each of those districts from which those districts benefit. They buy property, the people that live there, the ones that have children that go to school, almost all of them with exception of a few students. They pay rentals, they invest, they bring in money from services for those institutions that are located there. Consequently they get benefits that no other districts throughout the State of Illinois have. Impaction just simply compounds disparity between different areas of the state. We should make it equal and we should vote 'no' on this tabling motion and make it right for all of the districts of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan, to explain his vote."



Hanahan: "I'm voting 'no', Mr. Speaker, and I'll tell you just plainly the truth why. The fact remains, I'm sick and tired of seeing people whose ox is getting gored around here, who think they know everything about school aid when it comes to their position but when it comes to something back home they run off at the mouth and then they ask the very people that they said a few minutes ago didn't know anything about school aid, they ask for their help. Well I'm telling you my help says 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle, to explain his vote."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker, partially in terms of a point of personal privilege, the comments by Representative Hanahan are obviously directed at myself and some other people. We're not talking about cutting full funding by 2 percent, we're talking about cutting the lion's share of much of school aid in our particular districts if we cut out this Amendment. If the Office of Education and the people who are for this Amendment had told us before the year started they were going to cut out impaction aid, that would be one thing. But they didn't. This thing came to the floor with the money in it for impaction aid. And now there's an effort to cut it all out. We're not talking about 2 percent of our budget, we're not talking about 2 percent of our school aid. We're talking about a hell of a lot more money than that."

Speaker Matijevich: "Before I call on Representative Bradley, I understand that some unauthorized people are on the floor of the House. Will the Doormen please remove any unauthorized people off the floor of the House? All unauthorized people, remove yourselves immediately. The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley, to explain his vote."



Bradley: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was quite disappointed and I know just exactly how Representative Hanahan feels, but the fact of the matter is we can't cut our nose off to spite our face on this issue. There's no question...just...that impaction aid is certainly justified in every sense of the word. We're talking about state employees working in buildings that there is no real estate taxes paid on. That's what impaction aid is all about. I don't care how much rent they pay, how much they invest, how much they..... that doesn't help those school districts. The only way those school districts are helped locally is through real estate taxes. And we have buildings in the Normal area, Illinois State, Normal University, that we collect absolutely no real estate taxes from at all. Impaction aid is very vital to our system. I hope that you will reconsider your vote and let's defeat...or let's vote 'yes' on this motion so we will continue to have impaction aid. It's going to devastate the school districts in my, that I represent. There's over four hundred thousand dollars involved here for one school district and I urge the Members to reconsider and vote 'aye' on this motion."

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

Barnes: "Thank you...thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. One question prior to my explanation of vote. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Yes, Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "One question prior to my explanation of vote. I understood the Chair requesting the number of unauthorized persons on the floor, I would like to ask the question, how many people are allowed on the floor from the Executive Branch?"



Speaker Matijevich: "I believe there's two, according to our rules."

Barnes: "According...according to my little minus count right now, I see quite a few more than two."

Speaker Matijevich: "Could the Governor please come up here and get his men off the floor and women too?"

Barnes: "That's the first thing. If we got to have unauthorized people off the floor I think we should have them all off. Except for the number that is authorized, that's what I'm saying."

Speaker Matijevich: "I think...All right. Proceed, Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "In explanation of my vote and very briefly on the former Amendment that was before us, Amendment #2 to House Bill 689, the mover of this motion and many other people had the opportunity at that time to vote for, to vote for what they're trying to do right here in this motion. If they had supported Representative Brady in his motion to table Amendment #2, if they had looked at the Bill at that time, this was included and not...and had not been touched. But apparently... apparently, there are some self-centered people involved here and they're only concerned about their own...about their own ox. Well I don't have any impaction up in my district and I feel strongly about full funding. I feel that we have it, we should...we owe it to our constituents and the money is there for it but I also feel strongly that depending on whose ox is gored, a number of people in this Body feel that they have..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Bring your remarks to a close, Representative."

Barnes: "In bringing my remarks to a close...feel that they have the only knowledge in this whole area. And based upon my past six to eight weeks studying this whole



situation with the staff, I'm going to vote 'no' on this Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich, you're light isn't working... do you want to explain your vote?"

Friedrich: "Yes, I do."

Speaker Matijevich: "Go ahead, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I'm beginning to feel sorry for these people who have universities in their district, so I suggest that we not enlarge them any further. On behalf of the people in my district you're invited to bring a state university to my district so we can suffer along with you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell, to explain his vote. Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On the motion to table there are 62 voting 'aye', 101 voting 'nay', 4 voting 'present' and the motion to table fails. Now we revert to floor Amendment #4, which I think we have had floor debate on and we will have Representative Schneider, from DuPage, to close on Amendment #4."

Schneider: "Very simply, Mr. Speaker, you are right. We have had a lot of decision and understanding what this Amendment does. I would very simply move for its adoption."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage moves the adoption of Amendment #4. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. Amendment #4 prevails. Amendment #5... are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5, Hoffman, Schneider. Amends House Bill 689 on page 1 by deleting line 14 and inserting in lieu thereof, and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Amendment now adds that money that we have just removed from impaction for.... from that line item into general



aid apportionment to increase that then by two million, five hundred thousand dollars. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brady, the Sponsor of the Bill."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, I would just like to emphasize again that I think we have the ability to fund education, the quality manner in a full way. What we're doing here is very piecemeal, but it is the wish of the Members who have offered these Amendments to take the time to do it. I've got all the time in the world this evening to stand here and do it. I would like to support every Amendment that adds money to the fully funding formula and this is one that just adds 2.5 million. I hope we certainly get a lot higher than this but I urge your support."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, with the adoption of Amendment #4, the House indicated its will to release two and a half million dollars of money that would otherwise go to impaction. And now the opportunity in Amendment #5 to send that money over to make up part of the distributive formula. It would be my urging and the Members of our side of the aisle that we support Amendment #5."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McClain, Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Gentleman might yield to... for question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates that he will."

Bradley: "I wonder if you could point out to us those areas that have impaction that we just lost. How much of this two and a half million would come back to those school districts, in particular mine. I would like to have a printout on that if you have one available or if you know what we would gain in Normal Unit 5. If you have a printout on it, I wish you



would tell us. We lost four hundred and thirty-nine thousand in impactation aid. How much are we going to gain in this?"

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, we are taking two million, five hundred thousand dollars and distributing it to all the schools in the State of Illinois according to the formula. We consider that formula fair and I understand probably, Jerry; you don't...."

Bradley: "You're not answering my question, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Well, I don't have a printout, so I'm telling you that general distribution of dollars...."

Bradley: "Would you take this Amendment.... hold the Amendment until we find out so we can vote realistically on it?"

Schneider: "No."

Bradley: "Then I would like to speak to the Amendment."

Speaker Matijevec: "Proceed, Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Gentleman with Amendment #4 has taken out two and a half million dollars from school districts, who are in a position, that have impacted areas. And obviously what he is intending to do is to redistribute that money to other areas in the State of Illinois who do not have impactation areas... impactation. He can't tell me what we're going to gain or what we're going to lose in our impacted areas, such as Unit 5, or the schools in Lincoln or schools in Charleston. They're going to lose a lot of money with Amendment #4, but he is unable to give us any idea to what we're going to gain in Amendment #5. Well, we're not going to come anywhere close to picking up the money we just lost. What he is doing is taking money from those schools or con on it and take it and put it in his school and it's kind of a selfish act. At the least for him to be doing something like that and I urge the Members to defeat this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevec: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Gene Hoffman."

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



reference to the last speaker, I think the answer for him as well as other people who would take the same point of view is, that what's going to happen now is.... they're going to get their fair share. They are going to get their fair share just like every other school district in this state. They are going to get their fair share of the general distributive formula and they will use that, the local school districts can use that as they wish. Now, he certainly... as Representative of that area has an illegitimate right to take the position he takes. However, as it has been well pointed out and by a number of Members on the floor of this House besides myself, there is no justification today for impaction. Its time and its place have passed and therefore, if you want to redistribute to your school district and all the school districts over the state this two and a half million dollars you must adopt it and you should adopt Amendment #5."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Jack Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, it has all been said, I move the previous question."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Will, moves the previous question. The issue is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. We revert now to Representative Glenn Schneider, on the Bill."

Schneider: "Thank you again, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. It's an item that has taken a lot of our time. Amendment #5 does add two million, five hundred thousand dollars to the general apportionment of state aid. I would ask its support, move its adoption."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider, has moved the adoption of Amendment #5. Those in favor of that Amendment shall all vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Take the



record. On this motion there are 148 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present' and Amendment #5 is adopted.

Representative Mann, for what purpose.... 'aye', Representative Mann. VanDuyne, 'aye'. Roger Keats, 'aye'. Jack Lauer, 'aye'. Representative Edgar, 'aye'. The Gentleman from Logan, Representative Lauer, for what purpose do you rise?"

Lauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had my light on before the motion was made to close debate. I would like to explain my 'no' vote on this."

Speaker Matijeich: "Proceed."

Lauer: "We have a situation, Mr. Speaker, that we talk about the distributive aid formula which is grossly unfair. It was set up by the two Gentleman from DuPage County. Two teachers who actually are analogous in the modern situation of the Italian robber Barrett...iniquitous, unprincipled, unscrupulous. And it's an absolute rape of downstate schools that you let these two clowns to get by with it."

Speaker Matijeich: "And motion....Amendment #5 is adopted. Are there further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #6, Hoffman, Schneider. House Bill 689 on page 1....."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, first I would like to start out with a point of personal privilege. I am shocked and chagrined that my friend, Representative Lauer, would cast dispersion upon two upstanding, upright Gentlemen who happen to be part of the honorable profession of teaching as he has done, a former member of that group himself. I am shocked and chagrined but be that as it may, I would like....."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell, for what purpose do you arise?"

Yourell: "I think we ought to have a Roll Call on Lauer's remarks."

Speaker Matijeich: "Can you top that...."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, I won't speak for Representative Schneider but



I think I would take a voice vote. But seriously, due to the unwillingness and the fact that the Sponsor of this Bill is castè. in concrete in terms of his willingness to consider another Bill. I'm going to ask him, I'm going to give him an opportunity... one more opportunity to be reasonable. I'm going to give him one more opportunity to be reasonable, to take this Bill out of the record at this point so we may consider Amendment on Representative Hanahan's Bill...."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brady... give us a quick answer."

Brady: "Mr. Speaker, I think that because there is a lot of confusion ringing, it is difficult for the Member who just spoke to see. I'm the one being reasonable, I think there is a lot of unreasonableness going on here. They are trying to offer Amendments which has to offset some other money somewhere, sometime, somehow. If they want to put money in education, stand up and be counted and put some money in. We need some money for quality education. Let's proceed with the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "I think his answer was 'no', Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "I got that message."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Hoffman: "But he was working a periphery there. All right, because the Sponsor of the Bill is unreasonable and unwilling to take this Bill out of the record at this point, I will have to move to table.... I would like to table...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Does Representative Hoffman have leave to table Amendment #6...."

Hoffman: "6 and 7."

Speaker Matijevich: "6 and 7, the Amendments are withdrawn. 6 and 7. Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8, Meyer. Amends House Bill 689 in Section 1 and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Meyer."



Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #8 does not reduce the bottom line for you fiscal conservatives but sends twenty million dollars over to fund the Textbook Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, the State of Illinois sends over one billion, three hundred million dollars to support public schools. This Bill would permit six million, six hundred and sixty-six thousand dollars to be used to provide money for textbooks for children who do not attend public schools. This is less than one half of one percent of the total state aid. 99.5% of the state money would go to state.... public schools. I urge your support."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members. I'm in sympathy with Representative Meyer in what he attempts to do. He attempts to put more money into a program that he and I know very well. As a matter of fact if he would have refreshed you, he could have told you that it came out of a Bill numbered in his name and a concept that Jane Barnes was working on that we devised a textbook Bill in the Senate and House last Session. We were able to put some money into that Bill. That Bill gave textbooks to needy children everywhere, not only nonpublic school children, public school children. I wish that that program was fully funded, but that program is clearly a categorical program. We are dealing with the funding formula Bill here. I will assist Representative Meyer to try to get adequate funding for textbooks if he goes about it in a categorical way. I think we are abusing what we are trying to do here in this funding formula and this may be the only time you see me objecting to putting money into a Textbook Bill but I urge you to defeat this measure.... put in this way to you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."



Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it might sound strange to some Members here but I find myself in agreement with the sentiments expressed by Representative....

Speaker Matijevich: "Just a minute, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes, for what purpose do you rise?

Peters: "What do you need, a cannon around here to get some attention?"

Barnes: "I would like to raise questions relative to the Amendment, with the Chair. The language in the Amendment would suggest that you would subtract twenty million dollars. I've never seen an appropriation in that manner and I would like a opinion from the Chair relative to whether or not this language.... this Amendment, as written, is directive or substantive language not in keeping with the appropriation process."

Speaker Matijevich: "Hold for one minute. Representative Peters, will you continue while the Chair is perusing the Amendment?"

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Barnes may well be right in the objection that he has made to the Amendment... but, if in fact he is right and the Speaker so rules, that will solve this particular problem. There are a lot of Members I know on the House floor who are indeed sympathetic to the idea of general revenue funds.... public funds going to support textbook program. But I don't know that there are that many who at this stage of the game, at any rate, would end up saying that we can't end up taking twenty million out of the distributive fund to put into the textbook fund to come near to fully funding the twenty-seven million dollars that the textbook program will eventually require. I have certain misgivings as to whether that line item ought to be funded. And if it is funded at this stage, how much money we ought to give to that particular item, but that will come up later on when we discuss House Bill 2361. And at this stage at least, in all respect to the hard work



that was done on this Bill and this concept by Representative Meyer, I have to maintain a consistent position in regards to the fiscal ability of the state to meet this obligation, and ask that the Members who feel that they can't join with me in opposition to this particular Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Chair will rule on the point of order by Representative Barnes, that the Amendment by Representative Meyer does not add substantive language and it is therefore in order. Any further discussion? Representative Meyer to close." Oh, I'm sorry. Representative Hanahan, from McHenry County."

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I stand in opposition to the Gentleman's Amendment to the Bill, knowing full well and like a lot of you... that we're in a trick bag here. Because a lot of us, and I would say in excess of a hundred Members here on the floor of the House, demonstrated time and again that we support the textbook program. But I suggest to the Gentleman and to the Members of this General Assembly that this is not the manner in which to do it. That what you're doing in essence is taking from the general distributor formula this twenty million dollars, that should not be subtracted from all the school kids, to support the textbook program. That it should definitely be in the Bill. And we have an Amendment for seven million dollars that is going to be offered later on the Grant Aid Bill and that's the Bill that should be utilized to provide the textbooks, if it is the will of the General Assembly. But to take the twenty million out of the distributive formula and then use that twenty million for textbooks is really not the manner in which it should be done. And, Representative Byers and I may disagree on the issue of textbooks but I'm sure that in thinking on what is happening with this Amendment that we are doing a wrong thing if we take from all the kids.... this textbook fund from the distributor fund. Let's take it from airplanes and let's take it from automobiles and all the other funding



programs that we pass out for all the Department of Corrections and Conservation, Labor and Business and Economic but let's not take it, let's not take it from the General Fund for schools."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I really question whether or not the Amendment is in correct form. But I would suggest to many of the Members here and..... to really read this Amendment, number 1, in the first Section of this Amendment where it says it subtracts from a number that is not listed.... a number that is not listed in the Amendment but it subtracts from whatever total that is provided by Section 18 (a). Now I'm not going to suggest there is going to be any total provided by 18 (a), Mr. Speaker... Mr. Speaker....."

Speaker Matijevich: "Mr. Barnes... let's give the Gentleman order. Proceed, Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "I would suggest to all of the Members, whether or not you support textbooks or not, to realize that this Amendment is doing two things. One, it says on the first hand to subtract from whatever total... is provided in 18 (a). Well, I go to a hypothetical question, although I am not suggesting that that may be but, I'm going to the hypothetical question that if nothing... if nothing is provided in 18 (a), you will by this Amendment be appropriating twenty million of new dollars for this purpose. This Amendment does two things, be very careful in what you put forth in this Amendment. It is worded in such a fashion that any amount... any amount that is remaining in Section 18 (a), twenty million dollars of that will go for this purpose. Now, if there is only twenty million left, that means that the whole twenty million dollars goes for this purpose. If there is zero left in 18 (A), that means that you will come up with twenty million new dollars for this purpose."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative



Lechowicz, "the Assistant Majority Leader."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, very briefly I rise to speak against this Amendment. And in turn I think the Membership of this Body knows my feeling as far as support to private education as well; but when you're jeopardizing twenty million dollars, that is, support to go to the distributive formula for the children in this state in public schools, I think you are doing it in a wrong way, Representative Meyer. I think the proper address should be addressed to House Bill 2361 and in turn that money will not affect the school children in this state that are enrolled in public schools. For this reason, I'm asking a 'no' vote on Amendment #8."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Meyer, to close."

Meyer: "You have cut off Representative Hoffman, who once again flay at the private school children."

Speaker Matijevich: "Run it, Ted."

Meyer: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment was drafted so that no matter what the bottom line is, it wouldn't add anymore money to the Governor's budget. That's the reason that it subtracts from the bottom line. This won't cost the taxpayers of the State of Illinois an extra nickel and of that twenty million dollars, two-thirds of that money, almost fourteen million dollars would go back to the public schools so the net reduction to the public schools would be six million, six hundred and sixty-six thousand dollars. That would leave them with over one billion, three hundred million plus dollars. And that would give them 99.5% of the money. 99.5%, that's almost whole hog but not quite. I urge the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Meyer has moved the adoption of Amendment #8, to House Bill 689. Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'nay'."



The Amendment fails. Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #9, Stuffle, Byers. Amends House Bill 689 as amended by deleting the dollar amount appropriation and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle, on Amendment #9."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker and Members. Amendment #9 is offered in total sincerity. Tonight some people have stood up and argued for full funding, I don't think one person on the floor is opposed to full funding. One Gentleman tonight questioned the position and the thinking and the knowledge of some of us who voted against full funding. We weren't against it because we don't think the money should go there, we were against it because we don't think the money is there to fully fund. There is no other reason for opposing fully funding the school aid formula. It was also acknowledged that some of us think we know everything. We've never said that and we don't think that, but in looking at this situation, in looking at the dollars that have been appropriated in the other Bill, 2361, in looking at the situation on this Bill, we think there has to be a realistic viewpoint at this time as to the dollars that are available. We take no position, we make no brief against anyone for full funding, but this particular Amendment along with the Amendment that's already been offered and already adopted that was offered by Representative Hoffman and Representative Schneider, would put us exactly, exactly between the Amendment offered and adopted in Committee by Representative Peters and the position of Representative Brady and Representative Hanahan for full funding. We wish we could have full funding. Some of us don't think we can with the increases requested in 2361. Therefore, this Amendment asks for an addition to the already existent line item, the general apportionment under 18-8 of twenty-five million dollars. That



196.

coupled with the Hoffman-Schneider Amendment would boost the original Peters' Amendment by twenty-seven and one half million dollars. It won't be full funding, we know that. It will be roughly 98% plus, about 98.2% of full funding. Someone to talk about percentages, that's nice to do. It's nice to say that we're only 2% away from full funding. It's nice to be emotional and say that we can go two more percent. But two more percent in this particular situation is nearly thirty million dollars. I would be the first to support full funding if we could hold the categorical increases or we could hold the line on categorical program funding to what we had last year. I haven't seen that and I don't think that's going to happen. Therefore, I've offered this Amendment along with Representative Byers in the hope that we can put together a position, at least on this side of the aisle that says we're going to boost funding above what the Governor claims we have and claims we need. Some of us believe in that and we ask for your support on this Amendment on the basis of a logical position. We can all be emotional, we can all attack each other, we can all say that the money's there or it isn't there, we can all argue those positions; but to be realistic, the bottom line is, how much money can we put into the school districts? How much money can we afford to put there? And if the Governor cuts this particular budget back to where he said he would, can we override him? Keep that in mind in voting on this Amendment whether or not you supported full funding, whether or not your emotions like mine lead you to really want full funding, but to think that with the categorical increases, we can't afford it. I ask for an affirmative vote to put us exactly between the Peters' Amendment and full funding."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, the Chief Sponsor, Representative Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, I don't want to



be redundant in anything that we have said before. It seems that good ideas that come out of tough decisions can only be arrived by travelling inches at a time. This Amendment takes us part way to full funding. As in the past Amendments, it's increased the formula: I have supported them. I urge you to support this Amendment. As the Representative who sponsored it spoke, said he feels sincerely that this is his limit, this is where he feels it ought to be at for any one of a number of reasons. I can't enforce enough the fact that I feel it ought to be fully funded. But Ladies and Gentlemen, if we have to travel in inches over the next ten days, I urge you to travel in that manner and I urge you to support this Amendment and start to raise the formula funding."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to say this. I think Representative Peters pointed out in his opening remarks that, you know, the budget that came out of Appropriations II increases the 93% that was suggested to every school district in plenty of time for them to negotiate their contracts to 96% of full funding which is a billion and a third dollars. And this is 3% more than the districts were told to expect. We already have in the Bill at 96% which is another 7% over what we had the last fiscal year. And we all know from our discussion tonight, we don't have one dollar more than that. We can't afford that twenty-five million that he's talking about in this Amendment and I certainly would encourage everyone to cast a negative vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Yeah, I... Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm really concerned because of all the rhetoric and articulation on the... by the



fiscal experts on education in the Illinois House. It seems to me that Representative Stuffle who proposed Amendment #9 to House Bill 689 said that if we adopt this Amendment, it will provide twenty-five million dollars more to our full funding program, that we would then be within 1.8% of the goal that we set down some years ago under House Bill 1484. But it seems to me that we're talking about 1.8%, less than 2% and I don't know of any fiscal expert in this country that can determine what this budget of eleven billion dollars is going to produce in added revenues in this year. Now, if we're willing to go to 98.2% to full funding, it seems to me we ought to be able to go to 1.8% more and do the job that the Constitution mandates and that we told the people many years ago that we would support. This Legislature is on the line right now, right now tonight to fully fund education. And I don't want to stop with this twenty-five million dollars, I want to go to another 1.8% and fully fund education. A previous speaker said that we're at the last dollar amount that we can afford. Now, I'd like to know where the hell he gets his information, that this dollar amount in this eleven billion dollar budget is within 1.8% or whether it really is 100%. I suggest we adopt this Amendment and then go to full funding of education which is the mandate of this General Assembly. Everyone voted for it, everyone campaigned on it. Let's do it and get it over with."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the first motion that was filed on this Bill by Representative Brady was to table my Amendment which deleted some fifty-four million dollars from the original appropriation. Had this General Assembly wished to fully fund education, that motion of Representative Brady's would have passed. This General Assembly in that vote,



made a determination that it just was not fiscally sound, possible, attainable to hold out to the school districts, to the teachers of the children, if you will, of the state, that we are able and would be able to give them 100% of funding. 96%, all reasonable individuals would agree that 96% is attainable. Superintendent Cronin says 93% to the schools is what you ought to expect. We're giving them a little bit more. It's there to give, the 96%. Representative Stuffle wants to raise it another 2% and there'll be another Amendment to raise it another 1%. And we'll go on our way to nickel and dime this thing back to the same situation we were in when Representative Brady initially offered his Amendment. Understand what you're doing here. The money just ain't there for 98%. We know 96% can be attained. Let's not again fool ourselves, let's not delude ourselves by accepting these Amendments which add on a million and two million and five million and eight million, that somehow we're dealing in nickels and dimes and we're not boosting this budget up... back to the one billion, three hundred and ninety-million it came in at. Now, let's not fool ourselves. I urge the Members who are, in fact, interested in giving education the kind of funds that we can give them and be sure that the school districts can count on getting what we promised they're going to get this year, to reject this Amendment #9."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, very great former Speaker of this House one time told me when I first came here that when you're hungry and you can't get a full meal, take a sandwich. That man was one of the great Speakers of this General Assembly and I listened to him. And over the years, I tried to take that advice and right now, once again, we're at that crossroad



or that decision-making time where when you're hungry, whether or not you're going to be willing to take a sandwich. Well, I'm going to take that sandwich and I'm going to vote for this Amendment. But in no way does that vote reflect my feelings that the commitment made by law, the commitment that this General Assembly has sought not to change by any Amendment to the existing statute, the commitment that the law of Illinois calls for and that's 100% full funding. I still stand in favor of. And for those of you that want to cop out and hide behind some fancy, 'falu'ting' expert opinions on how much money they're coming in with, I say to you cut the budget in other areas, don't cut out the budget in areas that you have already been mandated by your own laws and by your own inaction to change that law, by trying to hide behind that we don't have enough money because some expert tells us. Well, I don't have a crystal ball, but I don't know how to read the statute when it calls for the full funding. And even though I'm going to vote for this Amendment, in no way does this reflect my commitment to 100% full funding. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Matijevec: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As the Sponsor in 1973 of the Resource Equalizer Formula, I'm obligated to make a couple of observations. Number one, they will be, as always, accurate and forthright and to the point. Number one, the... House Bill 1484, that was in regards to something Skinner said on the side down there, the law specifically states that if the funds are not available that they will be prorated. We are following the law. We make the laws and we follow the laws. We make the law and we follow the law. And it provides for proration. And certainly those of us who work for and passed the Resource



Equalizer over the opposition, by the way I might say of many of the people who are prostrating themselves on this full funding issue right now. Those of us who worked for the Resource Equalizer intended that in the four year period of time that we would be able to fully fund and meet that particular projected commitment. But you know and I know what happened to the economy and the impact that it had on the resources of the State of Illinois. Now, those of you who had an opportunity to view a memorandum prepared by one of our more illustrious Members in regards to the resources that are available and in regards to the projections made by our illustrious Comptroller, who by the way at the time as Superintendent of Public Instruction opposed the Resource Equalizer, you know and I know that the resources are not available. That they're not available for twenty-five million, they're not going to be available for twenty million. And in reference to the comments of the last speaker, he said he'd learned from a previous speaker to take a sandwich if he couldn't get a full meal. Ladies and Gentlemen, that sandwich isn't even here. That sandwich is not here, let alone the full meal. Now you and I know that our revenue... our revenue system in the State of Illinois provides for an elastic, it is based on anelastic revenue system which includes the sales tax and the income tax. Now that happens to be a double-edge sword, as the economy goes down the taxes don't grow the same amount as the economy goes up, they do. I'm convinced, Ladies and Gentlemen, that the difference between the Committee Bill and full funding of fifty-four million dollars... I'm convinced that in the next fiscal year following this one we can fully fund the formula. But we lead people in false direction, we encourage people... we encourage people to believe that which is not true. And it seems to me, Ladies and Gentlemen, that if one thing has contributed more than any other to the disenchantment on the part of the



general public with our process and with governmentain general is that we have been false prophets. And for that reason, for that reason and emotionally, I'm with the Sponsor of the Bill; but practically, I know it's not there and for that reason as the Sponsor of the Bill in 1973, I ask that you vote 'no' on this particular Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative John Dunn."

J. Dunn: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Macon moves the previous question. The issue is, shall the main question be put? All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay' and the main question is put. On the Amendment to close, Representative Byers is going to close. Just a minute. Point of order by Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman, pointed out to this House in his debate on this Amendment in his opposition in...to it that next year, we would have the money to fully fund this formula. Is that what he said to this House?"

Speaker Matijevich: "That's exactly what he said. Shame on you, Gene."

Lechowicz: "Listen to it very carefully, Members on this side of the aisle. Next year, we will have the money to fund this formula. Next year, an election year."

Speaker Matijevich: "That's election year. I'm sorry. The Chair is out of order. Representative Byers to close."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that this is a very important vote and I think this money that now has been offered by this Amendment is one that recognizes reality. I think it's one that the State of Illinois can afford. I have, in the past, have voted against some of the motions to override the education budget, but this is one, I believe that we can support and one that I believe that



would be veto-proof. One that we could come back this fall if it was reduced and we could sustain. Then we'll know more about the picture of the state, the financial situation and I think an 'aye' vote on this would be a step in the right direction. And I would support and urge an 'aye' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "Before we get to that, Representative Hoffman from DuPage, what is your point?"

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of personal privilege in reference to the comment made by the illustrious Minority Leader. He knows and I know..."

Speaker Matijevich: "That you know that I know!"

Hoffman: "...that I for one am not a partisan politician, number one. Number two, I said that's what I think we'll be able to do. I made no reference to anybody else..."

Speaker Matijevich: "All those voting for Amendment #9 shall vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Representative Satterthwaite, from Champaign, to explain her vote."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is certainly not enough money to provide for our schools, but it is better than what we had before we passed this Amendment. The reason it is not enough for our schools is that by not funding the formula at the rate at which the statutes call for funding, we are going to find that our local school districts are going to be back on the campaign trail trying to pass another referendum so that they can tax you at the local level to get their real estate tax to make up the difference for what they're not getting in the formula this year. If you want to go this cycle at an even faster rate, then vote red and vote against this Amendment. However, if you want to provide a little bit more for them at the local level, if you want to give them as little pressure as possible for having to raise more taxes at the local level, then you should be voting green on this Amendment. What we have done is constantly make it inaccessible...(microphone



turned off)"

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, to explain his vote. Watch the timer."

Skinner: "I think all of those who voted for the state aid to education formula change next year ought to hold themselves personally responsible for the formula not being fully funded this year. It could have been fully funded this year. We didn't have to wait til next year, but you Gentlemen who have declining enrollment and Ladies who have declining enrollment made your choice. Now, I would suggest we all sit down and eat that crow pie."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman, to explain his vote. He's passing. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin, to explain his vote."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm a first-termer, unlike the Gentleman from McHenry County. But one of the things I have learned is that you got to compromise and I think this is an extraordinary reasonable Amendment. I think it's one that, you know, cuts right in half between what I would like to see which is full funding and what was offered by the Committee. I think it's something that makes infinite sense and it would demonstrate the commitments, the continued commitment of this Body to what I consider the number one priority - equality of education and the future of our children in Illinois. I urge more green lights up there."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, as I've urged you in the past, I urge you again we have to start and we have to continue and we have to grow with this. If we are not able to put this Amendment on, we're putting the Bill in a posture which I don't think the majority of us want to see it. I would urge you once again to support



this Amendment so that we can add this money to the formula."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Stuffle, to explain his vote."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker and Members, with all the consternation we've caused tonight, particularly myself, I would still ask for a green light up there. We're talking about something as opposed to nothing. We're talking about half a loaf as Representative Hanahan said, who he and I rarely disagree. We disagreed tonight but we're getting something here. As I said, I'd like to support the whole loaf, but we can't do that. In some of our minds, we're not claiming to be experts, we need half a loaf. And let me also ask the Chair that if this Amendment fails to pass, I would like both a poll of the absentees and a verification of the red lights."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Byers, to explain his vote. Representative Birchler, from Randolph, to explain his vote."

Birchler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't speak very often on this House floor, but I want to remind the people that have those red lights up there, we found money for Judges, for the courts and for things of that type. I also want to remind you that the schools are the backbone of education from birth to eternity. And I would like to see more green lights there so we can put this money back in. As someone said, this isn't the whole loaf, but I think we have a responsibility to our taxpayers back home. When we don't give them the money that we promised by our state formula, then it becomes the obligation of the local taxpayers. You'll remember this. Let's see some more green lights please."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Darrow, to explain his vote."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's my understanding that the Democrats had



a position on the education Bill. But after Amendment #2, I saw that the Democratic ranks were riddled. But evidently there were some negotiations between the Governor and some of our Members. It became quite... spiteful. I figured this is a way of showing some of those people who had not supported the Democratic position on the Second Amendment, but I have to look beyond my spitefulness and my feelings that we should vote like Democrats and not like the way Republicans did when we had Governor Walker. Be that as it may, I will switch my vote from 'no' to 'aye' for the school children and forget about my feelings towards some of our Democratic Members in name only."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to explain my 'aye' vote. I'd like to say first that it was suggested earlier in the evening...we're going to receive our fair share in downstate Illinois of the Resource Equalizer Formula of monies going to schools. The Gentleman said our fair share. We're not going to receive any of this twenty-five million because after we adopted the Resource Equalizer, now we have all of our schools and many, many of them that I represent are getting the flat grant. So we don't get anymore money anyway and it was the same Gentleman answering my question when we adopted the Resource Equalizer when I said, Will our schools get more money? His answer was 'yes' and that's certainly not true. It has not been a result of the Resource Equalizer. We're getting fewer and fewer dollars. In spite of that, I'll take a chance and vote 'aye' that somebody in the State of Illinois will receive a decent education that will receive some state money."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Lucco, to explain his vote."



Lucco: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this is a very, very important Roll Call up there. As I see a lot of red lights and I see a lot of personalities from I.E.A. sitting in the bleachers, I know a lot of people up there that are voting red when they ran last fall said, we are for full funding. I wonder where they're going to go, home when they run this next time, are they going to say they're running for full funding? They're going to support full funding like the I.E.A that has supported them? And I'd ask the I.E.A., are you going to support those who are voting red now? And then they're going to say they're for full funding when this is the best year we've had tonight? This is the closest thing to full funding, 98.2. Shame."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Kane, to explain his vote."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's evident from this Roll Call and from others that the Democratic Party is fragmented and there's a number of Members of the Democratic Party on this side of the aisle who are reluctant to vote for this Amendment or some of the others. And I would say that that reluctance is a product of the lack of leadership of the Democratic Party in this Session. There has not been one Democratic Leader who has come up with a bottom-line figure for education. We have said that education is our number one priority, but we haven't come up with an education program that makes sense. And I would say that if we are going to maintain that education is our number one priority we should come up with a program that says it and not put everything up for grabs at the last minute."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, the Assistant Majority Leader, Ted Lechowicz, to explain his vote."

Lechowicz: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in response to my distinguished colleague from Sangamon, may I



recommend that he read the platform of the Democratic Party which was adopted by the full convention. It's a very, very brief, succinct statement. The Democratic Party of the State of Illinois is for full funding for education. We've supplied, we've supported the full funding provision, we've supported the full funding provision within this House. The House did not concur in total with that position. We're supporting the 98.2% as offered by this Amendment. Now, don't tell me about the Democratic Party and as far as it's position on education. It's very clear. Full funding and, in turn, I'm telling you right now that next year as was pointed out by Hoffman, the money will be there. And let me tell my Democrats on this side of the aisle, there'll be a Republican Governor that's going to be offering the full funding and it'll be the first time to be offered in this state. It's a political decision. You make your bed and you sleep in it."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Emil Jones, to explain his vote."

E. Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise up in support of this half a loaf if you may call it that. And the reason why I rise up in support of it is because incorporated within the full funding Bill are Title I state funds for the educationally disadvantaged youngsters in the State of Illinois. There's about four hundred thousand of these youngsters in the public school system. Two hundred thousand of them are located in the City of Chicago public schools. And I want to see my Democrats on this side of the aisle to stand up and support the Amendment that I have to see that these educationally disadvantaged youngsters also receive full funding which they are not receiving at this time."

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



E. Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, very briefly and I'm voting green. and to suggest that as one of the speakers before me said that half a loaf is better than none. But I want to suggest one thing here in defense of the appropriations process. The Appropriations II Committee worked extremely hard on this package. We have worked in that Committee for the last six weeks, the last six weeks trying to develop a program that was reasonable and moderate in its approach towards full funding of education. And for anyone, for anyone based on the number of hours that I have and other Members of that Committee and Members of the Appropriations staff has put into this process to suggest that there was no program developed consistent with the Democratic principles, there is no way, no way that I can sit quietly by and not repudiate that contention. We've worked hard on this. I suggest you support this Amendment. This is better than nothing, but we worked hard to develop a moderate approach to full funding for education."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will... take the record. I already called on you. You weren't there, Representative Byers. The Clerk will take the record. On this issue there are 81 voting 'aye', 86 voting 'no' and Representative Stuffle has asked for a verification of the Roll. No, he's asked for... Representative Stuffle from Coles."

Stuffle: "Let's dispense with the problems of the possibility of calling the absentees. I would ask under Hanahan's rules..."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Chair will order an Oral Roll Call. Everybody in their seats. When your name is called stand up, say 'aye' or 'no' and push your red or green button or 'present'. Clear the floor of all unauthorized people from the floor of the House. The Clerk will proceed with the Oral Roll Call. Members will stand when your name



is called, announce your vote and vote your switch at the same time. Thank you. Everybody in your seats. Representative Abramson. Members in your seats. Now, we did this real well at the start of the Session. Let's proceed in that way. Those who are not Members, off the floor. Doorman, chase everybody off except we who are paid for our responsibilities. Representative Skinner demands that we be orderly. That's a switch. Proceed with the Oral Roll Call."

Clerk Hall: "Abramson, 'no'. Adams, 'no'. Anderson, 'no'. Antonovych, 'no'. E.M. Barnes."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative E.M. Barnes, do you wish to be recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "Pass. Jane Barnes, 'no'. Bartulis, 'no'. Beatty, 'aye'. Bennett, 'no'. Birchler, 'aye'. Bluthardt, 'no'. Boucek, 'no'. Bowman, 'aye'. Bradley, 'aye'. Brady, 'aye'. Brandt, 'aye'. Breslin, 'aye'. Rich Brummer, 'aye'. Don Brummet, 'aye'. Byers, 'aye'. Caldwell, 'aye'. Campbell, 'no'. Capparelli, 'aye'. Catania, 'no'. Chapman, 'aye'. Christensen, 'aye'. Collins, 'no'. Conti, 'no'. Cunningham, 'no'. Daniels, 'no'. Darrow, 'aye'. Corneal Davis, 'aye'. Jack Davis, 'no'. Dawson, 'aye'. Deavers, 'no'. Deuster, 'no'. DiPrima, 'aye'. Domico, 'aye'. Doyle, 'aye'. John Dunn, pass. Ralph Dunn, pass. Dyer, 'no'. Ebbesen, 'no'. Edgar, 'no'. Epton."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Representative from Cook, Representative Epton."

Epton: "I want to apologize. I did not push my switch. The Minority Leader has absolutely no confidence in me and walked over early and pushed my button. And I wish you would chastise him."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Minority Leader is chastised. How do you vote? The same way. All right. Consider yourself chastised, too."

Epton: "No."



Clerk Hall: "Ewell, pass. Ewing, 'no'. Farley, 'aye'.

Flinn, pass. Friedland, 'no'. Friedrich, 'no'. Gaines, 'no'. Garmisa, 'aye'. Geo-Karis, 'no'. Getty, 'aye'. Giglio, Giglio, 'aye'. Giorgi, 'aye'. Greiman, 'aye'. Griesheimer, 'no'. Hanahan, 'aye'. Harris, 'aye'. Hart, 'no'. Hoffman, Hoffman, 'no'. Holewinski, 'aye'. Dan Houlihan, 'aye'. Jim Houlihan, 'aye'. Hoxsey, 'no'. Hudson, Hudson, 'no'. Huff, 'aye'. Huskey, Huskey, pass. Jacobs, 'aye'. Jaffe."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, I've been watching that board and I think it's really rare and interesting that there is not a single Republican Member of the... single Republican Member of this House..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Jaffe, on an Oral Roll Call you cannot explain your vote. We all understand your explanation. Jaffe votes 'aye'."

Clerk Hall: "Jaffe, 'aye'. Johnson, Johnson, 'no'. Dave Jones, 'no'. Emil Jones, 'aye'. Kane, pass."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ryan, would you chastise your own Members?"

Clerk Hall: "Kane, 'aye'. Katz, 'aye'. Keats, 'no'. Kelly, 'aye'. Kempiners, 'no'. Kent, 'no'. Klosak, 'no'. Kornowicz, pass. Kosinski, 'aye'. Kozubowski, 'aye'. Kucharski, 'no'. Lauer, 'no'. Laurino, 'aye'. Lechowicz, 'aye'. Leinenweber, 'aye'. No. Leverenz, 'aye'. Levin, 'aye'. Lucco, 'aye'. Luft, pass. Macdonald, 'no'. Madigan, 'aye'. Madison, pass. Mahar, 'no'. Mann, 'aye'. Marovitz, 'aye'. Lynn Martin, 'no'. Peggy Smith Martin, 'aye'. Matejek, 'aye'. Matijevich, 'aye'. Mautino, pass. McAuliffe, 'no'. McAvoy, pass. McBroom, 'no'. McClain, 'aye'. McCourt, 'no'. McGrew, pass. McLendon, 'aye'. McMaster, 'no'. McPike, 'aye'. Meyer, 'no'. Miller, 'no'. Molloy, 'no'. Mudd, 'aye'. Mugalian, 'no'. Mulcahey, pass. Murphy, 'aye'. Nardulli,



'aye'. Neff, 'no'. O'Brien, 'aye'. O'Daniel, 'aye'. Pechous, 'aye'. Peters, 'no'. Pierce, 'aye'. Polk, 'no'. Porter, 'no'. Pouncey, 'aye'. Pullen, 'no'. Reed, 'no'. Reilly, 'no'. Richmond, 'aye'. Rigney, 'no'. Robinson, 'aye'. Ryan, 'no'. Sandquist, 'no'. Satterthwaite, 'aye'. Schisler, 'aye'. Schlickman, 'no'. Schneider, 'no'. Schoeberlein, Schoeberlein, pass. Schuneman, 'no'. Sevcik, 'no'. Sharp, pass. Shumpert, 'aye'. Simms, 'no'. Skinner, 'no'. Stanley, 'no'. Stearney, 'no'. Steczo, 'aye'. E.G. Steele, 'no'. C.M. Stiehl, 'no'. Stuffle, 'aye'. Sumner, 'no'. Taylor, 'aye'. Telcser, 'no'. Terzich, 'aye'. Tipsword, 'aye'. Totten, 'no'. Tuerk, 'no'. Van Duyn, 'no'. Vitek, 'aye'. Von Boeckman, 'aye'. Waddell, 'no'. Wall, 'no'. Walsh, 'no'. Wikoff, 'no'. Willer, 'no'. Williams, 'aye'. Winchester, 'no'. Wolf, 'no'. Younge, 'no'. Yourell, 'aye'. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijeich: "Wyvetter Younge, would you push your button? Mr. Speaker. Are there any additions to the Roll Call? The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "I'd like to be recorded as 'aye'."

Speaker Matijeich: "Record Representative Mautino as 'aye'. The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, record me green, 'aye'."

Speaker Matijeich: "Record Representative Dunn as 'aye'. The Gentleman from Perry, Ralph Dunn."

R. Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, record me 'no' please."

Speaker Matijeich: "Record Ralph Dunn as 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Barnes."

E. Barnes: "Record me 'aye', Mr. Speaker. And I'd like to know what the Speaker voted also."

Speaker Matijeich: "Record Representative Barnes as voting 'aye'. The Gentleman, Representative McGrew, from Knox. The Gentleman from Winnebago... the Speaker wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. The Gentleman from



Winnebago, Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, record me 'aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Record Representative Mulcahey 'aye'.

Are there any other additions to the Roll Call? Are there any others? Are there any changes? Take the record. Clerk, give me the record. There are 82 'ayes' and 86 'nays'. And the Amendment fails. Further Amendments, are there further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #10, Schneider. Amends House Bill 689 as amended on page 1 by deleting line 14 and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Glenn Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The last Amendment which included twenty-five million or so above the budget of the Governor was in my judgment more than we could account for in strict accountable budgeting. I have drafted an Amendment that is twenty million dollars above that figure and it's based primarily on the assumption that if we work out our problems over the next couple of days and weeks, we can strike from the categorical grants a figure sufficient to cover a twenty million dollar figure. We were off to a good start earlier this evening by reducing the impact to two... by \$2.5 million. I suggest there are close to twenty million dollars available with the appropriate cuts in that budget that we have yet to deal with. So I would ask that this House and the Members who are seriously concerned about funding education with as many dollars as we can seriously get, adopt this Amendment which is Amendment #10 and which is twenty million dollars over the 1.302 which came out of the Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brady, the Sponsor of the Bill."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, what we're now going into is an exhibit, I think, in the legislative



process of how 177 Members can get up one at a time and give you a dollar figure and say that's what the magic is, that's what the amount of money should be, this is what education should be financed at, and choose to have their views visited on us as the final arbitrary figure. I've worked long and hard on this Bill and many Members of this Assembly have. We've tried to reach many different compromises, but I think on behalf of the Membership that we could go on all night in this kind of foray and because of that, at this time, I stand in opposition to this Amendment and any further Amendment that is offered by any Member of this Assembly that is not full funding. I urge you to oppose this."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, again I find myself in agreement with Representative Brady. We are getting, I think, the sense of what the House wants us to do in the direction we're going. This Bill will be passed out, will be considered again in the Senate and will come back here for the Conference Committee. The House again will have the opportunity to make their judgment as to what the Senate or that Committee has recommended to us. I would suggest and ask the Members of this House to join with Representative Brady and myself in opposing Amendment #10."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. For those of you that are interested in unit districts and elementary districts, those basically in the suburbs and downstate, what has happened... if you look at the Governor's appropriated budget, the high school districts get an 11% increase, the elementary districts get about a 7% increase, and the unit districts get about a 5% increase. This is just an example of the high school districts



trying to rip off a majority of the money of this twenty million dollars. And quite frankly, all it is is headlines and I stand also in opposition to this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Tim Johnson."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Champaign has moved the previous question. The issue is, shall the main question be put? All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay' and the main question is put. On the Amendment, Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. That the spokesperson for the City of Chicago argues that he's worked long and hard does not really relate to the facts. He alleges to have worked long and hard. I showed him those figures, I showed them in hard facts. He's reluctant to challenge that because he knows that a lot of the benefits that accrue to the city are not subject to scrutiny. He has seen what I can come up with in these dollar figures..."

Speaker Matijevich: "One moment. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Brady, for what purpose do you rise?"

Brady: "I find it flattering to be called the spokesperson from the City of Chicago, but he is alluding to the fact that he says I didn't work hard and labor over these figures. He knows full well that he was called in individually with several Members..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Schneider to close."
Representative Schneider to close the..."

Brady: "I take exception to the comments being..."

Speaker Matijevich: "We all know you're not the spokesperson, John... Mike. Representative Schneider to close."

Schneider: "So what I'm suggesting again, Mr. Speaker, that if he's willing like anybody else to sit down and look at where it is, we can spend money and cut money rather than going blindly for full funding which we know will



be vetoed, then you can have a proposal such as Amendment #10 to deal with. We may settle it in Conference eventually, but this is the Amendment I think we ought to start with. It has good possibilities. I ask its adoption."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Schneider, has moved for the adoption of Amendment #10. Those voting for the Amendment shall vote 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. To explain his vote, Representative Barnes from Cook."

E. Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Very briefly, this Bill was in the Appropriations II Committee for some six weeks where I am Chairman thereof. And I would just invite the financial wizards that are now coming up with the correct formula to suggest to me why when this Bill was heard at least, at least a minimum of four to five times, why they did not come before that Committee to suggest any, any, if you will, any reduction or increase or any figure where this Bill should be appropriated, the amount that should be appropriated therein. I would also suggest to all of the financial wizards that are on the school formula that in the next Session, in the next Session, if you will, when the good Governor down on the second floor suggests full funding, I hope you will... I hope you will invite yourself to be Members of the appropriations process and deal with your expertise in financial wizardry within the Committee structure of this General Assembly. I vote 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Robinson, to explain his vote."

Robinson: "Mr. Speaker, I resent the attacks that have been made on the Sponsor of this Amendment, Representative Schneider. This afternoon... You know, Doug Kane and I don't always agree, but we do agree tonight on the lack of leadership in the Democratic Party. This



afternoon, this afternoon... Representative Madigan...."

Speaker Matijevec: "You're out of order. You're not explaining your vote. Will the Gentleman explain his vote?"

Robinson: "Mr. Speaker, this afternoon we could have come up with an agreement on the Democratic side of the aisle on funding for education. The Majority Leader came around, the Majority Leader came around and invited those..."

Speaker Matijevec: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Houlihan. You can yield on explanation. I'm sorry about that. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. The speaker is out of order. There's 128 negative votes. Let's take the Roll Call and let's move."

Speaker Matijevec: "Take the record. On this issue, there are 26 'ayes', 128 'nays' and the Amendment fails. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matijevec: "Third Reading. On the Order of... the Gentleman from McLean, Representative Deavers, for what purpose do you rise?"

Deavers: "Purpose of a motion. I move we adjourn til ten o'clock in the morning."

Speaker Matijevec: "I didn't recognize you for that. I was looking over on this side of the aisle. I hold that one for McBroom. On the Order of Second Reading appears House Bill 2361. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman, for what purpose do you rise?"

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to announce that the next World Champions; the Chicago Cubs, are leading six to nothing in the second inning."

Speaker Matijevec: "Beautiful. That makes my day, Gene. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2361. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the State



Board of Elections. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2 and 3 were adopted in Committee. 4, 5 and 6 were withdrawn. 7 was adopted, 8 was withdrawn, 9 was adopted. 10 failed, 11 was adopted, 12 was withdrawn and Amendment #13 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right. Representative Geo-Karis from Lake, for what purpose do you arise?"

Geo-Karis: "I was just going to ask you, Mr. Speaker, whether you announced the results of Amendment #10. That's all."

Speaker Matijevich: "Yes, I did."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Clerk, in error I believe..... to correct the tapes, said that this is a Bill for the State Board of Elections. This grant make the Board of Education Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ewell, for what purpose do you arise?"

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would suggest that those that want to get their press releases ready, do so off the floor of the House because there are unauthorized people on the floor of the House and they ought to do that somewhere else."

Speaker Matijevich: "Would all of those who are working on their press releases retire to the...."

Yourell: "There are plenty of places for you to do that."

Speaker Matijevich: "...side hall, it is real cool out there. Reread the Bill for the purposes of the record."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2361, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Board of Education. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Further Amendments? Representative Ewell, the Gentleman from Cook, for what purpose do you arise?"

Yourell: "The same thing is going on, Mr. Speaker. They ought to



get the hell off the floor of this House."

Speaker Matijevich: "Will all unauthorized persons get off the floor immediately. All unauthorized personnell... off the floor. Let's do it right for a change. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, just as a point of inquiry. There is some thirty Amendments on this Bill, what are our intentions tonight?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Our intentions are to conclude the Second Reading of this Bill. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell, persists on all unauthorized personnell off the floor."

Yourell: "Let's go, Mr. Speaker, they voted for the rules, let's live up to the rules."

Speaker Matijevich: "All right, are we on Amendment #14, Mr. Clerk? Are there any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijevich: "No motions filed. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters, for what purpose do you arise?"

Peters: "To make an inquiry of the Chair. Representative Hanahan, if you would follow me please. So if we're correct here according to the records that we have, Amendment #13 was offered in Committee by Representative Dunn and was adopted. Representative Houlihan offered Amendment #14, which lost and #15, which also lost. So we should now be on Amendment #16. Just for the purpose of the record. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "Are there any motions on Committee Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Matijevich: "Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #14 and 15 failed in Committee. Floor Amendment #16, Janes Barnes and Brady. Amends House Bill 2361 as amended on page 24 and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Amendment #16.... who is the Sponsor of



of that? Jane Barnes, the Lady from Cook, Representative Jane Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #16 restores the seven million dollars to the textbook program. I would ask a favorable vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I support this Lady's Amendment and I ask Members of the General Assembly that if you support the needs of the citizens of Illinois in the area of reimbursement for the textbooks, that we support this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment is for the textbook line and adds seven million dollars to the budget. This is also the Amendment that we discussed in the Conference Committee. I would have hoped that this line item was for a little bit less but it is introduced at seven million and I would trust that the Members of the House would use their good judgment in voting on this particular measure and be guided by their conscience as to what they feel is right."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to oppose this Amendment. Even with the great respect that I have for the Sponsor. I would like to talk to you though about what we're doing with this type of Amendment. First of all, this money that we're taking out of the school fund to pay for textbooks is money that has been paid by the parents of students in our schools today. So we're losing input into our school system of funds in the amount of seven million dollars. Number two, we're going to have the state control the selection of our textbooks under this



program. All of you who know, Dr. Cronin's operation... the expensiveness of that bureaucracy, know what this means. I know the reason for this Amendment and that is to help our parochial schools. I can sympathize with it but it has to be one of the worse things we've concocted here in many years and I would ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Byers."

Byers: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question? Representative Barnes, why are we asking for three and a half million dollars more this year when your Governor has said that we need to have a bare tight budget of austerity and why are you asking for three and a half million dollars more?"

Barnes: "Well, I had asked for seven million last year and they cut the appropriation in half and I asked for seven million again this year."

Byers: "Well, if I might address the Amendment. I really think it is really very hypocritical of us, after failing to put this other money in there, to say yes, we're going to spend money for something that boys and girls right now in the State of Illinois have and that is good textbooks and they are getting them in a manner where... that the parents are buying them. The children get to keep the books, they take them home, they use them and their brothers and sisters... hand them down and there is nothing wrong with the present system that is on the State of Illinois right now. I can speak from experience on this because I used to make a living selling textbooks to schools and that was my job and how I made a living. But, let me tell you this, there are very, very few people that support this. There is a few people who like to give away programs but this is one that is really ridiculous and we should vote this down and vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Keats."



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

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved the previous question. The issue is, shall the main question be put? All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no' and the main question is put. To close, Representative Michael Brady from Cook, the hyphenated Chief Sponsor."

Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members. With Representative Barne's permission, we did have this come up earlier in the place that I said was the wrong place for it to be funded. This program is funded at the level of seven million dollars because that is what we funded it last time at. The Governor chose to veto that number and bring it down to three and a half million. We're just taking it back to the seven million that was a prior commitment of this Legislature to fund this Act. This is the best administered and run program in the Illinois Office of Education in the State of Illinois. I welcome any of you to look into it and find out that total dollar amount that is appropriated here goes out in a much fuller way in the loan of textbooks than in any other program that is presently being administered. It's needed very much, not only by children in nonpublic schools but public schools as well that can't afford the levies and the rental of books. And I urge your support of this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes, has moved the adoption of Amendment #16 to House Bill 2361. All in favor shall vote 'aye', opposed vote 'nay'. The... to explain his vote, from Cook; Representative Buz Yourell."

Yourell: "I do appreciate the sentiments of the Sponsor in the movement of this Amendment but I... even though it's a Democratic sponsored Amendment because this Amendment was originally a Democratic idea in the last Session of the General Assembly and everybody knows that. But I cannot understand why anybody would vote for this Amendment in lieu of the light that the knowledge that the Sponsor of the



Amendment voted against twenty-five million dollars appropriation
 Amendment to the full funding of the equalizer. And I am
 delighted to vote against it because.... and I apologize
 to my Democratic colleague who originally proposed this
 Amendment from two years ago," but I think that we cannot
 pass this Amendment for seven million dollars when the
 Sponsor of this Amendment voted against a twenty-five million
 dollar Amendment to full funding of education."

Speaker Matiejvich: "The Lady from Adams, Representative
 Mary Lou Kent, to explain her vote."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is something that I just
 cannot understand your logic. Why can you vote for seven
 million dollars for school children to have free textbooks
 when they already can get textbooks if they are poor. Now,
 it is just absolutely stupid in my explanation for you to
 say that we can't fund what we are responsible for and yet
 you will pay for a program that we do not need at this
 time. I just do not understand why people can vote for a
 new program even though we started it last year, I was the
 same way last year. Let's get those schools that we need
 to fund and fund them now. And do not vote for this
 Amendment."

Speaker Matiejvich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative
 Farley, to explain his vote."

Farley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of
 the House. I disagree with the two former speakers. This
 Amendment does in fact fund school books, textbooks for
 those children that in fact need those books. I think that..."

Speaker Matiejvich: "Representative Tim Johnson from Champaign
 to explain his vote." I'm sorry, I was discussing something
 Representative Farley had not concluded. Representative
 Farley would you conclude your remarks."

Farley: "Thank you. Yes, Mr. Speaker as I was saying, I sat
 on the House Revenue Committee and we put a lot of Bills



through for senior citizens and we put a lot of Bills through for the aged and the children of this state. And I state to you, we have no more cherished possessions than the school children of this State of Illinois. All of ours in this state are the most prized possessions that we stand here and state that we have. And, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would state to you that this Amendment is in fact the right direction that we should take to provide those children with the needed material being, books, textbooks to provide them with an education and to move ahead and I would....."

Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On the motion to adopt Amendment #16, there are 85 voting 'aye', 71 voting 'no', 3 'present' and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #17, Polk: Amends House Bill 2361 on page 2 by deleting line 3, 5 and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Ben Polk, the Sponsor of the Amendment. Is he here? Representative Ben Polk, on Amendment #17."

Polk: "The total amount is three million, eight hundred and ninety-seven thousand total. Out of that 3.8 goes in the grant line; ninety-seven thousand goes to the administration; personal services are thirty-five thousand dollars. The total amount is all federal funds, as I understand it is... is an Agreed Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook... McHenry, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I fully support the Gentleman's motion to adopt Amendment #17. Vocational education is a very important issue in this state and I think we would be doing a disservice unless we adopted this Amendment and I support that Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters, on the Amendment."



Peters: "Mr. Speaker, likewise we support Amendment #17. It adds 3.9 million dollars but totally of federal funds. . . does not affect the General Revenue Fund at all. It is all federal funds, we support the Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The motion. . . on the Amendment, all in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay' and Amendment #17 is adopted. I have a motion here by Representative Gene Barnes, the Gentleman from Cook has a motion. I move to table Amendment #3, Committee Amendment #3, to House Bill 2361. Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. In light of the circumstances that are taking place now and in light of the many number of Amendments that have been filed to this Bill: to facilitate time and to be consistent with my commitments to all of the Members and all of the people who have been calling my office concerning education. I move at this point to table Amendment #3 to House Bill 2361, which I sponsored in Committee and was adopted there."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #3 was offered in Committee by Representative Barnes as he indicated. It was adopted by a voice vote of the Committee and what that Amendment does is that it reduces the various categorical grants by seventy-three million, four hundred and ninety-six thousand, six hundred dollars. This Amendment was accepted by us although we had our own Amendment for some seventy-one or two million dollars of reduction. It was an easier way to go, it showed an attempt on both sides of the aisle to reach a compromise in regard to categorical grants, to put the Bill in a position where we would be able to consider it properly within reason here on the House floor, to send it on to the Senate and again to Conference Committee, put it into the



kind of shape that we could all deal with. I would sincerely hope that the Members of this House would reject the motion by Representative Barnes to table Amendment #3. I repeat, I request that the Members of this House do not adopt Representative Barnes' motion to table Amendment #3. A 'no' please."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Houlihan, moves the previous question. The issue is, shall the main question be put? All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay' and the 'ayes' have it. To the main motion, Representative Gene Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to be very brief again. I have just received from the Page, who is passing out Amendments like we pass out candy on Christmas. Amendment #30 and all of these Amendments are simply trying to put back in what was taken out by Amendment #3. And as I say again, since that was my Amendment to facilitate that time and not to go through this whole charade of line by line and Amendment by Amendment, I move to table this Amendment to facilitate the time and to allow these Members to have the Bill back in the fashion that they apparently want the Bill in. I move to table Amendment #3."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Gene Barnes has moved to table Amendment.... Committee Amendment #3 to House Bill 2361. Those in favor of tabling Committee Amendment #3 vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Representative Gene Hoffman, from DuPage, did you want to explain your vote?"

Hoffman: "Not necessary."

Speaker Matijevich: "Not necessary, he says. On the... have all voted who wished? Take the record. On the motion to



table Committee Amendment #3, 65 voting 'aye', 89 voting 'nay' and the motion fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #18, Hoffman, Schneider. Amends House Bill 2361 as amended on page 23 by deleting line 29 and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "Amendment #18, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Glenn Schneider."

Schneider: "John, Gene has got it."

Speaker Matijevich: "Gene Hoffman, I'm sorry."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #18, reduces the categorical grants for special education and transportation back to the estimated expenditure level for FY 77. This would provide funds which on the average is equal to three dollars and eighty-two cents per day, per child in special education for transportation costs. Let me repeat that figure, three dollars and eighty-two cents a day per pupil for transportation cost alone if my reduction Amendment passes. The intention of Amendments #18, 19, 20 and 21 is to move this money from the categorical program into the General Distributive Fund. I've spoken with the Sponsor of the previous Bill that we considered, asked him if he would be willing to take the Bill back from Third Reading to Second for the purpose of increasing the level of the General Distributive formula if 18, 19, 20 and 21 were adopted or anyone of the four. He said that he would take that into consideration and I'm sure if there is additional money here that he will be reasonable tomorrow and will consider taking these particular Bills back. So the purpose of this is to get at the problem that we tried to get at when they took the Bills out of order and I would encourage the adoption of Amendment #18."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, once again.... once again you have to stop and use judgement here on what is happening. At no



time during this General Assembly has anyone said to the people of Illinois that they want to cut special education and transportation to the school district and the real estate taxpayers of Illinois. Now the law is very clear of the reimbursement figure, the estimate by the Department or by the Office of Education is not pulled out of the hat, is not pulled out of thin air nor is made on any other judgment except by law that we have created and passed. Now, the estimate for this year in special ed. transportation that are factual.... not something that some Representative pulled out of his head but factual... happened to be twenty-nine million, nine hundred and thirteen thousand, one hundred dollars. That is fact. Now the kids have already been transported, the kids have already had an opportunity of following the law that we passed and the School Boards have acted by mandating that they be transported through the Transportation systems that we have approved by law...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Excuse me, the Gentleman from DuPage,

Representative Gene Hoffman, for what purpose do you arise?"

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, recognizing that the hour is late and we have some other Amendments coming along and I want to save every energy that we have for tomorrow....."

Speaker Matijevich: "Does the Gentleman have leave to table Committee.... Floor Amendment #18? Leave...."

Hoffman: "I would like to make the same request on #18, 19 and 20, and go directly to Amendment #21."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman have leave to table Floor Amendments #18, 19 and 20....are withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #21, Hoffman, Schneider. Amends House Bill 2361 as amended on page 21, line 14 by deleting two million, one hundred thousand dollars and inserting in lieu thereof, the following."

Speaker Matijevich: "First the Gentleman from DeKalb, Representa



Ebbesen, for what purpose do you arise?"

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, could we strike Representative Hanahan's remarks on Amendment #18 please?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave. Somebody asked for leave to short debate on the Amendments? Do we have leave? Leave. The Amendment #21.... Dean Hoffman from DuPage."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #21 deletes the line item for the gifted education program. Now, those of you who have been here as I have for at least eight years know that under Superintendent of Public Instruction of DuPage, we introduced the gifted program as a seed money program in which the state would put up for four or five years or three or four years... seed money to get the program started. That was about eight years ago and we still find in the line item money for gifted programs. Now, many school districts have gifted programs and I'm all for them but it seems to me that the time has come that we take this particular amount of money and put it in the general distributive formula and let those local school districts make the decision of what they want to do on the gifted program. The gifted program is not mandated, they may choose to do so, to use it if they wish. Those school districts who have good and viable gifted programs are certainly going to continue them under the general distributive funding. And so it is for that reason that I have introduced Amendment #21, which will eliminate the line item for the gifted program and my intention then is to.... would be to increase this amount of money into the general distributive formula at some point along the line. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Matijevich: "Who stands in opposition? Representative Hanahan, from McHenry County in opposition to Amendment #21"

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I don't know how many Members of the General Assembly have ever met a gifted child but last year in the State of Illinois this



program, the gifted program helped support the seventy-one thousand, two hundred and sixty-one gifted children receive special education in this state. Now, the request to completely annihilate... completely annihilate the gifted program down from two million, one hundred thousand dollars when we spent last year... we spent last year two million dollars and to reduce it from two million and one hundred thousand dollars just plain irresponsible when you consider that the state receives from each gifted child that education in Illinois. The dividends that receive about getting 6% or 7% or 8% dividends on and you talk all in these cases the gifted children return your money, but they return a 100% increase economic not 6% or 8% increase tax level of payment in the ability benefits and and provide those kinds of innovated and to earn money not sometimes complete revolutionary types believe it will benefits back to this state because they have of education. look at Representative Kosinski, for example. been.... and Representative Madison, many gifted young students through- out this program will never have the chance to maybe succeed in finding a cancer cure. Maybe succeed in finding a cure for epilepsy, maybe succeed in trying to find out why the help we don't have more money for education in this state..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Would you bring your remarks... Re- Gene Hoffman, to close."

representative Hanahan: "I expect to completely designate and do away with the House program... to me is irresponsible. If you want the gifted money, cut out the Governor's airplane but to save some children that are gifted from having quality don't comment they need."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Gene Hoffman has moved the amendment #21. All those in favor say 'aye', adoption... and the Amendment fails. Further Amendments? opposed"



Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #22, Conti. Amends House Bill 2361 on page 23 by deleting line 1 and inserting in lieu thereof..."

Speaker Matijevich: "On Amendment #22... who is the Sponsor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Conti."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Conti on Amendment #22."

Conti: "Well, first of all before I address myself to the Amendment, I don't pretend to be an expert in school problems and I certainly want to address my remarks to Eugene Barnes and his Committee and all the Members for the endless hours that they brought their expertise on the floor of this House. Although I understand my Amendment... let me first explain what it does. It reduces the general revenue grant from the bilingual education to zero from twelve and a half million dollars. The City of Chicago who will get nine million, two hundred and fifty thousand dollars, downstate will get three million, two hundred and fifty thousand. Although I understand that I am sympathetic to the problems of the minority groups, the concepts embodied in the bilingual law are certainly contrary to the position that I hold on how these problems ought to be resolved. It is my feelings that an individual progresses more rapidly and effectively in our society by mastering our customs and our language. The law in my judgment does not achieve the objectives of Americanizing our new citizens, consider them the proper tool for survival. We all have two heritage and we should be proud of our origin, work brought this to light to me more than any history that I ever read. My parents came from a latin country and they did a good job in teaching me the mother tongue. More so than my school system taught me the English language because when I went to school we didn't have a common school distribution fund, we had sixty children in a classroom. I am proud that we are gradually recognizing this problem and are totally responsible for the funding of our school children. But we are not doing enough for the rehabilitation of our education."



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

or are retarded children. So by excluding this luxury of teaching.... 'states Polish names'.... Latinos or any other language let's Americanize these people so that we don't have a language barrier... job seeking then will not be a problem for these minority groups, welfares will be reduced... welfare roles will be reduced and let's look at QueBec and what it's doing to Canada by having two languages. Eleven states teach bilingual and cost the Federal Government two hundred million dollars for this program. I urge you to vote for this Bill.... for this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "Standing in opposition to Amendment #22, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Art Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I have the highest regard for the Gentleman who put this Amendment. I understand how he feels but I would like to remind the Gentleman and those in the chamber we're talking about American citizens who receive these benefits...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Excuse me, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jacobs... Wolf, for what purpose do you arise? Jacob Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I thought we had leave for short debate on these Amendments."

Speaker Matijevich: "Well, this is the opposition. Representative Telcser is standing in opposition."

Wolf: "I simply make the point that those who received the benefits of this program are American citizens, they are not foreigners as was indicated by the Gentleman who put the motion. I might also ask that while it is true that they are having abuses... many abuses in the field of bilingual education as were documented in recent newspaper stories, bilingual education which is mandated in many instances does serve a useful purpose. It does help young students who come to the mainland to learn the English language. That is the purpose of bilingual education programs to help these students not fall behind in their academic programs



but to learn the English language so they can move into regular classrooms and proceed and progress with the English language. I think reducing this to zero amount really is not a rational way to attack what I recognize is a problem in bilingual educational program and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti has moved the adoption of Amendment #22, to House Bill 2361. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Representative Conti, to explain his vote."

Conti: "Turn me on."

Speaker Matijevich: "You're on, Elmer."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, I don't take any pride in authorship in this Bill. I would like to have the closing remarks made by Jack Davis...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Conti, we all by leave said that we're going to have short debate and there are no closing on short debates."

Conti: "That's right, there are no closing remarks in short debate."

Speaker Matijevich: "I'm sorry. To explain his vote, Representative Tom Hanahan from McHenry."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I hope that the Members of the General Assembly that are voting green right now will be able to go back home and explain to the School Boards that where the statute mandates the bilingual program and they must provide the bilingual program that the state is not going to reimburse them. That's what this Amendment is doing, you're not kidding yourself, you're not kidding the people back home. You're telling the people right now by voting 'aye', that yes, you have to... you have to provide bilingual education under the School Code but we're not just not going to pay for it. That's what you're talking about here by this 'aye' vote and I'll tell you



another thing. I'll tell you one other thing about bilingual education. The Gentleman is absolutely in error when he says we're trying to promote or create a second language. Bilingual education is the only vehicle that is going to take people out of slums and out of those ethnic neighborhoods and give them a chance to participate in....."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Jack Davis, to explain his vote. The Co-sponsor of the Amendment."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I offered this Amendment in House Appropriations II Committee and miscount of the noses and withdrew it after I got their attention. After counting noses when the Committee was over I realized that it would have been adopted. Simply because we don't have bilingual education in Illinois, we have monolingual education that keeps Spanish speaking and other ethnic groups in a classroom speaking their own language and not simulating into the community main stream of American life. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the cruelest and most vital form of segregation... segregation, listen to me over there... that exist in the State of Illinois today through language barrier continuation of this abusive and ridiculous non-evaluated program in the state schools of Illinois. To address Mr. Hanahan's remark about mandated program, there is an Amendment on your desk right now to Senate Bill 1281...."

Speaker Matijeich: "Continue, Representative."

Davis: "Sponsored by Representative Hoffman in the House, to remove that mandate. A permissive 'may' not 'shall' remove all the mandate from the bilingual education program. So that the local school district, any urban areas where the problem is greatest and develop their own programs that are meaningful at least until the Illinois Office of Education gets it act together and evaluates the program and comes up with something a little bit meaningful. Ladies and Gentlemen



you will have another opportunity to erase the mandated program after you pass this Amendment. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lechowicz, to explain his vote."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you know, I know the hour is late but if any Amendment should be defeated it should be this one. We in turn in this General Assembly has always tried to provide a helping hand for Americans of respect of nationality. And I heard the Gentleman's remarks as far as this Amendment was concerned; may I point out to you that there are many Americans of Puerto Rican extraction who in turn, their native language is Spanish. They come to this country in good faith and provide a working economic benefits for their family and in turn, in fact in the City of Chicago I would say conservatively one-third of the population of the City of Chicago now is of Latino extraction. In this state they are talking about seven hundred thousand people or greater of Latino extraction. Try to provide them with an opportunity, especially the children... an opportunity to learn our system. It is very difficult, Ladies and Gentlemen, if you learn a foreign language as a child and in turn ask that child to go to a public school and does not have the opportunity of learning especially in the early ages the area of additional language. This Amendment as is presently drawn should soundly be defeated and we in turn by not providing the funds are not eliminating the law....."

Speaker Matijevich: "Would the Gentleman bring his remarks to a close?"

Lechowicz: "... you and I know it and I would strongly recommend, Mr. Speaker, if this Amendment is adopted I want a verification on it and I'll tie this House up from...



until June 30th if necessary."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Kempiners to explain his vote." The timer is on."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't like what has happened to bilingual education program. I think we are doing something that wasn't intended to, it was intended to be a bridge and it's not that anymore. But, I don't think the solution to the problem is cutting off funding 100% all at once. I think it is working to get that program to do what it was intended and that is, to integrate these children successfully to a school program. I voted for the four million reduction in Committee and I'm not sorry about that. I don't think we needed the sixteen million but I can't vote for one that will cut the funds out entirely. I've got a community in my district that has a 17% Latino population and these people, many of them don't speak English. And if we're going to integrate these school children we have to teach them English and not maintain them in a classroom with their native tongue but to teach them as rapidly as possible to speak English. And we won't do that by not putting any money into this program. And I would urge....."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marovitz, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. One thing that we ought to understand, if we cut this money out or not bilingual programs are federally mandated. We're still going to have to provide these programs in our schools and the money is going to come from other places and take away from all the children... even those who do not benefit under bilingual education. Ladies and Gentlemen, times change... our country changes. We have to deal with reality and this program deals with reality. The only ones who will suffer if we cut bilingual education are the kids. I heard somebody mention welfare, the way to reduce welfare



is to provide quality education to everybody, not to cut programs that help kids. If there are problems in this program and there may be, this isn't the way to solve it. Let's go about solving with constructive suggestions not by cutting the programs all together. Please, vote 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Representative Cunningham, to explain his vote. One minute."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what an irony that these ethnic politicians would continue to enslave members of their constituency who cannot speak the English language by continuing to isolate him in a foreign tongue. English is the language we all speak here, now is the time to wean them from the...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Why don't you try it out, Roscoe?"

Cunningham: "Pardon?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Why don't you try it out?"

Cunningham: "I congratulate the Sponsor of this motion, if we had had bilingual education, Elmer Conti would be mumbling around in Italian instead of leading the House of Representatives, he deserves a green vote. Line up with him for the future of those who need to learn English to get ahead in the world."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman, to explain his vote."

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Don't be misled by the serene song that we may be eliminating a mandated program all together one of these days. Believe me, this is a mandated program right now and if you don't fund it you're going to be stuck with it. And let me mention one other thing, the people are talking like this is an open ended thing, the kids are using their native tongue throughout their entire schooling and that is totally false. If you go back and read that statute and I urge you that you read that statute, you will see that



they get phased out of it. The whole point of it is to teach them to learn English and learn the other subjects at the same time."

Speaker Matijeŭich: "Representative Deuster, to explain his vote... from Lake."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have one school district or one school in my district, Diamond Lake School. That they qualify under the federal program, they won't have the State of Illinois program because it is so botched up. We have a lot of Spanish speaking children there and our superintendent knows how to do a superior job but he doesn't want to work with the state program. Now, this is not going to cut out any money or stop any programs. All we're doing here is a transfer. We need more green lights and we are just transferring funds from a strict program that an intelligent administrator in my district thinks is no good... to the general funds of the school so they can take care of the needs of these children. But, they can do it intelligently and without having a lot of red tape and having their hands tied behind their backs. This is not going to hurt any children. The children who have a real need are going to be tutored and helped in making the transfer of.... to moving into the English speaking classrooms. This is not going to hurt anybody and I urge more green votes."

Speaker Matijeŭich: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich, to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, my grandparents came here a few years ago and they couldn't speak any English but English was the language of the land and they learned it and their children learned it. Look around this room, Matijeŭich, Conti, Lechowicz, Laurino...."

Speaker Matijeŭich: "Hip hip hurrah."

Friedrich: "Vitek, Giorgi, Giglio. How far back do you have to think... you would have to go till they couldn't speak



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

English. But they came here and they accepted English as the language of the land and that's the way they got ahead. Learning the language of the land, let's let the other people do it too, if they want to be in this land... let them speak English."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Schneider, from DuPage. Glen Schneider."

Schneider: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. One of the problems clearly that is a difficulty with, the bilingual is not so much the intent of the law but actually the accountability. The Illinois Office of Education in my judgement has not been really affectively able to implement the program as witnessed by the fact that when request for the funding and particularly in Chicago were made by IOE for the number of pupils involved, they could not produce those figures. In fact last year as late as December 30, 1976, they were nine weeks behind on identifying those pupils. I think this vote that I'm offering is a vote for the kind of kids and the kind of district that will be able to have an accountable program. And I solicit a green vote until we can iron out all the problems with implementation and the function of the program and the proper funding."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Roger McAuliffe, to explain his vote."

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of Elmer Conti's Amendment here. Election day in my precinct when we go to vote....."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed. Sorry."

McAuliffe: "On election day when the people in my precinct go to vote we have signs in English and Spanish. We don't have any signs in Polish and we don't have any signs in Italian. There are no schools in Chicago that have bilingual education for Polish or Italian people or German people and I think it is crazy to have it just for Spanish people. I



have Italian neighbors and they all came from a..... the adults don't speak English but the kids do because they are going to school with other kids that speak English. And if they put them in a school with Italians and they only spoke Italian, they would never learn English. So, it is just a waste of time and a waste of money to keep this bilingual education program going. They should go to school and learn English. English is the language of the United States... not Spanish."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti, to explain his vote."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that the Gentleman says he's going to tie this House up until June 30th. I thought that's what we were elected for, to be here until June 30th. But, he comes from a heritage, a very proud heritage of eight hundred and forty-thousand of them in the City of Chicago. And also, the other Gentleman that followed him speaking, we haven't any Yiddish classes or any Yiddish schools that we had also. I'm prepared to stay here until June 30th. I'm not, as I said, I'm not anti anything. If there is anything that I would like to see is the educable mental retarded children taken. My conscience has been bothered for the last three weeks when I took one million and six hundred and forty thousand dollars budget and I voted against it because the Governor said that there wasn't any money in the schools in the school fund to teach these kids, who when I voted against that Bill, my conscience has been bothering me. I searched my soul to try to find some money...."

Speaker Matijevich: "A point of order by Representative Ted Lechowicz.... we're searching your conscience."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On a point of order, my name was referred to in debate. Let me just point out to this House, I come from a poor family and my mother and father speak Polish. They sent me to a Catholic school...."



they sent me to a Catholic school because at that school they had an opportunity and....."

Speaker Matijevich: "Point of order from an Italian here."

Lechowicz: "I'll give you a point of order in one second."

Speaker Matijevich: "Point of order from an Italian."

Lechowicz: "They had a program available in that school....."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Conti....."

Lechowicz: "...on the availability of transgression from one language to another."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Conti, for what purpose do you arise?"

Lechowicz: "And in turn they provided an opportunity for...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Point of order...."

Lechowicz: "And it should be provided and should be...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Point of order. Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, a point of order...."

Speaker Matijevich: "The point of order is well taken. Representative Pullen from Cook County, to explain her vote."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I recognize...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Let's have order. Proceed."

Pullen: "I read a story a couple of weeks ago about a young man who was studying in a bilingual program and someone asked him. How are you doing in school and he said, 'Actually I'm really frustrated because they keep teaching me the language that I speak at home. I already know that language. I need to learn English. I would like to be learning my studies in English but they think I should be learning it in my native language.' I want to see that young man and others educated properly and I ask you to vote 'aye' for this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Gene Hoffman, to explain his vote."

Hoffman: "I pass, Mr. Speaker."



Speaker Matijevich: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On the Amendment to adopt... the motion to adopt Amendment #... there is a call for verification, I understand that. On the motion to adopt Floor Amendment #22, there are 83 'ayes', 86 'nays', 1 voting 'present' and Representative Elmer Conti asks for a verification and there is a request for a poll of the absentees. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jim Houlihan, for what purpose do you arise?"

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, why don't you take an oral Roll Call, we're going to vote for the...."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Chair will order a Oral Verified Roll Call. All Members shall be in their seats, clear the floor. The Doormen have their responsibility of clearing the aisles, clearing the floor of all unauthorized people. When the Clerk calls your name you shall rise and at the same time call out your vote, 'aye' or 'nay' and also at that time depress the red or green button. The Clerk will proceed with the Oral Roll Call. Let's have order. Members be in their seats. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson, 'aye'. Adams, 'aye', Anderson, 'aye'. Antonovych, 'non'..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Will the Members be in their seats. Sitting in their seats. According to the rules, you should be in your seat. The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Hanahan, for what purpose do you arise?"

Hanahan: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker. You know, on this kind of verification we have to see the person who is hitting the button."

Speaker Matijevich: "That's right."

Hanahan: "And it is impossible... people milling around and walking around. I hope the Clerk at least or the Speaker at least verifies the person saying 'aye' or 'nay' and hitting the button."

Speaker Matijevich: "The point of order is well taken. Members



be seated and when your name is called, stand up as for the rules. So, everybody must be seated when the Roll Call is being taken. Continue."

Clerk O'Brien: "E.M. Barnes, 'pass'. Jane Barnes, 'no'. Bartulis, 'aye'. Beatty, 'no'. Bennett, 'aye'. Birchler, 'no'. Bluthardt, 'aye'. Boucek, 'no'. Bowman, 'no'. Bradley, 'pass'. Brady, 'pass'. Brandt, 'no'...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Bradley, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bradley, votes 'no'. Breslin, 'no'. Rich Brummer, 'aye'. Don Brummet, 'aye'. Byers, 'aye'. Caldwell, 'aye'. Campbell, 'aye'. Capparelli, 'aye'. Catania, 'aye'. Chapman, 'no'. Christensen, 'no'. Collins, 'aye'. Conti, 'aye'. Cunningham, 'aye'. Daniels, 'pass'. Darrow, 'no'. Corneal Davis, 'no'. Jack Davis, 'aye'. Dawson, 'no'. Deavers, 'pass'. Deuster, 'aye'. DiPrima, 'no'. Domico, 'no'. Doyle, 'no'. John Dunn, 'aye'. Ralph Dunn, 'no'. Dyer, 'aye'. Ebbesen, 'pass'. Edgar, 'aye'. Epton, 'no'. Ewell, 'pass'. Ewing, 'no'. Farley, 'pass'. Flinn, 'no'. Friedland, 'aye'. Friedrich, 'aye'. Gaines, 'aye'. Garmisa, 'no'. Geo-Karis, 'no'...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Geo-Karis, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Geo-Karis, 'no'. Getty, 'no'. Giglio, 'no'. Giorgi, 'no'. Greiman, 'no'. Griesheimer, 'aye'. Hanahan, 'no'. Harris, 'no'. Hart, 'pass'. Hoffman, 'aye'. Holewinski, 'no'. Dan Houlihan, 'no'. Jim Houlihan, 'no'. Hoxsey, 'aye'. Hudson, 'aye'. Huff, 'no'. Huskey, 'pass'. Jacobs, 'no'. Jaffe, 'no'. Johnson, 'aye'. Dave Jones, 'aye'. Emil Jones, 'pass'. Kane, 'aye'. Katz, 'pass'. Keats, 'pass'. Kelly, 'pass'. Kempiners, 'no'. Kent, 'aye'. Klosak, 'aye'. Kornowicz, 'pass'. Kosinski, 'aye'. Kozubowski, 'no'. Kucharski, 'pass'. Lauer, 'pass'. Laurino, 'no'. Lechowicz, 'no'. Leinenweber, 'aye'. Leverenz, 'no'. Levin, 'no'. Lucco, 'no'. Luft, 'pass'. Macdonald, 'aye'. Madigan, 'no'. Madison, 'pass'. Mahar, 'aye'. Mann, 'no'. Marovitz, 'no'. Lynn Martin, 'aye'."



Peggy Smith Martin, 'pass'. Matejek, 'no'. Matijevich, 'no'. Mautino, 'no'. McAuliffe, 'aye'. McAvoy, 'pass'. McBroom, 'aye'. McClain, 'no'. McCourt, 'aye'. McGrew, 'aye'. McLendon, 'no'. McMaster, 'aye'. McPike, 'no'. Meyer, 'no'. Miller, 'aye'. Molloy, 'no'. Mudd, 'aye'. Mugalian, 'aye'. Mulcahey, 'aye'. Murphy, 'no'. Nardulli, 'no'. Neff, 'aye'. O'Brien, 'pass'. O'Daniels, 'aye'. Pechous, 'aye'. Peters, 'no'. Pierce, 'no'. Polk, 'no'. Porter, 'aye'. Pouncey, 'no'. Pullen, 'aye'. Reed, 'aye'. Reilly, 'aye'. Richmond, 'no'. Rigney, 'aye'. Robinson, 'no'. Ryan, 'no'. Sanquist, 'no'. Satterthwaite, 'no'. Schisler, 'aye'. Schlickman, 'aye'. Schneider, 'aye'. Schoeberlein, 'pass'. Schuneman, 'no'. Sevcik, 'aye'. Sharp, 'pass'. Shumpert, 'no'. Simms, 'aye'. Skinner, 'aye'. Stanley, 'no'. Stearney, 'pass'. Steczo, 'no'. E.G. Steele, 'aye'. C.M. Stiehl, 'no'. Stuffle, 'aye'. Sumner, 'aye'. Taylor, 'no'. Telcser, 'no'. Terzich, 'pass'. Tipsword, 'aye'. Totten, 'pass'. Tuerk, 'aye'. Van Duynes, 'no'. Vitek, 'no'. Von Boeckman, 'no'. Waddell, 'aye'. Wall, 'pass'. Walsh, 'aye'. Wikoff, 'aye'. Willer, 'aye'. Williams, 'aye'. Wincheser, 'aye'. Wolf, 'aye'. Younge, 'no'. Yourell, 'pass'. Mr. Speaker, 'pass'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Are there any Members wishing to be recognized to be added to the Roll Call? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Katz."

Katz: "'Aye'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Just a minute, the Clerk will go through the absentees one time. Representative Katz wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. The Clerk will go through the roll once." At the end he can change though."

Clerk O'Brien: "E.M. Barnes, Brady, Daniels...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Just a minute, Representative Brady wishes to be recorded as 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Brady, 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Speaker wishes to be recorded as 'no'."



Clerk O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, 'no'. Daniels, Deaver, Ebbesen.."

Speaker Matijevich: "Ebbesen, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ebbesen, votes 'no'. Ewell, Farley, Hart, Huskey, Emil Jones... Emil Jones, votes 'no'. Keats, Kelly...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Just a minute, Representative Keats."

Keats: "Vote me 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Keats 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Keats, 'no'. Kelly, Kornowicz, Kucharski, Lauer...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Lauer. Lauer, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Lauer, votes 'aye'. Leinenweber... oh, I'm sorry, you already were 'aye'. Luft, Madison, Peggy Smith Martin... Peggy Smith Martin, 'no'. McAvoy, O'Brien, Schoeberlein, Sharp, Stearney, Terzich, Totten and Yourell."

Speaker Matijevich: "Are there any changes? Representative Boucek."

Boucek: "Mr. Speaker, change my vote from 'no' to 'yes'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Boucek from 'no' to 'yes'. Representative Ed McBroom from Kankakee."

McBroom: "I rise to change my vote, Mr. Speaker, but before I do that... I did have a lot of confidence in you, John, but I would like to get Speaker Redmond back on the podium."

Speaker Matijevich: "You want me to adjourn is that it?"

McBroom: "That's right. 'No'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Record Representative McBroom as voting 'no'. Are there... Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Please record me as 'yes'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Ewing from 'no' to 'yes'. Other changes? Representative Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Please change me to 'no'."

Speaker Matijevich: "Caldwell to 'no'. Representative Jane Barnes. Change Representative Barnes to 'aye'. Are there any other changes? Clerk, give me the Roll Call. The Clerk will have one minute to make sure that everything is



in order. The Clerk has requested that he wants to make sure the total is correct now.... we all want accuracy that's for sure. On the motion to adopt Amendment #22, the vote is.... the Clerk says it's the same. 79 'ayes', 80 'nays' and the Amendment fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #23...."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Clerk has lost Amendment #23, is that Representative Collins.... we've got to find it."

Collins: "No, you don't, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to have to table it."

Speaker Matijevich: "Leave to table Amendment #23. Amendment #23 is withdrawn. He's the Sponsor of the Amendment... he's the Sponsor. Leave to withdraw Amendment #23. Amendment #23, is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #24, McClain. Amends House Bill 2361 by deleting the last Section of the Bill and inserting in lieu thereof; the following: Section 7 and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Adams, Representative McClain on Amendment #24." Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In line because I have lost those other Amendments in other departments I move to withdraw this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "Does he have leave to withdraw Amendment #24? Amendment #24, is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #25, Collins, Levin, Marovitz. Amends House Bill 2361 as amended in Section 3 and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Amendment #25, the Representative from Cook, Representative Phil Collins. Amendment #25. Could we have order."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 25, is the Amendment which replaces Amendment #23, which we just tabled. Mr. Speaker, I can't even hear myself. I doubt if anybody else can hear me."

Speaker Matijevich: "Could the Republicans urging Representative



Roger Keats to go home, please be quite. Representative Collins, proceed. Let's have order."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #25 deals with the money for the education of children with severe or profound handicap. The amount asked for by the Office of Education was ten million dollars which was subsequently cut by two million, six hundred and fifty thousand dollars in the House Appropriations Committee. The Amendment #25, would restore the full amount to the ten million dollars that is needed. If those of you who served in the last General Assembly will remember that we were forced to restore funds by the means of an override when Governor Walker vetoed the same funds out... much needed funds for these.... for the care and education of these children. Now, this is money that is given into non public institutions in areas where public schools cannot handle the care and education of these children. Now, I say to you, these are children who are not educable in the normal sense. These are children who are severely and profoundly handicapped to the extent..... Mr. Speaker this...."

Speaker Matijevich: "Let's have order, this is a very important Amendment. Let's have order."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, my words are not important but this is an important subject. It deals with children who are not only helpless but penniless and really need the money provided in this Amendment. These are children who are in most cases are not even ambulatory, they have to be....."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters, for what purpose do you arise?"

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I know that a number of Members are agitated over that last vote. Let me just indicate that we have one more Amendment on the same subject which cuts a little bit on money on this program and we can, I think get that Amendment passed. Hopefully we can now give Representative Collins



the attention in the next four or five Amendments⁵⁻⁷ then we will be done with this Bill for tonight."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Collins, lets get back to Representative Collins on the Amendment."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. These children of which I speak, children who not only have to be transported in specially equipped vehicles in many cases have to be carried bodily because of their afflictions. They are children who in many cases are not even trained in the simple methods of toilet training. Teachers in the public schools who have been forced because of lack of facility to try and care for these children have complained that they are not only not able to take care of these children because of lack of training and lack of facilities but because of their attempt to care for these children they are not able to give proper attention to the education of normally educable children. It is a situation which is deplorable. In the last Session we appropriated after veto override eleven million dollars for the care of these children. We now are attempting to provide ten million dollars. The Amendment that was adopted in the Appropriations Committee cut the appropriation to seven million, six, when initially the Office of Education claimed is only the amount that was needed in the last year. It now appears that much more is needed. As a matter of fact the Office of Education figures alone would admit that it reached eight million, two was expended last year and I'm told that when final figures are in the bills will run at least eight million, eight. So, somewhere between eight million, eight and ten million is certainly needed. So, let me say furthermore than the need for these funds this is false economy. Because if these children are forced to go back into the public schools which are not equipped to care for them, it will require the installation of special equipment. It will require the purchase and rigging of special transportation.



It will require the training of special personnel for the care and safety and it will mean the loss of special grants and gifts, community funds and etc., which are available to nonpublic institutions and are not available to the public..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Will the Gentleman bring his remarks to a close?"

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I would solicit support for this Amendment and I would attempt to offer..... to answer any questions."

Speaker Matijevich: "Who stands in opposition to the Amendment? Representative from DuPage, Representative Hoffman, in opposition."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have filed Amendment #30 which is in direct response to this same issue that Representative Collins brings forward. Amendment #30, would add a million dollars to the Committee's Amendment, reduction to 7:3. 8.3 million dollars will cover the cost. In fact I have allowed a quarter of a million dollars above and beyond what we would conservatively estimate that this program would cost in the coming fiscal year. The hour is late, I don't want to go into explaining how average titution cost are computed on the local school district against the cap of twenty-five hundred dollars. But, let me just say that as inflation moves forward, the responsibility of the state is reduced if the number of clients remain the same. I'm inclined to think that the figure of the Committee may very well be closer to the figure that I have in Amendment #30. I rise in opposition to Amendment #25, because it's a million and seven, in my judgment, more than we will need to pay the claims of 100%. It is for this reason that I've introduced Amendment #30. I've discussed this with Representative Collins, we don't agree on the numbers and for that reason he introduced Amendment #25. I would ask that we defeat



Amendment #25 and adopt Amendment #30, which will pay these claims 100%. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins has moved for the adoption of Amendment #25. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed say 'no'. The Amendment is adopted. The 'ayes' have it. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #26, Byers. Amends House Bill 2361 on page 24, by deleting line 15 through 17."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Highland, Representative Byers on Amendment #26."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, I move for adoption of Amendment #26."

Speaker Matijevich: "In opposition, Representative Hanahan from McHenry."

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman failed to explain what he is trying to do here. So, don't be misled by his speed and agility in trying to get a Bill... Amendment Bill passed. It is going to completely remove the textbooks. Now, this is what the Gentleman is alluding to by his fast shuffle of moving to adopt this Amendment. I've seen fast footed movements before and I've seen them fail and I sure hope that this, right now Amendment #26 fails. Because it would be completely contradictory to the intention and wishes of this House as earlier, evidence earlier this evening when we adopted Representative Barnes Amendment to this Bill. This is once again an act almost in desperation against knowing odds that the General Assembly has spoken out clearly on the issue of textbooks and the Gentleman is asking to completely remove it. I oppose it."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Highland has moved the adoption of Committee Amendment #26. Those in favor of the Amendment say 'aye', opposed say 'nay'. And the Amendment fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #27, Byers, Stuffle. Amends House



Bill 2361 on page 24, by deleting line 18 through 20."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative... the Gentleman from Highland, Representative Byers, on Amendment #27."

Byers: "Well, this is a very fine Amendment and I move for adoption of Amendment #27."

Speaker Matijevich: "In opposition from Cook, Representative Ellis Levin."

Levin: "Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this Amendment. It would fund zero, the program for truance. Now, we have.... I have been through some of the schools, the private school that helps deal with the problems that some of the truance have and it is very similar to special ed. for the handicapped. Unfortunately, public schools aren't able to provide the facilities all the time, in order to be able to deal with the problems that these kids have. I've been very impressed with what the private schools have been able to do, they work with these kids for awhile and they are able to get them back in the public schools. I urge the defeat of this Amendment."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Highland has moved the adoption of Amendmetn #27, to House Bill 2361. All in favor say 'aye', opposed say 'nay'. And the Amendment fails. Further Amendmetns?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #28, Conti. Amends House Bill 2361 as amended on page 23, by deleting line 1 and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Representative from Cook, Representative Conti on Amendment #28."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've heard much ado about staying here until June 30. I am sincere about this Bill and I certainly want to get the attention of the Members of the House. This is one of the few last remaining Amendments of this Bill. I could remember back in 1943, as I stated once before here in this House when Bernice Vandervise started the common school distribution fund. And she said that it would only cost



nine million dollars and someone questioned that there is no lid on it and it would run away with it some day. She said, 'no' it would never exceed eighteen million dollars. Today I don't have to tell you what that fund is. In 1972, the students increased eighteen hundred and fifty seven percent when we came in with the bilingual language. Since 1972, the funding has increased.... listen to this please... fifteen hundred and forty percent. Fifteen hundred and forty percent since 1972. Now, where are the economics? And there is no lid on this one either. Are we going to end up with a five hundred million dollar program, a six hundred million dollar program? Amendment #28, all it does is reduce the bilingual program by four and a half million dollars. If we are sincere in trying to help some of these educable and mentally retarded children and I've heard Hanahan, I've heard the Gentleman on the other side of the aisle looking for two million dollars.... looking for five hundred thousand, looking for one million dollars. I'm giving him four and a half million dollars back. I'm only reducing the bilingual program to put him on notice that we want him in this country, that we want Americanize them, we want to get them off relief roles, we want them to become American citizens. So, give me this notice to these people that we want to start teaching them American. Cut this bilingual program four and a half million dollars and it will be the first in history of the State of Illinois where we started a program and we actually reduced it after a few years instead of a no lid program. I ask for your favorable vote, the Amendment reduces the bilingual program by four and a half million dollars. The City of Chicago gets five million, nine hundred and twenty thousand dollars, downstate will receive two million, eighty thousand dollars."

Speaker Matijevich: "In opposition stands Representative Hanahan from McHenry County."

Hanahan: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm



reading Amendment #28 and I can't find what the Gentleman is talking about. I don't see any reimbursement to special ed. here. I don't see any line item in House Amendment #28 to help the educational disadvantaged. I don't see anything that he's talking about. I'll tell you what I do see, I see a further reduction in the appropriation towards... for the bilingual programs in the State of Illinois. I see the City of Chicago getting ripped off for another three million, six hundred and thirty thousand. I see downstate being taken advantage of at the tune of a million and one hundred and seventy thousand. But, I don't see anything being put in there for educational disadvantaged children. If it were in there maybe you would have some sympathy. The fact remains that once again this Amendment... all it is going to do and we have already addressed ourselves, is completely emasculate the bilingual programs that are being taught in the schools. If you want to do that then just change the mandated programs first, come back here next year and do what you're attempting. But, to ask us to emasculate bilingual at this time, it's too late in the game, Elmer, and I ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, has moved the adoption of Amendment #28 to House Bill 2361. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed say 'no'. The 'nos' have it. Further Amendments?, Roll Call, all right, okay. I see five Members. All right. Roll Call on that Amendment. Those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Peters, to explain his vote."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there is a lot of problem with this particular program. I think the close vote on the original Amendment offered by Representative Conti will give a very loud and clear signal to the individuals running the program in regard to shortcomings of the program. He has now offered an Amendment



here which would further reduce this by four and a half million dollars. I personally feel that that Amendment is in line and in keeping with what the budget should request here and would urge an 'aye' vote in passage of this Amendment."

Speaker Matijeich: "The Cubs are leading 8 to 2, in the 7th inning. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Jack Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed a privilege to be able to vote on the side of my Leadership this time to reduce this budget by four and a half million dollars. I'm also delighted with the wisdom of the balance of the Members of the House who have decided to vote for this Amendment, and I congratulate all of you for fiscal responsibility and finally listening to Mr. Conti in my argument on...."

Speaker Matijeich: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On the motion to adopt Amendment #28 there are 89 voting 'aye'... all right... a Member, or I thought that was Roscoe. Representative Cunningham, to explain his vote. One minute."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, how unfortunate we must settle for the booby prize, we could have the main prize in this thing. As I told in Appropriations this afternoon, you're fight here, it is completely out of shape. You ought to have it changed and corrected tonight if you're going to be the Speaker up there. You see how the score lies."

Speaker Matijeich: "You notice you're on the left side, it is my left here, Roscoe. On this there are 89 voting 'aye', 67 voting 'nay', 2 voting 'present' and Amendment #28 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #29...."

Speaker Matijeich: "Just a minute, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Elmer Conti."

Conti: ".....speaks in Italian."

Speaker Matijeich: "See Senór:"



Conti: "...Speaks Italian..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Tante Gracias. I hope we can say good-night to... how do you say goodnight? Buenos dias. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #29, Anderson. Amends House Bill 2361 as amended on page 24, deleting line 17 and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "Elmer, it's Buenas noches. On Amendment #29, the.... who is the Sponsor? Sponsor of the Amendment? Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to withdraw that Amendment please."

Speaker Matijevich: "Does the Gentleman have leave to withdraw Amendment #29? Leave. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #30, G.L. Hoffman. Amends House Bill 2361 as amended in Section III, by deleting and so forth."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, since we've adopted Amendment #25, I would like to withdraw Amendment #30."

Speaker Matijevich: "Does the Gentleman have leave to withdraw Amendment #30? Leave. Amendment #30, is withdrawn. Are there further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #31, Byers. Amends House Bill 2361 as amended by increasing by ten million the items on page 24, line 17."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Meyer:"

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This increases the Textbook Bill by ten million dollars. It would give three million, three hundred and thirty-three thousand dollars to the students who are attending nonpublic schools for textbooks. This is 0.025, one quarter of 1% of the total school budget 99 and 3/4's%, and that isn't lifeboy; goes to the public schools. With this Amendment one quarter of 1% would go



to the students to provide textbooks for nonpublic schools.
I move for its adoption."

Speaker Matiejvich: "Who stands in opposition? Representative Byers is in opposition, the Gentleman from Highland."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, we put seven million dollars in this line already tonight and I think that is enough damage to the State Treasury and a 'no' vote would be appropriate on ten million dollars."

Speaker Matiejvich: "The Gentleman from Cook has moved the adoption of Committee Amendment #31. All in favor say 'aye', opposed say 'no'. The Amendment fails. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Matiejvich: "Third Reading. Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Matiejvich, Chairman on the Committee of Appropriation I, which the following Bills were referred. Action taken June 21, 1977. Reported the same back with the following recommendations. Do pass as amended, Senate Bill 752, tabled in Committee. House Bill 2292. Representative E.M. Barnes, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations II, to which the following Bills were referred. Action taken June 21, 1977. Reported the same back with the following recommendations. Do pass Senate Bill 437, Senate Bill 437. Do pass as amended House Bill 2410, House Bill 2417, Senate Bill 435 and Senate Bill 830. Representative E.M. Barnes, Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations II, to which the following Bills were referred. Action taken June 21, 1977. Reported the same back with the following recommendations. Do pass as amended Senate Bill 438. Representative Matiejvich, Chairman on the Committee on Appropriations I, which the following Bills were referred. Action taken June 21, 1977. Reported the same back with the following recommendations. Do pass Senate Bill 36, 718, 767 and 1302. Do pass as amended Senate Bill 35 and 961."



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

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, I noticed that I wasn't recorded on Amendment #16, on the last Bill and I would like to be recorded as 'aye'. It won't change the results."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Announcements. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there will be no meeting of Appropriations I Committee tomorrow. We are meeting Thursday but we don't know the time. I will announce it on the floor of the House tomorrow. No meeting tomorrow. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Younge. Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House stand in perfunct for... five minutes. No... not necessary? Mr. Speaker, I move that the House stand adjourn until tomorrow morning at ten o'clock A.M."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the Gentleman's motion that the House adjourn until tomorrow morning at 10:00 A.M. All those in favor say 'aye'.... Representative Polk."

Polk: "I just wanted to verify. Appropriations II is meeting at zero eight hundred hours in the morning. Is that correct?"

Speaker Redmond: "According to the navy time, it is zero eight hundred."

Polk: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "The Marines always tag along. The Gentleman's motion carried, we now stand adjourn."



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	1.
1	9:30	Speaker Redmond	House to order	
		Reverend Krueger	Invocation	
		Speaker Redmond	Consent Calendar, 3rd	
2-3		Clerk O'Brien	Reads consent calendar, 3rd	
		Speaker Redmond	Senate Bills, 2nd	
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads SB 550	
		Clerk O'Brien	Motion to table #1	
		Speaker Redmond		
		McPike	Moves to table #1	
		Speaker Redmond		
4		Skinner	Opposed to tabling	
		Speaker Redmond		
		McPike		
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR SB 550	
		Skinner	Calls for quorum	
		Speaker Redmond		
	9:37	Clerk O'Brien	SB 639	
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR SB 639	
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 686	
		Speaker Redmond		
5		Clerk O'Brien	Motion to table #1	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Dyer	Moves to table #1	
		Speaker Redmond	#1 tabled	
		Clerk O'Brien	#2	
		Speaker Redmond		



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	2.
		Dyer	Explain #2	
	9:39	Speaker Redmond	#2 adopted, 3rd reading	
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 689	
6		Speaker Redmond	TOOR	
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 693	
		Speaker Redmond	3rd reading	
		Clerk O'Brien	Agreed Resolutions 354 & 355	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Madigan	Moves adoption	
		Speaker Redmond	Adopted	
		Madigan	All members co-sponsors	
		Speaker Redmond		
	9:41	Lechowicz		
7		Speaker Redmond		
		Giorgi		
		Clerk O'Brien	HR 355	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Giorgi	Moves adoption	
		Speaker Redmond	HR 355 adopted	
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 735	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	Motion to table #1	
		Speaker Redmond		
8		Kempiners	Moves to table #1	
		Speaker Redmond		
9	9:45	Stearney	Explains #1	
		Speaker Redmond		



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
10		Houlihan, D.	
11		Speaker Redmond Dyer Speaker Redmond	
12		Skinner Speaker Redmond McAuliffe Speaker Redmond Huff	Supports
13		Kempineres Speaker Redmond Stearney	To close
	9:55	Speaker Redmond Bowman Speaker Redmond Clerk O'Brien	Roll call for attendance Explains vote Motion to table fails #2 failed in Committee
14	9:56	Stearney	#3, move to table
15		Speaker Redmond Ryan Speaker Redmond Clerk O'Brien Speaker Redmond Stearney Speaker Redmond	Objects Stearney withdraws #3 Floor Amendment #4
		Houlihan, D.	Amendment distributed?
16		Stearney	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan	
17		Stearney	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kempiners	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	
		Stearney	
18		Speaker Redmond	
		Hart	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bowman	
	10:05	Skinner	MPQ
		Speaker Redmond	
		Stearney	To close
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #4 adopted, 3rd
		1/4 Ebbesen	SB 762, leave to table #1
		Speaker Redmond	Tabled
		Clerk O'Brien	#2
20		Speaker Redmond	
		Waddell	
		Ebbesen	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan, D.	Yield
21		Ebbesen	
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted, 3rd reading
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 878, 2nd, no CA



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
27		Telcser	
		Speaker Redmond	#2 adopted, 3rd reading
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1068, 2nd, no CA
		Speaker Redmond	
	10:29	Houlihan, D.	Hold 1068
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1092, 2nd, #1 adopted
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Motion to table #1
28		Houlihan, D.	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Daniels	Support
		Speaker Redmond	#1 tabled
		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #2
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan, D.	
		Speaker Redmond	#2 adopted, 3rd reading
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1142, 2nd, #1 adopted
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	#2
		Speaker Redmond	TOOR
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1149, 2nd, #1 adopted
		Speaker Redmond	
29		Clerk O'Brien	#2
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Collins	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Conti	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bluthardt	
30	10:38	Collins	
31		Speaker Redmond	
32		Collins	To close
		Speaker Redmond	
		Conti	
		Speaker Redmond	#2 adopted
33		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1177, 2nd, #1 adopted
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Martin, L.	Keep on 2nd
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1358, 2nd, #1 & 2
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mudd	Leave to table #1
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kane	Question
		Mudd	
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment tabled
34		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #3
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mudd	
		Speaker Redmond	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	8.
		Madigan	Explain Amendment?	
		Mudd		
		Speaker Redmond		
		McBroom	Yield	
35	10:43	Mudd		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Darrow	Yield	
		Mudd		
		Speaker Redmond		
36		Van Duyne		
		Speaker Redmond		
37		McMaster	Yield	
		Mudd		
		Speaker Redmond	Adopted, 3rd reading	
		Deuster	Leave to return SB 325 to 2nd	
		Speaker Redmond	Leave granted	
		Beatty		
38		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Beatty	Leave to table #1	
		Speaker Redmond	Withdraw it	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #2	
	10:52	Deuster		
		Speaker Redmond		
	10:55	McClain		
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted	
		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #3	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Beatty	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Deuster	
		Speaker Redmond	
39-40		Waddell	
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted, 3rd reading
		Telcser	
41		Speaker Redmond	Leave to return SB 1023 to 2nd
		Telcser	Move to table #2
		Speaker Redmond	Tabled, leave on 2nd. Consent calendar prev. read. Bills passed
42		Clerk O'Brien	HB 362, 3rd
		Speaker Redmond	
43		Martin, P.	
44		Speaker Redmond	
		Bluthardt	
		Speaker Redmond	
45		Martin, P.	Poll absentees
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mautino	'Aye'
		Speaker Redmond	
	11:07	Martin, P.	PPC
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 973, 3rd
		Speaker Redmond	
		Gaines	Sponsor



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1033, 3rd reading
		Speaker Redmond	
46.		Winchester	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Darrow	Question
		Winchester	
		Speaker Redmond	
47		Giorgi	Question
48		Winchester	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Winchester	To close
49		Speaker Redmond	HB 1033 passed
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 1044, 2nd, #3,5,6 adopted
		Speaker Redmond	
50		Stearney	#8
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kent	
51	11:20	Stearney	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Johnson	Yield
		Speaker Redmond	
		Stearney	
52		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijeovich	Yield
		Stearney	
		Speaker Redmond	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Kent	
		Speaker Redmond	
53		Barnes, E.	
54		Stearney	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Barnes	
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #8
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #9
55		Speaker Redmond	
		McBroom	Moves to table
		Speaker Redmond	Withdraws it
56		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #10
		Speaker Redmond	Keats withdraws
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #11
	11:35	Kane	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kent	Oppose
		Speaker Redmond	
57		Barnes	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kane	To close
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #11 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #12
		Speaker Redmond	
58		Katz	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Barnes, E.	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kent	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	
59		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #12
		Lechowicz	In chair
		McClain	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
60		Hoffman	
	11:45	Speaker Lechowicz	
		Kent	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		McClain	To close
		Speaker Lechowicz	
61		Peters	Explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	Fails, 3rd reading
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2361, 2nd, #1,2,3,7,9,11 & 1
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	Motion to table #9
		Speaker Lechowicz	TOOR
62		Levin	Motion to table
		Speaker Lechowicz	
63		Peters	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
64		Hoffman	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Marovitz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
65	11:56	Hanahan	Support
66		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Polk	Oppose
		Speaker Lechowicz	
67		Levin	To close
		Speaker Lechowicz	Motion to table
		McClain	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
68		Levin	To close
		Speaker Lechowicz	Motion fails
		Hanahan	Take Bill out of record
69		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2402, 2nd, #1 adopted
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Walsh	Amendment not germane
		Speaker Lechowicz	Chair rules it is
		Walsh	
		Clerk O'Brien	#2 tabled #3 withdrawn
		Walsh	Move to table #4
		Speaker Lechowicz	
70		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #5
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Walsh	
71	12:12	Harris	Oppose Amendment #5
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Dunn, R.	Urge defeat #5



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Madigan	Oppose
		Speaker Lechowicz	
72		Geo-Karis	Oppose
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Taylor	MPQ
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Walsh	To close
		Speaker Lechowicz	
73		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment lost
		Walsh	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Lechowicz	3rd reading
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 963, 2nd, no CA
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	#1
		Speaker Lechowicz	
74		Bowman	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
75		Totten	Yield
	12:23	Bowman	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Greiman	Responds to Totten
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Totten	More questions



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
76		Greiman	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
77		Bowman	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
78		Totten	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Pullen	Urge defeat
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Freidrich	Against
		Speaker Lechowicz	
79		Hudson	Urge defeat
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Schlickman	Yield
80		Bowman	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
81		Greiman	
82		Speaker Lechowicz	
	12:37	Taylor	MPQ
		Speaker Lechowicz	
83		Bowman	To clsoe
		Bluthardt	
84		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment #1 adopted
		Clerk Hall	#2
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Greiman	
		Speaker Lechowicz	#2 adopted
		Clerk Hall	#3



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Greiman	
		Speaker Lechowicz	TOOR #3
		Clerk Hall	#4
		Speaker Lechowicz	
85		Porter	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
86		Greiman	Oppose
		Speaker Lechowicz	
87		Conti	In favor
		Speaker Lechowicz	
88		Bowman	Oppose
		Speaker Lechosicz	
	12:52	Porter	To close
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Porter	Poll absentees
		Speaker Lechowicz	
89		Lauer	Change to 'aye'
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Van Dwyne	'No' vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Breslin	'No'
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Porter	Asks verification neg.
		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	17.
		Younge	'No'	
90		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Farley	'No'	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Gaines	'Aye'	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Porter	Verify neg. roll call	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Clerk O'Brien	Neg. roll call	
	1:00	Speaker Lechowicz		
		Porter	Slow down	
91		Clerk O'Brien	Continues	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Epton	Switch to 'aye'	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
92-93		Clerk O'Brien	Continues	
		Porter	Questions neg. roll call	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Von Boeckman	'No'	
94		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment fails, 3rd	
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 550, 2nd, #1 adopted	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		McPike	Motion to table #1	
95		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Skinner	Oppose motion	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
96		McPike	To close	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	18.
		Speaker Lechowicz	Motion prevails	
		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #2	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
97	1:17	Skinner		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		McClain	Oppose #2	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
98		McPike	Oppose	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Skinner		
		Speaker Lechowicz	Roll call	
99		Skinner	Explain vote	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment fails, 3rd reading	
		Clerk Hall	SB 878, 2nd	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Clerk Hall	Floor Amendment #1	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Terzich	Move to table #1	
100		Speaker Lechowicz	Tabled	
		Clerk Hall	#2	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Terzich		
101		Speaker Lechowicz	Adopted, 3rd reading	
		Clerk Hall	SB 881, 2nd, #1 adopted	
		Speaker Lechowicz	3rd reading	
		Clerk Hall	SB 967, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Lechowicz		



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
101	1:28	Giorgi	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
		Clerk Hall	SB 968, 3rd reading
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Getty	TOOR
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk Hall	SB 981, 3rd reading
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Giorgi	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
		Wolf	Leave to vote 'aye' SB 967
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Hudson	Vote 'no' on SB 967
102		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk Hall	SB 1007, 3rd reading
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Polk	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
		Mulcahey	Leave to vote 'aye' on SB 967
		Speaker Lechowicz	
103		Clerk Hall	SB 1013, 3rd reading
		Speaker Lechowicz	
	1:32	Deuster	
		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 1013 passed
		Conti	Record 'no', SB 1007
		Speaker Lechowicz	
104		Houlihan, D.	Leave to return SB 1025 to 2nd



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk Hall	Amendment #1
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Jaffe	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
105		Leinenweber	Question
		Jaffe	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Waddell	Question
106		Houlihan, D.	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Katz	Inquiry
107		Houlihan, D.	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Friedland	MPQ
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Jaffe	To close
108		Speaker Lechowicz	#1 adopted, 3rd reading
	1:42	Houlihan, D.	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk Hall	SB 1043, 3rd reading
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Greiman	
109		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
		Clerk Hall	SB 1037, 3rd reading
		Speaker Lechowicz	
110		Pierce	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	21.
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Leinenweber	Question	
110-111		Pierce		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
112		Geo-Karis	Question	
		Pierce		
		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed	
		Clerk Hall	SB 1053, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Telcser		
		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed	
		Clerk Hall	SB 1138, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
113		Leinenweber		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Lucco	Yield	
	1:53	Leinenweber		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		McClain	Yield	
		Leinenweber		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Houlihan, D.	Question	
114		Leinenweber		
		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1143, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Daniels	Leave to return to 2nd	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	22.
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #2	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Daniels	Leave to table #1	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
115		Houlihan, D.	Question	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment #1 tabled	
		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #2	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Daniels		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
116-117		Houlihan	Question	
	2:00	Daniels		
		Speaker Lechowicz	TOOR	
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1136, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
118		Sharp		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Walsh	Urge 'no' vote	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
119		Lucco	Support	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Pierce		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Sharp		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
120		Cunningham		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1208, 3rd reading
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Macdonald	Leave to return to 2nd
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	#1
		Speaker Lechowicz	
121		Levin	
121A	2:10	Levin	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
122		Hoffman	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
123		Pierce	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Levin	TOOR
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1236, 3rd reading
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		O'Brien	
124		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
		Collins	Introduction
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Matijevich	Announcement
		Speaker Lechowicz	
125		Barnes, E.M.	Announcement
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Porter	Change to 'aye' SB 1007



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	24.
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Deuster	Same request	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Clerk O'Brien	Committee report.	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
	2:22	Giorgi	Recess till 6 P.M.	
126		Speaker Lechowicz		
	6:00	Speaker Redmond	House to order	
		Ebbesen		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	Messages from Senate	
		Speaker Redmond		
127		Mulcahey		
	6:50	Speaker Redmond	House to order	
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1202, 3rd reading	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Totten	Leave to return to 2nd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Luft	Leave to table #2	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Houlihan		
128		Speaker Redmond	Table, 3rd reading	
		Geo-Karis	Leave to return SB 626 to 2nd	
		Speaker Redmond		
129		Geo-Karis		
		Speaker Redmond		



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	25.
		Houlihan, D.		
		Geo-Karis		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Geo-Karis		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Reilly	SB 40, returned to 2nd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	#1	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Reilly		
130		Speaker Redmond	Amendment adopted, 3rd reading	
	7:00	Ryan		
131		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1317, 3rd reading	
		Lauer		
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1364	
		Speaker Redmond		
132		Bennett		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Houlihan, D.	Yield	
133		Bennett		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Dunn, R.	Support	
		Speaker Redmond		
134		Mugalian	Support	
		Speaker Redmond		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	26.
		Waddell		
		Speaker Redmond	Passed	
		Clerk O'Brien		
		Speaker Redmond		
135		Giglio	Leave to return to 2nd	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Clerk O'Brien	#1	
	7:15	Collins		
136		Speaker Redmond		
		Deuster	Amendment #1	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Schlickman		
		Speaker Redmond		
137		Deuster		
		Speaker Redmond		
138		Robinson	Vote present	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Johnson	Question	
		Deuster		
		Speaker Redmond		
139		Mugalian	Responds	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Johnson	Point of order	
		Mugalian		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Giglio	Responds to Johnson	
		Speaker Redmond		



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Mugalian	
		Speaker Redmond	
140		Ebbesen	
		Speaker Redmond	
	7:25	Conti	
		Matijevich	In Chair
		Deuster	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Giglio	
		Speaker Matijevich	TOOR
141		Clerk O'Brien	SB 119, 3rd reading
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Terzich	Leave, etc.
		Speaker Matijevich	Objections
		Terzich	SB 119 sponsor
		Speaker Matijevich	
142		Schlickman	Yield
143		Terzich	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Waddell	Yield
		Terzich	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Stuffle	MPQ
144		Speaker Matijevich	
		Terzich	To close
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Leinenweber	Explain vote



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Matijevich	
145	7:35	Griesheimer	Explain vote
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Dyer	
		Speaker Matijevich	
146		Stuffle	
		Speaker Matijevich	SB 119
		Terzich	Poll absentees
		Speaekr Matijevich	
		Geo-Karis	Change to 'aye'
		Speaker Matijevich.	
		Luft	Change to 'aye'
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
		Speaker Matijevich	
147		Beatty	'Aye'
		Speaker Matiejvich	
		Holewinski	'Aye'
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Flinn	'Aye'
		Speaker Matijevich	
		DiPrima	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Anderson	'Aye'
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Mulcahey	
		Speaker Matijevich	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	29.
148		Jacobs	'Aye'	
		Speaker Matijeivich		
		Ebbesen		
		Speaker Matiejevich		
		Schlickman	Request verification	
		Speaker Matijeivich		
	7:43	Conti		
		Speaker Matijeivich	Dump rull	
		Schlickman	Withdraw request	
		Speaker Matijeivich		
149		Freidrich		
		Speaker Matijeivich		
		Lechowicz		
		Speaker Matijeivich		
		Freidrich	Verification	
		Speaker Matijeivich		
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads affirmative roll call	
		Speaker Matijeivich		
150		Freidrich	Sit down	
		Speaker Matijeivich		
		Clerk O'Brien	Continues	
		Speaker Matijeivich		
151-152		Friedrich	Questions affirmative roll	
		Speaker Matijeivich		
		DiPrima	Change to 'aye'	
	7:55	Speaker Matijeivich		
		Getty	Change to 'aye'	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
153		Speaker Matiejvich	
		McClain	Vote 'aye'
		Speaker Matiejvich	
		Tuerk	Vote me 'aye'
		Speaker Matiejvich	
		Pechous	Cast me 'aye'
		Speaker Matiejvich	
		Freidrich	Withdraw request
		Speaker Matiejvich	98 'ayes' 49 'no' SB 119 passe
154		Ebbesen	
155		Speaker Matiejvich	
		Clerk O'Brien	HB 689, 2nd, #1 & 2 adopted
		Speaker Matiejvich	
		Brady	Move to table #2
		Speaker Matiejvich	
		Brady	Explains motion
156		Speaker Matiejvich	
		Hoffman	Inquiry of sponsor
		Brady	
157		Hoffman	
		Speaker Matiejvich	
		Hanahan	Point of order
		Speaker Matiejvich	Speak to motion
		Hoffman	Motion in writing
		Speaker Matiejvich	
		Brady	
		Speaker Matiejvich	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
158		Schneider	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Hanahan	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Winchester	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Stuffle	Question of order
		Speaker Matijevich	
159		Stuffle	
		Speaker Matijevich	
160		Pierce	Support motion
		Speaker Matijevich	
161		Peters	
		Speaekr Matiejvich	
		Jones, E.	MPQ
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Peters	Parliamentary inquiry
162		Speaker Matijevich	Previous question previls
		Brady	Move to table #2
163	8:15	Speaker Matijevich	
		Hanahan	Explains vote 'aye'
		Speaker Matijevich	
164		Conti	Explain vote
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Jaffe	
		Speaker Matiejvich	
165		Collins	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Matijevich	
166		Stuffle	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Madison	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Brady	Poll absentees
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Madison	Leave to be verified
167		Speaker Matijevich	
		Schlickman	
		Clerk O'Brien	Continues
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Brady	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Brady	Questions
168		Speaker Matijevich	
	8:30	Ryan	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Clerk O'Brien	
169		Brady	
		Speaker Matijevich	Motion to table filas
		Clerk O'Brien	#3 failed. Amèndment #4
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Hoffman	Renew request
		Speaker Matijevich	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
170		Brady	
		Speaker Matijeich	
		Hoffman	
		Speaker Matijeich	
171		Schneider	
		Speaker Matijeich	
		Stuffle	
		Speaker Matijeich	
		Brady	
		Speaker Matijeich	
		Stuffle	
		Speaker Matijeich	
172		Schneider	
		Speaker Matijeich	
		Schneider	
		Speaker Matijeich	
		Lauer	
		Speaker Matijeich	
		Stuffle	
		Speaker Matijeich	
		Meyer	
		Speaker Matijeich	
		Lauer	
		Speaker Matijeich	
		Meyer	
173		Speaker Matijeich	
		Kane	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Lechowicz	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Kane	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Peters	
174		Speaker Matijevich	
		Schneider	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Lauer	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Lauer	
		Speaker Matijevich	
175		Stuffle	
		Speaker Matijevich	
176		Hoffman	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Ebbesen	MPQ
		Speaker Matijevich	
177		Stuffle	
		Speaker Matijevich	
178		McGrew	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Edgar	
		Speaker Matijevich	
179		Pierce	
		Speaker Matijevich	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Skinner	
		Speaker Matijevich	
180	180	Tipsword	
		Speaker Matijevich	
181	181	Hanahan	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Stuffle	
		Speaker Matijevich	
182	182	Bradley	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Barnes	
		Speaker Matijevich	
183	183	Barnes	Explains vote
		Speaker Matijevich	
184	184	Barnes	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Friedrich	Explains vote
		Speaker Matijevich	Motion to table fails
		Schneider	To close Amendment #4
		Speaker Matijevich	Amendment adopted
	9:06	Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #5
		Speaker Matijevich	
185	185	Schneider	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Brady	Support
		Peters	
		Speaker Matijevich	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	36.
186		Bradley		
187		Hoffman		
		Speaker Matijevich		
		Davis, J.	MPQ	
		Speaker Matijevich		
		Schneider	To close	
188		Speaker Matijevich	Passed	
		Lauer		
		Speaker Matijevich	Amendment adopted	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #6	
		Speaker Matijevich		
		Hoffman		
		Speaker Matijevich		
		Yourell		
189		Hoffman	Contineus	
		Speaker Matijevich		
		Brady		
		Speaker Matijevich		
	9:15	Hoffman		
		Speaker Matijevich	Tabled #6 and 7	
		Clerk O'Brien	Floor Amendment #8	
190		Speaker Matijevich		
		Meyer		
		Speaker Matijevich		
		Brady	Oppose	
		Speaker Matijevich		



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	37.
191		Peters		
		Speaker Matijeovich		
		Barnes	Ruling from chair	
		Speaker Matijeovich		
192		Peters		
		Speaker Matijeovich		
193		Hanahan	Oppose	
		Speaker Matijeovich		
		Barnes, G.		
194		Speaker Matijeovich		
		Lechowicz	Against	
		Speaker Matijeovich		
	9:26	Meyer	To close	
195		Speaker Matijeovich	Amendment fails	
		Clérk O'Brien	Amendment #9	
196		Stuffle		
		Speaker Matijeovich		
		Brady		
		Speaker Matijeovich		
197		Ebbesen		
		Speaker Matijeovich		
		Yourell		
		Speaker Matijeovich		
198		Yourell		
		Speaker Matijeovich		
199		Peters		
200		Hanahan		



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Matijeivich	
201-202		Hoffman	
		Speaker Matiejvich	
		Dunn	MPQ
		Speaker Matijeivich	
		Lechowicz	
		Speaker Matijeivich	
		Byers	
		Speaker Matijeivich	
203		Byers	To close
	9:45	Speaker Matijeivich	
		Hoffman	
		Speaker Matijeivich	Amendment #9
204		Satterthwaite	
		Speaker Matijeivich	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Matijeivich	
		Levin	
		Speaker Matijeivich	
205		Brady	Explain vote
		Speaker Matijeivich	
		Stuffle	Explain vote
		Speaker Matijeivhc	
		Birchler	
		Speaker Matijeivich	
206		Darrow	
		Speaker Matijeivich	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
 STATE OF ILLINOIS
 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	39.
		Bradley		
		Speaker Matijevich		
207		Lucco		
		Speaker Matijevich		
		Kane		
208	9:55	Lechowicz		
		Speaker Matijevich		
		Jones, E.	Explains vote	
		Speaker Matijevich		
209		Barnes, E.		
		Speaker Matijevich	Amendment #9	
		Stuffle		
210		Speaker Matijevich	Oral roll call	
		Clerk Hall	Calls affirmative roll	
		Speaker Matijevich		
		Epton		
		Speaker Matijevich		
211		Clerk Hall		
		Speaker Matijevich		
		Jaffe		
212		Clerk Hall		
		Speaker Matijevich		
		Dunn, J.		
		Speaker Matijevich		
		Dunn, R.		
		Speaker Matijevich		
		Barnes		



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
213		Speaker Matijevec	
		Mulcahey	
		Speaker Matijevec	Amendment fails
		Clerk Hall	Amendment #10
		Speaker Matijevec	
		Schneider	
		Speaker Matijevec	
214		Brady	Oppose
		Speaker Matijevec	
	10:15	Peters	Oppose
		Speaker Matijevec	
215		McClain	Oppose
		Speaker Matijevec	
		Johnson	MPQ
		Speaker Matijevec	
		Schneider	To close
		Speaker Matijevec	
		Brady	
		Speaker Matijevec	
216		Schneider	Continues
		Speaker Matijevec	
		Barnes, E.	Explains vote
		Speaker Matijevec	
217		Robinson	
		Speaker Matijevec	
		Houlihan	Point of order
		Speaker Matijevec	Amendment fails, 3rd reading



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Deavers	Motion
		Speaker Matijevich	
	10:22	Schlickman	
218		Clerk O'Brien	HB 2361, 2nd
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Hanahan	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Yourell	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Yourell	
219		Speaker Matijevich	
		Conti	Point of inquiry
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Peters	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #14, 15 filed
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #16
220		Barnes, J.	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Hanahan	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Peters	
		Speaker Matijevich	
221		Ewing	Oppose
		Speaker Matijevich	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Byers	Yield?
		Barnes, J.	
		Byers	Address bill
		Speaker Matijevich	
222		Keats	MPQ
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Brady	To close
		Speaker Matijevich	
223		Yourell	
		Speaker Matijevich	
	10:32	Kent	
		Speaker Matijevich	
224		Farley	
		Speaker Matijevich	Amendment #16 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	#17
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Polk	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Hanahan	Support
		Speaker Matijevich	
225		Peters	Support
		Speaker Matijevich	Amendment adopted. Barnes moves to table #3
		Barnes	
		Speaker Matijevich	
226		Peters	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Houlihan, D.	MPQ



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	43.
		Speaker Matijevich		
		Barnes, E.		
227		Speaker Matijevich	Motion to table fails	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #18	
		Speaker Matijevich		
	10:42	Hoffman		
		Speaker Matijevich		
228		Hanahan		
		Speaker Matijevich		
		Hoffman		
		Speaker Matijevich	Hoffman tables #18, 19, 20 withdraws	
		Clerk Hall	Amendment #21	
229		Speaker Matijevich		
		Ebbesen		
		Speaker Matijevich		
		Hoffman, G.		
		Speaker Matijevich		
230		Hanahan		
		Speaker Matijevich		
231		Clerk O'Brien	#22	
		Speaker Matijevich		
232		Conti		
		Speaker Matijevich		
	10:55	Telcser		
		Speaker Matijevich		
233		Wolf		
		Speaker Matijevich		



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	44.
		Conti		
		Speaker Matijevec		
234		Hanahan		
		Speaker Matijevec		
235		Davis, J.	Explains vote	
		Speaker Matijevec		
236		Lechowicz		
		Speaker Matijevec		
		Kempiners		
		Speaker Matijevec		
237		Marovitz		
		Speaker Matijevec		
		Cunningham		
		Speaker Matijevec		
238		Bowman		
		Speaker Matijevec		
		Deuster		
		Speaker Matijevec		
239		Friedrich		
		Speaker Matijevec		
		Schneider		
		Speaker Matijevec		
240		McAuliffe		
		Speaker Matijevec		
		Conti		
		Speaker Matijevec		
241		Lechowicz	Point of order	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	45.
		Speaker Matijevich		
		Pullen	'Aye'	
		Speaker Matijevich		
242		Hoffman		
		Speaker Matijevich		
		Houlihan, J.		
		Speaker Matijevich	Verify roll call	
		Clerk O'Brien	Call roll	
		Speaker Matijevich		
		Hanahan	Point of order	
243		Speaker Matijevich		
244		Clerk O'Brien	Continues	
		Speaker Matijevich		
		Katz		
245		Speaker Matijevich		
		Clerk O'Brien		
		Speaker Matijevich		
		Boucek		
		Speaker Matijevich		
		McBroom		
		Speaker Matijevich		
		Ewing		
		Speaker Matijevich		
		Caldwell		
246		Speaker Matijevich	Amendment #22 fails	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #23	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Collins	Leave to table
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #24
		Speaker Matijevich	
	11:31	Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		McClain	Move to withdraw
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #25
247		Speaker Matijevich	
		Collins	
		Speaker Matijevich	
248		Peters	
		Speaker Matijevich	
249		Collins	On Amendment #25
		Speaker Matijevich	
250		Hoffman	Oppose
		Speaker Matijevich	Amendment adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #26
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Byers	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Hanahan	
		Speaker Matijevich	Amendment fails
251		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #27
		Speaker Matijevich	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	11:42	Byers	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Levin	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #28
		Speaker Matijevich	
252		Conti	
		Speaker Matijevich	
253		Hanahan	
		Speaker Matijevich	
254		Peters	Explains vote
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Davis, J.	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Cunningham	
		Speaker Matijevich	Amendment #28 adopted
255		Conti	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #29
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Anderson	Withdraw Amendment #29
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Matijevich	
		Hoffman	Withdraw #30
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #31
		Speaker Matijevich	
256		Meyer	
		Speaker Matijevich	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	48.
	11:52	Byers	Oppose	
		Speaker Matijevec	Amendment fails, 3rd reading	
		Clerk O'Brien	Committee reports	
257		Speaker Redmond		
		Porter		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Matijevec	Announcement	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Lechowicz	Move adjourn until 10 A.M.	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES