

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

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order. The Members will please be in their seats. We will be led in prayer this morning by Father Allen..... Quincy, Illinois."

Father Allen: "Let us pray. Father of us all, we thank you for the many good gifts you have given us and for calling us to be your people. We praise you as God of creation and the Father of Jesus in whose image we seek to live. He loved all peoples and enriched us with his witness of justice and truth. Give our Legislators the moral strength they need to be men and women of justice and truth. Help them to seek out not their own personal welfare but the welfare of the citizens of our state. Help all of us to see that it is better to serve than to be served. Lord, bless us with all of your goodness. We make our prayer in Jesus's name. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1030.... that's out of the record. 1030 isn't agreed. House Resolution 1031, Dawson. 1032, Dawson. 1033, Dawson. 1034, Dawson. 1035, Polk. 1036, Kelly. 1037, Leverenz. 1038, Wikoff. 1040, Matijevech. 1041, Geo-Karis. 1042, Murphy. 1043, Jaffe. 1044, Waddell. 1045, Skinner. 1046, Lucco. 1047, Ryan."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Clerk O'Brien: "1039 is a Death Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, 1031 by Dawson and 1032 by Dawson and 1034 by Dawson recognize the Eagle Scout Award. 1035 by Polk talks about a professional librarian. 1036 by Kelly marks the 20th anniversary of the founding of City of County Club Hills of Illinois. Leverenz's '37 also honors boy scouts. Wikoff honors Champaign's Chamber of Commerce. Matijevech talks about Romero and Loretta C. Bourdeau. 1041 by Geo-Karis marks the Memorial Hospital celebrating it's 50th anniversary. 1042 by Murphy honors Honorable Allan L. Schoeberlein of Aurora who's retiring.... no, who's received the Pilgrim Degree of Merit of the Loyal Order of Moose. Jaffe's 1043 honors our colleague that we'll read later on maybe in the day. 1041...44 by Waddell notes



a 35th wedding anniversary. 1045 by Skinner talks about a German Democratic Republic. 1046 by Lucco honors the fire chief of the City of Edwardsville. And 1047 by Ryan notes that our Attorney General William J. Scott was selected to receive the Wyman Memorial Award at the 76th annual meeting of the National Association of Attorney Generals. And I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye' and those opposed 'no' and the 'ayes' have it and the motion carries. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Further Resolutions? Representative Daniels, for what purpose do you rise?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Res....."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute."

Daniels: "After this one, if you'll recognize me,"

Speaker Redmond: "Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1030, Peters."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee on Assignments. Now Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, parliamentary inquiry, if I might. Senate Bill 1783 is currently on Second Reading on the Calender. It is my understanding that it was read a second time yesterday. My question of the Chair is as follows: if this Bill is called today and placed on Third Reading, is it in a posture in which this House can pass that Bill within the rules of the House..... without granting leave of the House to do so?"

Speaker Redmond: "I'll have to wait until the Parliamentarian gets here and I'll get back to you as soon as we iron it out."

Daniels: "Would you recognize me then when he gets in?"

Speaker Redmond: "I will."

Daniels: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "I will. Death Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1039, Pechous-Klosak. In respect of the memory of Mr. John Karner."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi moves the adoption of the Death Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye' and opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries. The Resolution is adopted. Representative Kempiners, it is not too late. Representative



Van Duynes."

Van Duynes: "Did you ever hear that old saying that you never really know what true happiness is until you get married.... and then it's too late?"

Speaker Redmond: "To whom are those remarks?"

Van Duynes: "..... Don't believe it now, I was just kidding."

Speaker Redmond: "To whom are those remarks directed?"

Van Duynes: "I said in reference to Mr. Kempiners. You know, he's been trying to keep it a secret, Mr. Speaker. But I think it's somewhere around the weekend of the fourth of July like....."

Speaker Redmond: "Fireworks on the fifth. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to call to the attention of the Members that Walter Kozubowski is National Chairman of the Midwest Conference of the Council of State Government, which I think is quite an honor to him and to this Body. But I am happy to see that he has on the agenda one session which said the special workshop on how to cope with stress and tension during the Session time."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's the... who's the monitor of that, George Ryan?"

Friedrich: "No, it says Dr. Carl and Ellen Harshman.... St. Louis University."

Speaker Redmond: "What does he know about it?"

Friedrich: "I doubt if he knows very much if he's ever been in one."

Speaker Redmond: "I think we oughta....."

Friedrich: "I think Walter would know more about that."

Speaker Redmond: "What we really need is a pharmacist to tell us the problems there. Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Kempiners should be advised of the fact that it is not true that married people live longer than single people. It just seems longer."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, today we have a octogenarian going back to a tertiarian. Harlan Rigney has a birthday today. And happy birthday to Harlan Rigney from all of us. Happy bithday to you, happy birthday to you, happy birthday dear Harlan, happy birthday to you."

Speaker Redmond: "Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr.



Speaker. I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of the Bills of the following title to wit: House Bills #1270, 2540, 2600, 3201 and 3377. Passed by the Senate June 26, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of Bill of the following titles to wit: House Bills #2555, 3279, 3157, 3392, 3274, 297, 2105, 3296, 2911, 3124, 2985, 3327 and 3334 together with Amendments. Passed by the Senate as amended June 26, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Bachelor Epstein give you any counsel, Representative Kempiners? Did Bachelor Epstein give you any counsel? On the Order of Concurrence, 2843, Representative Freidrich. Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Would the record show that Representative Kornowicz is excused because of illness?"

Speaker Redmond: "Any objections? The record will so show. Representative Ryan, are there any Republicans whose absence should be excused? Is Representative Friedrich here? On the Order of Concurrence on page 8, 2843."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we nonconcur in this Senate Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion that we nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3."

Friedrich: "And that a Conference Committee be...."

Speaker Redmond: "Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye' and opposed 'no' and the 'ayes' have it. The motion carried and the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 and a Conference Committee is requested. Are there any other items on nonconcurrence..... that the Sponsor desires to nonconcur? On the Order of Concurrence..... 2554, is Representative Yourell on the floor? Out of the record. 2619, Representative Emil Jones. 2619, on the Order of Concurrence. Out of the record? 2707, Representative Terzich. Representative Terzich. Out of the record. 2775, Representative Jane Barnes. 2775."

Barnes, J.: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move not to concur in the Amendment."



Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Lady's motion. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Would the Sponsor hold this Bill for a bit?"

Barnes, J.: "Yes."

Madigan: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 2790, Representative Tipword.

Out of the record. 2835, Representative O'Brien. Out of the record. 2891, Representative Richmond. Out of the record. 2894, Representative Matejek. 2946, Representative Pierce. 2969, Representative McAuliffe. Out of the record. 2979, Representative Gaines. Out of the record. 2981, Representative Jane Barnes. Jane Barnes... 2981. Representative Jane Barnes."

Barnes, J.: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to move not to concur in Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Redmond: "2981."

Barnes, J.: "But I would like to concur with Senate Amendment #3 and Senate Amendment #4."

Speaker Redmond: "The Lady moves that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2981. Those in favor say 'aye' and opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Leinenweber, for what purpose do you rise?"

Leinenweber: "I just wanted to make sure that this Bill will come back once more. There's a person with extreme interest in this and I just wouldn't want him to miss the opportunity of commenting on it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I believe on the previous motion to concur, that that would require a Roll Call vote."

Speaker Redmond: "To nonconcur?"

Madigan: "I thought your motion was to concur on...."

Speaker Redmond: "Nonconcur on...."

Barnes, J.: "Not to concur on Senate Amendment #2, but I want to concur on Senate Amendment #3 and Amendment #4."

Speaker Redmond: "Nonconcur on 2. Now the question is on the Lady's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendments 3 and 4. Those in favor will vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Representative Walsh."



Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker, there's no point in doing this. If we're nonconcurring in a Senate Amendment.... we might as well just nonconcur and let the Senate....."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, you.... Representative James Houlihan."

Houlihan, J.: "For Mr. Walsh's edification, we've spent a great deal of time on this and we want the Conference Committee just to deal with the subject matter which we're not in agreement with. So by....."

Walsh: "Your...."

Houlihan, J.: "Representative Walsh, will you let me finish? By concurring, then we are in a position where the Senate may recede. We may not have that subject matter in the Conference Committee. As you know, the Conference Committees ought to be limited to the areas which are not in agreement. They should not go all over the ball field and put in completely new matters. That is the hope of the Legislature in the past. So Representative Walsh, you're out of order in that contention. No, that's very serious, Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Point of order. It's an exercise in futility, Mr. Speaker. This can come back OTB when the Conference Committee get through with it. There's no sense in nonconcurring and then concurring."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "For Mr. Walsh's edification... and it's rather early in the morning, I realize that Off-track Betting would be not germane to this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I think that the Lady is within her rights to have made the motion to nonconcur on 2 and concur in 3 and 4. We have attempted to limit the consideration of the Conference Committee to those items in which there is disagreement.... that's what we've tried to do. Have all voted who wish? It requires 89 votes. Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, I don't find these Amendments in my book and I wonder if the Sponsor would give us some indication what happened in the Senate."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes, J.: "Could you repeat that, Representative Satterthwaite? I didn't hear you."

Satterthwaite: "I'm just asking for information about what would be in the



Amendment we're asked to concur with. I don't have them and I'm just trying to find out what.... what we're doing."

Barnes, J.: "Well, number one, Representative Satterthwaite, I am not concurring with the Senate Amendment. This is the Illinois Arts Council Bill. And they've put a cut in the grant for 354 thousand, 700 dollars. And I moved not to concur with the cut. And while I know that it isn't essential to concur with Senate Amendment 3 and Senate Amendment 4, I just thought that I would let it be known that I was in agreement with Senate Amendment 3 and Senate Amendment 4. And they have put another Bill onto this Bill and it's involved with the Illinois Racing Board.... it's House Bill 2980. Representative, I don't mind answering your questions, but I wish that you wouldn't be talking to somebody else when I'm explaining it."

Satterthwaite: "Well, I just have a staff person here with a print-out of what these Senate Amendments are doing, that's all. I'm just trying to get some information. I don't know whether the rest of the Membership is aware, for instance, that Senate Amendment #3 adds 7.8 million dollars to this Appropriation Bill. I think that we've put 116 votes up there without really knowing what we're doing."

Leinenweber: "Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I understand.... I suppose it's possible for the Senate to recede so we might not get this Bill back again. I wonder if the Sponsor could enlighten us as to the poem that Representative Collins wrote to her on the bus in Ireland."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes, J.: "I feel....."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners, will you pay attention? Representative Barnes."

Barnes, J.: "Representative Leinenweber, I would really like to have Representative Collins tell you what that was about. It was just such a intimate, lovely poem."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Klosak. Your light is flashing too, Representative Klosak."

Klosak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to help the Democratic Representative who has some inquiries about this Bill. What we did in



2981 is take the Racing Board appropriation of 7 million dollars and tackit on to the Arts Council Bill in the form of Amendment #3 and 4 which we are asking concurrence in. Now the 20.... the Bill 2980, which... it did deal with the Racing Board appropriation has had a full and complete hearing in our Appropriation II Committee and that is the reason that Representative Barnes skimmed over it. Actually there's very little increase. There is approximately 160 thousand dollar increase over last year and that is due to the need for additional personnel because we have more days allocated in 1979, plus some laboratory equipment. That is the effect of Amendment 3 and 4, which we are asking concurrence in."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 121 'aye' and 16 'no' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3.... wait a minute now. We nonconcurrred in 2 and we concurrred in 3 and 4. Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "May I have leave of the House to change my vote to 'no' on 2981?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. Judiciary II, 3006, Representative Getty. Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, could we hold this for just five minutes at the request of the Majority Leader?"

Speaker Redmond; "Take it out of the record. 2894, Representative Matejek. Representative Matejek on 2894."

Matejek: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that the House concur with Amendment #2 to House Bill 2894. It amends the Lein Act to return Section #5 to the Act, which was inadvertantly deleted. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2894. Those in favor vote 'aye' and those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Representative Conti. Representative Luft, will you please sit down?"

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it's a little early in the morning for me and I would like at least a little explanation of what I'm voting for. The final days..... in trouble."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matejek."

Matejek: "Representative Matejek, it's a technical Amendment that returns Section #5 to the Act. The Section refers to.... prescribes that no payment to a contractor shall be regarded as rightfully made, as against any sub-contractor. So it fits in the sub-contractors also in being liable."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 118 'ayes' and 1 'no' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment 2. Representative Cunningham, for what purpose are you interrupting?"

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, no interruption intended and I know that's it's a trifle irregular but this historic House is honored this morning by having a distinguished personage from the Washington, D.C. Press Corps. The Honorable T.R. Reed, from the Washington Post who faces the Republican side of the Press Box. Stand up, T.R., so they can see you. Reed was my biography in the recent ill-fated campaign. And after it was over he said, 'I do not specialize in obituaries. That was a broad complaint. T.R. Reed, from the Washington Post. Forgive the interruption."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anything unusual in the Press being on the Republican side?"

Cunningham: "It's indicative of the intellectual capacity."

Speaker Redmond: "And political success. Representative Summer. Representative Cunningham. Representative Summer here? Representative Cunningham, would you mind answering an inquiry from the Chair? What was the prediction of the Gentleman from the Washington Post with respect to the winner in the Republican Primary? Whom did he predict was going to win?"

Cunningham: "A thousand apologies, esteemed Leader, but I didn't hear the question."

Speaker Redmond: "I say, did the Gentleman from the Washington Post... did he make the prediction in the Republican Primary to which you refer, and what was that prediction?"

Cunningham: "Like all of the soothsayers he was wrong because it was an illogical conclusion. History will vindicate his judgement."

Speaker Redmond: "How about his prediction in the Democratic Primary, was



that correct?"

Cunningham: "He sees nothing but disaster in the fall for the party of the jackasses."

Speaker Redmond: "And he was wrong in both of those primary contests, so it would follow that he'd be wrong....."

Cunningham: "As the night, the day."

Speaker Redmond: "3197, Representative Kane. Representative Kane on 3197."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3197. This is the Comptroller's operating budget for next year. And the Senate removed 213 thousand dollars from the State Officer's Salary Section for those positions in state government that have been vacant for a year or in some cases up to eight years. And the Directors of those particular agencies have told the Senate that those positions are not going to be filled in this coming year. And so the money to fund those positions is being removed from this Bill. And I would urge concurrence in Senate Amendment to House Bill 3197."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1. Those in favor will vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 119 'aye' and 15 'no' and the House does concur in Senate Amend..... Representative Ryan... Representative Schlickman, will you please sit down? I couldn't find Representative Ryan. I could hear a voice, but I couldn't see him. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "That's all right. Forget it, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there are 119 'aye' and 15 'no' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3197. 3220, Representative Vinson. Representative Vinson... out of the record. 3235, Ralph Dunn. 3235."

Dunn, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 3235 was to transfer a fund to the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Mines and Minerals. While the Bill was in the Senate, they added Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3. And I move to concur on these three Amendments. I thought someone might want to know what



they are. They're House Bill 2964.... it's the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Mental Health appropriation. It's some 400 million dollars. And these three Amendments that were added contains that Bill. I'd be glad to answer any questions I can about them, but it.... I'd move to concur."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "Was this a.... will the Sponsor yield? Is this the whole Mental Health budget then in this?"

Dunn, R.: "That's correct."

Anderson: "Well, what happens to the consumer's Amendment that was in there?"

Dunn, R.: "I tell ya.... I'd refer any questions about.... technical questions like that to Representative Kempiners, who is the House Sponsor of House Bill 298...74. He could answer that, I guess."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "What was the question, Mr. Speaker?"

Anderson: "What happened to the consumer's Amendment that was on the Bill?"

Kempiners: "The consumer Amendment is not included in here, Mr. Anderson."

Anderson: "Well then I don't think we should concur with this."

Kempiners: "I understand that it's being attached to a Commission Bill. I would urge that we concur in this. It includes the 3 million dollar cut that was made in Committee to the Department's budget. And I for one would ask the House to concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 as a matter of course. What you're interested in is coming in another budget or another Bill."

Anderson: "Are you sure it's coming, Representative Kempiners?"

Kempiners: "The information that we have from the Senate is that it is included in another Bill."

Anderson: "Well, I think Representative Dunn has a question too. He was Sponsor of that Amendment."

Speaker Redmond; "Representative John Dunn."

Dunn, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have a question. I'm not really sure for whom at this point. House Bill 2964, which is the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities' budget, as it now stands in House Appropriations II



Committee, it is amended to include the Amendments to which Representative Anderson just referred... the so-called Community Coalition Amendment. And if I understand Representative Kempiners correctly, it is not included in this Amendment. Is that correct, Representative?"

Kempiners: "That's correct. The Community Coalition Amendment is in another Appropriation Bill."

Dunn, J.: "Well, Mr. Speaker, let me speak to the concurrence then. It is true as Representative Anderson has indicated, that I have been trying to attach the Consumer Coalition Amendment to the Department of Mental Health budget and it has been a very difficult task because no one, until this very moment, has been exactly sure where the Department of Mental Health's budget is. It's hard to attach it on to something when you don't know where the budget is in the first place. For the record, the Community Coalition Amendment is not on any Bill at the present time. This is our only chance, those of you who support the Community Coalition Amendment.... which is an Amendment to provide additional grants to your local agencies back home. The agencies back home to provide services to the mentally ill, the developmentally disabled, to provide special residential care services, to provide for alcoholic treatment, alcoholic treatment care. These items... these services all can be provided in your local communities at a greater taxpayer savings than they can by the State Department of Mental Health. We have had success. This House has supported this kind of Amendment every year. Every spring we've added this Amendment on to indicate to the administration that we feel serious that the people who are in the local communities needing treatment should have taxpayer dollars following them. Over the years we have gotten into a situation where we have approximately 80% of the people who need mental services in the communities, but approximately 80% of the taxpayer dollars for the Department of Mental Health remain with the institutions. Everybody knows there's fat in the Department of Mental Health's budget. The Community Coalition Amendment seeks only to shift 8 million dollars. The Bill, I believe as it now stands on the Amendment to House Bill 3235, I think, contains a 3 million dollar cut, which the staff made. 3 million dollars was reduced from the budget. This Community Coalition



Amendment would add 8 million dollars on. We have not had a chance to do that. The only opportunity to do this was in House Appropriations II Committee with the Bill itself. And that Bill remains in Committee, did not get out of Committee. We have not had a chance to have a full hearing on the Community Coalition Amendment. And if we concur with House Bill 3235, that chance will be lost forever. We should nonconcur with House Bill 3235. Send this Bill to Conference Committee and at least give those who are interested in this budget a chance to have input through the Members of the Conference Committee on this Bill. I urge you to defeat House Bill 3235 and nonconcur. Do not vote to concur. Vote to nonconcur and send this to Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to correct an impression that I gave to.... in response to some of these questions. It's my understanding, for Representative Anderson, that the Amendment that he's concerned about is on a Commission Bill in the Senate. Representative Anderson, did you hear that? The Amendment.... I misunderstood your question. Your Amendment is on a Commission Bill in the Senate. Representative Dunn is correct and I gave the wrong information there.... that the Amendment that he is referring to is not on a Bill currently. However, it's my understanding it is going to be offered to a Bill which he is sponsoring, which is House Bill 3128... or has been prepared for that and also for Senate Bill 1469. So that, if this is correct, that the House will have an opportunity if they so desire to vote for that Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dunn."

Dunn, J.: "What Representative Kempiners says is true. I have been running around this Chamber trying to find the Mental Health budget and in every opportunity... file the Coalition Amendment to try to tack it on. I did take a Bill that I have, House Bill 3128... I have an Amendment filed, but that's a House Bill on Third Reading. The chances of getting that passed with the Coalition Amendment on it are two, slim and none. Now Senate Bill 1456 is a Bill that we thought at one time might have this budget in it and I believe that the Community Coalition Amendment may be filed on... on that Bill. But the



point is, this is where the Mental Health budget is now. And the Community Coalition people have not had a chance to be heard in connection with this budget. We should defeat this concurrence. We should then nonconcur and we should put this Bill in Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Edgar."

Edgar: "Would the technical expert on this Bill... answer a question? Where did he go? Where's Kempiners?"

Speaker Redmond: "It's pretty hard to hear you when you turn your head from the microphone."

Edgar: "Well, I was looking for Kempiners. Well,...."

Speaker Redmond, "Lots of people are. Representative Kempiners, if you were in your seat, Representative Edgar could direct a question to you. Don't be too nervous now."

Kempiners: "I'm not in my seat because I'm not the Sponsor of this Bill."

Edgar: "You're the technical expert though, you're the one answering the questions now. You mentioned the fact that this Amendment.... the Coalition Amendment was going to put on another Bill. Does this mean that the Department is going to support it on the Senate Bill?"

Kempiners: "Well, I would doubt that, Representative Edgar."

Edgar: "Okay, let me ask you another question. You said they cut 3 million dollars from Mental Health?"

Kempiners: "Yes, Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3235 reduces operation by 3 million, 4 thousand, 900 dollars."

Edgar: "Would the Department agree to take that 3 million dollars and give it to the Coalition?"

Kempiners: "It would be my understanding that the Department is not supporting this cut. The reason I am supporting it is because both Democratic and Republican staff in their analysis felt that this.... that this cut was justified. And I'm not saying... I didn't say the Department supports this cut, I'm saying that I, as a Sponsor of this Bill, support this cut."

Edgar: "But if this would go through there would be 3 million freed up that we could give to the Coalition, wouldn't it?"

Kempiners: "Well as you're aware, in Committee I tried to transfer a



million of this 3 million into the alcoholism line item... if you remember my activities in Committee, which were not successful."

Edgar: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes, E.M.: "Thank you, very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to concur in this concurrence on House Bill 3235. Both staffs of the House.... both staffs of the House and both staffs of the Senate has worked on this Bill and has worked on this concurrence. As indicated to you, I would imagine by the Sponsor, that there are relatively small difference between the recommendation of the House and the recommendations of the Senate. But to extend that.... but to extend that to all of those questioners that may be concerned relative to whether or not the Department is supporting this... to extend that in the Senate with these recommended cuts... and there is only 63 thousand dollars difference from the House, the Senate staff of both sides of the House sit down with the Department and said that these figures we... would be cut at this recommended level and for you to give us... you the Department, to give us where you can absorb these reductions and where you would propose that these reductions will be entered. What you have before you then is a... is in essence the reduction that the figures that have been offered to us directly from the Department for the individual reduction in this budget, which totaled approximately 3 million, 5 thousand dollars at this point, which the difference is only 63 thousand from the recommendation of the House. I agree with the Senate. These are... these are the areas where the Department has indicated to us here that these cuts can be absorbed, should be made on that basis and on the basis of the work that has been put in to this concurrence. I agree and would urge all Members of the House to support the Sponsor and the concurrence on House Bill 3235."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan."

Houlihan, J.: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I agree with the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee that the cuts that are here.... that are embodied in this Amendment, are legitimate cuts and that they're reasonable cuts. And they are apparently agreed to by all of the people who have worked on the budget."



The issue that Representative Dunn is trying to raise is that when we considered this budget in the Appropriations Committee there were other issues that were involved that the House ought to vote on. There were other issues that had not been included in the Amendments that the Senate offered. And Representative Barnes and I believe that if we agree with these concurrences we will preclude Representative Dunn from having an effective vehicle to consider those particular items, which were in fact adopted in the Appropriations II Committee. And I think by concurring we put ourselves in a position that Representative Dunn's issues cannot be addressed by the full House. Whether they are accepted or rejected is another matter, but anybody who wants Representative Dunn to have that opportunity... and I think that the Chairman of the Committee ought to want to have some of his Members have that opportunity."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as the previous speaker just indicated, there is no substantial disagreement on the Amendment that went on in the Senate for the Mental Health appropriation budget. However, it does only part of what our House Committee was suggesting be done to the budget. There is no way that we can really handle this issue unless it goes to a Conference Committee and there is an opportunity for the consumer Amendment to be considered there for this budget. Representative Edgar, I believe, has a very good point. The fact that 3 million dollars can be eliminated from the Department's part of the budget in no way means that we ought to reduce 3 million dollars from the total money available for mental health services in this state. There is a great need for additional funding in the community portion of our services for mental health and every opportunity ought to be afforded to provide that money for those services. Not only should we be sending this Bill to Conference Committee to have that consideration made there, but I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that when a Conference Committee is appointed on this Bill we need to be sure that the Membership of that Committee is really representative of the action that was taken in the House Appropriation II Committee. We should be assured that that Conference



Committee will include Representative Dunn or Representative Anderson or some of the other Members who were staunch supporters for the community Amendment. And I recommend to the Speaker that this consideration be given when it goes to a Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would concur with the remarks made by those who suggest that we concur in this particular piece of legislation before us now. And I suggest to you that a couple of the real... very real reasons for doing that is; one, that the staffs on both sides of the aisle and in fact on both sides of the rotunda have ended up in agreement in terms of the fact that these 3 million dollars in cuts can end up being made. Secondly, what must be considered is the fact that when the so-called Coalition Amendment for 8 million dollars was considered there was not a Member in the Senate Committee who would offer that Amendment in Committee. So from the very practical matter of trying to move things around to have that stuck into that Amendment would have brought problems in terms of some resolution of that issue on the Senate floor. The Senate attempted to resolve that issue, I think from a very practical kind of way in going... in what they're going with in attempting then to consider the Coalition Amendment as a separate... totally separate item aside from the budget... as a whole. I would request that Members of the House carefully consider their vote here and in fact move... support of Representative Dunn's motion and the others here who speak in favor of concurrence on House Bill 3235."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "In the past I've stood in support of the Department recommendations with regard to grants to mental health... community mental health facilities, but at this point I think we've waited long enough. It's time for the Governor and the Department of Mental Health to come up with the names of the five or six mental health institutions that are no longer needed in the State of Illinois... to close those institutions and to transfer the money to the communities. I am... I conclude after having badgered Dr. DeVito for over a year as a Member of the administration's party, that



that we're never going to get an answer out of the gentleman until we force it out of him. I think sending this Bill to Conference Committee will be a step in that direction.... just as was support for deleting the 29 million dollars for for the jail in Centralia when we have other mental health institutions.... of when we have mental health institutions that could be converted to prisons for substantially less money. So I would urge a 'no' vote on this concurrence so that Representative Dunn can continue to put the heat on the Department."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dunn to close."

Dunn, R.: "Thank you, Mr..... Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Dunn coalition seems to have fallen apart today over a friendly little 3 hundred and..... 423 million dollar budget, and that's not too bad. I would urge that we accept the Senate Amendment and concur on House Bill 3235, which includes House Bill 2964, the Department of Mental Health appropriation. I think it's been pretty well explained. The staff has agreed on the recommended cuts, which totals 3 millions, 4 thousand, 900 dollars. And I would urge a concurrence."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 3235. Those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 104... 105 'aye' and 48 'no' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 3235. 2891, Representative Harris. Representative Ebbesen, for what purpose do you rise?"

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was called off the House floor on that last Bill. Could I be recorded as voting 'aye'?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to be recorded as voting 'aye'? Hearing no objection, request is granted. Representative Richmond makes the same request. Is there any objection? Hearing none, Representative Richmond will be added to the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Amendment #1 to 2891 is a School Aid Formula revision that distributes new school aid dollars next year in a way that is fair to



every section of the state. All Members of the House know the problems we've had in the past few weeks with the School Aid Formula. Several weeks ago we adopted the School Aid Amendment on the floor of this House by a large majority which indicated that the feeling of this House... that the schools in the City of Chicago should not receive any more than 30% of the new dollars going to schools next year. We have no desire to penalize the City of Chicago. I want to emphasize we have no desire to penalize the City of Chicago.... should not receive any more than 30%. We recognize that the City of Chicago because of its very size and complexity has special problems, many many special problems and deserve special treatment. I want to emphasize, deserves special treatment. At the same time; however, we cannot and we must not penalize the rest of the state. The formula embodies in the Senate Amendment gives the City of Chicago a 30% of the new dollars to educate 22% of the public school students in the State of Illinois, in comparison to the formula Bills that we originally to us that gave between 42 and 52% of the new dollars to the City of Chicago. And some 15 to 18 million are redistributed from the City of Chicago schools to suburban and downstate schools. The formula in the last several years has resulted in several financial hardships for downstate schools particularly. And the change that we are proposing today for...is a... goes a long way towards correcting those inequities. There are a number of specific changes in the formula that I will briefly mention. Number one, the tax rate that unit and elementary districts must levy to qualify for maximum state aid are reduced 7¢ and 4¢. Number two, the guarantee for people with the maximum tax rate is increased from 1260 per pupil to 1293. The percentage increase for Strayer-Haig Districts is increased from 25% to 50%. The maximum increase in state aid that any one school district can receive over the previous year is increased from 25% to 35%. Number five, a maximum decrease that any one school district can receive in state aid next year is 10%. Number six, the maximum weighting of Title I students is decreased from 75 one-hundredths to 67 and 5/10ths one-hundredth. Number seven, the minimum weighting of Title I students is increased from 37 and 5/10ths% one-hundredths to 45 one-hundredths. Number eight, the first .375 of Title I weighting for



school districts larger than 50 thousand students is earmarked for a specific attendance center where the Title I students attend. The total cost of these changes in the formula... next school year will be 72 million more than we distributed in the School Aid Formula this year. That represents a 5 and 5 tenths% increase in formula funds this year...less than the increase in the cost of living. Hear that, less than the increase in the cost of living. If education is our number one priority, which in my judgement everyone in this House knows the value of education in the State of Illinois, we have all said that it is and then.... it is a sum that we can all live with. This is a formula that is good for the whole state. This is a formula that is almost identical to the formula that 115 of us voted for three weeks ago.... 115 of us voted for this formula. The provisions are almost the same. The cost has only been scaled down by 12 million. I urge a vote.... positive vote for School Aid Formula for fairness on Bill 2891 as amended."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, it's so nice to join Clyde Harris this morning.... Clyde Harris.. the new southern leader who has been born recently on a Bill. Clyde Harris comes out of this as John Porter was going to come out of it earlier. A few moments before this Amendment was attached to his Bill... he was not aware of the magnitude, as was John Porter earlier in the game. Unfortunately John Porter is no longer now going to be leading the field, but he will have his own Bill, which will put him down in infamy. What we're doing here today is simply saying to those of our friends in Cook County and Chicago that we've always.... I'm a little bit tied up right now.... what we're simply.... he pointed out that I still owed him 20 dollars from the appropriations party, which I did not get to attend last night, Mr. Speaker. I'll bring that to everybody's attention. What we're attempting to do today is say to all of the people downstate and the suburbs and to our friends in Chicago, that this year.... hopefully when we all depart from the General Assembly and six months later our administrators do not come back to us and say, 'We heard what you were going to do to us, but my God, what really happened?' Today is no different. On our desks are printouts



that are getting to be in numerous colors and in numerous figures. Every year since I've been down here the figures have been different on each and every one. And I think you'll find it's the same way today. The printout that you received three days ago is different from the one you received two days ago and the one that you received this morning. What we are attempting to do is to put a coalition, however, on all of those printouts meeting different people's attitudes and coming up with a final determination of what downstate is really and truly is going to receive this time. The State Board had made a recommendation for those of us downstate to receive an increase of a 2.3%. If you'll look at the Amendment now and what we feel that it means to us in downstate, it looks to be closer to 11.6%. There are many districts who you are going to have downstate who you're going to have real problems in going home and saying, 'I really helped you this year.' Because when they look at the amount of money that they thought they were going to receive and the amount of money that they are going to receive, it won't be as much as we had originally said, but without this Amendment let me assure you, that they would have received considerably less. We're providing a 90% hold harmless for the school districts for those who have the problem of declining enrollment and the increased property tax. We are putting on the infamous Jones' Amendment, which is one that we have been wanting to do... and we have been trying to put on our Bill. And Mr. Harris is able to work this coalition out with the Senate. We are helping those Strayer-Haigs although... as has been pointed out to me by my good friend from DuPage, a limited number of Strayer-Haig Districts. We are helping those districts out because it's obvious of their need. All in all if this Amendment had been placed on our desks at 10:00 yesterday morning and an opportunity for us to have looked at it yesterday instead of being placed on our desks at a quarter of 6 and asked to have voted at 6, I think this Bill would have been placed out last night. We have no objections to what is attempting to be done here. We think it's great that the downstate Democrats and the Chicago Democrats have finally joined the Republican Party and have decided



that it's time that we give that we give all districts an equal amount of money. We enjoy the coalition that we had with Mr. Stuffle and Mr. Kane that we had earlier in the Session. We hope to continue on with that type of coalition. All we're concerned about is to make sure that all students in the State of Illinois receive an adequate and a fair share. I just... I think this Amendment does it and I support Mr. Harris and would like to see this Amendment passed."

(continued on next page)



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Well, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, first let me say that I'm glad to see that some enlightenment is coming from the other side of the aisle. At this very moment there's circulated measures around that said that this Bill doesn't do enough for Chicago or doesn't do enough for another region. There are people who are still trying to oppose it; but the enlightenment shows that we the Democrats have come together and are going to stick together solidly, no matter what comes from the other side of the aisle, to pass a Bill here today that is good for all of the people of Illinois whether they're Democrat or Republican. It's the children of Illinois that we're concerned with. The Democratic Party has put together here, in my opinion, an excellent School Aid Formula Bill for the entire State of Illinois. There have been rumors going around that Chicago... Chicago does not get enough. Frankly, Ladies and Gentlemen, Chicago has agreed to this Bill because it is equitable for the whole state. We have the opportunity..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner, please!...Come to order."

Brady: "We might have the opportunity to try and be obstructionists and do nothing, so that Chicago could reap money and the rest of the state may get hurt; but we entered into negotiations early in this Session to say that we need a new formula because the old one is inadequate. Under this year's payout Chicago is getting 410 million dollars in state aid. If nothing happens but to fully fund the present formula Chicago would still gain because of its position in the present formula...it would receive up to 422 million dollars. But Ladies and Gentlemen, because this coalition was put together we now are participating at a level of 431 million dollars, an extra 9 million dollars above that or 21 million dollars in new state aid for the City of Chicago. Chicago school children definitely need that money. And that 21 million dollars will bring us into the 31 percent level of the funding of the distributive formula for state aid, holding us consistent with where we were last year. My opinion, Chicago can live with this formula, can equitably live with it and in so doing will be assisting the rest of the children in the State of Illinois;



to add on new monies that we've been able to prioritize (sic) and find...that Governor Thompson didn't find in his budget. Governor Thompson would have been 26 million dollars below this level in his budget;..of course since then, he's found 7 million in the air somewhere, so he's 19 million below this. But, Ladies and Gentlemen, in my opinion and the opinion of the Democrats, the 19 million dollars is there, it is a priority to spend it on education and I urge all of your support on this good Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to make a couple of observations. One, this will be the first year since 1973 that we will be moving away from equalization or moving away from what we call in school aid circles, fiscal neutrality. You look at the printouts that have been distributed comparing what would happen under the present formula for next year and what will happen under this, you'll see very quickly that the rich get richer and the poor get poorer. For example, Cairo's increase will be 1.46%. East St. Louis actually will get less under this program. Posen-Robbins, 3 tenths of a percent, Markham 4%, Madison 2, Granite City 6. The two poorest counties in the state ... at the tip of the state, Alexander and Pulaski, one gets 2% and the other one gets 1½%. But if that's what you want to do... if that's what you want to do then that's what we're going to do. And some... some of the comments that have been made and will be made will be countervailed by the facts. But as frequently happens in this kind of a situation, you do what you can do to maintain what you think is your position, philosophically. You do what you can do to maintain the principles that you think ought to be applied. And when it comes down to the final decision to push you button, you frequently have to rise above those principles. And so today I stand before you as one Member of this House who will rise above his principle and will vote for this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, last evening we had some problems with this particular Bill in the concurrence. I



think that they've been worked out in most cases. At that time there was much ballyhoo about a number of things... about what this concurrence did. And somehow some people seem to think it was entirely different than the proposals embodied in the ... House Bill 2903, sponsored by myself and Representative Kane earlier and in the so-called reference to the Polk-Stuffle Amendment which has been on your desks for many days. There were many comments about who was or wasn't in the Chair and what wasn't being done. But I say to you now, that I think both sides have participated in this program. Representative Polk speaks for the Republicans in claiming credit for a Republican proposal and a coalition. I speak now to say that the Democrats have helped achieve this. The Speaker is, contrary to many people's claims last night, deserving of applause for helping ... working out disagreements. He is in the Chair, he is directing this activity. This concurrence is the same. This concurrence proposal, I reiterate, is the same as the Stuffle-Kane Bill with only one minor difference of 7 dollars on the guarantee. It is the same in its distribution pattern as the Polk-Stuffle Amendment. It is the same as 2903, which received on Second Reading in the same form... virtually, 112 votes. It is fair to downstate, it is fair to Chicago, it is fair to the suburbs. It does restrict the Chicago base to 31% of the new money, but that is fair with 22% of the students. In contrast to a proposal of the State Board of Education, instead of cutting down state aid by a half a million dollars this year, this proposal increases that aid by 12 million dollars. And it does so at a state-wide cost of 17 million dollars less than the State Board's proposal. It is not partisan. It's Democrat and Republican. And I ask you to vote not on the basis of party, but on the basis of your schools in your district. Don't be taken in because this is the only game in town. There are little or no alternatives. There are only two that I see and that is going to a Conference Committee where.... I have to admit I think downstate and suburban areas have always lost from the formula. The other possibility of an alternative is to end up with nothing. Some have circulated things showing districts getting less



than last year. In some cases that is true because they were overwhelmingly overpaid, but this proposal sets a base for those districts. It makes changes supported by virtually every education group in our districts, the farm bureau, the school administrators, the School Board Association and the Illinois Education Association. It increases over the aid, otherwise that would be available this year, tremendous amounts in suburban and downstate areas. Peoria County schools would receive a 15½% increase over the aid that would otherwise be available this year. The Evanston School District's 35%, DuPage 11, Cole 17, Vermillion County 12 and so on down the line. So I urge you to join the coalition, Democratic and Republican, to hammer this out... to keep it out of the Conference Committee for once, to vote for the students in the school districts who need the money. Take the money. It's available. We can afford this program and we should support it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Speaker... Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, last week I was criticized for asking to have the Clerk read an Amendment. If the other side of the aisle... didn't throw a 17 page Amendment at us last night.. the last few minutes of the Session, we could have gotten together. I'm sure that there's no pride in authorship of this Bill. If we had had the opportunity to read this Amendment, we could have had this Bill passed out of the House. The only difference between the Bill that Polk and Stuffle gave us about a week or ten days ago is... a little bit more responsible. They're not betting on the 'if come' on the 30 million dollars. Now I'm going to rely very heavily on the Governor, that if he feels that we're not going to get the 30 million dollar grant, that he use the amendatory veto power. But I want to extend my appreciation to the Polk, to Stuffle and to Gene Hoffman who helped me... and Schneider, who helped on the School Problems Commission. I think that this is a good Bill. I don't think there should be any pride in authorship and I think we all ought to get behind it and vote for it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."



Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this motion for concurrence on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2891. It has often been said that compromise is the genius of the legislative process. I submit to you that the development of this Bill is a classic example of the compromises that can be reached when reasonable people from both sides of the aisle and from all regions of the state enter into a negotiation with the thought in mind that they wish to construct a School Aid Formula which will be fair and equitable for every school district in this state. Some have said that the amount of money that will be provided to the Chicago Board of Education under this Formula Bill is less than would be provided to the Chicago Board of Education under the current Formula Bill. I submit to you that those of us from the City of Chicago entered this Session and entered into negotiations on this formula change, knowing full well that we would receive less money after the negotiations than we are now. We are willing to accept that because we recognize that it is in the best interest of the people of the state and the operation of this Legislative Body that this compromise be negotiated and that it be entered into the statute books of our state. I suggest to you that those of us who have worked actively in this process have done an excellent job. They ought to be commended. They ought to be remembered by us for many many months to come. I thank them and I recommend an 'aye' vote on this motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, like every downstate Legislator, I have a particle of paranoia in all legislation that so vitally affects the great Metropolitan area of Chicago, but neither my talented staff nor my gifted advisor in matters of education, the young man from Charleston, have been able to find the kicker that we suspect is in here for Chicago. And in view of their inability to find this kicker, I suggest that we should examine this legislation objectively with our suspicions laid aside. With that premise, I would say this to you and I hope that it is not being over simplistic, we should recognize that there are two factors in this type of legislation. One is the formula



and the other is the price. So we should say, is the formula right and is the price right. Of the formula, those of us from downstate must recognize ... it's been underlined here again and again, the formula is right for downstate. It's an act of unequal magnanimity that Chicago would yield on the old formula which would have benefitted them over us. But now as to the price, is the price right? No, the price is too high. Last year we spent 1.7 billion dollars. This year His Excellency has said that there are 110 million dollars in the cupboard that can be spent additionally for secondary and primary education. So we are confronted with the fact that the formula requires a little more money than we have in the till of the Governor said available.... 30 million dollars. But do not despair of that because the Governor has a pen with which he can make a reduction veto. Let every educator in the State of Illinois recognize that when we pass this legislation we do not guarantee 100% funding. Let them not come back in a few months and say, 'We were tricked'. You'll be... end up with about 98.5%, that's 30 million dollars less than full funding of this fine new formula. Recognizing those realities, I urge each of you to join with me and cast an 'aye' vote not alone for the little children for whom we each anguish, but also for your downstate taxpayers. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Emil Jones."

Jones, E.: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am proud to rise and join my downstate leader, Clyde Harris and support this Bill.... House Bill 2891 as amended. For the first time since the Resource Equalized Formula was adopted in 1973, those children across the State of Illinois who generate the millions of dollars in the School Aid Formula are being included in this Bill. They aren't being counted this time, Ladies and Gentlemen, but they are being included. Those are the individuals who need the additional resources to bring them up to parity as far as education is concerned in the State of Illinois. So I am proud to join with my colleagues from the City of Chicago, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and my new downstate leader here, Clyde Harris here, and... and support House Bill 2891 because all the children... all the children across the State of



Illinois will benefit and that's what we are about."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a historic moment for school funding in Illinois. Five years ago we introduced a new formula for school aid in the state. And at that time Chicago School District was having tremendous problems. And we passed a School Formula that helped Chicago and has helped Chicago over the past five years... repaired a lot of the problems they had five years ago. And we put a lot of money into the City of Chicago. And I think that that has helped them and it's helped the whole state. We've come now to the realization that it's time to help the other school districts in this state, particularly those that are in the downstate areas that have been particularly hurting over the last two or three years. And as we joined with Chicago five years ago, Chicago is now joining with us now to help the school districts in this state that are particularly hurting. One of the earlier speakers said that the changes in the formula today are moving that formula away from equalization and that we're putting money.... we're making the poor districts poorer and the rich districts richer. And a number of school districts were named which he said were getting small increases. But, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to point out that it all depends on what it is that you're comparing things to. And the small increases that he was pointing to are increases on top of increases that they would have already gotten under the formula if it had not changed. Those increases are not increases over last year. The differences that are in the printouts that are on our desks are differences over what the old formula would do next year if there had been no changes. He mentioned the City of East St. Louis and the school district of East St. Louis; well, under the old formula East St. Louis would have received an additional 5 million dollars next year over the current year. This new formula gives them that 5 million new dollars plus a little bit extra. And the implication is that that little bit extra... only 1 or 2%, is all of the increase that East St. Louis is going to receive. Well, that's just



not true. East St. Louis is going to receive more than 5 millions dollars more next year than they received this year. And I think it's very necessary that when we're talking about figures for school aid, that we make very clear what kinds of figures we're talking about and what kinds of bases that we're moving from. The poor districts in this state are still going to be getting large increases over what they got last year. I think the one difference between this Bill and the proposal that has been around before, some people are talking about fiscal integrity and that we shouldn't be betting on the federal money before it gets here, is that what we're saying with this formula is that we are going to tell the school districts of this state now when they're putting together their budget, how much money they're going to have to spend, that the state is going to take the chance on whether or not the federal government puts that money into Illinois. We're saying we're going to take the chance, not the school districts around the state. I don't think that we should leave the school districts around this state hanging until October or January or February to know whether they're going to get an additional guarantee of 10 dollars per student or not. There's no way that school districts can function under those circumstances. The State of Illinois with balances of upwards of 100 million dollars in the General Fund can afford to take those chances. I think that this is a good formula. I think it's good for all of the state, the price is reasonable and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keats."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry to dampen the enthusiasm the Members have for the concurrence of this Amendment, but I do believe, Mr. Speaker, that from the standpoint of consistency and integrity, I must raise a parliamentary inquiry and that inquiry is one of germaneness. Mr. Speaker, a year ago to this date there was a House Bill amending the Criminal Code which



went to the Senate. And the Senate amended that Bill affecting the Criminal Code. It came back to this chamber for concurrence, Mr. Speaker, and you established the precedent that day, which I think was welcomed and I appreciated it although it subjected me to some political abuse. What you did, Mr. Speaker, a year ago was to rule that you as Speaker have the authority to rule with respect to the germaneness of a Senate Amendment. Also, Mr. Speaker, you determined a year ago.... don't get on the telephone, Mr. Speaker, listen to me. You determined a year ago, Mr. Speaker, that the subject of a Bill is not the chapter of the revised statute that's being amended, but rather the content of the Bill. Now, Mr. Speaker, directing your attention to House Bill 2891; the subject of this Bill is the expansion of the definition of safety education."

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

Stuffle: "On a point of parliamentary inquiry too. Last week at the behest of Representative Tipsword and myself, we asked you with regard to a Bill that amended the School Code if an Amendment to the same School Code dealing with an entirely diff....."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I don't consider that that's a point of order and I will recognize you for debate....."

Stuffle: "Okay, will you recognize me after that?"

Speaker Redmond: "And with respect to Representative Schlickman, I think I must put Representative Keat's question and then we'll go back to you for conclusion. His question was shall.... the previous question. So the question is shall the main question be put? Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no' and in the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. Now Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we have here a Bill as it was passed by this chamber that dealt with the subject of the definition of safety education. Now this Amendment has nothing to do, Mr. Speaker, with the subject of safety education; rather as was described by supporters of the concurrence of this Amendment.... we have a Senate Amendment dealing with the formula by which public



schools in this state will be aided. And I respectfully suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, putting aside the merit of this Amendment, but concerning myself, Mr. Speaker, with your consistency and integrity in assuring me that what you did a year ago and which I supported was not politically motivated. I respectfully suggest that you have no alternative but to rule, Mr. Speaker, that this Amendment is not germane and therefore should be ruled out of order."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, on that point, last week Representative Tipsword and I rose to question the germaneness of an Amendment to the School Code on a Bill where Representative Hoffman attempted an Amendment dealing with school holidays. The original Bill had nothing to do with the Section on school holidays. We asked you if the Amendment was germane and you responded that it was. Representative Tipsword then asked you why and you said because both the Amendment and the original Bill amended the School Code. Thus, I think Representative Schlickman is wrong and you have set a precedent not only on the issue but even with regard to an Amendment to the School Code specifically."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I will remember the ruling with respect to House Bill 1500. The reason for the ruling there, not only because the Senate had not passed upon it, but also the Bill, 1500, contained in the title.... it was an Amendment for the habitual criminal. So it described... it was limited to that very restricted subject matter. In this particular case, both the Bill and the Amendment are Amendments to the School Code. The Parliamentarian advises me and I concur that the Amendment is germane. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if you will look at the title of the Bill as it was passed by this House, it refers to a specific Section of the School Code. Now the Amendment refers specifically to two other Sections of the School Code, Sections that deal with entirely different subject matters. And I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, if we're going to have rules, if we're going to have a deliberative process, if we're going to have consistency, if



we're going to have integrity, all those things that I know you've stood for... at least prior to your elevation to Speakership, that you revert back to your good ol'days and find... and so rule that this Amendment is not germane."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I've ruled on that and in my honest opinion and judgement there's a big difference between this and 1500 because 1500 was limited and restricted to the habitual criminal law. Now Representative Harris to close. Would the Gentleman standing between the Chair and Representative Harris please sit down?"

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think that we all see in the Members of the House that all groups have been consulted, compromises have been made. Yes, we aren't all satisfied. In my judgement, this is the best compromise that we could have for schools. All I ask is a favorable Roll Call. Members of the House can offer for education for all the best education that Illinois' ever had. Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2891. Those in favor vote 'aye' and those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Lee Daniels to explain his vote. One minute and the timer is on."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm supporting this Senate Amendment but I want to caution you on one thing. The State Board of Education recommended a 46 million dollar increase for the City of Chicago over last year. This Amendment gives them 21 million dollars. In fact, there is a loss over the State Board Education's recommendation. Now be careful if House Bill 2632 comes back to you. That's the Bill that contains the operations and grants program because that's the one that the City of Chicago may make up it's 25 million dollar loss in bilingual education and also in teacher's retirement. So let's see if the City of Chicago really has lost money under the State Board of Education and let's support this as we are doing. It's an excellent compromise by downstate legislators on both



side of the aisle."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brady..... Bradley rather. I mix fellows up. Only one has and one hasn't."

Bradley: "We're not going to..... vote together.... Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "A 'd' and a 'l'."

Bradley: "Thank you. I'm not trying to take time explaining my vote because it's very obvious that this Bill is going to pass, Mr. Speaker. But I would like to very definitely thank the Chicago Members and the suburban Members on this side of the aisle for realizing in... that downstate was in a serious problem funding their schools. I'd also like to commend Senator Joyce for taking this Amendment and placing it on Senator Buzbee's Bill and putting it before us here this morning. I think that's very significant that the Senate has recognized four days before we're leaving this Session on Friday, the great need we have in downstate Illinois. It was said that some are not completely satisfied with this legislation. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to go on record that I am satisfied with this piece of legislation. It recognized the need that we have....and I think it recognized all all those meetings that were held throughout central and southern Illinois last winter and early this spring. We have a problem. The problem is being solved here to a great deal... to some extent. I don't know how we could be any fairer. And I'm simply rising to thank those Members from Chicago, from the suburbs because I have had downstate Members coming over to me for the last week and especially the last three or four days saying, 'Is Chicago really going to go with us on this? What are we having to do... what are we going to give them?' The answer is nothing. Chicago is for good government and I appreciate them being with us today and realizing that we have this need. And I thank them sincerely. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich. One minute to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I read a book one time about what to do if you don't have a choice. Well, I have a choice in this matter. I



can either vote for this or vote for something that comes out of a Conference Committee appointed by Representative Madigan and Senator Hynes. The truth about the matter is, this is a great compromise. Chicago, who has less ADA than they had before, gets 21 million dollars more. Every county in my districts gets less dollars than they did last time. Now the guys that are for this say, 'Okay, you better take it because it could be worse.' Well, that's a heck of a reason for voting for a Bill because I've gotta go home and explain that the state is gonna put 120 million dollars more into school education and every county in my district gets less money. What kind of a compromise is that? We get the short end of the stick again. And if some of you guys will look around you'll see from this printout, you're gonna get less money. Let's see you go home and explain it. The only thing I can say is, it could have been worse and believe me that's not much of an explanation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipword, one minute to explain your vote."

Tipword: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I'm very happy to stand to support this Bill. And I very much appreciate, as others have mentioned, what so many have done here on the floor in working out this compromise from all sections of the state. I'm happy to support this Bill even though it isn't our total answer to our school problem. We have for instance in our district... one district... or within our legislative district, a school district that getting a 432% increase, that's magnificent. That takes them from 2 thousand dollars to 14 thousand dollars, which may run them for another day or two. But nevertheless, overall this is the best thing we've ever had in downstate Illinois and for our schools throughout the entire State of Illinois in any year that I've been in this Legislature. I would just simply like to point out that this is not the answer to our total problem. It takes care of an urgency that we have today, but we've got to do something about the State Formula. We talk about the poor districts and the rich districts and we base that upon the valuation



of land. Land is no longer a true indication of the resources that are available to schools. The land may be worth a lot, but the income from it may be very very small in accordance with the weather that we have...for instance, relating to farm land. It may be very small after you take out the taxes of other kinds that are taken off of that land, whatever that land may be. We've got to revise our formula in the future. And regrettably, I'm not going to be here to help on it, but I know that you will all do a good job in revising it to better relate it to what the resources are throughout the State of Illinois, what the income resources are to the people and upon a completely new formula base the kind of funding that we're going to give to our school districts in the state because if we don't, we're going to have this kind of a problem occurring year after year after year. I commend you for what you've done here today and I know the work that you're going to do on the formula in the future. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sumner."

Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm voting 'yes' on this Bill because at least we are starting the redistribution of funds downstate. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't know who the negotiator was for the suburbs in this Amendment, but let me tell you maybe we should have some additional ones next year. One chart they didn't give to us Democrats was to show what our school districts got last year as compared to what they get under this Amendment. I know why you didn't bring it out, because it would show every school district virtually in my area is getting less money this year under this so-called... downstate Amendment than they did last year. Now true, they're getting more than they would have under the present formula, but everyone knew that the present formula was going to be amended... that it didn't work, that it was obsolete. Now I'm going to support this Amendment because it's the best that we can do and it does give us more money than we would have under the existing formula. But I wish someone



had had the courage to gives us a chart showing how much less money our school districts are to get this coming year under this concurrence Amendment than they did last year. Because that would have been, I think, a shock to many of you suburbanites here and you would provide for those figures. And I think the down-staters country-slicked us on this one and they came out very well, they're happy, they're patting themselves on the back, but the suburban school districts and parents and children are going to be very unhappy when they see how much less money they get this coming year under this so-called compromise than they got last year. But apparently this is all the choice we have and we could come out even worse, I suppose, so I'll vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the only.... I don't want to address myself to the Bill... just say in response to the last speaker, if you'll get the Senate printout they will show that comparison and you have an additional column to work with. And for the benefit of each Member of the House, a little arithmetic and you can figure out what that differential is by just getting the printout from the Senate, which has that additional column."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan. Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, in a word of that immortal Chicago philosopher, Jane Byrne , this Bill is downstate grease. The formula is wrong and the price is too high. It's not necessarily good for the party, good for the state, or good for the children. We're in a tank simply because we, as Democrats, do come to a conclusion that sometimes you have to try to agree on a particular thing. But I'd like to point out to all of my colleagues that we of Chicago are in fact taking it on the chin. You are in fact taking it away from us. It's not coming out of the sky and it's not just pie. But I say that we are of a spirit that says that sometimes you have to look at the common good. And I wonder when the City of Chicago has a problem and we are pinched, where will our statemen be, or will everything we do be considered Chicago grease? Thank you."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think we've said enough on this subject. The fact remains that Doug Kane, Ben Polk, Schneider, Stuffle... Bill Harris and others who worked on this compromise have at least given us something because if we didn't accept it, we'd get nothing in my area. And frankly, I think a compromise between parties is more important because our school districts are not going to understand whether we're Democrats or Republicans. And I have faith in Governor Thompson that he's going to do the right thing when this Bill hits his desk."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As hyphenated Chief Sponsor of this Bill, I'm extremely pleased to find that we have a... the major Bill of the Session attached to it. And naturally of course...I urge it's passage. But I... unless it's been said... in appreciation of those who worked out the compromise, I think... well... to add to what Geo-Karis said, I would like to acknowledge the efforts of those people who.... I've been reading about in my mail all spring. The school ... people are asking me to support the Kane Amendment, the Stuffle Amendment, the Bradley Amendments and Bills, McClain, Polk, Hoffman, Brady, Schneider, Jaffe and Lucco. These people are the ones who really worked out in the background and got this thing put together. And as a coalition, I think we have something I think that we can be very proud of. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bennett."

Bennett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just very briefly... and a new something different than what has been said here today. I, six months ago, formed an Advisory Committee on the School Aid Formula made up of superintendents, principals, teachers, school board members and just by chance we met in Springfield yesterday - about eight or nine of us - and digested the Polk-Stuffle Amendment. We didn't know what was going to happen of course, last night or today when we did that. I was really interested in getting their reaction because I know in the past when the Legislature has



adjourned and you've gone home, you've run into this problem downstate - what did you do to us? I got their reaction on, at least the Polk-Stuffle Amendment, which was certainly... similar and alike of what we're going today. And their reaction was tremendous. And I think that points out what you can expect when you go back to your district from your school people. They're going to applaud you once and for all."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want you to reflect on the words that Representative Bradley used in describing this School Formula. He said, 'This is going to help our downstate schools a great deal... to some extent.' And I think that's very true... to some extent. I have very few school districts in my entire legislative district that are going to gain any money over last year, predominately they are losing money over last year. And I've got to go home and tell them, 'Look, you're getting hurt, but you're not getting hurt as badly as you would have if we had not passed this formula.'..... and that is completely true. Let me say, in my estimation if you want to be fair and honest about giving 'A's' to your school pupils back home, there's only one fair way to do it and that is by an actual flat grant per student. And believe me, if I am fortunate enough to come back next year, I intend to introduce that type of legislation. Forget your formulas. Give the... treat all the kids in this state equally. Give us a flat grant per student... that is fair."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the vote on the board does indicate the interest all of us have in finding a solution. And I think it does also indicate the bipartisan nature of the solution. I want to express my thanks knowing how difficult these things are, serving on the Appropriations Committee and having been at one time or another on negotiations on other kinds of issues, how difficult these things be. And I think the Members of the House ought to know that the participants



in this; Polk, Stuffle, McClain... down the line, Schneider, those people who have worked on this have done an extremely good job for all of us, Democrats and Republicans, for all of us from one end of the state to the other states. And I think also what deserves mentioning here is the fact that an organization that some of us at one time or another might have had some doubts about and some concerns about was very instrumental in attempting to reach a compromise on this issue. And I publically extend my thanks, not only to the Member... individual Members involved on both sides of the aisle, but also my thanks to the representatives of the IEA for their input and their activities in reaching this compromise."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to explain my vote, but I do plead with you to turn off the T.V. lights so we can stop all this explanation."

Speaker Redmond: "I think you're right. According to the rules, you're not permitted to take pictures during an explanation of vote. Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have a very painful decision to make. When this Bill was the Polk Bill and the Republicans were accused by my good friend from the other side of the aisle from Chicago, of taking money away from Chicago, I opposed it. And now that it has become a Democrat Bill, it still takes money away from the poor kids in Chicago. I'm going to have to vote 'no' in protest in the name of the disadvantaged students in Chicago whose money has been taken away. I'm going to have to vote 'no' in protest on behalf of the teachers in Chicago whose money's been taken away when they have to teach disadvantaged children. And I'm going to have to vote 'no' because they are taking money away from those students who need it the most. I don't care whether it's a Republican Bill, a Democrat Bill or a compromise Bill. It still takes money away from the poor and gives it to the rich. It's going to pass so Emil Jones' Amendment is safe. Therefore, in protest on behalf of all



the kids whose money has been taken away, I'm going to have to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think this is a day that the down-staters, the people in Leadership, and those people who are responsible for putting together this compromise should be very happy in sharing it. I received quite a bit of mail from people in my district in regards to this issue. It's one of the biggest issues we have to vote on. It has a direct effect on local... property taxes. And I think that another concern is full funding. I hope that the Governor will go along with the Legislature and full funding this particular formula. I think it sets a better base for future negotiations. I hope also that he will reconsider his position on debt service for school construction so that we can make this Session one that we can remember in equitable treatment for all of the school districts throughout the State of Illinois. And I'm very happy that we came to this... this end. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker, I see there are three who are not voting and I believe that they're absent so I don't see where you have anything to gain by continuing this harangue on explanation of votes. I would suggest to you to exercise the good judgement of the late Ralph Tyler Smith when he was Speaker. And when you see that there are more than sufficient votes, that we cut off the explanation of votes and go on to the next order of business."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want to add my appreciation for the tremendous job that my colleague, Doug Kane, has done on this... on this legislation in this instance. It has been a most serious problem in this district in particular and I salute Doug and all of the others who have worked out this fine resolve."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I



think in all of the years I've been in the General Assembly, I've never seen a resource equalizer that's actually been fair. When I first came here, downstate controlled the Legislature, Chicago was getting the short end of the stick. After the one-man, one-vote rule, it's a different situation... we still didn't have a fair resource equalizer formula. But I want to say to you today that this is a compromise, there has been compromise. And I think this is the fairest approach that has been made to the School Aid Formula since I've been here. And I commend every one of those people who worked so hard to get this job done. I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, you don't know how dangerous it is up there, you know. That Gentleman next to you is going to push you over and he's going to use the Attendance Roll Call for some business up there."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't push so easy. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 173 'aye' and 1 'no' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2891. Senate Bills, Third Reading. I didn't give you the warning did I, John? Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if before you go to Senate Bills, Third Reading, if we could go to ... back to 3006. I had asked that it be held for five minutes and I thought it was with the understanding we could go back to it."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, what was the number of that one?"

Getty: "3006."

Speaker Redmond: "Back on concurrence. 3006, Representative Getty,"

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 3006 is the Bill which was technical in nature to clean up certain language and technical problems with House Bill 1500, the Criminal Justice Reform Bill. The Amendment, which the Senate added, Senate Amendments #2 and 3, add technical language and provides that costs may be a condition of a court imposed probation or conditional discharge and further provides that other reasonable conditions,



inserting the word 'reasonable' as limiting language... to conditions which a court may impose in its proper discretion. That's Amendment #2. As for Amendment #3, it clarifies language in the Habitual Criminal Section, Article 33b, which seemed to give immunity from the death penalty to a habitual criminal which was not the intention of House Bill 1500. It was the intention of House Bill 1500 to remain silent on the point.... and that clarifies this aspect of House Bill 1500. And I would move for concurrence in Senate Amendments #2 and 3."

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

Leinenweber: "Then it's fair to say, Representative Getty, that these are strictly technical.... without substance?"

Getty: "That's correct. The entire.... by agreement on both sides of the aisle and with the Governor's Office, this Bill, House Bill 3006, was to carry only technical clean-up type language and that is all that this does."

Leinenweber: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the.... the Gentleman... Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan, D.: "I have a question of the Sponsor if he'll yield please. Mike, on Senate Amendment #2 in lines 16, 17 and 18, the language... the new language in the Amendment would be that the court may in addition to other reasonable conditions relating to the nature of the offense or the rehabilitation of the defendant as determined..... What exactly does that do? Does that expand or limit the court as far as its powers on the imposition of a condition of probation?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mike Getty."

Getty: "It was the intention to make clear that the conditions that would be imposed by the court.... must bear some relationship to the offense or the rehabilitation of the offender placed on probation, not something completely out of line. And it was a fear expressed because the language seemed to be possibly overbroad. Some people brought it to our attention."

Houlihan, D.: "So in effect then what this does is.... is does not



give them leeway to impose conditions other than those already specified in this statute, but it limits those conditions to be related to the offense and to the rehabilitation. Is that correct?"

Getty: "Right."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3006. Those in favor.... 2 and 3. Those in favor vote 'aye' and opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? It's been called to my attention that former Representative Bill Barr is the Speaker's gallery. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Is he a Democrat or a Republican?"

Speaker Redmond: "Nonpartisan, I think. He left here to run for Mayor of Joliet. And I.... Senate Bills, Third Reading. Senate Bills, Third Reading.... Senate Bill 2038. Didn't I? Yeah, on this question there's 156 'aye' and no 'nay' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #2 and 3 to House Bill 3006. Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We in Will County are glad to say that Bill Barr is a Democrat."

Speaker Redmond: "And we in Bensenville are also glad. 2038, Representative Porter. 2038, Senate Bill, Third Reading. 238."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 238. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Porter."

Porter: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this was a Bill that started off doing a great deal. The Senate amended it down so it's more or less of a merely Bill. And while it was probably or likely at some time going to have a moment of great glory, it is back to the merely status with which the Senate sent it over to us. None of the Amendments, of course have been offered and the Bill does really only two things. If a school district in Illinois wants to conduct minimum competency testing voluntarily, then this Bill would merely allow the Illinois Office of Education to provide assistance if it was requested to do so. Absolutely nothing is mandated. If a school district then does conduct minimum competency testing the Bill would allow the IOE to



gather information about that program and whether it is successful or is a failure and to gather that material together by 1980.

That's all the Bill does. It does not mandate anything except a report so that we can gather together information to know about the program. And I would urge the Members to support the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Taylor. James Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Mr. Speaker, I have an inquiry of the Chair... the Clerk. I'd like to know if my name is included as a hyphenated Cosponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Porter, do you know?"

Porter: "Yes, it should be, Jim, because I made that request on the floor of the House after the Bill was reported out of the Committee, as you remember. It should be."

Taylor: "Well, thank you, Mr. Porter and the Clerk. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in support of this legislation. I do think it is very much needed in our state and I would urge support of all of the Members of the House for Senate Bill 238."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise also to support this concept. If I were to express one dissatisfaction it would be that... it should apply to all of the agencies."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Peters, for what purpose do you rise? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 146 'aye' and 8 'no' and the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 250 Representative Leinenweber."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 250..."

Speaker Redmond: "No, Sandquist."

Clerk O'Brien: "... a Bill for an Act to revise the law in relation to mental health and developmental health disabilities. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Sandquist."

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



this is the first Bill in a series of four that have.... that deals with the problem of mental health. This is the main Bill which revised the Mental Health Code. It came out originally of a Governor's Commission back in 1973. There were over two years of study that was put into this by a staff of 36 Commission Members and 47 advisory members and consultants. From that, a number of Bills were introduced. As you know, there was a Joint Committee of the House and the Senate that studied these Bills. And this main one, 250 sets up the right of the patients who are in need of mental health care.... it sets up the fact that they can refuse care unless they're causing physical harm to themselves or to others. It sets up the procedure which we discussed yesterday in Amendment #19 whereby... at the present time now, both clinical psychologists, psychiatrists and physicians; as well as qualified examiners who are social workers and registered nurses with psychiatric training can make decisions affecting the admission of people on involuntary commitment. I think this is something that Illinois can look forward to... this package of Bills. And I certainly urge your support. Representative Houlihan might... Dan Houlihan, who is Chief Cosponsor, will close the debate."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan, D.: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a significant Bill that is before the Body today. It is a result of several years of work, both by a Commission appointed in 1973 by the then Governor and worked on for two to three years by that Commission and then addressed specifically in legislative form by a special Joint Committee of the House and the Senate. There has been.... not only considerable work done, there has been considerable debate as to all provisions of what is now in this Bill, a complete revision of the Mental Health Code of Illinois. It may as well be called civil rights for the mentally ill, which is the guiding principle of the Bill. One of the significant features of the Bill is that we have incorporated the professional in the treatment of mental health along with the medical profession, as far as addressing the needs of mentally



ill persons. In the ~~form~~ now that the Bill has been amended, I think it has addressed the basic concerns of those who did have some apprehension as far as the scope and the specific contents of the Bill. I think those concerns have been resolved substantially and I join with Representative Sandquist in urging the Body to support the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask the Sponsor a number of questions concerning this legislation.... if Representative Sandquist will yield."

Sandquist: "I'll yield."

Darrow: "Representative Sandquist, in this legislation you make provisions for the patients to do some sort of work and be compensated for that work, is that correct?"

Sandquist: "That is correct. That's consistent with the current status of the law."

Darrow: "That won't have any bearing on the current employees at a state hospital, would it?"

Sandquist: "No, it will not."

Darrow: "Now, also... if a third party objects to the discharge of a person from a mental health facility, could this be possible.... could a state's attorney, for example, object if a patient were being released who had been placed in a mental facility due to his... let's say, not guilty by reason of insanity...a situation such as that?"

Sandquist: "Yes, he could object."

Darrow: "At the hearing.... he would not have to file a petition on his own?"

Sandquist: "That is correct."

Darrow: "And in this legislation... the provision in there regarding observation of a patient every fifteen minutes, is that still in the Bill?"

Sandquist: "Yes, that's still in. That's in seclusion, that is."

Darrow: "All right, now if...if a sixteen year old were to commit himself to a mental health facility or if a fourteen year old



were to seek counseling without his parent's consent, would the parents be liable for that?"

Sandquist: "No, they would not. It's the same as current law and there's a special provision on it."

Darrow: "Well, who would pay for it?"

Sandquist: "The... the same as under current law."

Darrow: "Well, I'm not aware of who pays for the counseling... for example, if a fourteen year old went for four sessions with a psychiatrist, who would pay for that if the parents wouldn't?"

Sandquist: "Well, there's no parental liability. If it's a public aid recipient, it would be paid by public aid."

Darrow: "But what if he isn't.... if his parents aren't on public aid?"

Sandquist: "There's no parental liability if there's no parental consent. The person then would be.... who did the treating may not get paid. It's similar to going to a school counselor."

Darrow: "Now another question is...it's my understanding that if the patient wishes, he may have free access to the telephone."

Sandquist: "Generally yes. It can be restricted by the Director, but ... of the institution, but generally he does have it."

Darrow: "Would this include long distance telephone calls?"

Sandquist: "Well, within reason, yes."

Darrow: "Well, would there be any restriction on that, depending on the person's mental capacities? For example, you're not going to allow a person who's hallucinating to request a call to the President or something like that?"

Sandquist: "Well, it would be the judgement of the treating people, but he does have the right to make those telephone calls. Anything can be abused, but he would have that right and they... they would... the treating people would have to make the judgement."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the Gentleman kindly bring his question to a close."

Darrow: "Well, I have one other question with regard to the.... as I recall there were some Amendments here to shift the burden of the cost from the state to the county.... the various appointment of counsel and things like that. Was that Amendment successful?"



Is the county picking up the tab or is the state still picking it up?"

Sandquist: "It's the same as under current law. They would be."

Darrow: "The county would still be responsible?"

Sandquist: "Yes."

Darrow: "And this would include the appointment of attorneys?"

Sandquist: "That's right."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to briefly address this Bill. I think the concept contained in the proposed legislation is very good. I think it does provide some.... some good interpretation, some liberal ideas and thinkings that... when it comes to the treatment of the mentally ill. However, there are some problems with it, the technical aspects of it, that I hope the Members would be aware of. I think what we would be doing today is passing this legislation out and then next year we'll be back having to amend it. I think the concept is good, but I'm going to be voting 'present' because I'm not too sure that we should pass it out. I think we should hold it in Committee and do a little more studying on it. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keats."

Keats: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Will the Sponsor yield for some questions?"

Sandquist: "Yes."

Keats: "Okay, I would like to ask some questions concerning the appeal process. One of the major problems we have had in this area is the fact that no one ever seems to be responsible on appeals. What significant changes are there in the appeals process today from the past one that has been such a problem?"

Sandquist: "Well, the appeals are handled by the court and there's no changes on that, Roger."

Keats: "Okay, there are no changes. In other words, an individual can hire an attorney to defend him or herself, right?"

Sandquist: "Right."

Keats: "All right, now who pays for that attorney?"

Sandquist: "Well, if the individual hires them, the individual pays



for it. "

Keats: "If the individual cannot pay, who will pay?"

Sandquist: "Well, a number.... it could be the public defend.... on an appeal it would be the appellate defender."

Keats: "Basically what you're saying is the taxpayer will pay though. That would be safe to say?"

Sandquist: "If they can't afford it, yes. That's true now."

Keats: "Okay, moving to appeal on the thing, that's true now and that's part of our problem. How far can these appeals go? Is there a set level or could virtually every appeal be taken to the Supreme Court at the taxpayers' expense?"

Sandquist: "Well, they could as in any other field. They could be, but...."

Keats: "Well, this is the question we asked.... it could be taken to the Supreme Court, but is it safe to say that the Supreme Court Justice's knowledge in the mental health field is probably significantly less than would be a practitioner in the State of Illinois or at some lower level where the individual may have some expertise in that field?"

Sandquist: "Well, yeah.... it depends on whether or not constitutional questions would come up in the Supreme Court."

Keats: "Okay, what we are saying right now, we are prejudging court decisions. What I'm asking and what I'm particularly worried about-and we've seen as a problem in the mental health field-is that no one seems responsible. Everyone is willing to pass the buck because they know that it can continue to go up through the court system. Why do we not have an appeal system set up within those who know something about the field? I'm saying this in anyway to deride Judges in Illinois or in America, but their knowledge in the mental health field would be substantially less than a practitioner in that field. Why do we not have an appeals process that deals with practitioners in the field who might actually know something about the subject?"

Sandquist: "Well, I think some of your.... what you're talking about is considered in another Bill that's coming up.... the advocacy.



That does provide for experts in the field and the whole human rights authority, but that's in another Bill."

Keats: "Well, what I'm saying is that there's no limitation to be sure that it's experts dealing with it. We are throwing everything into the court. I don't think the term would be to call this the 'Welfare Act for Lawyers of 1978', but what I am asking is, why do we not have a direct tie-in on this Bill with experts so that when a patient does have some form of problems.... why can that patient be assured that they will be viewed, judged and treated by people who have expertise in the field rather than simply an outside party?"

Sandquist: "Well, this Bill certainly encourages that. It sets up that every patient is entitled to treatment and a treatment plan. Once you get into the courts though, you can't set up a separate system of courts for this field.... like any other field."

Keats: "Well, we're not asking for separate courts. What we're asking for is an appeal system within the experts. Instead of having a Bill... I know from the legal point of view, we're saying that everything should go to the courts, but there are many people in the world who are not lawyers.... in fact, it might even be a majority of people in the world who are not lawyers, and they might feel that there is someone who has expertise and that some civil rights are not being violated simply because someone who knows something about the subject is involved. To turn it over to the Judges is not a guarantee that that individual will receive fair treatment. If anything, in this case, it's almost a guarantee that they will not receive fair treatment."

Sandquist: "Well, I really..... really don't know what that question is."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Will the Gentleman bring his remarks to a close?"

Keats: "Okay, may.... I finished with a statement. I appreciate the questions. I know some of them are vitually rhetorical questions... it is difficult to ask. But one of the major problems with the Bill, it isn't simply what Representative Darrow has said, although he has raised some very important points within the Bill and that



there is virtually no control, but the second factor is the appeals process. The involved individual who may actually have serious problems will be thrown back into the court system with people who know nothing about the subject. And that individual is very capable of falling through the cracks. This is Bill, I don't really think has enough safeguards for the individual. And in reality we'll simply keep many of America's lawyers busy in the near future at the taxpayers' trough being paid to handle court cases that in no way will help the aggrieved person but will simply pay a few legal bee.... fees for a few lawyers. I ask you to listen to what Representative Darrow said because he raised some excellent points. And think about it.... there is no appeals process to protect the individual. This is simply an appeals process to protect the lawyers."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff."

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

I don't want to make.... ask any questions on this proposition, rhetorical or otherwise. I just want to make a statement based on my personal experience with the mental health program and how it works. As this Bill moved through the Committee, I had higher hopes that at last we were going to put some reason and sanity in a in a institution that lives up to the expression, snakes pit. And I think of the snake pit primarily due to the way the personnel who operate these facilities function. One of the reasons I have a low opinion as to any good that may come of this is the psychiatrists themselves.... at the moment they are in a inter-mixing battle with the clinical psychologists as over who should have the right to sign the qualifying certificates. I stated yesterday and I submit again that in the area of involuntary commitment, that you very seldom see any as long as the psychiatrists have anything to do with it because as Representative Keats pointed out, buck passing doesn't stop with the psychiatrists it will begin with the psychiatrists. And I would like to see after this Bill has been promulgated and signed into law, the type of minimal competency tests given to the psychiatrists



to see if they're even aware of the laws that have been promulgated in House... SenateBill 250. For that reason, I'm going to stay on 'present' when this comes... comes time for a vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell. Bus."

Yourell: "Yes, would the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Yourell: "Representative, does this Senate Bill still have included within it Amendment #12?"

Sandquist: "No, it does not. It was withdrawn yesterday."

Yourell: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentle...."

Sandquist: "Wait a minute.... but it has 19, which is similar to 12."

Yourell: "Is that the same as 12?"

Sandquist: "No, it's not the same."

Yourell: "Did the clinical psychologists have an objection to 12 and because of that objection it was withdrawn and then 19 was put into it?"

Sandquist: "The clinical psychologists, I believe, had an objection to 19 as well. Nineteen was worked out, what we the Sponsors thought was a good compromise. Neither side is really completely happy with it, but I think everybody is in agreement that the Bill should pass."

Yourell: "Well, now... finally what you're saying is simply that Amendment #19 is not exactly the same as Amendment #12, but rather it was.... amended with an agreement wherein the clinical psychologists did have an opportunity for input. Is that correct?"

Sandquist: "Well, they still have an opportunity for input. They do sign one of the certificates. They are raised to a higher level than they are now.... and are recognized as such."

Yourell: "Well, I've had some objections to Amendment #12. They want the Bill, but there were objections to Amendment #12. Now, are they... would you say that I would still have a problem with those people who had indicated to me an objection to 12 by adopting 19?"



Sandquist: "I will be honest with you. You will still have some clinical psychologists who will object to 19, but it is a better Amendment, from their standpoint, than 12 was. But I will admit that you will still have some objections."

Yourell: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dawson. Dawson."

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move the previous question."

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

Sandquist: "Well, I think you've heard enough about this Bill. It's a great step forward. It might not be perfect, but it is something that the State of Illinois needs. And I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 250 pass? All in favor vote 'aye' and all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Bowman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask some questions of the Sponsor, which seems like we won't be able to do during the explanation of vote phase, so I take a pass."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly, to explain his vote. The timer is on. Kelly."

Kelly: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I did want to ask Representative Sandquist about the Section dealing with the counseling for minors. I would liked to have known what type of counseling is being provided, not only under this legislation, but under the current system. And it seems to me that without parental consent, lots of things in the counseling area that I don't favor... I don't go along with. And I'm just going to vote 'present' because of that. I don't.... I vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 123 'ayes', 16 'nays' and 16 recorded as 'present' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Kindly record



Mr. O'Brien as 'aye'. And Garmisa as 'aye'. Mr. Adams, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Adams."

Adams: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have leave to be recorded as 'yes' on 238. It won't change the outcome."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to be recorded as 'aye' on Senate Bill 238. Is there any objections? Hearing none, the Gentleman will be so recorded. Mr. Stanley, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Stanley: "Yeah, I'd like to be recorded as 'aye' on this Bill. I was just off of the floor for just a second."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to be recorded as 'aye' on 250? Any objections? Hearing none, the Gentleman will be so recorded. Senate Bill 252. The Lady from Cook, Miss Pullen."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 252. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Probate Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 252 provides for a limited guardianship for disabled adults, those who are ruled incapable of taking care of all their own affairs. At this time, someone who is ruled legally incompetent can have a guardian appointed, but in so doing that person loses all his rights. This Bill would provide for a limited guardianship so that he would still be able to maintain many of his rights. And there would be someone to take care of whatever problems he would not be able to take care of himself. It will do much to prevent our older people from having to go into nursing homes and it will help them to maintain their independence. I urge a favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 252 pass. All in favor vote 'aye' and all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 158 'aye', 1 'nay', 2 recorded as 'present' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 253."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 253. A Bill for an Act to create the Guardianship and Mental Health Advocacy Commission. Third Reading



of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, there are two hyphenated Sponsors along with myself, Representative Marovitz and Representative Telcser. And I would like to turn this over to Representative Marovitz at this time."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill, Senate Bill 253, is a result of bipartisan work of a Governor's Commission appointed in 1973 and subsequently a Joint House-Senate Committee to revise the Mental Health Code, which was also bipartisan in nature, all of whom came up with agreement on this particular piece of legislation. It is my belief that this Bill now before us is the single most important piece of legislation for the mentally ill in the State of Illinois. It creates the Guardianship and Mental Health Advocacy Commission, under which there are three divisions. The Legal Advocacy Service, the Human Rights Authority and the Office of State Guardian. The Legal Advocacy Service will provide legal representation for the mentally ill and proceedings relating to mental illness, such as commitment and discharge and transfer. It is an independent agency to protect the statutory rights of the mentally ill in the State of Illinois. It's one thing to legislate right, it's quite another thing to protect them. The second division is the Human Rights Authority which provides informal volunteer ombudsman type boards across the state to informally mediate questions or disputes relating to the mentally disabled. The Human Rights Authority would be staffed by volunteers patterned after a successful Human Rights Authority in Florida. This is a state-wide system of voluntary lay advocates. Finally.... the final division is the Office of State Guardian which would serve as guardian of last resort for mentally disabled persons in the state who require a guardian and have no one else to serve. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Mr. Speaker, as I said, I think this is one of the most important single pieces of legislation that we have



pending today. We have dealt in this House with pieces of legislation that are important to our individual districts. This is a piece of legislation that is important not to one district, but to fifty-nine districts throughout the State of Illinois. It's important to every individual throughout the State of Illinois. We're talking about people, not pork. And I think that this Bill deserves the serious consideration and the support of every individual in the House of Representatives. It is supported by the Illinois Mental Health Association, the Illinois Association for Retarded Citizens, the Illinois Psychological Association, the Illinois Nurses Association and it is supported in concept and structure by the Department of Mental Health. It is endorsed by the Illinois State Medical Society. It has been worked on for the past five years. It has been endorsed by papers throughout the State of Illinois. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I seriously wish everybody would take a look at this Bill, give it your favorable consideration, and vote 'aye' for every mentally disabled individual in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there's one point with respect to this Bill made by a Joint Sponsor with which I agree. Yes, it is important and yes, it deserves your serious consideration. Once you give that consideration and once you look at the Bill as he asks you to do, your response... I believe, must be a 'no' vote. Now what the Sponsor didn't tell you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, is that by Senate Bill 253 we would not only be creating a Commission, we would be creating an agency of state government. More government, more bureaucracy. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we wouldn't be just creating any ordinary state agency, we would be creating a state agency independent... free from any other governmental agency. And that's exactly what this Bill provides in Section 3, page 2. Consider what other governmental agencies include. First and foremost with respect to accountability of public funds is the State Auditor General, expressly by Section 3. We would have a



new agency of state government and we would have one by its terms, free and independent from audit and accountability. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, you go on. We would be creating an agency of state government with the authority to issue rules and regulations to be promulgated and directed towards other state agencies. And these other state agencies would have to respond to this state agency within a prescribed time as to why it didn't comply with the rules of regulations of that state agency. And then in Section 8, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we would be mandating the Director of this state agency to provide legal council and representation for recipients of services. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, by this Bill we would be creating the largest law firm, public or private, in the State of Illinois. You go on, Mr. Speaker. I know it's 1978, but by this it sure shows that 1984 is right around the corner. In Section 17 on page 8, we would be giving this new agency of state government, independent of all other agencies of government, in the course of an investigation the authority to go onto property, public or private, and conduct whatever investigation it desires, quote.... 'within reasonable limits and in a reasonable manner'.... end of quote, without defining what is reasonable and without requiring due process i.e. securing a warrant. Further, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, talking about 1984....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Will the Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to to close?"

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I am about 7 minutes, I've got 3 to go."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm giving you a warning right now."

Schlickman: "Section 28, we give to one of the Regional Boards, people who are not nominated and confirmed by the Legislature, such other action as may be reasonable and appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act. Absolutely no limitations on their authority with respect to other state agencies and with respect to private agencies. And then look at Section 35, for those of you concerned about fiscal responsibility. For the first time to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House,



in Section 35, we relate the appropriation of one agency of government to the appropriation of another agency in state government. Specifically, it provides in Section 35 that the annual appropriation of this Commission shall be no more than 1% of the annual appropriation from the General Revenue Fund to the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. Now you know what minimums are like, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, they become the maximum. And sure we appropriated about 1.5 million dollars this year, but if we take the annual appropriation D.H..... M.H. and D.D., we're talking 4 million dollars. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, sure this is an important Bill..... it's awesome. And it is deserving of your consideration, serious consideration. That should mean, I think, a 'no' vote. A new state agency, independent and free from other agencies of government including the Auditor General. And independent state agency mandated to provide legal services to all recipients. A new state agency empowered without any inhibition or restrictions....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to a close."

Schlickman: "Just a minute, Mr. Speaker. A new state agency empowered without warrant to go about the property of any other state agency and upon property of private agencies. And all of these public and private required to respond to rules and regulations. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is a Bill that is deserving but it's deserving of a 'no' vote. And I urge your 'nay'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, no one could follow up any better on the indictment that Representative Schlickman just returned on Senate Bill 253. Everything he said is absolutely true. The only thing that can be said on behalf of this Bill is that one of the most blantly unconstitutional provisions of it was amended out by Representative Marovitz on Second Reading. And that was the provision that mandated that the three branches of government appoint members to this Commission, which is an



executive agency. Once again, just to review the apparent constitutional violations in this Bill, the search and seizure provisions of both the United States and the State of Illinois Constitution are absolutely violated by the authority we are giving this agency. We are creating an independent executive agency within the Executive Branch of government independent of the Auditor General. There will be no one to review how the money is to be spent by this Commission and it can be an awesome amount, this year a mere 1 million, 5 hundred thousand dollars. And I suggest to you the debate.... the other night when we were going through Commissions one by one, we didn't find any Commissions with any where near that type of appropriation. But as pointed out by Representative Schlickman so appropriately, the 1 million, 5 hundred thousand is just this year. Next year assuming that the total appropriation for the Department of Mental Health... to be 40 million.... it can have up to 4 million. It'll be higher next year, you can bet that because of the Bill we just voted on a short time ago. But the real hidden cost here, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as Representative Schlickman again pointed out, is what cost we're going to impose on other agencies of government by an executive agency with no one to review it. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in the name of all common sense and fiscal responsibility, please vote 'no' on Senate Bill 253."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz to close."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to address myself to one of the points brought up by one of the previous speakers; and that is that it is not subject to the purview of the State Auditing Act and the Auditor General. Nothing could be further from the truth. And if one would check the State Auditing Act; Section 3-12, they would find that this particular agency, as all state agency and their officers, must comply with the terms of the State Auditing Act. This is very definitely not independent of the Auditor General. This is not independent also in... in that the members



of the Commission... the nine members of the Commission are all appointed by the Governor, each and every one. So therefore, if we talk about independence, it's only independent in the sense that it's independent from other agencies. This Commission and boards and divisions of the Commission can only recommend rules and recomm.... recommendations to other state agencies. Any citizen in the State of Illinois can do the same. There is nothing mandatory about the suggestions that the Commission will give to various state agencies. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we stand here each and every day and talk about serving people. It's easy to talk about service to Illinois citizens. It's very easy for all of us to talk about serving our constituents. It's easy to talk about serving people who are less fortunate. It's easy to talk about com.... combating mental illness, but now is the time to put that talk into action. Now is the time to talk about really helping people and get away from talking about pork for awhile. Now is the time to act. The real question in this particular piece of legislation is whether we, as elected officials, are prepared to spend a comparatively small amount of money to provide effective advocacy for the interest of individual patients or whether the system will operate in its vast, impersonal, bureaucratic way without accountability and without the focus on individual's rights and needs which effective independent advocacy can assure. Surely our society and we as elected officials in the State of Illinois should look with favor and be concerned in providing structured assistance to those who are least able.... and I repeat, least able to assert their own rights, and therefore can suffer grave injustices in state institutions. I have a letter here from the Department of Public Aid and it says that the Department of Public Aid is of the opinion that some or all of the costs associated with the Guardianship and the Legal Advocacy Service that we're talking about today could be and would be reimbursed under Title 20 legislation, federal funds. Consequently, we're talking about a small amount of money compared to the rights and the needs and



the mental health of every citizen in the State of Illinois. This is the most important legislation for the mentally ill that we have heard in this House. And I respectfully solicit your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 253 pass. All those in favor vote 'aye' and all those opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I simply submit that we would be better off spending this money directly on the improvement of mental health by spending it one new professionals and new employees in the agency, rather than creating this new agency."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Beatty, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to explain my 'yes' vote. This question has been studied now..... currently for about four or five years. And these recommendations that we find here are one of the things they're supposed to prevent are the dumping of patients into the different communities because as this Bill requires, if there's a question on the family's mind as to whether a patient should be discharged or not, there will be a hearing on it. And the state will not just be able to dump them as they have dumped hundreds of people in Representative Marovitz's district. And so this Bill is part of the package that is necessary.... the whole package is tied together. Each time a patient is to be transferred or any action is going to be taken, if there's any disagreement and the patient's good is going to be considered, he's he or his family have the right to interpose themselves so that the state does not have absolute control over the patients. And I think that this is most important. I think one of the aspects of this package also deals with the treatment of patients. If they're entitled to legal services, there is some help that can be given them by a doctor or some medical service that they are not getting. It is my



belief that this law and the other laws in the package will enable the mentally ill to get the treatment that will help them become....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Will the Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to a close?"

Beatty: "..... back in our society. And so I think, Ladies and Gentlemen, we should really pass this Bill to help the people who are not able to help themselves. I ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Madison: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I heard the explanation from Billy Marovitz, but since the alliance has apparently been broken, before I vote I'd like to hear Penny-Pullen's side."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 108 'ayes' and 48 'nays' and 10 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 255."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 255. A Bill for an Act to protect the confidentiality of records and communications of recipients of mental health or developmental disabilities services. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Lee Daniels is the Joint Chief Sponsor of this legislation. The current Illinois statutes record the privilege of confidentiality to only certain designated therapeutic professions. And the statutes govern each of the professions according to different standards and frequently in an inconsistent manner. Furthermore, there exists no statutory privilege to protect persons consulting therapists other than those specifically designated in existing confidentiality laws. Thus, Senate Bill 255 has attempted to consolidate the standards pertinent to confidentiality into one comprehensive law. The statutory provisions would extend to persons who provide to mentally disabled persons. And the term mentally disabled



is a new term that has been put into Section... Senate Bill 250 and refers to the mentally ill and also to the mentally retarded. Before there can be any disclosure of a record of confidential communication, the informed consent of the recipient with certain exceptions, is required. Nothing in the statutory revisions precludes the therapists from making limited disclosure to prevent a recipient from causing imminent physical harm to himself or to others. The recommendations also define exceptions to privileged and judicial administrative proceedings. This Bill, as far as I know, has no opposition. It's one of the Bills that has been worked over thoroughly with the consent and the knowledge of all of the participants involved and all the agencies involved, including law enforcement, the psychiatrists, I'm glad to say the psychologists and all others. And I ask for a big green vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 255 pass. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 156 'ayes', 1 'nay'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 309."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 309. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Dan Houlihan. Danny. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I may have just a moment please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Surely. Will get right back to it, if you'd like. Put up 386. We'll get right back to it. Senate Bill 386."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 386. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 386 starts a series of five Bills upon which you received a great deal of communication in support of



the package put together by the School Problems Commission, the Illinois Office of Education, and most recently... since the Bill came over from the Senate to the House, working in conjunction with the Code Department and the Governor's Office. House Bill 386 provides that the State Board of Education will supervise all educational programs for the handicapped, including those administered by other state agencies. And it would work out that this supervision is a joint program between the Illinois Office of Education and the state agency. You will also find, in 386, procedures for evaluating, identifying and placing handicapped children in special ed. classes. It revises the hearing appeals and the fact that you have to have an IUT for all children who are placed... worked out in cooperation with all of the ... all of the parties involved."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 386 pass. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Yes, Sir. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keats. I'm sorry. Have all voted who wish?"

Keats: "It's too late now, but there were some huge questions on this Bill. I had my light on.... some questions that really reflect on whether or not this Bill accomplishes anything other than to spend a lot of money. And there's no point in asking it now because no one will pay enough attention to learn anything about the Bill. So the thing is greased. And thank you for ignoring me."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Kinding record Mr. Hanahan as 'aye'. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 148 'ayes', 6 'nays', 11 recorded as 'present' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from.... Senate Bill 309.

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 309. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 309 would simply extend the rescision



date not to participate in the Judicial Pension System from 1976 to 1979. This is the... almost an annual moving forward of the recision date which is fairly routine each year here in the Legislative Session. The intention of the trustees of the Pension System being to encourage all eligible to participate in the system. By way of clarification, there was an Amendment placed on the Bill which would have given credit for an assistant public defender... credit into the Judicial Pension System. The House Sponsor of that Amendment was Representative Giorgi. However, we have made clear to Representative Giorgi that that Amendment will not accomplish what was his intention. And it is by his agreement and the agreement of the Senate Sponsor that that Amendment will come off in the Senate. And because of the time frame that we are in with today, pursuant to our rules, we're going to move the adoption... or urge the adoption of Senate Bill 309 with the understanding that we will take that public defender's provision off in the Senate."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Wolf."

Wolf: "A question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he'll yield. Jake Wolf, Danny."

Wolf: "Yes, my objection was going to be on that public defender.

Now this is a Senate Bill that is now being read a third time in the House. How are you going to take that off in the Senate?"

Houlihan, D.: "They will nonconcur in House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 309."

Wolf: "Okay, you're certain?"

Houlihan, D.: "Yes, I have this worked out, Jake. I have the same concern that you do. The system is very concerned about it, but we've been able to indicate to Representative Giorgi that what he was attempting to do would frankly not be accomplished by his Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Robinson." Any further discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 309 pass. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have



all voted who wish? Kindly record Mr. Ebbesen as 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Jane Barnes as 'aye'. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 133 'ayes', 19 'nos', 4 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On Senate Bill 388."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 388. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the second in the series of Bills that I mentioned to you that provides that handicapped children attending nonpublic schools shall be accepted and served by the public schools on a part-time basis. And here in the House we added an Amendment to clarify the limitations as far as transportation were concerned. And I would ask your support of Senate Bill 388."

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

Polk: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, of all the Bills that were brought up in this special handicapped program, this is the.... this is the only Bill that I think received any negative votes and this only received two. I think it only.... I think the only reason that it only received two was to show you the power that Glen Schneider and I have on that Committee. Glen and I voted 'no' and everybody else voted 'yes'. Our intent for doing so was to just to point out that there was some concern we had in relation to the nonpublic schools. But the intent was to make sure that this Bill was passed and put on the statutes. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell."

Waddell: "A question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he'll yield."

Waddell: "What was the final decision as far as busing from one district to the other was concerned?"

Hoffman: "All right, the Amendment provides that the busing is limited to the.... to a joint agreement. In other words, that the busing would be no greater for this pupil than any other



pupil with the same handicap in a joint agreement district or
or in a district that has it themselves."

Waddell: "Not to the handicapped, but how.... how about the distance?"

Hoffman: "The distance would be no greater for this.... for a pupil in this category as a pupil who attended the public school. For example, if Dundee is in a joint agreement with.... you know, the neighboring district and a handicapped attended a public school in Dundee and went to that neighboring district, the same thing would be true of the part-time student who attended the... the nonpublic school. So it's exactly the same..... no additional movement."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 388 pass.

All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Glen.....

The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce, to explain his vote. No?

Mr. Pierce. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 150

'ayes', 2 'nays', 6 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having

received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed.

Senate Bill 393."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 393. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

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

House Bill 393 provides that medical services which are provided

will be provided only for diagnostic and evaluation purposes.

And that they have to be provided by a person who is an M.D.

That's all that the Bill does and I would ask for your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate

Bill 393 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'.

Marco.... Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The

Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 156 'ayes',

3 'nays' and 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received

the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."



Speaker Lechowicz: "...Senate Bill 395."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 395, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code, Third Reading of the Bill."

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

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

Senate Bill 395 provides that the education of a child in a residential, nonpublic, facility shall be provided 'no cost' to the parents. Sometimes severely handicapped children may be placed in private special education facilities to best meet their needs. The parents, under 94-142, Federal Legislation, can no longer be held accountable to pay extra costs that the school district doesn't pay. And, so, in Senate Bill 395 you will find a formula that's been agreed on by all the parties involved, the school district, the teachers...er... the School Board Association and the various special interest groups that provides that up to...it's a two tier formula that provides that the school district pays 25...er the per capita tuition costs up to 45 hundred dollars and above 45 hundred dollars they pay one more additional ... tuition payment and then the state picks up the rest of that particular cost. It also provides, in House (sic) Bill 395, for putting in place the Governor's purchase of care service aboard with the addition of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to provide for a cost containment and cost controls. This Bill, as I pointed out, is significantly different than it came out of the Senate. We've eliminated current funding and there is no ...the only fiscal impact on this this year is to be taken out of 94-142 money. And there's an Amendment going on to the categorical Bill that will earmark 3.5 million for room and board costs that would be the responsibility of the State Board of Education as opposed to the responsibility presently being carried by other state agencies. This Bill, again as I said, has been worked out by the parties involved. I would ask your support."

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

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

McClain: "Gene, could you tell us...I know that the fiscal impact this



year is minimal, but what's the future fiscal impact, especially when you consider taking off the ..the cap?"

Hoffman: "All right. Let me ...let me back into that question by pointing out that...by providing the...the process that we have now for cost containment on maintenance and custodial care under the Governor's rate review board into this process that ...that responsibility we've had to give to them. We estimate that in FY 80 the additional ... the additional costs will be 12 million dollars.....to the state."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Tuerk: "Gene, I realize we're under the gun on 94-142, can you give us an idea of the fiscal impact for the entire package of Bills that are involved?"

Hoffman: "Representative Tuerk, let me back into that question too...and point out that we will be receiving, in FY 79, 35 million dollars from the Federal Government, 75 percent of which will be passed through to the local districts and the...25 percent of it retained by the state and that is projected to escalate up until they're 40 percent of the per student cost average across the country, by 1982. The total this year, the impact, will be an additional 3.5 million and in FY 80 that 3.5 million would hold plus the estimated 12 million, so we're talking in number in FY 80 of about 15 million. Keeping in mind, that by that time our reimbursement from the Federal Government to local school districts and to the state will be about 42 ...about 42 million. Let me also point out that much of what is required under 94-142 we're always...we're already doing and that's why the increase isn't so much."

Tuerk: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Yes. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Katz: "Representative Hoffman, is there a choice to be made with regard to 94-142? In other words, you are just sort of presenting it as if there's no choice that's involved with regard to the State of Illinois?"



I wonder,...what is the choice? And are we making an election to come under 94-142, in endorsing the Bill?"

Hoffman: "Representative Katz, perhaps we can continue our conversation that we held on the plane the other day...going back. Our choices are...are to receive...to receive the funds. The requirement is to provide for...for conformance. The question of whether we will conform or not conform under this legislation, in our judgment, we believe we are meeting the criteria; but we do not go into conformance with 94-142. As I mentioned to you before we have to be found in conformance by the Federal Government. And in my judgment if we are found - and I believe we will be - found to be in conformance with 94-142, then what we have done and what we have put in the statutes, they have accepted and they accept us on that basis, not on some other basis. In the State of New Mexico, their State Board of Education said, you know...'Keep your money, we're going to do our own thing.' I think I would point out, to Representative Katz and the other Members of the House, that all of these folks that have come to us in support of this particular program are not outlanders. They are our own constituents, they are our own citizens who believe that this legislation is the right and just and proper thing to do. After working on this legislation since August of '76, the School Problems Commission and those of us outside the Commission who have worked on this...believe this is the right thing to do. Our option, I believe, ...to support this Bill or not to support it. And I urge your support of this legislation."

Katz: "Excuse me..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Katz, do you have any more questions?"

Katz: "Yeah. Well actually it was about a 12 second question to which there was a 12 minute answer. Representative Hoffman..."

Hoffman: "I learned that from Representative Katz, whom you may know, from the other side of the aisle."

Katz: "Yeah. Representative Hoffman, you know...we did have a conversation on the plane, but I'm really raising the issue because it does seem to me that we're engaged in debate on a very important subject. And the question of a private conversation is really rather irrelevant..."



Hoffman: "Correct.."

Katz: "...to the preceeding of this matter. Now, I asked you a question and I didn't really understand the answer. The question I asked you was, is there an election that the State of Illinois makes, under 94-142, whether to comply or not? If there is an election, what is the mechanism by which we make the decision as to whether to comply or not?"

Hoffman: "All right. Let me...Let me be a little more succinct and if I can I'll also be parsimonious, by pointing out that we can either comply and, you know, say...'We don't want to participate, we don't want to take the money.' or we can comply to the legislative process and if, in my judgment and the judgment of those of us who've worked with this kind of thing before, is if we don't comply through the legislative process where all of the people are represented and involved, the decision is going to be made by some Federal Judge who has little or no understanding of the problem. And it seems to me that the reasonable place to ...to resolve the issue is right here in this Body. And it's for that reason I urge support of this legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Katz."

Katz: "Are we complying by voting for the Bill, or not? I'm really trying to get an answer. Are these Bills...this particular Bill, are we making an election to be bound by 94-142, in voting for the Bill? Yes or no?"

Hoffman: "As I stated to you before, we believe that these Bills will put us into compliance, but we have to be found in compliance....we have to be found in compliance by HEW. We believe that we will be. We are...we put these Bills through so that we would be in compliance and that is the intent."

Katz: "All right. Mr. Speaker, may I just talk very briefly on the issue?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Katz: "I think that we are facing a very monumental problem once we do elect to comply under 94-142. The Members of this House should understand that we are thereby submitting to the federal control, the question of what services we will provide for the physically handicapped. There are no limits under the regulations, as I read



them, under the Federal Act; that is perhaps one of the reasons why New Mexico elected not to comply. For example; in my district we have children who want to go, and who some psychiatrists may feel ought to go, to a residential care facility...that may run 50 thousand, 60 thousand dollars a year. Once we have elected to comply we will thereby be subjected and our school districts will thereby be subjected to suits in federal courts by parents who allege that they have rights arising out of 94-142. Now that is a very serious matter and we will then be buying a 'pig in a poke'. Whatever the federal courts determine are the needs of the handicapped we will have to provide. Now I do understand that in this legislation an attempt is made to provide a middle-ground with regard to limiting the liability... that we may have to an individual child. But I would want to point out to you that we cannot, by passing a law in Illinois, limit an individual right under a federal law once we have elected to come under that federal law. We are in fact buying a 'pig in a poke' when we do come under the federal law. It is a very serious decision. The Federal Government does have a provision for partial funding..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to a close."

Katz: "Yes...But once we have come under the law, we will be under it for all purposes. And if the Federal Government treats this as seed money, if they withdraw funding, we will still be obligated to provide it. It is a very serious problem, a significant intrusion of federal law, into an area of education that has been traditionally left. It provides our schools with an obligation to perhaps provide family therapy for a young child..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to a close."

Katz: "Yes, I'm doing it right now. ...It's a most important Bill, Mr. Speaker. ...But a child who is adjudged to have problems interfering with his learning, arising from his family, there may be an obligation on the part of a school district to provide family therapy for that family. I think it is an obligation too grave to be undertaken and I would caution us about the consequences of the step that we are taking."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, would the Gentleman yield to...question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Pierce: "On the...We started back in 1969, with House Bill 2671, which I Sponsored, which provided that the school districts would pay 2 thousand - later raised to 25 hundred - or tuition, whichever is less, for the handicapped child who because of the nature of his handicap must attend a nonpublic school. In this Bill you raised that maximum to 45 hundred or tuition, whichever is less. Is that correct?"

Hoffman: "Run that by me again, Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "We raised the 2671 figure for nonpublic schools from 25 hundred to 45 hundred dollars, is that right?"

Hoffman: "The per capita tuition figure which we had in that Bill was against 25 hundred and that goes...the first tier is 45 hundred."

Pierce: "That could be higher with approval of the Governor's Rate Board, is that right?"

Hoffman: "No. That's the level for the first tier. Then when you go to 46 hundred dollars the school district gets involved in paying again a second tuition cost and then the rest of it is paid by the state and the cap, whatever it is, is put on by the Rate Review Board."

Pierce: "Right. Right. At present the school district pays its average costs for the nonhandicapped child and the...and the state pays the balance. Hopefully they reimburse that the next year. I think you do that here. You haven't gone to current funding?"

Hoffman: "Correct."

Pierce: "Now...say a residential school, outside the state, is that...the school district...does the school district pay for the forgetting the educational costs for the moment...how about the custodial, residential and food costs? Is the local school district primarily responsible for that or is the state agency primarily responsible for that?"

Hoffman: "That will be determined by the Rate Review Board. In a number of places through the Bill we provide that current law and practice



will continue and that's the cooperative thing we had in 386, between the other agencies."

Pierce: "Is the feeling that the other state agencies will pick up most of the residential costs, both for in-state and out-of-state...the private institutions?"

Hoffman: "Well, with the exception of the estimate that we made of 3 1/2 million dollars that we put in of the state share of 94-142 money, the answer to that is 'yes'."

Pierce: "And those private placements - and this goes back to Mr. Katz's question - those private placements still must be approved by the local school districts and by the State...State Superintendent of Education. A parent can't just decide to send his student to a... his son to a 50 thousand dollar .."

Hoffman: "Correct."

Pierce: "...facility?"

Hoffman: "Correct. If a parent chooses to send his son to a 50 thousand dollar place on his own, he pays for that. That's specifically stated in the legislation."

Pierce: "The approval must come prior...by the local school district... joint agreement..."

Hoffman: "The IEP is all worked out. The whole process, and everybody's rights are protected in this instance. Yes."

Pierce: "And there's a right of appeal in there and a right to a fair hearing and so on and so forth ...that the consumer group seems satisfied with? Is that correct?"

Hoffman: "That is correct. All parties that are involved feel that it is a ..fair and adequate"

Pierce: "I think as someone who was involved in this field earlier...And... now on the Bill, Mr. Speaker, I think they...the School Problems Commission, has done a wonderful job here in coming up with a package of legislation that the school people feel they can live with. At least I heard from my high school district and they're satisfied with it. The consumer groups and the parents and those with learning problems..severe or not so severe...feel they can live with, the administrators of special education. We come into conformity with



the Federal Act, which is something we should do, because that is an improvement in handicapped education. It's something that we should be proud to conform with, not something we should be ashamed of or hesitate to conform with. It's something the Governor's looking at to see if he can live within his budget. And I know he has a problem there. I certainly hope that school districts in the future will not be required to pay the residential, custody and care costs of the students in the residential facility, because I've always felt..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to a close?"

Pierce: "Yes. I've always felt that public education should pay the educational costs of the students. The cost of education in the public or private school, but not the residential, custody and care costs. The Department of Mental Health, the Department of Public Aid or some other...Children and Family Services...some other Departments should be responsible for that and, I think, you could set up an interagency arrangement to work that out. And having reviewed this Bill, in light of my original House Bill 2671, which actually pioneered and predated the Federal Legislation back in 1968, became effective in '69, I feel that this Bill does improve, modernize, and bring up to date the things that we in Illinois have been doing for years. It's a good Bill. It's a good concept and I intend to support it and, I think, the School Problems Commission, Senator Berman, Representative Hoffman, Schneider and the others on the School Problems Commission deserve a lot of credit for this package, including their staff."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook...Mr. Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As a Member of the Subcommittee on Special Education that reviewed this and the other Bills in the package, I rise in support of House Bill...Senate Bill 395. First of all I'd like to compliment both the House and Senate Sponsor for the way they've handled this legislation. Initially there were many problems with these Bills and they've been worked out because they work with all the various groups, parents, private schools and everybody else that has been concerned. Let me say that I think the



formula is a very fair formula. I would like to correct one point. The question was asked by the previous speaker, 'Is the formula an increase from 25 hundred to 45 hundred?' Actually, it's not. Actually, it's an increase from 3 thousand to 45 hundred, because the 25 hundred dollar figure in the existing law did not include summer school, which had an additional 5 hundred dollar figure. So the actual increase is from 3 thousand dollars to 45 hundred dollars; because the 45 hundred dollar figure does include summer school. The other question that was raised by one of the previous speakers is.. 'Well, if we elect to participate, aren't we locked in?' And I would suggest, we're not really electing to lock ourselves in, we're deciding whether or not we want to be in compliance. If in the future we decide that this is too costly, we can always change our laws and procedures and effectively opt out. So we're not putting ourselves in a situation where, for perpetuity, we're going to be stuck with something that's going to get out of our hand fiscally because we're going to have the opportunity to review it. Let me finally suggest that ...that if we don't pass this legislation, there still is a legal procedure that is available to parents who want to see their children placed, who want the expensive facilities in terms of special education....and that is Federal Civil Rights Law, Section 504. So that whether or not we pass this legislation we still...going..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to a close?"

Levin: "...be open to legal challenges in federal courts, so I think that it's important that we do pass this legislation. And again I compliment the Sponsors in the way they've handled this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye'; opposed.... The previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman, to close."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think the Bill has been explained well on the floor by a variety of speakers."



You've heard from the folks at home that are involved in this on ... from one point or another. We do have consensus and I would ask that we have that consensus here on the floor of the House. I'm going to ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 395 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Lady from Cook, Ms. Pullen, to explain her vote."

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the problem with 94-142 is, that we're trying to implement with this, ... it was designed for states that didn't have good special education programs. We have a good special education program and what we're doing in looking for federal dollars is promising to spend millions more than anything we could possibly hope to realize from 94-142. This particular Bill is one of the most costly in the package. I urge you please to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130 'ayes', 20 'nays', and 8 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, with your permission and permission of the House, I would like to go to 1055, which is two Bills down, which is part of this package. And we can finish it all up at once."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? Hearing no objection, the Clerk will read Senate Bill 1055. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, on the previous Bill, I pushed the wrong button. I'd like to be recorded as 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Which Bill is it?"

Simms: "3...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh, 395?"

Simms: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to have his vote changed from 'aye' to 'no'. That's Mr. Simms. And Mr. Stanley wants



to be recorded as 'aye' on that Bill. The results are the same.

Senate Bill 1055. Jack, you want to read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1055. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

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

House Bill 1055 is..... I'm sorry. Senate Bill 1055 is the least controversial of the entire package. It sets up a special education handicapped persons Advisory Committee with 15 members which include teachers and parents of handicapped children and handicapped adults, representatives from the agencies.. The purpose of which is to... provide advice to the State Board of Education, the General Assembly, the Rate Review Board and to help in determining who the hearing officers ought to be in the criteria of them and so on and so forth. I would ask your support of Senate Bill 1055."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1055 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Conti, 'aye'. On this question there's 153 'ayes', 1 'nay'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. And may the Chair take a little special privilege and introduce the former Representative and now Senator, Senator Art Berman, who's standing next to Gene Hoffman. Art, good seeing you again."

(Continued on next page)



Speaker Lechowicz: "...here's the package of Bills that we just worked on. Senate Bill 736."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 736, a Bill for an Act to exempt, from certain occupation and use taxes, machinery and equipment, and repair and replacement parts therefor, which will be used by the purchaser or a lessee of the purchaser directly and exclusively in the manufacturing or assembling tangible personal property for sale, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Jack, correct the Board. 7-3-6. Thank you. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have leave to have this Bill taken back to Second Reading for an Amendment that was agreed upon with Mr. Ryan. I promised him I'd bring it back to Second Reading for an Amendment?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to bring the Bill back to Second Reading. Any objection? Hearing none, the Bill is on Second Reading. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Totten: "An inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. If he brings the Bill back to Second Reading for an Amendment, can he ...then bring it to Third Reading and pass it on the same day?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He'd need either leave of the House or if he can't get leave he'd need 107 votes to do it."

Totten: "Okay. He'd have to move then to suspend the rules to go to that?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "If there's objection, yes."

Totten: "Okay."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments on the Bill?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5, Ewing-Madigan, amends Senate Bill 736 by deleting the title and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we discussed this Amendment yesterday. I'll go over it very briefly and then be glad to answer any questions. The Amendment is an agreement to bring tax relief in the form of sales tax relief for manufacturing equipment, for new and used machinery, for new industry and for



old industry here in the State of Illinois. The tax relief would be phased in over a six year period, and it would begin on January 1, 1979. All purchases of machinery equipment would - for new manufacturing facilities or expanding facilities - would be available for this tax relief. In order to receive a refund a purchaser of manufacturing equipment would be required to file a claim with the Department of Revenue within 90 days of the purchase. There is a provision in this Amendment which allows for municipalities to opt in...to also give relief for their one cent of the sales tax. If they do not so agree there will be no loss of local revenue with this measure. I would be more than happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion...on the Amendment? The question is, shall Amendment #5 be adopted? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye'; all opposed... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian...on the Amendment."

Mugalian: "Yes, on the Amendment, I have a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he'll yield."

Mugalian: "I'd like to know if the Sponsor can tell me...what percentage of the population of Illinois will be receiving tax relief as a result of this measure?"

Ewing: "Well, if we're talking about individuals or corporations. I..."

Mugalian: "Both."

Ewing: "...I understand that there are about 16 thousand manufacturers within the State of Illinois who would be...qualify for this type of tax relief if they were to make such new purchases."

Mugalian: "Did you say 60 or 16?"

Ewing: "16 thousand. That would be corporate and individuals and partnerships and trusts and whatever..."

Mugalian: "And how many business entities are there in the State of Illinois?"

Ewing: "Pardon. I didn't hear your second question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "How many business entities are there in the State of Illinois?"

Ewing: "I couldn't tell you. I have no idea."

Mugalian: "One more question. When this Bill is finally implemented, I know



it's phased in, I heard of fiscal impact...referred to yesterday. What was that figure, when it's finally implemented?"

Ewing: "182 million."

Mugalian: "182 million. Will that impact on the special funds of the state or the General Revenue Funds?"

Ewing: "General Revenue Funds. It's sales tax which goes into General Revenue Funds. I think... "

Mugalian: "Thank you."

Ewing: "...I think that the proponents of this measure feel that this.... there's no question that this type of tax relief will trickle down to all consumers and hopefully will spur economic growth in this state to the point that there will not be a net loss of state revenue."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #5 be adopted. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', all opposed ...Amendment #5 is adopted. Is there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. The Gentleman asks leave of the House to have the Bill considered immediately. Is there any objection? Objections have been raised. The Gentleman moves...that the appropriate rule be suspended....that 35-C be suspended so that Senate Bill 736, as amended, could be considered immediately. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. This requires 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 133 'aye', 14 'nays', and the rule is suspended. The Clerk will read Senate Bill 736."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 736, a Bill for an Act to exempt, from certain occupation and use taxes, machinery and equipment, and repair and replacement parts therefor, which will be used by the purchaser or a lessee of the purchaser directly and exclusively in the manufacturing or assembling tangible personal property for sale, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Capparelli. ...One moment, Mr. Capparelli, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"



Schlickman: "Well, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, if we want to proceed with Third Reading, we better suspend another rule; that rule requiring that a copy of this Amendment be on our desk."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's been distributed. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, the Amendment now is the Bill, and I just would ask for a favorable Roll Call. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 736 pass? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, this Bill, as amended, deals with the question of exemption of the sales tax on the purchase of manufacturing equipment. It has been the subject of debate for at least a year and a half. I am not satisfied with the current status of the Bill. In particular, I object to the provision of the Bill which provides that the tax will be refunded to the purchaser after the tax has been paid. It seems to me that in the case of a large industrial firm, they can well afford to pay the tax first and then file an application with the Department of Revenue to obtain the refund. However, in the case of moderate size and small companies, it seems to me that this is too great a burden to place on the company and in particular ...in particular a comptroller or accounting office; number one, to acquaint themselves with the form; number two, to process the form through the Department. I intend to support the Bill at this time because I have been told by both the House Sponsor and the Senate Sponsor that they will take this Bill into a Conference Committee and attempt to resolve the issues which remain to be resolved regarding this issue."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't think the Sponsor has to worry about it. I think the skids have been greased. And he knows it's not personal, I love Representative Capparelli, he's a beautiful guy. You know, every couple of years a Bill comes across, you tell yourself, 'That Bill will never get out of Committee. That's a preposterous Bill.' Certainly, once in a while a Bill comes along, you say, 'there isn't a member of my Party that would be found dead supporting that



kind of provision. But, here it is, passed out of the Senate, got out of House Revenue Committee. I wish I could have the attention of the House. I'd like to say my piece on this because this Bill has kept me awake several nights this Session."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly give the Gentleman your attention. And may I also point out that the decorum of the House is in pretty good shape."

Mugalian: "I'd also like to remind you that maybe you'll be running against somebody in the fall that will watch your voting record on this abysmal Bill. This Bill masquerades as a job-creating Bill. How does it create jobs? By encouraging capital intensive industry. Which means, if you know anything about economics, that it will reduce jobs. Now I asked the Sponsor of this Bill, in Committee, for an analysis as to how it would create jobs. He said, respectfully, I don't have one. He didn't get one, he's never seen one. I asked the Legislative Council to get me an economic analysis on this Bill. to see if there was any evidence that it would do what it's supposed to do. They have no such analysis. I got their report and there's no way can they show that this will create jobs. There was an article by the editor of the Lindsey-Shaub newspapers,.....Robert Hartley, on June 4, discussing this Bill. And he had consulted an economist, and he said this Bill would not do what it would...what it was supposed to do. This Bill is a handout, Ladies and Gentlemen. It's incredible that we would do this in the face of a tax revolt. It's also incredible that we...we just voted out a school aid Bill that's going to cost 20 million...maybe it's 30 million more, of General Revenue Funds and now here we come with a Bill that, when fully implemented, is going to take 150 million dollars out of the General Revenue Fund. This is GRF money. Now what could this kind of money do for us? It could double or triple the cost of living, the five percent cost of living, for public aid. What it could do for our resource equalizer formula...what it could do for our county jails, Ladies and Gentlemen, it could double or triple our grants to local agencies for community mental health and developmental disability. Now this is supposed to help the buyers of machinery. They're able to save a four percent sales tax, but one half of that



savings goes to Washington because they deduct that four percent on their income tax return. So, you lose 100 million dollars - plus - for the General Revenue Fund, but that gain does not go to the taxpayers of Illinois. Half of it goes to the...to Washington, D.C. But the manufacturers of machinery are largely monopolists, they have patents and they do not have any competition, so they could easily raise their prices the four percent that it would reduc...that would be reduced from the sales tax under this Bill. Not only that... most large manufacturers of machinery are not Illinois manufacturers, they're from all over the country; and they are the ones that would get the break if there's any increase in sales by these monopolistic makers of large machines. Now look...there's a political impact here, my candidate for Governor, Michael Bakalis, is supporting this Bill. That I find to be incredible. I don't know what Governor Thompson's position is, but if they both support this Bill I'm not sure I could vote for either one of them. Now all this Bill does.... I haven't taken my ten minutes...really all it does is reduce the state revenues and it does it substantially. Now it would be a lot more forthright of us to just make a grant to the machine manufacturers; a grant of one half of the 150 million dollars. That's much more straightforward, there's no rebate plan, you just give them the money. I have seen Bills in this House, Ladies and Gentlemen, that shift the tax burden from one class to another. Sometimes it's a good idea, sometimes it's not. I have seen Bills that give subsidies to one business segment of the state or to another, but this is the first Bill I've seen that is virtually a draft on the Illinois Treasurer. Just a blank check to a favorite segment of the economy. Not only has there been no testimony given that this Bill will do what it pretends to do, but there has been no analysis or report by any economist anywhere that it would do so. Now this Bill is going to sail out of here. There's a campaign coming in November, you vote the way you have to, but I can't see how anybody who believes in equal treatment or who believes in a tax revolt or who wants to give tax relief to the little people in this state, could possibly vote for this rip-off. Thanks for listening."



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

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would have to agree with Representative Madigan, it might have been better had this been a direct elimination on the tax on the front end rather than a rebate. But let me suggest to the last speaker that recent statistics show that Japan is pouring 20 percent of the economy back into the industrialization of Japan. West Germany is pouring 15 percent back into new machines and the United States, now, is down to less than 8 percent. We have been a leader in industrial production, that's the reason we're a prosperous nation. We are losing our standing because the plants can't afford to retool and keep up with modern production. When that happens, jobs will suffer and I can tell you there won't be any taxes for public aid. So, this is an attempt on our part to be competitive with foreign countries. Another thing it is, it's making us competitive with other states who already have this provision...and...and industry is going to those states where they do not have to pay tax for new equipment. So...I think, that somebody better think about this or we'll kill the goose that laid the golden egg, and there won't be any money for schools or anything else unless we keep on being a great industrial nation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Matula."

Matula: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Many times we all have spoken to the fact that we wanted to help industry. We wanted to help business. Here's an opportunity at present, facing us, where we can do something for business. As you all know, business has been down in the State of Illinois by moving it into a sun belt area. I feel that this particular Bill will help. It will create an incentive to many, many businesses...small or large. In.. Due to the fact that they may have a piece of old equipment and they may decide, just by this Bill, to purchase a new piece of equipment which will help. Not only from the standpoint of manufacturing but it will also possibly help by inducing more ...more workers and better business for the State of Illinois. So I feel that this Bill is a good Bill and this is an opportunity to help business in the



State of Illinois. So I do hope that we get a lot of green votes."
 Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Although I feel that House Bill 3168 is a better quality Bill dealing with the same subject matter, I am in support of this Bill. You know it's a little difference what a day makes, as far as the figures that come from the Governor's Office. Last year on House Bill 1812, which was substantially broader than this Bill and also had no great improvisation, the maximum amount was 80 million dollars; and, now I understand it's up to...supposedly 160...182 million dollars. I'd hate to have them as my accountant. However, this Bill is a tokenism for the manufacturers in the State of Illinois. This Amendment also provides for a six year grade-in...arrangement, so it wouldn't be fully funded for at least six years. There are approximately 36 states that offer this type of incentive. When is Illinois going to wake up to the fact that we have to keep our industry in the State of Illinois. We can't have them going out to the sun belt and any other state. We've got the..the people, we've got the energy, we've got the resources right in the State of Illinois. This is simply a gesture to the industry that we want you to work in Illinois, we want you to provide jobs and we need your business. So this, to me, is simply a tokenism. I think we should even go a little bit further. And I would urge everyone to support Senate Bill 736."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I listened with great interest to one of the Gentlemen...a prior speaker...said that this is just a big advantage for business. Let's not kid ourselves, if we don't have any business we have no market for labor. And labor and business go hand in hand and if we can keep business in Illinois let's do it. We've lost 200 thousand jobs. We've sent a lot of people away because of some of our Workmen's Comp. Bills or what have you. We've tried to adjust them. Now let's have some sense. When you buy big equipment it's expensive. Let's help out. If we help business we're helping labor. I speak for the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keats.... The question is



shall Senate Bill 736 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 139 'ayes', 19 'nays', 4 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

Speaker Redmond in Chair.....

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Richmond. Representative Brummer, for what purpose do you rise?"

Brummer: "I didn't hit my switch on that last one. Could you record me as voting 'aye' please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to be recorded as voting 'aye'? Hearing no objection,... recorded. Representative Richmond, for what purpose do you rise?"

Richmond: "To.... thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to request the the change of the....on the Calendar to Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "This is Resolutions and Representative Richmond is recognized. Do you have that Resolution, Mr. Clerk? Mr. Richmond. He's got it, I believe. Don't you, Jack?"

Richmond: "I'd like the Clerk to read the Resolution, please."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1043. Whereas, today marks the 41st wedding anniversary of our friend and colleague, Joey Lucco.... is that a different one? House Resolution. Whereas, the House joins with the entire State of Illinois in honoring Mr. John I. Alber upon the occasion of being the Illinois winner of the Environmental Law Essay Competition, sponsored by the Association of Trial Lawyers of America. And whereas, John Alber is presently a student at Southern Illinois University School of Law, Carbondale, Illinois. And through his academic efforts will work towards contributing to our society. And whereas, John Alber, an outstanding young man, exemplifies the American.... American ethics of honesty, responsibility and industry. And whereas, John Alber's achievement of winning the Environmental Law Essay Competition is worthy of recognition by the State of Illinois as it reflects favorably upon the recipient, his parents, and Southern Illinois University School of



Law. Therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 80th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that we join with the proud family and many friends of Mr. John I. Alber in congratulating him upon the occasion of being the Illinois winner of the Environmental Law Essay Competition, that we commend him for his dedication, effort as exhibited by his attaining one of the highest distinctions in which a law student can aspire. And we wish him the best of luck and continued success in all of his future endeavors. And be it further resolved, that a suitable copy of this Preamble and Resolution be presented to Mr. John I. Alber with the respect and regards of the people of the State of Illinois and the Members of the General Assembly."

Speaker Redmond: "He's represented in the 58th District by some other southern Illinois leader, Clyde Richmond, Clyde Dunn, Clyde Birchler and the adjoining district... Clyde Harris. And Clyde Winchester back there. I'll turn the Chair over now to Clyde Richmond for the purpose of introducing the gentleman."

Richmond: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It is a pleasure to... and honor to be able to introduce to you... present to you this fine young man who has distinguished himself in our estimation to a great extent as recipient of this award. First, I would like to present... to introduce to you, Dean Hiram Lesar, of SIU School of Law. And Robert G. Heckenkamp of Springfield, immediate past president of the Illinois Trial Lawyers Association; and presently second vice-president of the Illinois State Bar Association, who will make the presentation to the recipient, John Alber. Robert Heckenkamp."

Heckenkamp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and distinguished Members of the House. On behalf of the Association of Trial Lawyers of America and the Illinois Trial Lawyers Association, I'm privileged to present to Mr. Alber this award as a token of appreciation for his success in this competition. I'm particularly happy, and I think you indeed should be proud that the recipient of this award is a student at SIU College of Law and Institution which



was created and is in existence by reason of your effort for the short time... since 1972. I also wish to compliment Dean Lesar for his outstanding efforts in raising the stature of that institution to the level for which it now enjoys among the legal fraternities. Mr. Alber, I am pleased to hand to you the certificate of appreciation from the Association of Trial Lawyers of America... a certificate of membership in the Illinois Trial Lawyers Association and a check representing a token contribution to you in appreciation of your effort. Thank you for your valuable time."

John I. Alber: "Well, thank you very much. It was an honor to participate in your essay contest. I'd also like to thank Dean Lesar for... and I suppose all of you, for creating and assuring good health of SIU Law School. It's becoming an important institution for me... more important every year. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of the Resolution. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all opposed... the Resolution is adopted. The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker, if I could have leave of the House as voting 'aye' on House... Senate Bill 736. I was over in the Senate when the...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to be recorded as 'aye' on 736. Any objections? Hearing none, you'll be so recorded. Mr. Friedrich, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Friedrich: "Same request, Mr. Speaker. I was in the back room in a conference...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "736?"

Friedrich: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to be recorded as 'aye' on Senate Bill 736. Any objections? Hearing none, you'll be so recorded. Senate Bill 825."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 825. A Bill for an Act in relation to the regulation of independent colleges and universities of the Board of Higher Education. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 825, I think is a clarification that's been needed for quite sometime in the statutes in the School Code of the State of Illinois. Currently, the Board of Higher Education is mandated to more or less police the programs that the State of Illinois is concerned... as it relates to private schools. However, by the same token, the Illinois Office of Education is the actual certifying of persons for all of the various degrees and so on and so forth that are granted through the private institutions. What this Bill purports to do is very very simple. We deleted the words 'Superintendent of Public Instruction' and inserted in lieu thereof 'The Board of Higher Education'. It was a compromise that has been worked out for many many many parties involved. And I know of no opposition to the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 825 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 141 'ayes', no 'nays'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1395."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1395. A Bill for an Act authorizing the Capitol Development Board to convey certain real property in Sangamon County, the City of Springfield. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to take the Bill out of the record. May I point out that today is the last day to..... today is the last day for Senate Bills to pass the House unless they're appropriation matters. So if you want to assure yourself of meeting the deadline, I'd be rather hesitant of taking anything out of the record. And with leave, I'd like to bypass the appropriation matters so that we can continue on with Senate Bills, Third Reading that are not Appropriation Bills to try and meet the deadline. Senate Bill 1455."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1455. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections



of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1455 is the Bill that we discussed Saturday. It extends the..... through the fiscal year 1979, the provisions of applying money for summer school to handicapped children. We also adopted an Amendment which provided that Memorial Day would be held on the same day as the federal holiday and provided that the school districts could change their calendar to do that. That's the Amendment that Representative DiPrima put on. And I would ask for your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1455 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 147 'ayes' and 9 'nays' and 3 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Caldwell.

Caldwell: "Mr. Speaker, I mistakenly pushed the wrong button. Could I be changed....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to be changed from 'no' to 'aye'. Hearing no objections, it's so recorded. And also Mr. Van Duyne wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Mr. Collins."

Collins: "I... I pushed the wrong button, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to be recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Collins 'no'. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "He pushed my button wrong too. No."

Speaker Lechowicz: "No. Mr. Simms. Simms, 'aye'. Okay. Senate Bill 1512."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1512. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Weights and Measurement Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Schuneman. Take it out of the record? Senate Bill 1562, Lyñne Martin."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1562. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections in the title of Section 1 of an Act to provide for the enforcement by the Department of Public Health of certain state and local food handling and health regulations. Third Reading of the Bill."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Winnebago, Miss.... Mrs. Martin."

Martin: "Yes, this Bill sets up the Department in injunction powers.

It does not extend any new rules or regulations. It also carries with it an Amendment that extends the date for restaurant to have to have someone.... on a premises that has had that training with the Board of Health. Many of you are very interested in that Amendment.... know that we must have passage of that Amendment. I'd ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1562 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 135 'ayes', 17 'nays', 3 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1570, Mr. McAuliffe."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1570...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's an appropriation. We can take that out. Senate Bill 1605."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1605. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Lobbyist Registration Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dan Houlihan. He's not in the.... take it out of the record. Senate Bill 1611. What's the next one? Senate Bill 1617."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1617. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Dave Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the Senior Citizens Improvement Act. As it was amended yesterday, it raises the ceiling for those that qualify to 15 thousand income. And I think it had quite a bit of debate yesterday... on the Amendment stage. And I move...I move its passage at this time."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer. The question is, shall Senate Bill 1517 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who



wish? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Skinner: "I'd just ask for a very slow Roll Call because it seems to me that this is the Bill that the Governor is gonna have a chance to sign that may take him off the hook on property taxes. And everyone ought to be voting for it if this is indeed the property tax relief Bill that ends up getting signed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "One that.... Dick, will you hit Chuck Campbell as 'aye' please. He wants to be recorded. Thank you. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's ¹⁶¹ 'ayes', 1 'nay', 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bil 1630. Mr. Telcser."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1630. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 1630 is a Bill which deals with the 120 day notice which is given to a tenant in buildings which are being converted to condominiums. Last year we passed this Act and there was language in the Bill which alluded to the recording of a notice. That never was the intent of the legislation. Other parts of the Bill did not allude to it..... did not allude to the recording of the notice. And we took an Amendment from Representative Dan Houlihan to insure that condominium conversion, which have taken place between the time of the Act becoming law and now, would clearly not have to record those notices. And so, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that's what 1630 is all about. It's a simple Bill and I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1630 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Elmer, you know. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 163 'ayes', 1 'nay' and 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."



Senate Bill 1672."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1672. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Capitol Development Bond Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is the CDB Authorization Bill which we amended yesterday. And I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1672 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 126 'ayes', 27 'nays', 9 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1680."

Clerk O'Brien: Senate Bill 1680. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Election Code...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Jack. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, on a point of order."

Matijevich: "Just for the record, that was an Authorization Bill And I think that you ought to show that it received it's 3/5ths. Is that true, Ted? The last Bill that we just did."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yeah, but... the... the count was 126."

Matijevich: "But you have to say the 3/5th's Constitutional Majority."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The... Senate Bill 1680 passed by 3... Senate Bill 1672 passed by the 3/5th's required vote. Mr. Conti, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Conti: "Somebody shut my juice off. I can't vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, well, we're not on the question yet, Sir."

Conti: "Yeah, but I can't vote. On the last Bill I couldn't vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll have the Clerk take a look at it. I'm sorry, the electrician. You want to be recorded on the last Bill, Sir?"

Conti: "On this 1680? I want... yes, if I had an Amendment, I want to be recorded as 'aye'."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman wanted to be recorded as 'aye' on 1672. Any objections? Hearing none, the Gentleman will be so recorded. Now, back to Senate Bill 1680."

Clerk O'Brien: "I read it a third time."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It was read a third time. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Robinson."

Robinson: "When we were on this Bill on Second Reading, the Sponsor indicated he would move it back for Amendments 14 and 15... move it back to Second Reading. So could we do that now, please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to correct the previous speaker. I had made a statement that if there were no other Amendments that were going to be offered, we would consider moving it back if I had an agreement from the Gentleman that was submitting the Amendments 14 and 15. And I never got to that agreement because other Amendments were offered. So we had no agreement to bring the Bill back to Second Reading. And I would like to proceed now with the Bill on Third Reading."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Robinson."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, may I proceed with the Bill on Third Reading?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Bill was read. You may proceed."

Bradley: "Fine, thank you."

Robinson: "Mr. Speaker...."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have never really gotten to the... what the original Bill addresses itself to on 1680 because we've talked about so many other different things. But what the Bill really does... that it mandates that the... within 30 days after the canvass proclamation and the results of the Primary, the County Clerk shall determine fair and impartial methods a random selection for the order of the placement of political....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Bradley. There's a point of order raised by Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Yeah, as I I offered Amendment #14. And as I recall,



there was a controversy then as to whether the Bill was going to be left on Second or moved back to Third. And the Sponsor... in fact I raised the question in debate and the Sponsor I thought indicated a preference in moving it back to Third Reading.... from Third to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment. And I thought that's what the arrangement had been. So I would like to I would simply like to... especially since we glossed over Amendments 15 and 16 so cavalierly that we at least give the Sponsors of those Amendments the same courtesy that I was afforded on for consideration of Amendment 14."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I very clearly remember Representative Bradley indicating that he would be willing to bring back to Second, assuming there were no Amendments. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no way that the Sponsors of Amendment #14 and 15 and 16 can make the commitment to Representative Bradley that there will be no other Amendments. And he knows that. That left that Bill with the understanding that it would be brought back to Second and I think in the spirit of cooperation and in the spirit that when you give your word around here, you keep it. And Representative Bradley ought to recognize the fact that they could not commit themselves that nobody else would add in other commitments and that he ought to bring the Bill back to Second."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Does it require leave of the House to bring it back to Second?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, it does."

Daniels: "All right, I think that's basically a decision of the House if the Sponsor doesn't want to take it back to Second. And secondly, if the House doesn't want to take it back to Second, then they would be able to resist that effort."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Well, are we on 1680? I haven't heard any....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, we're going to hear the Gentleman's....."

Bluthardt: "Sponsor of the Bill..... yeah, he's going to open first."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley, on Senate Bill 1680."

Bradley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And just to clarify the situation and make it clear to everybody, we did go back and pick up Amendment #14 for Mr. Bowman because his Amendment was on the desk.... and we went through it and it's on the Bill and was adopted. So if I can continue in the explanation.... before I was interrupted; the County Clerks now with this Bill... instead of the county.... instead of the party label of the party that the County Clerk affiliates with being first on the ballot, it will have to be done by lot now within 30 days after the Primary and certifying where.... or which major political party will be on the ballot for the general election. That was where we started out with the Bill. What brought this about was a law suit by at least two or three former Members of the House. It was successful and it was taken to the Appellate Court and appealed. The Appellate Court, in their findings, suggested that somehow... some lottery system must be used. And I quite agree with it. And it applies to every county... in the State of Illinois. There are, I believe Amendments #2, 3, 9 and 14 that have been adopted on the Bill. Number 2 simply says that in the case of a vacancy with the Clerk of the Circuit Court, that the appointee shall be a member of the same political party. Amendment #3 talks about the residency requirement... the years necessary to be a resident of that particular district before serving or being appointed to serve on the Board of Elections. Amendment #9, is Mr. Kelly's Amendment, that suggests that we have an advisory referendum in the State of Illinois on the question of ERA. Amendment 14 was Mr. Bowman's Amendment. It designates that the names of the candidates for election to the federal offices shall be listed above the names of the candidates for election to all other offices. And that is the.... form that this present Bill is in. And I respectfully request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt."



Bluthardt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The Bill is a very bad Bill. I notice the Sponsor didn't mention the worst feature of it and that's the clustering.... where you're permitted to cluster four precincts in one. That will result in perhaps up to 3 thousand people being allowed to vote in one precinct. And I don't know how they're going to handle it, parking situation and all other situations. So I'm opposed to the Bill on that grounds. I'm also question the wisdom of removing the residency requirement. While this appears to require a 10 year residency for appointment to the City... or the Board of Election Commissioners, in effect it removes it by saying that the Judge may ignore for good cause shown any residency requirement that is now in the law. And then I'm also opposed to it because it relegates the Office of Governor to something below Congressman on the ballot. This means that all federal offices shall be on the ballot prior to any state offices. And that puts our Governor down in the three or four slots down on the ballot and I think that's bad. And I think it's bad for both parties. I think this whole Bill is bad and it ought to be defeated."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment that was put back by a motion to table the House Amendment, which took it out of the Senate Bill..... and in the Senate Bill was the provision that the collection authorities could cluster up to four precincts and just elect up to three..... and just elect up to three Judges. Now the way this Amendment reads is really bad. Because if you're gonna cluster four precincts into one little zone voting area and you say let's say you have 500 people per precinct.... 800 precincts that's.... capacity voting there. Where are you going to get the parking space? Where are you going to get the convenience of letting these people vote in time.. so the vote can count? I think that you ought to know that there was a law suit in Lake County, which was directed to the County Board and to the Clerk, on the basis that the primary election was done just that way with clustered



zone voting.... having more than one or two precincts in an area. I can tell you that there were many many complaints. And the law suit..... the decision of the law suit was the effect that it could not be done because it was not legal in the statutes. I submit that this provision is in there to make what happened in the March election in Lake County legal now. It was illegal then. I submit that it is a very very unfair thing to do to deprive voters of the right to vote. It was done on the basis that it would save money. And yet in the very manual the Clerk put out, it was stated that no...possible no money would be saved. But I think it's more important for people to have the right to vote rather than to be disenfranchised on the basis of cost. And I... let's say that it did cost a little more money. So I'm saying, Ladies and Gentlemen, that there's one provision, that I noticed the Sponsor did not dwell on, that would permit a clustering up to four precincts and which will allow you to have only three Judges per precinct. And if you read that provision, it says the Judges may not be... all of one party. 'May' is not a mandatory thing. It says 'the state shall not be of all one party'. So it can be a hardship on either party in different areas of this state. And I submit that the Bill, with this Amendment in it, should be defeated."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I used to have a precinct, before they cut it up..... it had 3,000 registered voters... actually it was 2800. In the election of 1972, 24 of them came out to vote. And I could tell you, we would have had a lot more except a lot of them went home because by the time they finished voting it was 9:30 at night. Fortunately, a good many of them had the sense to stay around there and a lot of them gave me their vote or I might not be here today. But I think it's a bad idea. You're going to find people who just refuse to come out and vote because of the inconvenience. This cluster provision is a bad one and it makes the whole Bill bad and you ought to vote 'no'."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly."

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm going to support this proposal for one primary reason and that is because the House approved the referendum vote on the ERA, which would be on the November ballot. We all know how crucial this issue is. And we all know the effects from both the proponents and the opponents in our district who are very intense on this issue. This is the last opportunity we will have to place the ERA question on the ballot in November. And I intend to support this proposal, not only for that reason, but because there are... most of the Bill itself is very beneficial. And I certainly think the good far outweighs the bad. And I would like to ask your favorable consideration in voting favorably on this Bill."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to ask you to defeat this Bill. There is no provision requiring Election Judges to be residents of the precincts that they represent. There are no provisions for specific Election Judge Authorities to settle polling place questions in voting disputes. There is also no provision for the central territorial positioning of the polling places for easy access. They can be in line until 2, 3, 4:00 in the morning in returning some of these ballot boxes. And all of these people that were crying for good elections and consolidation of elections... if there's anything that's going to discourage people from voting in school elections, and or consolidation elections, it's this Bill. It should be defeated."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I hope everybody was listening to Harry Leinenweber because I want to hear some of you say that what they're doing in his precinct is illegal. You have too many registered voters, Harry. You've got too many. And that's against the law. Now what this Bill does, it provides us in Lake County because if we pass this law, my County Clerk is permissibly going to use the



clustering system... the voting zone system. And let me tell you, we used it in the primary election and was one of those that was not bad, Adeline. Everything is bad to you. I was one of those that was very apprehensive until I saw it in use. And I'll tell you, it looked very professional to me. And if Harry Leinenweber's 3000 people were there, you wouldn't have just had those measly handful of Judges to handle 3000 people. You'd have had adequate Judges. And let me tell you, they cooperate together. And let me tell you another reason it will work. If there's one thing that works in behalf of honest elections, it's the adverse situation where you have one party looking at the other party. And when you've got that many Judges in one voting zone, believe me, you've got enough Democrats looking at the Republicans and enough Republicans looking at Democrats. And that makes it work too. Believe me, this is the wave of the future. The Board of Elections is entirely in favor of this. They want to see it work. But my County Clerk had no choice...she had no choice. She was either going to break one law or break another law. She either was going to have to have over sized precincts like they have with Harry Leinenweber, or she was going to break this law. She broke this law in favor of the other one because it was going to cost money and she was not going to be a hardship on anybody. It worked. You'll be able to move the lines. I've got one of those over sized precincts too, but now we can't find Judges. There's many Judges.... they won't work anymore. And now you're going to extend the hours and make it tougher. But believe me, this system will work. Give it a chance and you'll find out it will work in Illinois. It's permissive and it's worked in other states and we can use it too."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this Bill. There's such a conglomeration of bad ideas in this Bill that I think every Member in this House can find some reason for being opposed to it. As a matter of fact, the only good provision in my view is Representative Kelly's



Amendment, which a lot of people do oppose. But I think the worst... the worst feature of this Bill is the clustering Amendment that is in the Bill. It is asking this House to legitimize an illegal act that was committed in Lake County just as Representative Matijevich just got through admitting. This is the first time that I've heard anybody admit that it was an illegal act, but it most certainly was in violation of the Election Code. And now this House is being asked to say, 'That's fine, go ahead and do it again or anytime that you want'. Beyond that, I'd like to point out further to the Members of this House, that in Committee.... the Members of that Committee were misled into believing that this feature would be taken out of the Bill and it was by Amendment #1. But when the Amendment was offered to put it back in on the floor of this House, the Sponsor of this Bill conveniently forgot about those assurances that this Bill.... this feature would be out of the Bill. So this is not only a bad feature of the Bill, it's blatant bad faith on somebody's part. The Members of the Election Committee were told outright that this feature would not be put in this Bill only to find that when it came out on the floor of the House it was inserted again. I think even if you like the Bill, you ought to join with us in killing it just to renounce such examples of bad faith on the part of a Member of this House. I urge every Member of this House to vote 'no' on this very bad Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Robinson."

Robinson: "It is because of the bad faith that the previous speaker mentioned that I am going to vote against this Bill. Amendment 15, which Representative Skinner and I and many others have tried to offer on this Bill is for open primary. There has been no vote on open primary this year. When Mr. Matijevich had an Election Bill for clustering of precincts, he came to me and said, 'Please don't put open primary on that.' I made a commitment. And I lived up to that and I did not put it on there. When Representative Brady had a Bill for absentee ballots he said, 'Don't put open primary on there cause it would kill the Bill.' And I took the



Amendment. And Mr. Brady kept his word and I kept mine. But I think that the people of this state have a right for this Legislature to vote on open primary. We have never done it, not last year and not this year. There has never been a vote on the issue of open primary. We tried procedural moves, we've tried other things, but never has the Speaker or his surrogates in that Chair allowed a vote on open primary, either last year or this. We asked the Sponsor of this Bill to allow us this vote. The first Amendment on open primary was knocked off the Bill because one comma and one number in the Preamble made that out of order. We then filed an Amendment that would have put that in order. And the Speaker moved it to Third Reading against his previous ruling because the press had broken down and it had not been printed in time for that reason. Let me conclude by saying that there's one reason why this House has never had a vote on open primary. It's because the Majority Leader fears and knows that open primary would win. He knows that if the Amendment stayed, there would be a majority on 1680 for open primary. And so they've used every possible way to stop any kind of vote on the issue. Because of that, because of the lack of faith of the Sponsor, I'm going to have to vote 'no' and I urge others to do the same."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Stephenson, Mr. Rigney."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', all opposed.... the previous question's been moved. Mr. Bradley to close."

Bradley: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I could respond in many ways to many of the speakers and I'll try to take them one at a time. That Bill was pointed out.... that it was on Second Reading for some two weeks..... ample opportunity for anybody who was as vitally interested in open primary as the... one of the previous speakers.... to... if he was on his toes, it gave him plenty of time to put an Amendment, a proper Amendment in on the Bill. Evidently he didn't do that and I think that was what those people who are so interested



in open primary ought to be asking him why he didn't get a primary Amendment written in the proper way so it could have been addressed on 1680. It's certainly not my job to help out every Member with their Amendments. As far as the clustering Amendment, I did take it off in the.... as I gave my word and I have absolutely no control on the floor of this House as to what other Members are going to do with Amendments. And there was a motion and then Mr. Collins.... knows that. He's been here longer than I have and he knows very well I have no control over what other Members want to do. I.... but I can't understand... and I hope that all of the Members on the other side of the aisle take a look at what the original Bill does. You cannot afford to vote 'no' or 'present' on this Bill. It gives you... it gives you for the first time in many many elections, the opportunity for your party to be designated first on the ballot. You're not going to get to be first if we continue to be.... continue the way we are and have the County Clerk and the party he is affiliated with be first on the ballot. If we adopt this Bill, at least you have the opportunity to be first at a lottery situation. I would think each and every one of you would be clamoring to support the Bill for that reason, if for no other. And we on this side of the aisle think that that is a fair thing to do. We want to give you every opportunity. And for you to be arguing about the clustering situation.... that really only affects, to the best of my knowledge right now, one small county in the northern part of the state. And you're losing this opportunity if you don't vote for it for your party to be listed first at a by lottery throughout the State of Illinois. I think you're certainly missing a golden opportunity. As far as the other Amendments that are adopted on the Bill, the speakers that adopted offered the Amendment have all spoken on this Bill. And I imagine that they are going to support the Bill. They got their Amendments on. I would urge them to support the Bill in the form that it's in. It's a good piece of legislation. The courts have so ruled that we've got to.... to do something like this and give the opportunity for



the parties to be put on the ballot through a lottery system. I respectfully request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1680 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer to explain his vote."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to correct the Sponsor of this Bill. I hope Representative Bradley is listening to this. I deeply respect his small county in central Illinois; McLean, but when he refers to only one small county in northern Illinois and refers to Lake County, I would point out to him that it's the third largest county in the State of Illinois. The second largest Republican county in the State of Illinois and we shouldn't be passing it off as a small county in northern Illinois. However, before I conclude my remarks, I would like to apologize to Representative Matijevich for comments made on the floor of this House by myself, when the cluster Amendment was on Second Reading. I believe I pointed out at that time that our Democratic County Clerk had broken the law in Lake County and that he, as County Chairman, was bailing her fat out of the fire. I received five phone calls from Republican County Board Members pointing out to me that the Republicans passed this in Lake County and that the Republicans on the County Board deeply want the opportunity to cluster. They're not trying to impose this on other people in the State of Illinois, but they seem to be in favor of it there."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser, to explain his vote."

Houlihan, J.: "Will the Clerk record speech #23 against.... for Representative Telcser?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Telcser, do you want to explain your vote?"

Houlihan, J.: "Speech #.... speech #23 for Representative Telcser, against the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's got it prerecorded and prefiled. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to explain his vote."

Skinner: "For the information of the Members of the House, Amendment # or the Amendment I adopted... or introduced on the open primary was filed in a timely fashion. In fact, it was filed



before the Bill was let out of Committee. The only reason that it wasn't in good order was because of the perfidy of those who adopted the clustering Amendment, Amendment #2. Somebody obviously broke their word, it wasn't us. But I rise to oppose this Bill because of the incredible.... just incredible behavior of the Speaker at the time this Bill was being heard. I had Amendment #16 printed and distributed. It was on your desks and the Speaker refused to call it. It called for a vote on Proposition 13 for residential property in Illinois. Now I think that is as important a thing to vote on as is ERA. I would like to see ERA voted on, but if this isn't brought back to Second Reading, there's no way that I would even consider voting in favor of it."

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

Geo-Karis: "My name...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The timer is on."

Geo-Karis: "My name was used in debate by my co-runner on the other side...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Point of personal privilege, I guess."

Geo-Karis: "It's a point of personal privilege. I have a letter here in the files... and it's a copy... addressed to the Clerk of the County County Clerk of my County saying that although her motive is commendable, it was illegal to cluster precincts into zone voting. And I've got it in the files if he cares to see it. And so this is the truth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stanley, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Stanley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm in a similar situation.... or was in a similar situation to Representative Skinner and Representative Robinson, when... the Amendment I had to enfranchise thousands of voters in Illinois was ruled out of order. That Amendment was property drafted, that was an unfair ruling. I'm voting against this Bill and I'm encouraging everyone else to. And let me say this, that if Representative Bradley says 'first' and Representative Matijevich says



'first', I wonder where their sense of fairness is. If they really want to expedite and make it easier for voters to vote, then what's the matter with extending those voting hours for people in Illinois till seven o'clock? And that's the issue on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are....and Mr. Von Boeckman is 'aye', please. On this question there are 75 'ayes', 75 'nays'. The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker, could we poll the absentees, please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman asks to have the absentees polled. Mr. Skinner, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Skinner: "Well, I would point out if all the absentees vote 'yes', it still will not have 89 votes, so it obviously is dilatory."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll poll the absentees. Yeah, because we.... we'd have 89 because Mr. Von Boeckman wanted to record himself as 'aye' here. He's right here, Von Boeckman. Came up to the Clerk and asked to.... That's all right. And a couple reds going green makes 89 and 90. Please proceed to poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bartulis. Caldwell. Corneal Davis. Deavers."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. McPike. Mr. McPike is 'aye'. Mr. Davis is 'aye'."

McPike: "I want you to change me from 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. McPike from 'no' to 'aye'. Mr. Davis wants to be recorded as 'aye'. Mr. Deavers, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Deavers: "Please record me as 'no', please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You're not recognized for that purpose. Kindly record him as 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ewing. Giglio. Harris. Hart. Kornowicz. McGrew. Mugalian. Schlickman. And Mrs. Willer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On this question there are 77 'ayes' and 74 'nays'. The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, could....I'd like to have this Bill put on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman asks....Bill be placed on Postponed



Consideration. This Bill will be placed on Postponed Consideration.

The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr...Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "I rise on a point of interest of concern to the entire Body,
Mr. Speaker, and I've been...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me.....could we have your attention, please?
Please continue, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I've been told that Representative Stanley
has asked that certain petitions calling for the submission of a
question of public policy to the electors of the state dealing with
political issues and that an accompanying letter which deals in a
great deal of political rhetoric and contains many political over-
tones has had several thousands of these matter xeroxed on the xerox
machines which are available for our use - and I'm not sure of the
propriety of this request and this action - but I think that this...
the Speaker's Office and the House Operations are entitled to know
if they're going to be reimbursed from some political fund for this
xeroxing which has occurred. And I have in my hand one of these
documents....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr...."

Madigan: "With the number 2000 written across the top which indicates
that 2000 of these items were run on our xerox machine and they deal
with a....definitely, a political question and they concern the
November election."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On the question..... Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Well, the Gentleman is totally out of order. If he has a
question like that he should bring it up to the Representative
before he brings it on this House floor and he should discuss this
through the proper lines. He's trying to introduce politics into
the very closing Session that we have right now. We've got more
important subjects to deal with like property tax relief than some
petty charges. Now, Representative Madigan, you know better than
that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Stanley."

Stanley: "In response to Mr. Madigan....."



Speaker Lechowicz: "...On a point of personal privilege...."

Stanley: "On a point of personal privilege. This is a petition that submits a question of public policy to all the voters of Illinois, Representative Madigan. It's not something that promotes the Republican Party, it's not something that promotes me. It is something that is a question of submission to the voters of Illinois. And let me, let me add one other thing that I think is significant here. Representative Madigan's charge is not right, and more importantly it shows that he is not interested in putting anything on the ballot in November. We've seen that relative to Representative Totten's Constitutional Amendment and I think this is another case in point."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let me announce since we have a little bit of a pause and let the tempers cool off just a little bit, introduce to you a Member from the Wisconsin General Assembly, Mr. Tom Hansen, Representative Tom Hansen. Tom."

Hansen: "Senator Graham took...has given me a lot of his time and hospitality, I'm very appreciative of that, introduced me to the Senate and I told them that the best recommendation I could make to them is to follow the Wisconsin Legislature and that we have been adjourned now for several months. As I...as I look over some of the things that you're doing in your closing Session, it looks like I haven't left the Capitol in Madison and I...I wish you well."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Senate Bill 1725. One moment. Mr. Keats, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Keats: "A point of clarification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir."

Keats: "It would be my understanding that if a Member of the House would make charges that are just plain obviously in error with the press here, I think it is not unreasonable to ask for an apology. He has made a personal attack on a Member of this House, questioned the credibility and the honesty for no reason."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You know.... Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I offered no charges, I offered no allegations, I simply raised the question and suggested that it would be in good propriety for the Gentleman to respond and whether in his opinion this is a political matter or a



nonpolitical matter; and that if in his opinion 110.

it was a political whether he intended to reimburse the House Operations, that's all."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He was on the phone, he didn't hear your question once again but that's all right. Senate Bill 1710. I'm sorry, yeah, 1710, House Appropriation Bill. 1725, Mr. Epton."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1725. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Epton."

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

Yesterday you had quite an extended debate on the Amendments offered to this Bill, an Amendment to table. The matter was thoroughly discussed. I will not take the time of the House to go into any further details. I can simply assure you that this is a Bill which is attempting to put the Department of Insurance in a posture whereby it can examine insurance companies for solvency and also handle the very thousands of complaints which today are coming into the Department. Today, for example, there are only fourteen people in the Department of Insurance to handle an excess of 15,000 complaints. By passing legislation of this nature we'll be able to reduce that, instead of a 65 or 75 day turnover, we hope the Department will be able to meet the request of the very...various community groups. I would be happy to answer any questions but in the meantime I solicit your vote in favor of this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, most of things that we do here are negotiable and whether they pass, whether you vote 'aye' or 'nay' doesn't make a whole lot of difference because the world will still train...turn in its predictable orbit. But this Bill, SB 1725, is a radical exception to that rule of complacency as I have recited. I earnestly ask you to believe that if you put this Bill on the...on the law books that you will be doing for small insurance domestic companies in the State of Illinois the same thing that the ax edge does for the chicken's head. It'll cut 'em off. You'll do the same thing for that valuable industry that House...that Senate Bill 234, 235 and 285 did for industry in Illinois. You'll have a mass migration of small domestic insurance



companies from the borders of this state to the more pleasant and hospitable climate of each of the surrounding states. Now I recognize that it's not a great concern to many of you that many of these companies will leave because you feel that's someone else's problem, someone else's ox is being gored. I speak from personal interest in the matter not for myself but for my community. We have a very fine insurance company in southeastern Illinois, a nonpolluting employer that we treasure greatly. I don't have a dime's financial interest in any way, directly or indirectly, in this company but I ask you to believe that you've signed the death knell for that company in Illinois if you take the position that's urged by this particular Bill. But let me cite some other things that'll happen that are of state-wide concern. The first thing that you do is create a burgeoning bureaucracy that knows no limit. The Department of Insurance within the last three years, the budget has doubled. It's 6.2 million dollars this year. Five'll get you ten if you pass this Bill it'll double again in the next two years. And the reason that is true is this, that this Bill makes the appropriation process in regard to financing of the Department of Insurance a ministerial act. It works like this. The Director writes down on a piece of paper, 'I think we need ten million dollars'. Then they send a note out to each of the domestic insurance companies of this state and say, 'Send in ten million dollars collectively.' And when they got the ten million collected, they come before the Department of...the... the General Assembly and say, 'we've got the ten million dollars in the kitty, authorized and to expend it.' Do you know that last year there were 196 employees of the Department of Insurance? This year there are 200, next year they've asked for 289. You pass this Bill and it's safely predicted that the number of employees of the Department of Insurance will go to 500 quicker than you can count 'em. Now you must recognize that small insurance companies, small domestic insurance companies that are proposed to be lugged here to the... to their financial destruction as compared to....foreign companies, cannot stand the amount of over-regulations that the large companies have, the giants of the industry, the CNA's, the all-state's, and by the way, the Director of Insurance here is the...the voice of



Allstate in this building. They can stand this kind of regulation but the little insurance companies can't and there isn't a one of you that doesn't have one of those little industries in your particular district. Keep that in mind. You do not want to see....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to a close."

Cunningham: "I'm not through yet. You gave...you must recognized that this is a brand new tax, it's a tax that'll have to be spread to everybody in the State of Illinois. If you treasure the right to say that you haven't voted for a new tax you cannot in good conscience vote for this because it is a new tax. The one invincible politician in the State of Illinois runs on rather a surprising platform, he has two hold cards that are somewhat negative, says, 'no new tax, no industry being driven from the State of Illinois during his administration'. How he can have his Director of Insurance here walk...walking the aisles, beating you over the head to vote for this Bill that's so destructive to the small, domestic insurance industry I'll never understand. There ought to be a man named Mike Bakalis praying in the wings that it would pass because if it does pass, no longer can the incumbent say that he hasn't driven jobs from the state and no longer can he say that he has not inflicted a new tax upon the citizens of Illinois. Vote for your own constituent's self...best interest, vote 'no' on this terrible Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Winnebago, Mrs. Martin."

Martin, L: "I would point out that under the system now used those companies that have the most complaints lodged against them pay more of the total cost. It seems to me that is fair. We have, unfortunately, some companies that deserve many of the complaints they get. Under this new system as proposed by the Department of Insurance, companies will be paying more than their fair share and the good companies will end up paying more of the burden. That seems to me a poor reward for good service in our state. I would also say that the Department of Insurance, when they talk with me, assured me that the small companies in my district would not be hurt. That is exactly the opposite and I do not appreciate getting incorrect information. I would suggest you vote 'no' on this Bill."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Sunday afternoon, late Sunday afternoon, we fought an Amendment trying to get this Bill back into the same shape that it was when it came from the Senate. We did not succeed at that time and the Bill in its present form ought to be defeated. It assesses, as you recall, the entire cost of the operation of the Department of Insurance against the domestic insurance companies only. From 55 to 60 percent of the premium dollars written in the State of Illinois or written by out of state insurance companies. And, yet, as Representative Martin just pointed out, we would be assessing the entire cost of the operation against the domestic companies, small and large alike. If it is truly what the Department of Insurance has attempted to sell us as a fair share funding then the...there is nothing fair that I can see about assessing the entire cost of the operation of the Department of Insurance against the domestic companies only when the majority of the insurance premium dollars written in the State of Illinois are written by out of state insurers. If you want to protect the industry of the State of Illinois you will vote a resounding 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to Senate Bill 1725. I'd like to point out something to the Members of the House. How many of you have been contacted by one of the large domestic insurance companies in the State of Illinois in opposition to this Bill? I'd suggest to you that nobody has been contacted by those large domestic insurance companies because they're not the ones that are being hurt under this Bill. The life insurance valuation tax is going to be gradually eliminated under the...under the procedures set up under this Bill and that tax which is being paid now by those large companies - and I'm thinking particularly of State Farm and Allstate, Continental National and Country Companies....the elimination of that tax is going to be the means by which the large companies are going to continue to pay the same amount of money, virtually, that they're paying now. The burden of the expense is going to fall on that group of smaller property and casualty insurance companies who are not now paying



those high life insurance valuation taxes. And I submit to you that this is going to be a reorganization of the expense of the Department of Insurance and it's going to fall on the smaller domestic fire and casualty companies doing business in the State of Illinois. I would also like to reiterate one of the statements made by an earlier speaker, and that is, that this process will tend to dilute the appropriation process of the Legislature. No longer will there be any reason to hold back on the growth of the Department of Insurance because the Department is simply going to pass on all of their expenses to the industry. Now that may sound like a good idea on the surface but if you'll stop and think about it you'll realize that you and I, as policyholders in the State of Illinois, are in fact going to have to pay those expenses. And I submit to you that this is a new departure which goes too far. We should give the Department of Insurance the authority to raise more monies for financial examinations of insurance companies. That was the proposal that would have been made possible under this Bill as it was amended in the Senate. That Senate Amendment has been taken off and I suggest to you that in...in its present posture this Bill should not be supported."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff."

Huff: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just like to take this opportunity to commend the much maligned Department of Insurance on the brilliant job of investigative reporting with reference to the question of red lining. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. McBroom."

McBroom: "...Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', all opposed... The previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Epton, to close."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's unfortunate that some of my colleagues are rather prone to exaggeration. I suspect that some of you already have been aware of that situation in the past as well as in the present. ...You take,



for example, the situation of a small company leaving the State of Illinois. This particular company which is going to leave this well run state will presently pay, under this Bill, a tax of approximately...an assessment of approximately 19,000 dollars. If the president decides that it isn't worthwhile staying in this state and goes to Indianapolis he simply will then have to pay 250,000 dollars to Illinois as a foreign premium tax; in addition to which he will have to pay a premium tax to Indiana of another 50,000. So this brilliant president will only cost his company approximately 281,000 dollars. Now as far as the smaller not being helped, actually the initial purpose is exactly that. Today you are maybe aware of the fact that when the Department of Insurance comes in and examines the company, especially the small companies and the small agencies and the small brokerage firms...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Epton. Give the Gentleman some order, please."

Epton: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please continue."

Epton: "It charges one hundred dollars a day per man. It can be in there for sometime, six weeks, three months. As a matter of fact, their examination alone can be enough to practically make a...agency insolvent or a small firm insolvent. In an effort to avoid that and to spread the cost, they're trying to do this throughout the industry rather than place an uncertain burden upon small companies or large companies. And speaking of large companies, the company that will pay the most for this assessment is Blue Cross Blue Shield. They will pay approximately 20 percent of the cost of this assessment. At the present time, Blue Cross Blue Shield pays five dollars to the State of Illinois for regulatory purposes. Even if they passed this cost onto the consumer - and you can bet they will - it will amount to less than one cent a policy. Finally, I should add, the Department of Insurance is not an organization which goes only in one direction. It not only tends to deal with insolvency, it intends to deal with all of the problems that face us in Illinois. I should add, nobody is giving foreign insurance companies a pass. They forgot to mention in discussion that the foreign insurance



Companies today pay 86,000,000 dollars as against approximately the 5,000,000 dollars received from domestic companies in fees and regulations. So don't think for a moment that the foreign companies are being hit. This is an excellent Bill. It's one that should pass out in its present form and I solicit your favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1725 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Collins: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would urge everyone to vote for this very fine Bill. The harangue we listened to from the Gentleman from Lawrence struck the bounds of credibility even for him. To suggest that this...any company would leave the state because of this Bill overlooks the obvious fact that Representative Epton just pointed out. Domestic corporations do enjoy the benefit of a two percent gross premium tax and it would cost him over a quarter of a million dollars for the company that he leaves...that he represents for them to leave the state. Furthermore, to cast any aspersions upon the present Director of Insurance I think calls for an apology and to suggest that he speaks for any one company...certainly would say he owes them an apology. This is probably the finest director we've had in our time here and a man who initiated an investigation into the very company he has just been accused of representing. So let's not fool anybody. To suggest that this would cause an increase in the budget overlooks the fact that the assessments are limited by this very Bill. And there is a cap in the Bill plus the fact that there is a sunset provision which will take effect in four years in which time we can decide whether this Bill has more....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to a close."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'll just say in closing, this Bill is designed not only to help the small companies and to maintain their solvency but to help the public and to provide protection for the consumer. I think this is a much needed Bill, a very good Bill and I urge your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite, to explain her vote. Timer's on."



Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think we all realize that if this vote...Bill passes and goes out of here today it would still have to go to the Senate for concurrence on the House Amendment. Regardless of what the controversy is over the state of one particular Amendment in this House, there are other House Amendments that already a part of this Bill. And, so, I suggest to you that it is a good Bill, it deserves your support. The controversy over the Amendment that did not go on here in the House could be resolved in a Conference Committee where we might come out with something acceptable to all sides and I urge your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter, to explain his vote; timer is on."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, our most important priority is to insure a balanced budget and to prevent tax increases now and for the future. But this Bill is not the way to do it. It may sound very good to call this fair share funding but we're putting into the law a principle that we're going to have to live with for a long time if this is adopted and it's one that will work against us rather than for us. If we provide that insurance companies may be assessed for their own regulation, even though we still have the appropriation range, we have no ability - or no desire - to prevent that budget from going up, up, up in the future. New York is the only state that has tried this and the cost of regulating for them are twice what they are for a comparable state such as California. I think it's a bad principle. I urge the Members to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, to explain his vote; timer is on."

Madison: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to inform my colleagues that my concern about this Bill will...surely relates to the small companies. And I just spoke with the Chairman of the Board of Supreme Life Insurance Company and although it's probably one of the largest black owned insurance companies in this country, in the relative scheme of things it's a small company. And I'm informed by that corporation that this Bill is...would...would severely hurt them and it is



definitely unfair to the smaller companies and I would suggest to my colleagues that we vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keats, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Keats: "Thank you, Mr...thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I ask you to vote 'no' and there are several good reasons. One, though, I do want to defend....I appreciated Representative Collins defending the Director of Insurance 'cause he is a good man, he's a constituent of mine and please don't bad mouth him. This isn't his fault, this abomination is someone else's fault. The problem with this Bill today in reality is it is a shifting of who is paying this insurance tax. Right now it is a little more evenly distributed. If this Bill passes, the companies that they.....have the most complaints against them will be paying less. Those companies with less complaints will pay more. Therefore, if your company with higher complaints, you're probably better off with this particular Bill. That's one thing to keep in mind. The second factor is, when...when we've had the one example where this has been done in New York, not only has it not been successful but as Representative Porter pointed out, the significant increase in the cost of regulation have been damaging not only to the taxpayers but to the entire insurance industry in that state. And, remember, we have to look at insurance protection for you and me that's upon those insurance companies, they share our risks with us. If we increase the cost of their insurance....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to a close."

Keats: "We are increasing their risks which is increasing our risk which is increasing our cost."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike, to explain his vote; timer's on."

McPike: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to correct what was just said.....New York does indeed fund their Department of Insurance the same way that we're proposing in Illinois and their budget has gone up two percent a year for the last eight consecutive years. Two percent. I would not call that a run away budget. This did not in any way, shape or form bypass the Appropriations Committee, the



Department of Insurance just like the Commissioner for Banks in Illinois would still come through the Appropriations just like they have in the past. You know, one thing that has been brought out is that Blue Cross Blue Shield who has 800,000,000 dollars in premiums in this state, 800,000,000 dollars, pays to the State of Illinois five dollars a year. Now it's absolutely incredible that a company that does one-fifth of the total volume of business in this state, one-fifth of the total volume, pays to this state only five dollars a year. We receive from foreign companies about 75 to 80,000,000 dollars a year from a premium tax and domestic companies who do the great majority of the business in this state only pay about 5 to 8,000,000 dollars. The...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to a close."

McPike: "Well, this is an excellent Bill and I really wish you would put a green vote up on that board."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Reed, to explain her vote. Timer is on."

Reed: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I surely am no expert in the field of insurance but basically I do know that subsidization of state government by private enterprise, be it foreign or domestic, large or small, is an incredible approach to government financing. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin, to explain his vote; timer is on."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my 'aye' vote let me suggest that the residents in my district are being redlined. The Blue Cross rates are going up and the senior citizens are being ripped off by the supplemental Medicare Insurance. I think we need this legislation so that the Department of Insurance can start doing something about these and other problems that affect the consumer. If you go back about three years, there really weren't a whole lot of visible issues that affect our constituents that are related to insurance. And it's been in the last two or three years that we've begun to see the kinds of problems that we've been talking about this afternoon. I think this Bill would give the Department the



ability to begin to better cope with these problems. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think it is interesting that this would be considered at a time when the Tribune carries an article on Parkinson's Law. In case you've forgotten what that is, it holds that people would stretch a given piece of work as far as time and a possibility of making themselves more important by adding underlings will allow. Therefore the bureaucracy grows and grows and becomes more inefficient. This will certainly encourage the bureaucracy to add more and more people in the Department of Insurance. This is a plan that is similar to what happens with savings and loans. And I can tell you what happens there because I have some first hand experience. The cost of examining savings and loans has gone up about 500 percent and the reason is they send their examiners in the first of the week, they're told, 'now stay there all week because we haven't got any place for you to go until next week.' About Tuesday they start reading the newspaper and about Thursday they finally get down to work and so the building and loan is soaked for all this extra time. That's what's going to happen here to instate insurance companies and that's the reason we don't have more insurance companies now because Illinois has not encouraged them. This is...this you should vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jim Houlihan, to explain his vote. Timer's on. Jim Houlihan. You want to explain your vote, Jim? You...your light's on."

Houlihan, J: "I realize that, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. I think that the arguments used against it don't take into consideration the fact that we have tried this practice in other...in other areas of state government and it's worked out very well. I think the...those who have suggested that it increases the cost just don't have it in line because the Appropriations Committee reviews those budgets and makes an evaluation. I can't see any reason why we shouldn't support this legislation. I think all the arguments have been made and I urge a few more 'aye' votes on



Senate Bill 1725."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell, to explain his vote, timer's on."

Waddell: "Because of a poor excuse for voting 'present' which is a conflict of interest, I shall continue to vote 'present'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann. Timer's on."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, there's one aspect of this Bill which alone would justify my affirmative vote. And that is, it will deal with Blue Shield Blue Cross, an institution which has grown to gargantuan limits upon which we have no fix, upon which we really have no legislative oversight and which is gouging you as well as my family. If it's happening to my family I'm assuming it's happening in your family and other families across the state. So I would suggest that on that count alone, the savings which will result from unneeded hospitalizations and the like, should justify your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh, Bill Walsh."

Walsh, Wm: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the point the last Gentleman makes with respect to Blue Shield, Blue Shield Blue Cross is a not for profit corporation and subject to the not for profit corporation laws and I find it interesting that the impact of this increase in tax will impact on them for 20 percent of the total whatever the total is and the total is indeed open-ended. Now it seems to me, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if we're going to have a tax increase - and let's call this exactly what it is, it's a tax increase - the time for it is not on Second Reading in the opposite House. Now I submit, Mr. Speaker, that policyholders, life insurance policyholders, are better able to pay than casualty insurance policyholders. This tax impacts on casualty insurance policyholders and it's not fair. Mr. Speaker, this is a bad Bill and should be defeated because of the Amendment that we put on it on Second Reading."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman, to explain his vote; timer's on."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I hear some of the opponents saying that they think this, you know, they're supporting



the small insurance companies. Well, I'm voting 'yes' because I'm voting for the small insurance companies. Right now the way the...the examinations are...are financed, it impacts most heavily on the small insurance companies and in fact a good examination could really wipe out the process of a small company for...for a quarter and perhaps longer. Under the proposed legislation that we're...we're now voting on the...these costs would be spread out over the entire domestic industry, paid up front and then the examinations could proceed without any additional costs to the small company. The practical effect of this, it seems to me, that it would make the Department more vigilant with respect to the small companies and we would be able to detect weaknesses in the small companies much earlier and to prevent companies from going under. That's what we ought to be doing and I...I think...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to a close?"

Bowman: "I think an 'aye' vote is a vote for the small insurance companies of this state."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff, to explain his vote; timer's on."

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

Very briefly, I'm...I'm voting for this Bill simply because I have faith in the present Director of Insurance and I'm voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1725 would create a rational modern means of funding the Illinois Department of Insurance by spreading the basic cost of regulation across the entire domestic insurance industry in proportion to each company's share of the overall Illinois market. All appropriation authority would be retained by the Illinois General Assembly with the General Revenue Fund being reimbursed by a fair share contribution from the domestic insurance industry. Now I leave this thought with you in considering whether or not to support this legislation. Equity funding is subject of the billion dollar bubble which was recently aired on tv, the subject of a multibillion dollar fraud - the largest fraud to ever hit mankind - was a domestic Illinois



insurance company. And I'm suggesting to you as the Department of Insurance itself has verified, that if we had more agents and examiners that equity funding may not have gotten into the trouble that it did. I urge your 'aye' vote for good government, for good examinations for the State of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?"

Clerk will take the record. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Epton, asks a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "E. M. Barnes. Gaines. Geo-Karis. Hart. Hoffman. Kane. Kelly. Kornowicz. McGrew. Schlickman. Skinner."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Schlickman wants to be recorded as 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "And Vitek."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Skinner, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Skinner: "Well, my name was called and I'm standing up to vote 'aye'. The equity funding part really got to me."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Skinner as 'aye'. Kindly... Mr. Vitek, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Vitek: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I may have a conflict of interest but I gotta vote my conscience as....Bernie Epton always says so I'll vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Vitek as 'aye'. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell. Mr. Ewell."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'present'."

Ewell: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Ewell as 'aye'. What's the count? Oh excuse me, Mr. Hoffman is 'aye'. On this question there are 91 'ayes', 66 'noes'. Gentleman asks for a verification. Verification has been requested. Will all unauthorized personnel remove themselves from the floor? Would the Membership kindly be confined to your seat? Clerk will proceed to verify the affirmative vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Antonovych. Jane Barnes. Beatty. Bianco."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Beatty is right here if you're writing them down."

Clerk O'Brien: "Boucek. Bowman. Bradley. Brady. Brandt. Byers.



Capparelli. Catania. Chapman. Collins. Daniels. Corneal Davis.
 Jack Davis. Dawson. Deavers. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. Dyer.
 Edgar. Epton. Ewell. Farley. Friedland. Garmisa. Giorgi.
 Greiman. Hanahan. Hoffman. Holewinski. Dan Houlihan. J. M.
 Houlihan. Huff. Jaffe. Dave Jones. Katz. Kempiners. Klosak.
 Kosinski. Kucharski. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leinenweber. Levin.
 Lucco. Macdonald. Madigan. Mahar. Mann. Margalus. Marovitz.
 McBroom. McClain. McLendon. McPike. Meyer. Molloy. Mudd.
 Mugalian. Murphy. Nardulli. O'Brien. Pechous. Peters. Pouncey.
 Ryan. Satterthwaite."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the Membership kindly be in your seat? Please proceed with the verification."

Clerk O'Brien: "Schisler. Schlickman. Schneider. Schoeberlein.
 Sharp. Shumpert. Skinner. Steczo. C. M. Stiehl. Taylor.
 Telcser. Terzich. Van Duyne. Vinson. Vitek. R. V. Walsh.
 W. D. Walsh....okay, those last two voted 'no'. R. V. Walsh
 and W. D. voted 'no'. Willer. Williams. Younge. Yourell.
 And Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Wolf, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Wolf: "I think somebody had my paper clipped wrong, would you change me to 'aye', please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Wolf as 'aye'. And Mr. Schoeberlein as 'aye'. Mr. Von Boeckman. Kindly record Mr. Von Boeckman as 'aye'. Mr. Christensen would like to be changed from 'no' to 'aye'. Are there any questions of the Affirmative vote? Mr. Keats."

Keats: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Bradley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Bradley? He's right here."

Keats: "Representative Brady."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Brady? He's right in the back of the chamber."

Keats: "Representative Byers."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who was that?"

Keats: "Byers."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Byers. Harold Byers.... How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly remove Mr. Byers from the Roll Call.

Anyone else?"

Keats: "Representative Capparelli."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Capparelli? He's right here."

Keats: "Representative Collins."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Collins? Right in the back of the chamber."

Keats: "Representative Dawson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Dawson? How is the Gentleman recorded? Mr. Dawson."

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman is not in the chamber, kindly remove him off the Roll Call."

Keats: "Representative Doyle."

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

Keats: "Representative Friedland."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who?"

Keats: "Friedland."

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

Keats: "Representative Holewinski."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Holewinski. He's in the chamber."

Keats: "D. Houlihan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's back in the chamber, yeah."

Keats: "Representative Jaffe."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Jaffe's seated in his chair."

Keats: "Is that bald head Jaffe?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, that's fullheaded Jaffe."

Keats: "Representative Johnson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Johnson? He's in his chair."

Keats: "Representative...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Now wait a minute. Timmy, you're recorded as 'present'. You want to...stay 'present'? Okay. Kindly record Mrs. Geo-Karis as 'no'. Henry. Mr. Kozubowski, what purpose you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Kozubowski: "Change me to 'aye' please."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Kozubowski as 'aye'."

Keats: "Walter, your soul may roast in the devil for that one.

Representative Klosak."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's going straight to heaven, I don't know about yourself. Mr. Bartulis. Kindly record Mr. Bartulis as 'aye'.

Mr. Matula. I can't see you, Paul. Mr. Matula."

Matula: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes."

Matula: "How...how am I recorded?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is he recorded?"

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

Matula: "Put me down for 'yes'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly change Mr. Matula to 'aye'."

Keats: "Representative Kozubowski will not be alone roasting in that location."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Do you have any more questions?"

Keats: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, could you remove the Assistant Director from lobbying the Members at this time?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "You got anything else, Mr. Keats?"

Keats: "Yes, we do. Representative Mudd."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mudd. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Mr. Mudd? How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yeah, here he is. Mr. Mudd's right here, Mr. Keats."

Keats: "Mr. Speaker, could you please have Mr. Haskin either refrain from lobbying from the Members or whatever is necessary? If he continues to lobby, please remove him."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. McClain. Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, a point of order. The Gentleman is in a verification, he ought to restrict himself to verification not to harass the gentleman. He's got a right to be here. And there's... according to rules whenever there's a Bill that affects a department one person from the department may be on the floor. So if the Gentleman would just kindly have a little decorum in the House and restrict himself just to the verification."

Keats: "There's substantially more than one person lobbying..."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Schoeberlein requests to be verified.

Mr. Schoeberlein requests to be verified. Do you have any further questions of the Affirmative vote?"

Keats: "Mr...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk."

Polk: "Please record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Polk as 'aye'. Mr. Stearney, what purpose do you seek recognition? Kindly record Mr. Stearney as 'aye'. Mr. Katz, what purpose...seek recognition?"

Katz: "I want to change from 'aye' to 'present'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Katz as 'present'. Mr. Giglio, what purpose you seek recognition? Kindly record Mr. Giglio as 'aye'. Better quit while you're ahead, Rog, it's getting bigger."

Keats: "What's the count, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Kelly, what purpose you seek recognition? Kindly record Mr. Kelly as 'aye'."

Keats: "What's the count, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll give it to you in a second. Are you through with the verification?"

Keats: "No, I'd just like to check the count, thank you. Depending... depending on what the count is has something to do with it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's gettin' bigger. What's the count, Jack? 98."

Keats: "We would just soon cancel the verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the count now, Jack? 98, what?"

Clerk O'Brien: "98 'ayes' and 61 'noes'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On this..... Mr. McGrew. Kindly record Mr. McGrew as 'no'. On this question there are 98 'ayes', 62 'noes'. And Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, what purpose... seek recognition?"

Cunningham: "Chicago machine should know there'll be 300 new jobs in the Department of Insurance if you'll pass the word by and have lots of regulations in Illinois."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We're gettin' 298, you're gettin' 2. That's not true, I don't know anything about that. The Gentleman from Marion, Friedrich, what purpose you seek recognition?"



Friedrich: "On a point of order, Mr....I guess it'd be a point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir."

Friedrich: "I'd....it was...report was raised a while ago that there was a director, Assistant Director, on the floor of this House, walking up and down the aisles lobbying. The rules do not provide for that despite what was said. And I deplore it and I think that there's people from the Governor's Office, there's people from the Department that are on the floor of this House from time to time and also on the other side of the aisle - it isn't restricted to one party, I fear that it is in strict violation of rules and I wish it would be enforced because I don't think people on the floor of this House ought to be harassed by people either from the Governor's Office or from various departments or from the Mayor's Office or anyplace else. I wish it would be enforced."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, a few people have been castigating the Assistant Director of Insurance and I'd like to say on the floor of this House that he was harassing nobody. As a matter of fact, he was down here and I asked him to come back and talk to a couple friends of mine to explain some points that I couldn't answer on that Bill. If anybody is guilty of any....of any misconduct it would be me because I invited him back to talk to some people who I thought he could answer their question. There was nothing improper done by the Assistant Director."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Everybody admonish Phil Collins. Senate Bill 1760. 6-1760."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1760. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to Comprehensive County Hospital and Governing Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin."

Levin: "...Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday we put onto this Bill Amendments 6 and 7. Together, these two Amendments constitute the Bill. Amendment 6 deals with the cash flow situation of the Cook County Hospital Governing Commission. It was indicated in debate yesterday. There was no opposition to Amendment 6. Amendment 7



was drafted by the Department of Public Aid. Again, it was supported by them and as was indicated in debate by myself and Representative McMaster. There is no opposition to Amendment 7. If there's any questions I'd be happy to answer 'em otherwise I urge passage of Senate Bill 1760."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan, D: "Question of the Sponsor if he'll yield, please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Houlihan, D: "With the adoption now of Amendment #6, as I take it, Amendment #6 and Amendment #7 in effect constitute the Bill, is that correct?"

Levin: "That's correct. Amendment #6 strikes everything after the enacting clause."

Houlihan, D: "Has there been a fiscal note filed as result of the adoption of Amendment #6?"

Levin: "Amendment #6, there has been no fiscal note requested. But Amendment #6 has absolutely no financial impact of any kind on the State of Illinois."

Houlihan, D: "Well, does #7?"

Levin: "Amendment #7 simply clears...provides a...additional procedure that can be used to expedite the paper work with respect to the MANG system."

Houlihan, D: "Well, am I correct though that the Bill now as amended would expand the eligibles on Public Aid who would be receiving medical assistance?"

Levin: "It makes nobody eligible who would not otherwise be eligible. What Amendment #7 does, and as I said it was drafted and is supported by Public Aid, is it provides for a precertification procedure where a doctor may certify - this is in Cook County - a doctor may certify to the department that he believes that a particular individual is going to go into the hospital within forty days. All the paper work is taken care of and if indeed that individual does go into the hospital within forty days then the department immediately shoots over the approval to the Cook County Hospital. It makes nobody eligible who would not otherwise be eligible."

Houlihan, D: "And you're telling us then that this has no fiscal impact,



is that correct?"

Levin: "As far as we can tell, it simply expedites the procedure."

Houlihan, D: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin, to close. Excuse me, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, we have a parliamentary inquiry relative to Amendments 1 and 2 on this Bill. Were they tabled?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Jack, were Amendments #1 and 2 tabled on this Bill?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted; 3 withdrawn; 4 lost; 5 withdrawn; 6 and 7 adopted."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does that answer your question, Mr. Madigan?"

Why don't we take this Bill out of the record, there's some question whether these Amendments were tabled or not and a motion filed. We'll try to get back to it in a later date. While I have the attention of the House, Jack, the Speaker asked and it was distributed on the floor I believe a memorandum subject to being Conference Committee meetings and I'd like to have the Clerk the memorandum. Jack, do you have it?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Early this morning there was passed out on every Member's desk a computer printout form with printing on both sides, the heading, Conference Committee History Pending. If you can find yours, it's... it may be confusing to look at but I could explain it to you and if you have any Bills on the Conference Committee stage you can follow them on this report which will be printed periodically. It has a time and a date so you can follow how recently the report was printed. The one Bill on this report that you can follow all the way through would be House Bill 933 sponsored by Representative DiPrima in the House and Senator Mitchler in the Senate. That Bill, on the first line you'll see, the House nonconcurred in Senate Amendments on 26 June '77. The next item, the Senate requested a Conference Committee on 30 June, the House named a Conference Committee on 30 June. The Senate named a Conference Committee on 30 June. The House reported their First Conference Committee on 1 July '77. The blank space, the Senate does not report Conference Committees so there's no date included. The House action, the House adopted the Conference



Committee on 1 July '77. On 1 July '77 in the Senate, the Conference Committee failed. When a Conference Committee fails, on the second line it starts Second Conference Committee. The next item, it says, 1 July '77 (S). This indicates the Senate requested a Second Conference Committee. Again, the date the House named their Conference Committees, the date the Senate names the date the House reported on this item on 27 April '78, the House adopted the Conference Committee. If the Senate were to adopt the Conference Committee the item would drop off of this report. If there's any question, please come down to the Clerk's desk for further explanation. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let me just also point out to you that each individual Member received a memorandum from the Speaker the subject being Conference Committee Meetings and it will be the obligation of the Conference Committee Chairman on House Bills to set a hearing time for meeting on their respective Bills. The Conference Committees on House Bills will meet starting at 8 o'clock Wednesday morning, June 28, 1978. The Chairman should phone Sandy Basler at 2-2602 to schedule the hearings on the respective Bills. After you have secured a hearing time and place please inform Nancy in the Speaker's Office at 2-6110 so that she can notify House and Senate Members of the time set for the hearing. House Members of the Conference Committees on Senate Bills will be advised of the time and place of meeting on Senate Bills by the Senate Chairman of the respective Conference Committees. Your complete cooperation is essential to an orderly scheduling and will be greatly appreciated. This memorandum was submitted to you this afternoon by the Speaker. Now let's get back to the business on hand, Senate Bill 1760, Mr. Levin. Believe you've read Senate Bill 1760 for the third time. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, I think we've answered the questions there are, if they're no more questions I urge an affirmative vote. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall 1760 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? No. Johnny, no. Have all voted who wish? Record me as 'no' will you, Jim? Danny, I want to be 'no'. Have all voted



who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 37 'ayes', 75 'nays', 18 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared lost. Senate Bill 1786."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1786. A Bill for an Act in relation to reserve mortgages. Third Reading of the Bill....Reverse mortgages."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Matejek."

Matejek: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1786 as amended amends the Illinois Banking Act, the Illinois Savings and Loan Act and the Credit Union Act to authorize these institutions to make reverse mortgage loans to persons 65 years of age or older for the purpose of paying real estate taxes on their homestead property. The term 'reverse mortgage' will be defined in this Bill as a loan extended on the basis of existing equities in homestead property for senior citizens. The Bill provides for reverse mortgage loans to be paid upon the sale of the property or death of the owner. If the property is in joint tenancy the loan would have to be repaid upon the death of the last surviving joint tenant who had a joint interest in the property at the time the loan was made. All joint tenants must be 65 years or older...of age or older. The homestead property for senior citizens is given the same meaning as the homestead property tax exemption provided for in the Revenue Act. The definition includes property occupied as a resident by a senior citizen and on which the senior is liable for payment of the real estate taxes. I would also like to thank at this time my distinguished Italian-American colleague on the other side of the aisle, Representative Conti, whose cooperation with respect to the Agreed Amendment which we put on yesterday. And I would ask for an affirmative vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1786? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 145 'ayes', 9 'nays', 4 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority hereby declared passed. Kindly record Mr. Bowman as 'aye' on that Bill, too. Senate Bill 1859, Mr. Edgar."



Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1859. A Bill for an Act relating to the release of highway easements. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Edgar."

Edgar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, this Bill is a very simple land transfer for one in Cumberland County and then also we added an Amendment on it on Second Reading that took care of a land transfer...the department in Randolph County I believe."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1859 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Marco. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 148 'ayes', 2 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1861."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1861. A Bill for an Act to transfer certain powers and duties relating to energy to the Department of Business and Economic Development in the Division of Energy. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis. Where's she at? Mrs. Stiehl. Oh, she's down in the Governor's Office? Well, we tried to call her Bill, you're my witness. Take it out of the record. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jim Houlihan, what purpose...seek recognition?"

Houlihan, J: "Mr. Speaker, this is identical to the Committee Bill that was passed out under the cosponsorship of Representative Stiehl and myself and Representative Kane. I wonder either could we come right back to it or could we proceed with it?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I will...we'll be on Senate Bills Third Reading I'll try to get back to the Lady the minute she returns to the floor as a matter of courtesy. Mrs. Stiehl, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Stiehl: "Oh...she's here, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Adeline, take it easy. Take it easy, Adeline.... Elmer. Where is El.... Yes, Mrs. Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I was going to offer to handle the Bill but the Sponsor's here."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's right. We'll give her a minute or two to



catch her breath. The Clerk will read Senate Bill 1861 please."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1861. A Bill for an Act to transfer certain powers and duties relating to the Department of Business and Economic Development and of the Division of Energy in the Department of Business and Economic Development to the Illinois Institute of Energy and Environmental Resources. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this... this Energy Reorganization Bill was heard before the Subcommittee of the Committee on State Government and was unanimously approved and the Senate Governments Committee passed this Bill; have made some very meaningful Amendments which I've accepted as House Sponsor. And what it does, it creates the Illinois Institute of Natural Resources which combines the Institute of Environmental Quality and the Division of Energy from the Division Department of Business and Economic Development. And...it...saves money for the taxpayers, gives better performance, cut out a lot of unnecessary ego trips in either department. And I move for its passage."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Adeline, as you know, I vote for all of your bad Bills all the time. Did you...what agencies are you amalgamating here?"

Geo-Karis: "The Agency of the Institute of Environmental Quality and the Division of Energy from the Business and Economic Development Agency. And if you'll recall, Representative, the Division of Energy was created by governmental...by Governor's Proclamation and now what we're doing is coordinating them into one Department."

Mann: "Well, may I address myself to the Bill, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that the..the Economic and Business Commission - while it's a very important Commission - should not be lumped together with a conservation commission because it's like lumping cats and dogs together. Now, and she says that's not what they're doing."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jim Houlihan, to respond to that inquiry."

Houlihan, J: "Excuse me, Representative Mann, what the legislation does



is implement the Governor's Executive Order and the Governor's Executive Order transfer the research aspect of the Division of Energy and it's primarily a research institute. It is not a development or promotion institute. It's not there as...Business and Economic Development exists to promote industry but...there to find research and information that would help Illinois dealing with...not only its resources but with use of its energy. And so in that respect it is a compatible blending and I think the Director of the Institute of Environmental Quality and all of the people involved with the discussions in the committee agree that what it did...it did not mix apples and oranges. And I believe most of the interests groups including the conservation groups and the League of Women Voters who have been 'viligant'...vigilant in protecting the environment all are in support of that merger."

Mann: "So are you telling me that the Department of Business and Economic Development is not merged in? Is that what you're saying?"

Houlihan, J: "The..the Division of Energy, the research aspect of that Division of Energy are merged with the Institute of Environmental Quality of three surveys in the museums but not the Department of Business and Economic Development."

Mann: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any further discussions? Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Lucco."

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Bill. The Legislative Division of the Illinois Energy Resources Commission, the Governor's people - and yesterday remember we had a lot of Amendments - Doug Kane's and this is very compatible as far as we're concerned. We'd be glad to go along with this particular Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1861 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I'm going to vote for this but I want to tell you that - and I commend the Senate - they...in the Appropriations Bill involving this agency, they took out some real money for some real needed projects. Projects like, study the social impact due



to power failures. Imagine that! We were going to study the social impact on power failures. In other words, when you have a power failure, nine months later there's going to be a social impact and that's the type of vulnerable flora and fauna of Illinois.

Imagine that, we're going to study which flora and fauna are vulnerable in Illinois. So I commend the Senate - at least in the Appropriation Bill - they took some of these valuable projects out but I'm going to support this Bill to merge the agencies."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 159 'ayes', 5 'nays', 6 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis, on a point of personal privilege."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to thank the Committee on State Government for their wonderful cooperation and..Chairman of the Illinois Energy Resources Commission for its wonderful cooperation. And I might tell you the Illinois Municipal League gave its blessings on this Bill as amended today. Thank you so much."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. Back on the Calendar on page 3. Mr. Davis, you want to have 1395 called? Dave. Dave Jones, 1395? You want to have that Bill called? Take it out of the record. Okay. On the Calendar on page 4 is Senate Bill 1605. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dan Houlihan."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1605. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Lobbyists Registration Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Houlihan, D: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As the Sponsor of Senate Bill 1605, I have filed a motion and I move to suspend Rule 35(g) with respect to Senate Bill 1605 and have this Bill removed from the Calendar until we reconvene in the fall."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman has moved that the House suspend 35c?"

Houlihan, D: "35(g)."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Objections have been raised. The question is, shall the House suspend? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from



Sangamon, Mr. Robinson, on a point."

Robinson: "...Have a question of where it will be on the Calendar in the fall?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Same order of business."

Robinson: "It will be on Third Reading when we come back in the fall?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "That is correct. There'll be a...well, I don't know about page 4. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. Mr. Houlihan. Well, then, get back to your chair, we'll recognize you. Jim Houlihan. Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan, J: "Mr. Speaker, could you clarify what the status of this Bill will be at this motion..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, first of all, he moved to suspend the rule and that's what we just voted upon..."

Houlihan, J: "The rules to what?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The deadline rule and now he is going to move to have this - and did move - to have this Bill..."

Houlihan, J: "Well, wait he hasn't...he hasn't moved the deadline though yet I'm...thinking about verifying it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's going to make the movement right now."

Houlihan, J: "No, this hasn't been announced yet whether this one has."

Speaker Lechowicz: "35(g) is a deadline rule."

Houlihan, J: "I understand that. Well is he moving...what was this motion he just placed?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Clerk read the motion."

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion. I move to suspend Rule 35(g) with respect to Senate Bill 1605 and have said Bill removed from the Calendar until the House reconvenes in the fall. Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan, J: "That...that motion has not been announced as having carried yet."

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, I'm going to give the announcement very closely, as soon as I get the results from the Clerk. On that question, 118 'ayes', 25 'nays' and 3 'present'. And on that question, Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "I wanted to explain my vote on that and I had my light on and I wanted to explain, I'd like to explain my vote still since it hasn't been announced."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Well it has been announced and it carries."

Greiman: "Pardon, it has not been announced."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I just announced it."

Greiman: "No you didn't announce, Mr. Speaker, you called on me first..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I..."

Greiman: "I'm entitled under the rules to explain my vote, it's not going to be some...you know, it's not going to stampede the House."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to explain his vote, are there any objections? Hearing none, explain your vote."

Greiman: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I thank you for the opportunity..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Timer's on."

Greiman: "To explain my vote on this. This is a Bill, we...we passed in this House a tough lobby registration Bill, the Senate came back with a very easy, weak Bill, a step back, a step way, way back as if the last year did not even happen. And now this Bill is being skedaddled around the deadline. The truth is that the Sponsor should call this Bill today, vote it up or vote it down, either way. If it votes up, if we should be foolish enough to pass this Bill sobeit but why should this Bill be carried on into the fall and not be subject to our deadline? I can't imagine why."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from...Senate Bill 1395. Yeah, you've announced that the motion carried. 1395, Clerk. Senate Bill 1395."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1395. A Bill for an Act authorizing the Capitol Development Board to convey certain real property in Sangamon County to the City of Springfield. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Dave Jones."

Jones, J.D: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to suspend the proper rules to continue this Bill into the October Calendar. It has to do with an easement problem.....Capitol Development Board and the details have not been worked out. There's no...it's a technical problem, nothing of a legislative nature."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman moves to suspend 35(g), are there any objections to use the Attendance Roll Call? Objections have been



raised. The Gentleman moves...the Gentleman moves to suspend 35(g). All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman, a question of the Sponsor."

Greiman: "I just had a question. I wondered....is there a Senate Bill that does the same thing 'cause we might want to have the Senate Bill in the same position as the House Bill. Is there one pending now?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "This is a Senate Bill, Sir."

Greiman: "Oh, I....okay."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Jim Houlihan, want to explain your vote? Just to point out the Gentleman needs 89 votes in order to accomplish his request."

Houlihan, J: "Mr. Speaker....and let me point out that I was...had risen to ask for a verification the last time when you steam-rolled the last motion through."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I don't believe I steam-rolled anything through. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, take the record. On this question there's 122 'ayes', 22 'nays', 6 recorded 'present'. The Gentleman's motion prevails and this matter will be placed on the Calendar for the fall. Which one? Senate Bill 1704, Sam? Representative McGrew, is he in the chamber? 1704. He'll be up here momentarily. I....we'll start doing the Appropriation Bills. On the Calendar, page 4, Senate Bill 1742. Mr. Griesheimer, is the Gentleman on the floor? Yeah. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1442. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Capitol Development Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, Senate Bill 1442 is the...sound Chinese... is the identical Waukegan Harbor Bill introduced by our Senator in the Senate and it has previously passed the House. Provides for the same amount of appropriation for the Capitol Development Board for the identical project for the Waukegan Harbor, 4,000,000



dollars, for its improvement. I would move its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk."

Polk: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Polk: "Yeah, you have the date yet on the Coho fishing fest for this summer?"

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I think the best thing for me to do on that is not to yield to the question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer, to close."

Griesheimer: "We had an understanding on these Bills. I introduced the original Bill in the House of Representatives, Senator Leonard introduced the same Bill in the Senate. It's slightly behind this one. We're merely asking support of this Bill in case there should be some problem with the House Bill, some technicality. The Bills are identical. I'm sure the Governor will not see fit to sign both of them. We're not looking for 8,000,000 dollars. I would move its passage."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Senate Bill 1442 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer, to explain his vote."

Griesheimer: "Well, at this rate, Mr. Speaker, we may have a credibility gap with my Senator if I don't do a good job on this right now. He seems to be a fine fellow and I told him that I would definitely support this and of course we do have the Democratic Lake County Chairman here today that has - I think he's giving the Speaker, right now, the finger - and we would really appreciate any consideration on this. It's a stopgap measure to make sure that there isn't some technical problem with the Bill which is before the Governor and I...will defer further...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me."

Griesheimer: "Comments to the distinguished Democratic Legislator from the 31st."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijeovich."



Matijevid: "I...I...Ron, I was...wasn't aware that we were going to pass both Bills. I talked to Howie Carroll and he said that we were...the Senate was trying to not have duplicate Bills. And Senator Leonard, the noble statesman that he is, he came to me a couple of weeks ago, he said, 'what would you do, I've got a Bill, Ron Griesheimer's got a Bill.' And I said, 'you know, we screamed politics last year' and I thought rightfully so because the Governor cut us off. And I said, 'I don't think we ought to scream politics this year, Ron Griesheimer started the whole thing, give him credit for it and you're the Senate Sponsor, you get credit for it. We don't have to play those games anymore'. And I think Senator Leonard is not aware that you're following through with the Bill. Do...do you have to or.."

Griesheimer: "Well, if...if...if the distinguished Democratic County Chairman of Lake County makes that as a representation just so that I'm not in any way breaking faith with Senator Leonard..."

Matijevid: "No...yeah I...."

Griesheimer: "There is already a Bill through on this, maybe the more popular thing would be to ask the...the Speaker to take this out of the record at the present time and then I would make the same motion that's been made before to put this on the Fall Calendar."

Matijevid: "Very good."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objection? Take it out of the record. All right, now the Gentleman moves that the House suspend Rule 35(g) and place the matter on the Fall Calendar. Does he have leave to use the Attendance Roll Call? Hearing no objection, the Attendance Roll Call will be used and the matter will be postponed till the Fall Calendar. On the Calendar, on page 7, is the report on proposed Constitutional Amendments. House Joint Constitutional Amendment #21. Clerk will go into that. And the Gentleman from Cook, Mr.... Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce, to present the report on House Joint Constitutional Amendment #21."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the rules of the House in the Statute, the Speaker of the House and President of the Senate appointed Joint Committee on the personal property tax Amendment; pro committee and anti committee. You will remember that House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 21 was sponsored by Representative McBroom. I had



a similar Amendment that passed both Houses and I later withdrew that eliminates the January 1, 1979 date for the end of the personal property tax on business entities and its replacement. The Constitutional Amendment knocked out that date and left it up to the Legislature whether it wanted to remove the personal property tax, and if it did, it still must replace it with other taxes. Now what this Joint Committee does is set the form of the ballot for the November Constitutional Amendment election, explains the...explains the proposition and then has the pro and con arguments that will be sent and distributed to all the voters. Registered voters will receive from the County Clerk of his county, and we'll appropriate money for that, pursuant to Statute the arguments pro and con. The decision was unanimous. All the Members of the Committee, the seven...excuse me, the eight House Members and eight Senators of both parties signed the report - I see one Senate signature is missing - but all eight House Members signed it. And I move the adoption of the report of the proposed Constitutional Amendment Personal Property HJRCA 21 so that it can be prepared, printed, published and distributed to the voters of our state to better inform them of the Constitutional Amendment that will be...they will be presented on the general election ballot the first Tuesday of November."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On the question, the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was one of the appointees to help draft the opposition arguments to this proposed Constitutional Amendment. One of the things we found out - those of us in the opposition - what we found out was when we checked the statutes in the procedure for these reports was that the opposition is really kind of foreclosed from having a lot of input other than their argument. In fact, they're totally foreclosed from anything to do with the explanation or the ballot proposition. The arguments that - with the exception of one line - which we were kind of hammered over the head by the proponents and forced to take out, the arguments we did draft - and I think they're pretty good, is certainly superior to the ones by the other side - but I might add that we suggested and a good critique - that the proposed order of the explanation of



the three paragraphs in the explanation are completely backward and are probably an attempt to phrase the thing in such...to bias the person who reads this so that they'll be induced to vote 'yes' when the best interests are that they should probably vote 'no'. We proposed that the - and I believe it was the exact reverse order - of the paragraph was a far superior way to explain the proposed Amendment. We also do not feel that the ballot proposition - although far superior from the first suggestion by the proponents which was an absolute call for a 'yes' vote - is not as good as the one we proposed. But once again, in the spirit of compromise, we were forced to yield because, again, we have no choice in the matter. So I just suggest to you that the arguments against are good, they lack one line which would make them much better. The ballot explanation could be far superior and the ballot proposition could be much better."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman...any further discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Miller."

Miller: "Mr. Speaker, I don't have a copy of the report at my desk."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's been....there...it's been distributed last Thursday."

Miller: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce, to close."

Pierce: "To close, I...I...congratulate Mr. Leinenweber on his very excellent arguments against; maybe he should have made them on the floor of the House in a little better form because it received three-fifths vote in the House and the Senate and it's a little too late to argue the point here but you have till November 2nd back in Will County to argue against the Constitutional Amendment. As you know...as the Gentleman from Will knows, I was not of one opinion on this. I'm talking to the Gentleman from Will. As the Gentleman from Will knows, I was not of one opinion and my Committee did pass out a replacement tax that the Representative Mughalian and I worked on and there was a Committee on Revenue Bill that passed. The Committee on Revenue passed the House and got bottled in the Senate Revenue Committee. So we did work hard on a replacement tax Bill that would have made this Constitutional Amendment



unnecessary. Unfortunately, the Senate bottled up...bottled up that replacement tax Bill and we're left now with a Constitutional Amendment. We can fight it from now till November. We did compromise with you on the statement. I agree with you the statement was a little bit on the pro side of the ballot question as it first appeared. We've changed that. We've improved that and I think we're all ready now to submit it to the voters. They're not going to read this as much as they're going to listen to you, Representative Leinenweber, all those coffees of the Watch and War Society of the Conservative Union and all the other groups that you speak to in Will County. And therefore I move to...the adoption of the report on the proposed Constitutional Amendment with all the House Members, Republican and Democrat, this time. Both the proponents and the opponents on the House side...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...Moves that the House...question...Gentleman moves that the House adopt House Joint Constitutional Amendment #21 report submitted. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. On that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian, to explain his vote."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, it may not be important to make some kind of record here but in the event it is, I would just like the House to know that I concur fully with Representative Leinenweber's remarks and analysis. We have no choice. Perhaps he's going to vote 'present'. I hope this passes because we have no choice. I'm going to vote 'present' to indicate my complete support of Leinenweber's remarks about what happened by the Joint Committee on the form of the proposition, the form of the explanation and the arguments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 123 'ayes', 9 'nays', 15 recorded as 'present' and the House does adopt the report on House Joint Constitutional Amendment #21. On House Joint Constitutional Amendment 29, the report by Representative Jaffe...and DiPrima."

Jaffe: "Okay, Mr...Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Joint Constitutional Amendment #29 is for the proposed Amendment to Section 6, Article IX of the Constitution to permit exemption from property taxation of post homes of congressionally chartered



veterans' organizations. This Amendment was put in by my predecessor as the legislative spokesman for the Catholic War Veterans, Larry DiPrima. I...I have to tell you that we met on a number of occasions and the report has been on your desk. The House Members who were myself, Woody Bowman, Representative Ewing, Representative Tuerk. On the Senate side, against, was Representative Wooten, Representative Netsch, Representative Hall, Representative Glass (sic). The proponents were, Representative DiPrima, Representative Hudson, Representative Murphy, Representative Waddell, Senator Vadalabene, Senator Sumner, Senator Mitchler and Senator D'Arco. All the parties signed the report. And I would move the adoption of the report with regard to this Constitutional Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, actually two. My first question is, are these reports subject to debate deadline?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, what was the question?"

Madison: "Are these reports that we're in the process of adopting, are they subject to today's deadline?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Are they subject to today's deadline?"

Madison: "Yes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, they're not but they've...been asked that since they do require publication in the newspapers throughout this state and the mailing that's involved, they ask that if there's...all possible to have these matter resolved today in case there's some ...a report is not adopted, then they can get some time in order to come up with a different report I guess."

Madison: "My second question, Mr. Speaker, is: are we finished? Have we completed the Senate Bills that are subject to today's deadline?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, Sir, we're not. They've all been called but there are two matters that have to be resolved and then we'll go back in the Appropriations."

Madison: "Then we've established these reports as a priority over Senate Bills?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, they've all been called, Sir."

Madison: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins."



Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I find myself in something of a quandry and I wonder if Representative Jaffe would answer a question? And I no longer have Representative DiPrima to turn to and so I have to turn to you, my leader. Where do the Catholic war veterans stand on this now?"

Jaffe: "Well, let me tell you, that's one of the things that Larry is upset about 'cause if you look on...in the arguments against the proposed Amendment, we say that the Amendment is unfair. It excludes noncongressionally chartered veterans organization such as the Catholic War Veterans, the Jewish War Veterans, the Italian War Veterans, the Polish Legion, the Navy Club and it also excludes all other social and fraternity groups such as the Masons, Knights of Columbus, Moose, Elks and others. So I think that...that's your answer, Representative Collins."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yes, Sir, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I want you to hear me out on this and hear me out real loud."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please continue, Mr. DiPrima.....have some decorum in the House."

DiPrima: "Yes, Sir, Mr. Speaker, I object most vehemently the second paragraph in the argument against the adoption of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #29. It reads as follows: 'The Amendment is unfair....'"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Please continue."

DiPrima: "The Amendment, it reads as follows: 'The Amendment is unfair. It excludes Catholic War Veterans, Jewish War Veterans, Italian War Veterans, the Polish Legion, the Navy Club and all other social and fraternal groups such as the Masons, Knights of Columbus, the Moose, the Elks and the NAACP.' No, they're included. Oh, yeah."

Speaker Lechowicz: "How did they get...."

DiPrima: "That was at the request of Madison and Caldwell and Emil Jones. Well, anyway, what I wanted to say is this. Number one, I am a member of the Catholic War Veterans."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I received a memorandum yesterday questioning that, I believe."

DiPrima: "When any veteran organization throws me out, you know what



happens to their veteran organization. Well, anyway, none of these organizations are actually exempted. You see, what we did, we included those that were congressionally approved veteran organizations. Now any one of these organizations is not exempted. If and when they become congressionally approved they would still be eligible for whatever benefits any of these veteran organizations will derive from this enactment of this Amendment. But, number one, I want to tell you this. None of these outfits got any club room. Now I belong to the Catholic War Veterans, we have...Morgan Finley's a member, Mike Howlett, the guy that won the Heisman Trophy, what's his name....Johnny Latner and all the big wheels, we ain't got three cents. We meet at a restaurant and everybody pays for their own dinner. So we haven't got any club room and that's the only Catholic War Veteran Post in Illinois. The Italian War Veterans, I was responsible for gettin' their charter about ten years ago. I had the Bill drawn up by Nick Ciaccio and the then Mayor of Springfield, Mayor Howarth. And they drew up the Bill for me and I presented it and it was passed and thereby chartered the Italian American War Veterans here in Illinois. But I ain't got nothing against any of these outfits but when you start looking here. Now the Jewish War Veterans, they gave me a citation last year because I'm circumcised. And then I showed him a letter...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the Gentleman kindly confine his remarks to the proposal."

DiPrima: "Oh, stay away from the medical version? Okay. Now, Representative Murphy and I introduced a Resolution barring the colon, you know, from the Nazi group and his hooligans from marching in Skokie and I got a telegram from the mother...the Jewish mothers saying they'll be praying for Murphy and I. So... huh? Yeah. But anyway...that's the only...and I want this paragraph excluded and I would ask for a conference to make sure that this paragraph is deleted."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jim Houlihan."

Houlihan, J: "Mr. Speaker, would the previous speaker indicate whether he wants to be on the proponents? I understand there's a.... proponents and opponents to the measure and what he's objecting



to is what the opponents say. Does he want to be appointed as one of the opponents to the Resolution this time?"

DiPrima: "Yes, Sir, by all means."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The...."

Houlihan, J: "Well, I think we ought to pass this. I think it's very irresponsible and I think that it's really nonsense. We're taking up a lot of time and it's just silly."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "Would the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Matijeovich: "Representative DiPrima, you've really outlined the arguments in favor of the proposed Amendment very carefully but the purpose of a report like the one you've given us is to give both sides of an issue. Would you delineate to us the...the other side of the coin, in other words, what are the arguments against the Resolution. Could you...could you give us some of those arguments?"

DiPrima: "You want me to give you any arguments against the Resolu... you guys voted for it, what do you want?"

Matijeovich: "Well, hey...hey...shut up, will you guys? Now this... this is the report, you gave this report."

DiPrima: "Well, like I say...."

Matijeovich: "Give us....you know, give it to us."

DiPrima: "If this paragraph were to be included and the voters started readin' this, if they're Catholics they'll say, 'ah-h-h, pickin' on the Catholics'. The Jewish War Veterans say, 'Ah-h-h, anti...'. And the Italian War Veterans would say, 'Ah-h-h.' And the Polish Legion, I've got lot of 'em in my district, that's all."

Speaker Lechowicz: (Comment in foreign language).

Matijeovich: "And the Irish...and the Irish War...."

DiPrima: "Ain't got no Irish."

Matijeovich: "They say put it on the books. Right? Okay, you guys, vote for it, that's all right."

DiPrima: "No, I think....this is very unfair, I mean...."

Matijeovich: "I got my poppy, vote for it."

DiPrima: "Just to point out these various ethnic groups and religious groups, I think it's very unethical, I mean it's unfair to the



Amendment. I don't think the thing'd have a chance to pass.

I mean, I want a half a chance as long as we went this far and we're going to get it on the ballot in November, I would request a conference to see if we can't remedy this Bill which is my pleasure."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff."

Huff: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I rise to support my esteemed colleague. I think that..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Which one?"

Huff: "Representative DiPrima, of course. I think his approach is honest and is forthright. He's asking for the privilege to set down and deal and I like...I like that style and I see nothing wrong with it. And I just wanted to say that he left out the black war veterans. Their expression would be expletives depleted."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Jaffe will yield."

Simms: "In your opposition to the Amendment you say that other fraternal organizations would be excluded by the proposed Amendment, such as the Masonic Organizations, the Knights of Columbus. That is predicated on the basis that it is not a congressionally chartered organization, is that correct?"

Jaffe: "That's correct."

Simms: "Then the only way that any organization as a...as a masonic or a shrine organization would have to become congressionally chartered, is that correct?"

Jaffe: "Well, you're never going to be able to include them, under this Amendment or anything else."

Simms: "Well, no, but I mean that's the only way they would be able to be qualified, right?"

Jaffe: "That's correct, sure."

Simms: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian,"

Mugalian: "Sponsor of...question of the Sponsor, Mr..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he'll yield."

Mugalian: "Mr....Representative Jaffe, did you attempt in any way to



write the argument in favor of the proposition?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Jaffe please."

Jaffe: "No, as a matter of fact, the Committee came to the conclusion very early that it would be unfair for the opponents to write the proponents' argument or for the proponents to write the opponents' argument. Therefore, we met separately and we did not even look at Representative DiPrima's arguments and we in no way tried to change it or nor would we try to change it. I think it would be vastly unfair for the proponents to try to write the opponents' arguments and vice versa."

Mugalian: "If you were filing a brief in the Appellate Court, would you ask for the right to write the arguments for your opponents?"

Jaffe: "No, of course not."

Mugalian: "Well, one more question, Representative Jaffe, apparently it is paragraph two which has drawn objection by Representative DiPrima, is that correct?"

Jaffe: "That's correct."

Mugalian: "Now, is there anything in that article, in that paragraph that is untrue?"

Jaffe: "No, it's absolutely right on the button."

Mugalian: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe, to close."

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, as I indicated beforehand, Representative DiPrima was the Chairman of the proponents' arguments and we, on the opponents', did not seek to change one word, one paragraph, one comment. We didn't seek to change anything in that particular argument. I think it would be vastly unfair for the House now to come in and for the proponents to write the opponents' argument. Not only would it be unfair, I don't think that we could really do anything that would notify the electorate of what the opponents' arguments actually were. I can understand Larry being upset about paragraph two but it's true. You know, this is...they're noncongressionally chartered veterans' organizations and the Catholic War Veterans aren't included, the Jewish War Veterans aren't included, the Italian War Veterans aren't included, the Polish Legion is not included nor the is the Navy Club. And I think the electorate



ought to know that and, you know, I think that we ought to give an affirmative vote on this particular report and vote it 'aye' and send it onto the voters."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House adopt House ...House Joint Constitutional Amendment 29 Report? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. It takes 89 votes. The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Waddell, to explain his vote; timer's on. Mr. Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's one thing to be correct in what you say but it's another thing to be misleading. And I believe the paragraph is in there also regarding the sale of alcoholic beverages yet everyone of us knows in their report on the opposite side that everyone of these institutions if they did not have this privilege would in no way be able to finance their own home. I happen to be a member of the proponents of this measure but I in no way am going to vote for this if it's going to be blatantly unfair that what you say and what the people do not pick up on is the fact that they have not presented the case, they have given facts but they're extraneous and actually do not in fact get down to the point."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing, to explain his vote; timer's on."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was a Member of this...on the opponents' side. What we said is true and fair. If the truth is misleading I don't know how it can be any truer than what we put it here. Everything we said is so. Now I don't think it really matters how we vote up here because if we get enough green votes to approve this this will go on the ballot and the people will have a chance to decide on the fact. If we don't get enough green votes, I'm sure in the Conference Committee the opponents will stand fast and the whole thing may go down the drain because there won't be any report. So maybe we'll win either way."

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

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In explaining my vote, I thought for a moment that there might be



dissension among the American-Italian Members of this particular House but when Representative Huff got up and supported DiPrima I knew that the northern Italians and the southern Italians had gotten together so I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman, to explain his vote."

Bowman: "No, parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker, what would happen if the...the House did not adopt a report at all? Suppose we went back and tried to rewrite it, came back and the House still doesn't adopt and we continue to do this, what would happen?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "It would go back to the Committee for a redraft."

Bowman: "Well, but in time for the November ballot? Suppose we couldn't agree?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Before we adjourn for the summer this thing has to be finalized."

Bowman: "But suppose we refuse to finalize? That's possible. What I'm suggesting is...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'd be here for a long time...."

Bowman: "...Boot it out now and...explain my vote then, the only reason I'm doing this is I fear we will reach a total impasse and the thing won't be on the ballot in November at all unless we vote this up right now."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We've got a week. The Gentleman from Cook, Deacon Davis."

Davis, C: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just looked at my membership card in the American Legion and here's what it says, '57 years continued membership'. I say that because I don't know whether anybody else has been a member of it that long. I attended the first convention in St. Louis, Missouri, one of the organizers. I'm going to change my vote because my friend over there seems to handle all the legislation to know."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, to explain his vote; timer's on."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, there once was a Federal Judge by the name of Kenesaw Mountain who...Landis, who later became the mogul for the major leagues. He ran everything and our Kenesaw Mountain Landis



is our distinguished colleague over here, Larry DiPrima. But I think no matter how much we respect his expertise on the issue of veterans maybe he's going just a little bit too far when he tells those designated the right the....the opposing arguments, when he tells them that their argument is poor and seeks to impose his will on this House. Now if,,,if we aren't talking about free speech here what are we talking about? Nobody's saying that his particular arguments are inadequate. Those are the affirmatives as he sees them and...and the negatives as Mr. Jaffe sees them are...are presented here. I don't understand why Larry can enforce upon the rest of the Members what ought to be said against in this Constitutional Convention, it just...it's screwy. It just doesn't make sense."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Yeah, now, you know, I think we've really reached the period of really being absurd. You have a situation here where there're two Committees appointed by the Senate and the House. One is to write the proponents' arguments and the other one is to write the opponents' arguments. Now if you're in a situation where you want the proponents to write the proponents and opponents' arguments, I think you're really getting to an absurd place. You know, then why have an opponents' committee altogether? I might tell you that Representative DiPrima read this entire report and he signed it. He signed it as well as all the Senators on...on both sides of the Committee, both the proponents and the opponents and so did all the House of Representative people. Representative Tuerk signed it. Representative Ewing signed it. I signed it. Representative Bowman signed it. You know, Representative Waddell signed it. Representative Murphy signed it. Everybody signed it. On the Senate side, everybody from D'Arco to Mitchler to Sumner to Vadalabene, Glass, Hall, Netschand Wooten. Everybody signed this particular report. Now if you want the proponents to write the opponents' arguments I really think you're doing an injustice to the people of this state and what you're in essence saying to them is we don't really want you to know what you're voting on."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to a close.

The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow, to explain his vote.
The timer is on."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To briefly explain my vote, this report that Representative DiPrima is opposed to is loaded against his side, it's quite obvious. The title of this is Veterans' Organizations Post Homes Exemption but yet what they're talking about is social and fraternal groups then they throw in the Masons, the Knights of Columbus, the Moose and the Elks to make those groups feel slighted. The purpose for this Constitutional Amendment was not to include those people in the first place. If they want to be included let them offer their own Constitutional Amendment. That part should be struck...stricken from it and I agree with Representative DiPrima. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. DiPrima, to explain his vote. Timer is on."

DiPrima: "I don't know. You people don't seem to understand me. Number one, all of these groups don't have a club house. You all voted for this Resolution and now...this Amendment and now you're going to have it killed by keeping this paragraph in this report here. So vote... change them lights to red because otherwise you're gonna have the Amendment killed and you're doin' nothing for the veterans. If you're with the veterans now vote red. If you're against them then stay green. I don't care."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff, to explain his vote. I'm sorry, what? The...the objections have been raised you spoke on the issue, Sir."

Huff: "But, Mr. Speaker, I haven't explained my vote. I think I'm entitled to that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, unfortunately, can't do both. The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson, to explain his vote. Timer is on."

Johnson: "Well, I listened now for ten minutes to people who are voting red on this and I haven't heard yet any objections to the substance or accuracy of Representative Jaffe's report. I guess what they want us to do is say that there should be no opponents put on the ballot, it ought to just go through with a hundred percent vote.



I think it's objective, I think it's fair and nobody has given us any reason why it shouldn't be there. And I certainly would urge everybody to vote green on this because I think it's the only responsible thing to do."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would urge a green vote on this. I think what's happening is that its the same kind of thing that happens in totalitarian country. I lived in a communist state for a while and the first thing that they do is to eliminate the opposition. They don't let you talk. They don't let you express your opinion. And this is what we're saying, is whether you're for or against the Amendment you should be able to allow the opponent to express their ideas the way they want to express them. The first element of totalitarianism is to shut your opponents up, don't let them talk, don't let them make the point that they want to make in the way that they want to make it. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I belong to the Catholic War Veterans who own property and I also belong to the American Legion who own property. Now I think these veterans organizations part of the opponents objection is in order but I don't think bringing into the Amendment people like the Knights of Columbus and the Masons who are not veterans' organizations has any substance in this argument. And I think it should go back to conference and I vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to say first that I'm not a member of any of these groups that they've mentioned on here, not the veterans or the Columbus...Knights of Columbus or the Moose or the Elk or any of those and I think that it's a very fair argument that Representative Jaffe has presented. After all, the members of these groups are taxpayers also and they should know that who's going to be picking up the taxes are members of those groups. And I think



the only fair thing to do is to accept the Amendment with the... the Amendment with the arguments as they have been presented here. It's a fair presentation and should go to the voters as Representative Jaffe has presented it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 83 'ayes', 71 'nays', 9 recorded as 'present'. Representative Jaffe asks for a poll of the absentees. Clerk will poll the absentees. Mr. Pierce, what purpose...you seek recognition? Mr. Pierce, please. Would you put Mr. Pierce on?"

Pierce: "Just a parliamentary inquiry. I don't know that you're right or wrong, but where in the rules would this report require 89 votes rather than just a majority of those voting on the proposition?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Joint Resolution 94 which set up the mechanic."

Pierce: "Oh, the...the Resolution that created this Committee required 89 votes?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir. Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "I just...I just want to make a parliamentary inquiry. I want the Members to know that in the...in the event that the opponents' argument goes down, you know that the proponents' argument also goes down and has to be rewritten. And I think that you ought to know that at that time we will then raise arguments to the proponents' argument."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Brady. Deuster. Ewell. Friedrich. Hart. Hoffman. Kornowicz. Luft. McGrew. McLendon. Peters. Shumpert. Williams. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Cunningham, please."

Cunningham: "Please change me to 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Cunningham as 'aye'. What's the count? Kindly record Mr. Abramson as 'aye'. Mr. Deuster as 'aye'. Mr. Lucco as 'aye'. Mr. Birchler as 'aye'. Mr. Walsh as 'aye'. R. Walsh. Mr. Huff, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Huff: "Just for a point of order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's your point?"



Huff: "Well, this proposition that we're debating now, House Joint Constitutional Amendment, is this a U.S. Constitutional Amendment or a State Amendment?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I...it's a State Constitutional Amendment... Illinois."

Huff: "All right."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Specifically."

Huff: "Well, just let me explain, according to the House Rules, an Amendment that would affect the Constitutional Amendment would need 107 votes and I heard you in reference to an inquiry from the floor as to how many votes were needed on this, you stated 89."

Speaker Lechowicz: "This is the report that's submitted to the people and needs the approval. It only takes 89 votes."

Huff: "I see."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's our count, Jack? On this question there are 89 'ayes', 68 'noes'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. DiPrima."

DiPrima: "I'd like to poll the...verification after...I'd like a verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right. Gentleman asks for a verification. The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich, wants to be recorded as 'aye'. That's 91. Mr. DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yes, I want everybody to know that I'm getting the Roll Call and this is going to all the veteran organizations."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman persists in his request for a verification. Clerk will call...excuse me. All unauthorized personnel kindly remove yourself from the chamber. Would you kindly be in your own respective seats? Clerk will proceed to poll the affirmative vote. Larry, now we've gone through a verification so if you wanted verification let us do what is necessary. Go on, verify."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Antonovych. E. M. Barnes. Bennett. Birchler. Bowman. Brandt. Byers. Caldwell. Catania. Chapman. Cunningham. Daniels. Corneal Davis. Jack Davis. Deavers. Deuster. Ralph Dunn. Dyer. Edgar. Ewing. Friedrich. Gaines. Getty. Greiman. Griesheimer. Holewinski. J. M. Houlihan. Hoxsey. Jaffe. Johnson. Emil Jones. Kane. Katz. Keats. Kent. Klosak. Kozubowski. Leinenweber. Levin. Lucco. Macdonald. Madison. Mann. Marovitz.



Lynn Martin. Peggy Smith Martin. Matejek. Matijeovich. Matula.
 McClain. McCourt. McPike. Meyer. Miller. Mugalian. O'Brien.
 Pierce. Porter. Reed. Reilly. Richmond. Rigney. Robinson.
 Ryan. Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schlickman. Schneider.
 Schuneman. Sharp. Simms. Skinner. Stanley. Steczo. E. G.
 Steele. C. M. Stiehl. Summer. Telcser. Tipsword. Totten.
 Tuerk. Vinson. R. V. Walsh. W. D. Walsh. Willer. Wolf. Younge.
 Yourell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Are there any questions of the affirmative vote?

Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, what purpose do you seek recognition?
 Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, could I have leave to be verified
 'aye'?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman asks leave to be verified, hearing no
 objections you're verified. You got any questions, Larry?"

DiPrima: "What's the count?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "90 'ayes' and 68 'noes'. The Gentleman from
 Winnebago, Mr. Simms, what purpose...seek recognition?"

Simms: "May I be verified as...on the Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman asks leave to be verified."

DiPrima: "Mr. Speaker, Lee Daniels."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. McDaniels. Oh, Lee Daniels. How is the
 Gentleman...how is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr...Mr. Daniels? Gentleman in the chamber?
 Remove him off the Roll Call. Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman.
 Kindly record Mr. Hoffman as 'aye'."

DiPrima: "I want to thank you, Gene; ever so much, Gene. After me
 going along with you you stick it to me pretty good. That's all
 right. I'll take care of that other little deal for you in the
 Senate. All right, WyvetterYounge."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge. Let me just ask
 the Members here...it's pretty hard for me, one, to hear the Gentle-
 man and, two, to see if the respective Members are in their chairs.
 How is the Lady recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'aye'."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Young in the chamber? Remove her from the Roll Call. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stearney, what purpose.... seek recognition? How is Mr. Stearney recorded? Recorded as 'no', he wants to remain that way. Any...Mr. DiPrima."

DiPrima: "You removed Wyvetter Young?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, I did."

DiPrima: "Edgar."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Edgar, he's in the chamber. Mr. O'Brien, what purpose you seek recognition?"

O'Brien: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is Mr. O'Brien recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

O'Brien: "Change me to 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly change Mr. O'Brien to 'no'."

DiPrima: "George Ryan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "George Ryan. How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He'll be right here. We'll take him off the Roll Call temporarily, I'm sure. Mr. Ryan. Take him off the Roll Call."

DiPrima: "Tom Miller."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman is in his chair. And kindly put Mr. Ryan back on the Roll Call. Yeah. Kindly put Mr. Ryan back on the Roll Call. Yes, Mr. Ryan. Mr. Ryan, change him from 'aye' to 'no'."

DiPrima: "Schlickman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Mr. Schlickman is in the chamber. Mr. Stanley, what purpose...."

DiPrima: "Thank you, Gene. Thank you, Gene, I'll stick it to you in the future, don't worry."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijeovich, on a point of order."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the rules of the House specifically say that a Gentleman on the floor cannot use names of other Members and talk and threat and talk in derogatory manner to other Members. Now this is the third time; he did it to John Sharp, he did it to Gene and I don't know if it was Gene Hoffman. This is the third time. I think three times is enough



and I think that to...for one Member on the floor to openly say he's going to attack somebody's legislation purely because of somebody voting on their conscience is out of order."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Your point is well taken. Will the Gentleman kindly just go through the verification and kindly conduct himself in the proper manner. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stanley, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Stanley: "Change my vote from 'aye' to 'no', please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Stanely from 'aye' to 'no'.

Mr. Daniels wants to be recorded as 'aye'. I...."

DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to apologize for my outburst. I shall control myself here on."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Do you have any other questions of the affirmative vote, Mr. DiPrima?"

DiPrima: "Klosak."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Klosak, he's in his chair. Mr. Johnson, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Johnson: "I just wondered if it would...point of parliamentary inquiry.

I wonder if it'd be appropriate to pose a motion if this fails to get 89, to reconsider the vote having voted on the prevailing side by which we put this thing on the ballot to begin with. This is irresponsible. It's retributive and I think this makes a mockery of the whole legislative process for somebody to threaten Legislators on the floor for what I think is the most obvious green vote I've ever seen. Is that appropriate to put that motion?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Not at this..."

Johnson: "Well, I will at the conclusion of the verification. This shouldn't even be on the ballot if we're going to make it a dictatorship where you've only got one...one proposition put. It's asinine. And I'm going to put that motion if...if the 89 votes aren't up there."

DiPrima: "Mr. Speaker, Glenn Schneider."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Schneider. The Gentleman's in the back of the chamber."

DiPrima: "Matejek."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Matejek. He's in the chamber."



DiPrima: "Could I have the count, now?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Are you through, Sir? What's the count? And how many noes?"

DiPrima: "Is Telcser here?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Telcser? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I don't see...is the Gentleman in the chamber? Mr. Telcser. Remove him from the Roll Call."

DiPrima: "Mr. Schuneman in?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Schuneman. Yes, he's in his chair."

DiPrima: "What's the count now?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the count, Jack? On this question there are 86 'ayes', 71 'nays'. The Lady...the Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Breslin, wants to be recorded as 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser, has returned. He wants to...put him back on the Roll Call."

DiPrima: "All right, please take the record."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "If you want to declare the results first I've filed a written motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "As the...what...what is the count, now, Mr. Speaker? In the event that it does not reach 89, I'm going to ask that it be put on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge, wants to be recorded as 'no'. She was removed off the Roll Call. It's 88 'ayes', what's the negatives? 88 'ayes', 72 'noes' and the House does not adopt. And the Gentleman asks the matter be put on Postponed Consideration, the Gentleman...the matter will be on Postponed Consideration. Now...Cook...Mr..... (tape). The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. DiPrima, what purpose you seek recognition?"

DiPrima: "Well, number one, I've never had to do this in all my years in the Legislature and I might have acted a little rambunctious. I hope you'll all forgive me. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think Mr. DiPrima



acted very graciously then and I certainly accept any apology but I didn't think any was necessary. We all know Larry and love him. Thanks, Larry."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, what purpose you seek recognition?"

Kane: "Parliamentary inquiry. Is it...if this motion is not called again by the Chief Sponsor, Mr. Jaffe, does the Constitutional Amendment die?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll face that issue when we come to it, we've got a number of days before the Session is over. On the Calendar is Senate Bill 1512. Mr. Schuneman. May I point out to you, Sir, that if the matter is not called today it will die. Okay. Also on the Calendar is Senate Bill 1704, Mr. McGrew. Mr. McGrew, you want that matter called? 1704. Out of the record. Okay. Well, go to appropriation matters. Senate Bill 1465. Read the Bill, Jack, 1465."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1465. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the commission to survey and study cities, villages and incorporated towns. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is a supplemental appropriation for the Cities and Villages Municipal Problems Commission necessitated by the fact that the Commission was required to move out of the Capitol Complex and rent space and the rental has busted our budget and we are in need of the additional 5,000 dollars to cover the rental. I would as for...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1465 pass? All in favor will vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Marco, 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Kenny, you want to vote Harris' 'aye', he's a Member of the Commission. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 132 'aye's, 17 'nays', 5 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1531 on page 4 of the Calendar."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1531. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Secretary of State. Third



Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate

Bill 1531 is the appropriation Bill for the Secretary of State for the ordinary and contingent distributive expenses of the office for fiscal year '79. It's a 1.7 million, or 1.5 percent greater than the state appropriation or the appropriation granted the office for fiscal year '78. The...as I pointed out, it's just a mere 1.5 percent total increase and I would be happy to answer any questions on the...on the Bill. It came out of Appropriation. We're using the Roll Call vote on the appropriation measure, I...and the appropriation. I move for the adoption...or the passage of Senate Bill 1531."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jim Houlihan."

Houlihan, J: "If the Gentleman will explain what the increase is in the Bill for the grants to the library."

Bradley: "Yes, the library grants went from...the fiscal appropriation from 10,102,000 in '78 to 16,829,000 for fiscal '79. It gives us a 66 percent increase. What it really does is fully funds that... the library system and the Secretary of State has been consistent in his position to fully fund that program. And what will...this additional dollars will allow us to do will be to increase the inventory for the library system which will provide as I said on Second Reading some additional books...braille, so for the blind it can be used; some tapes that can be used to distribute throughout the library system. And really fully fund the program and give us a very fine library system in Illinois."

Houlihan, J: "Well, Representative Bradley, when we're involved in a fiscal crunch, when our entire appropriations process has almost come to a halt because of the reductions that were made and the efforts to put an omnibus Bill and when the entire program of the Democratic Party has been to save dollars wherever possible, so that those dollars could be put into the School Aid Formula which is a top priority, how is it that the Secretary of State is asking for a 6,000,000 dollar increase in the library funding? I think that's totally irresponsible. I can understand his wanting to



increase it a certain percentage. I can understand his efforts to move toward full funding but when we've had fiscal restraint everywhere else why did he choose this year to try to fully fund it?"

Bradley: "Well, they're very....in answering your question, we are very fortunate this year in the expense item for license plates because of our going to the five year plates, the anticipated costs for making the plate has dropped dramatically. And I think, if I may point to you again, the total increase....is a very slight 1.5 percent increase in the...in the budget. So I think we're well within reason in thethis day of inflation to...respecting...."

Houlihan, J: "Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "That kind of a small increase."

Houlihan, J: "Representative Bradley, that argument reminds me of my wife who told me yesterday she saved me fifty dollars and asked me for it."

Bradley: "I hope you gave it to her."

Houlihan, J: "Well, I gave it to her and I asked her how she saved me the fifty dollars and she told me she went out and bought a dress for 250 dollars and it was marked down from 300 dollars. Your logic doesn't make any sense because there's a reduction in another area doesn't mean you can just pork barrel on for the library program. Now, I'm a...I'm a firm supporter of the library program but I tell you this it's a...irresponsible increase. It's something I don't think does justice to the type of restraint that we're trying to operate under in the appropriations process. If we put all this money into the library board what are we going to say to the Department of Veterans' Affairs when they come in for money? What are we going to say to the FEPC when they come in for additional money? What are we going to say to all the other areas where we're making cuts in order to fully fund or put more dollars into the formula, which we all approved, that was worked out with Representative Kane? I think the Secretary of State has taken a terribly irresponsible position on this. And I think not only that, he hasn't even consulted with the other Members of the Executive Branch in trying to work something out which would be responsible."



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

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

A question of the Sponsor, are...is this GRF money?"

Bradley: "Yes, it is."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much. I might point out to the Members of the House that right now in the Senate, or very shortly in the Senate, they're going to be considering the categorical grants for schools and the Amendment is being proposed, proposes to cut special ed and transportation, special ed transportation and transportation, down below a full funding level. And of course the transportation has a tendency to affect the downstate schools more than it does other places. Those cuts will be slightly less than...than this particular amount and both of those come out of the General Revenue Fund. Now you and I all know that there's been a lobbying effort on the part of...of people in the library business to increase their funding and, you know, there's no question but they have a perfect right to do that but we have the responsibility and the right to make a decision on where those...where the funds that are available ought to be spent. It seems to me that the previous speaker pointed out that, you know, we better be consistent with our priorities otherwise we just open it up for the gentleman who resides on the second floor to do pretty much as he...as he pleases. If you're interested in doing that I suppose you ought to vote for this. If you're opposed to it...to him having those kinds of decisions you probably ought to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen. The Gentleman from McHenry...Gentleman from McClean, Mr. Bradley, what purpose you seek recognition?"

Bradley: "I...I wanted to clarify something that the former speaker...asked me a question on the GRF funds. The whole appropriations is not completely GRF funds. You meant just for the library, that right?"

Hoffman: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady from Cook, Ms. Pullen."

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I agree totally with the Gentleman from the other side of the aisle who spoke previously, Mr. Houlihan.



that grants to library systems are very poor priority to be putting all our bucks this year and I would urge you to vote against this Bill until they're reduced or out."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter. Porter. The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when the Secretary of State came before Appropriations I he charmed and utterly disarmed the Members of the Committee and everyone left and they were highly cheered by what had been said and I'm going to vote for the appropriation. But there is an error here made by the Sponsor of this Bill, it's the political license with the arithmetic that is contradicted by the record. Last year the amount of money spent by the Secretary of State's Office was 107,000,000, this year it's 114,000,000. You don't have to be a whiz at arithmetic to know that the 7,000,000 dollar increase is about by 5.3 percent instead of the 1.5 percent that was represented for the press a moment ago. But we took some consolation, Sponsor, in the fact that on the prior year the expenditure had been 86,000,000,000 so there'd been a 21,000,000 dollar jump between '76-'77. We pointed this out to the Secretary when he appeared before our Committee and he agreed that it was an encyclical matter for our Committee and he agreed that it was encyclical matter, that is it'd have a bigger increase on nonelection years which I thought was commendable candor. One thing that was said before the Committee that I think that should be shared with you is that the Secretary favors the construction of prison plates for automobiles ...of our plates in the prisons. There's a Committee working on that now and I earnestly suggest it's the responsibility of every Legislator to remind those in charge with the turning out of auto plates that it makes no sense to go to Texas to buy automobile plates. I think we all should be pushing in that direction. I was glad to hear the Secretary make a forthright statement in favor of that proposition. For the reason suggested with the arithmetical changes noted, I'll be voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."

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



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed... Previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley, to close. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, what purpose...seek recognition?"

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, before you recognize the Gentleman, I wondered if I could ask the Sponsor a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objection? Indicates not."

Mann: "Thank you. Is the addition of the 6½ or 7 million dollars, is that all devoted to the library?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Did you hear the question? Gerry?"

Bradley: "Yeah. The...that makes up just about the total amount difference between the library system additions as to what the lower amount is for the license plate cost in the reduction. Just about the same. Balances off almost."

Mann: "Well...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The answer is yes."

Mann: "I'm not sure that enriching the library is such a bad idea, that's one of the obligations of this office. Can you tell me specifically what...what's being done or projected for the library?"

Bradley: "I...Representative Mann, I indicated that earlier. This will allow us where there is a formula for funding the library system just as there is the school system. This will allow us to fully fund it and increase the inventory in the library, in the State Library System. It will be an increase of books, books of braille, all kinds of additional inventory that's very necessary to fully fund the program."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley, to close."

Bradley: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, in a reply to one of the Members, a couple of things. One, there is a...a total of a 4.3 percent increase as the Gentleman from Lawrence indicated because we had never appropriated in the Secretary of State's Bill the federal funds that he spent and it was decided by the Appropriations Committee that we would appropriate those funds. If those funds had been appropriated last year they would have been more than they are appropriating this year. Regarding the Amendments and the suggestion that



we should be addressing ourselves to the library system and we are funding them too heavily. This Assembly addressed that very proposition on Second Reading and defeated it handily when there was a offer of an Amendment to cut the library system. So I think we've already addressed ourselves on that program. This is a very, very good appropriation insofar as it being certainly limited in... in...in increases. And I certainly suggest that we have a...'aye' vote on the appropriation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1531 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? There's a Lady from Winnebago, Mrs. Martin, to explain her vote. Timer's on. Mrs. Martin, please."

Martin, L: "May I suggest that this is the kind of thinking that led to Proposition 13. No one denies that the Secretary of State is a... a very fine man and charming, as Roscoe says. But it's the kind of thinking that says when you save money somewhere, as in license plates, you don't return that to the people, you don't talk about reductions, you don't talk about cutting anything, you pop it into another program. This is what caused 13 in California. It's the kind of thinking that's going to cause it here because people don't believe that when we save money on anything they're ever going to see any of it again."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 129 'ayes', 29 'nays', 4 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1535."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1535. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to higher education institutions and agencies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1535 came over from the House and was heard in Appropriations I Committee. Amendment was placed on there by a voice vote that...basically what the Amendment does is that it puts the ...provides the increases in each of the university's line item.



This is for the retirement...fair contribution to reflect the cost to each university of the administration of the University Retirement System. The present Bill, or as it came over from the Senate, had the appropriation made directly into the system and it did put it back in according the analysis and the staff's recommendation on both sides. It's the only retirement system which has the OCE broken out for the Senate and the system feels the Legislature does not have the authority to break it out of the semi-private pension system and should not be the only retirement system subject to that review. This did come out of Appropriations I with 27 to 0 vote. Be happy to answer any questions. If there aren't any, I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On the question, the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I read from the June 25th Champaign Courier, second paragraph of an article on page 4. 'The plan for 1979-80 proposes to reduce the retirement deduction from employee's paychecks from 8 percent to 4 percent. The state would be asked to provide the estimated 7.87 million dollars that would be lost in reducing employee contributions'. I would like to know if the Sponsor of this Bill is part of this plan to make the cut...the state bear an extra 4 percent of the employees' salaries so that we may pay their share, apparently, of...of their retirement fund."

Wikoff: "No, I was not a part of that, I wasn't consulted and that's talking about next year's appropriation. We're talking about this one, this is this year's we're talking about now. But, no, I was not a part of that and I don't really favor that, Cal."

Skinner: "Well, thank you very much. I hope the message goes back to the...the faculty senate of the University of Illinois that any of their discussions during this fall and during the summer, fall and winter, that it's supposed to lead to a net increase in their paycheck of 4 percent because the state's going to pick up the retirement, the 4 percent retirement payment, is just baloney and doesn't stand a snowball's chance in July."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1535 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Gentleman from Cook,



Mr. Bowman, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, I have a conflict of interest on this. I will vote my conscience."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 143 'ayes', 4 'nays', 7 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Yes, Ma'm. Mrs. Geo-Karis, kindly record 'her as 'aye'. Yes, Sir. Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Chair could tell us what the intent is for the day, I mean for the remainder of the day? How long are we going to be here and what the program is?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The intent of the Chair to continue on on Senate Bills Third Reading and possibly be through here by 8 or 8:30, perferably 8 if we..... Okay, Senate Bill 1556."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1556. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Legislative Space Needs Commission. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brandt."

Brandt: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 1556 is the annual appropriation Bill for the Space Needs Commission. The budget is in two parts, it's in operating and land acquisition. In the operating budget we are requesting about the same amount that we had in our 1978 budget. In the land acquisition budget we are requesting from the Capitol Development Fund, 3½ million dollars. We are also requesting a reappropriation of approximately 1,200,000 dollars which is the unspent balance from the 1978 appropriation. This proposed appropriation was contained in the Governor's Budget Message to the General Assembly earlier this year on page 252 of the Illinois State Budget Report. The Appropriations Committee I approved this Bill unanimously. I would appreciate a very favorable vote for the passage of Senate Bill 1556."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any questions? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1556 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. 'Aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 128 'ayes', 24 'nays', 4 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional



Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1558."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1558. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the State Board of Elections. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. The appropriation Bill for the State Board of Elections is in the amount of 2,454,195 dollars. This...this is a reduction over last year's appropriation of 99,929,000. The original Bill put in was for 2,554,124 dollars. The Senate reduced it by 99,929,000 leaving the amount 2,454,195, roughly 5 percent less than last year. I would ask for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that next to the Arts Council this is probably the most useless agency that we have in state government. It's been proven to be a...a...nothing but a dumping grounds for both political parties. And now I understand...now I understand that in the Senate they have removed our agreement to put all employees under the Personnel Code. And I think at the very least we could hold this Bill until that situation is straightened out but of course I'd be less than honest with you if I didn't tell you that it would be my desire to kill this appropriation entirely and put this agency out of business. I think we've had enough experience now where we...we now know how totally useless this agency is and I would suggest a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Without taking issue with the Sponsor it should be noted that while it's the...amount quoted is correct is how much less it is from last year's appropriation. Yet the fact remains that there's 92,000 dollars more than was actually expended last year. So it's sort of deceptive to say that there is a reduction in expenditures. There will be an increase if you approve this of 92,000 dollars. But the reason these sailed through the Appropriations I and here on the House floor is that we have each discovered that the Board of Elections for some reason is a sacred cow and will not be wounded knowingly



by any Member of the House. But the time has come to recognize that the cost of conducting elections in Illinois has become rather expensive. We each remember the day when Don Eds and two secretaries for 20,000 dollars performed the same function annually. This is now costing the taxpayers 2.4 million dollars. Somewhere along the line the Chief Executive needs to prescribe across the board ten percent reduction of all appropriations. I would just suggest that thought needs to come along but until then I presume we'll all be voting green on this except myself."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matievich."

Matijeovich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support Representative Bluthardt in the passage of this appropriation Bill for the State Board of Elections. I don't think at this late stage of a Legislative Session because we do take some difference, some of us may with the operations of the State Board of Elections that we hold any appropriation Bill as hostage because of some personal differences we make. So I would urge the Members we're moving along quite rapidly. I think everybody ought to get on the train now because then we can get on the road and go home. So I would urge the passage of this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's kind of hard to support a guy like Representative Cunningham but I'm going to have to be on his side this time. I think Don Eds was doing a great job before the State Board of Elections came along. I think we ought to do away with this once and for all. We got stampeded into this by the press thinking it was going to be a great thing. We're way...way...way spending too much money for the thing and we're talking about ten percent. You can save a lot of money here, you can save one hundred percent of what we're spending here. Don Ed didn't cut anybody out of his office. I think we ought to defeat this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt, to close."

Bluthardt: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. There's been some interesting comments. The...the first one to comment was the main Sponsor of the Bill that created the first State Board



of Elections. One of the things I'd like to point out is that a lot of the expense that have resulted, is resulted from other Bills that the first speaker had...was the Chief Sponsor, the Ethics Bill, the Campaign Disclosure Bill and so forth. This has led to much litigation. There is presently roughly 45 cases in litigation involving the State Board of Elections. This costs money. I think the State Board of Elections should be commended for the excellent job of reducing their expenditures and saving about 100,000 dollars over last year. I urge your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1558 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Robinson, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Robinson: "Well, I didn't get a chance to ask the Sponsor in debate but it is my understanding that there have been instances of contracts being extended in closed meetings in violation of the Open Meetings Act and I feel that this should be answered before we pass this out of here. So I'm going to vote 'present'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 116 'ayes', 34 'nays', 13 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1562."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1562. We already passed that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We passed that? Senate Bill 1570."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1570. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Court of Claims. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Senate Bill 1570 provides the money for the Court of Claims. Be happy to answer any questions on it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "How much is it?"

McAuliffe: "2,677,400 dollars."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter, on the question."

Porter: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Porter: "How much of that is for operations, Rog?"

McAuliffe: "I'll find out. 377,400 dollars."



Porter: "How much was the 1978 fiscal appropriation for the same work?"

McAuliffe: "393,000."

Porter: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Senate Bill 1570 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 146 'ayes', 11 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1575."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1575. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Office of Lieutenant Governor. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you...thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1575 appropriates 482,800 dollars."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Ma'm, there's a point of order being raised. Mr. Greiman, what purpose? Point of order."

Greiman: "I suspect I...should be a point of personal privilege. I had filed Amendment 2 to this Bill and was off the floor when it came up and I had...and not had an opportunity to speak with Miss Stiehl and I had asked her...we asked her if she would return it to Second Reading so that my Amendment that was filed in due time could be considered."

Stiehl: "Well, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Ma'm."

Stiehl: "I...I object to taking this back to Second Reading. This Bill has been on the Calendar for quite some time. When it was on Second, we held it there. When it...when it came up yesterday, we held it there for a while and then we moved it to Second. Now, we are here in the waning days....to Third Reading....we're here in the waning days of this Session. We have many important Bills to consider and I think it would be wrong to take up the time of this House to consider an Amendment such as Amendment #2. It is nothing but harassment. I think it is nonsense and I would ask that we keep this...and I would object to....to moving this Bill back to Second Reading."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Ma'm, the Bill's on Third Reading, want to explain the Bill?"

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

This Bill is an increase of 54,500 dollars over last year's appropriation. The new money is used for the Senior Citizens' Action Center and the Senior Citizen Legislative Forum. In fact, there is an 11 percent decrease in the operation of the Lieutenant Governor's Budget and I was...would ask for an affirmative vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On the question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gene Barnes."

Barnes: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question, please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Barnes: "What was that about the senior citizens that was added to this Bill?"

Stiehl: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear you, Representative."

Barnes: "What was that responsibility for senior citizens that's involved with this...appropriation."

Stiehl: "Oh, well, this is no...this is not a new program, Representative Barnes, this...this program was established, as I understand it, under Lieutenant Governor Hartigan. However, with the senior ...with the Legislative Forum at that time they did not have the appropriate funding for the senior citizens, representatives of the senior citizens' clubs from around the state to attend these action forums. And this is what they're doing, they're just providing the funds when a senior citizen is chosen from their club to represent ...to represent them and they cannot get to the meeting then they're providing the travel expenses for them to get there to express their opinion on legislation that they feel is important to the senior citizens."

Barnes: "How much will it cost?"

Stiehl: "Just a minute. It's about 15,000 dollars for the forum."

Barnes: "Well, Representative, I'm...it's not that large amount but I'm just wondering why do we have the Department of the Aging? If we have these functions over in the Lieutenant Governor's Office and we're going to add money there for it. As I understand it, the Department of Aging does a similar kind of work and I...why...why



here? Why not in the Department of Aging? It seems to me a couple of years ago that was a prime reason for developing that department so we would have one centralized place that would address the issues to....our senior citizens."

Stiehl: "Well, Representative Barnes, the Department of Aging supports this. They do not have the facilities to conduct this. They are more of a regulatory department, they handle the federal regulations and the federal funding and they're....really are no facilities in the Department of Aging for a program such as this and it...that's why it was devised that the Lieutenant Governor would do it. This was all established under...under Lieutenant Governor Hartigan."

Barnes: "Well, Mr. Speaker, to address the Bill. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I, for one, I don't believe I ever really addressed any Constitutional Officer's appropriation. I think that that is a proper function for Executive Branch. I'm going to support it but I really don't see the need and the reasons for having senior citizen's affair in the Lieutenant Governor's Office if we have a Department of Aging. Now that budget comes before my Appropriations Committee and I know that they are appropriating at a level more than sufficient to address and meet all of the needs of the seniors in this state. If they are not, we should do something there but to me to have a duplicate function over in the Lieutenant Governor's, whatever Lieutenant Governor, it just happens to be this one, to have a duplicate function in that office for him to run around the state to do something. I suggest him and the Governor get together and find something more appropriate to do with his time."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates she will."

Mugalian: "I wonder if the Sponsor will tell me what the Amendment offered by Representative Greiman would have done?"

Stiehl: "It would cut out the entire telecommunication system."

Mugalian: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's my private opinion and not the opinion of any Republican Member



of Appropriations I that you'll never find a better chance to save a half a million dollars than to vote 'no' on this particular Bill. The Constitution, the Constitution makes the error of creating Lieutenant Governor without any duties in that regard. If you read the newspapers this morning, two of them reported the Lieutenant Governor has become a tyrannical political boss. It's the classic case of the tail wagging the dog. It's axiomatic that a ticket divided against itself cannot stand. Surely it will fall in the autumn unless the head of the ticket squelches the rebellion now being led by the self-appointed titular head. I repeat, these are my personal opinions and are not in any way reflect the...the...this side of the aisle."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm going to support this budget of Lieutenant Governor what's-his-name, what's his name? McNeil, I hope...O-what? O'Neal...O'Hara? However, I think the Senate acted responsibly when they did take out that money for the Senior Citizens' Action Center. And I think that Lieutenant Governor Dave O'Neal acted very irresponsibly by sending out political letter...blackmailing many senior citizens and pulling the wool over their eyes. I think that we have one Department of Aging and that's where the affairs relative to those aged persons belongs, senior citizens, and I...I think that it's all right. We've got the hotline for senior citizens and that Amendment didn't affect it at all but many of the senior citizens thought that it did. And I really think that we...shouldn't have taken, or put the Amendment back on that the Senate took off. But I...you know, the Greiman Amendment was put...put in jest but...not jest, I imagine, but I know he had his purposes for it but if we would reflect a moment upon that Greiman Amendment about telecommunications. If we would take out a lot of telephones in state government, you....you wonder what that will do to cost of government. It will really decrease. There's just too many people on too many phones too often and I'll tell you the cost of government is increasing rapidly in many areas but it surely is in telecommunications. But I'm going to support the McNeal (sic) budget but I



think that he has used his office very scurrilously in the letters that he sends out to the senior citizens."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Boucek."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', all opposed... The previous question's been moved. The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Stiehl, to close."

Stiehl: "Thank...thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a well considered budget and it's one of the few that...that has a cut in the operations of the normal duty...functions of that department and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1575 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz, to explain his vote."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Just to explain my 'present' vote. I, as well as the Chairman of Appropriations I, do not support the new initiative by Lieutenant Governor McNeal in his senior action centers. And it is true that what he is trying to do here, duplicate the efforts of the Department of Aging which goes around the state and goes out to meet the senior citizens rather than truck them down here to Springfield and pay their expenses. It does also duplicate the Council on Aging and there are another five or six duties of the Lieutenant Governor statutorily some of which he misses meetings on, et cetera. The most flagrant violation of the office was using the...the stationery and the stamps and everything to crank up senior citizens to get them to contact us to support such a...increase and initiative measures that did not really do anything to begin with. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman...Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Marovitz, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Marovitz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's rare that I agree with my friend from Lawrence but I certainly am agreeing with him this time and I hope you don't say the same things about Roscoe and myself that you're saying about Penny and myself. But I would suggest that Representative Greiman's Amendment was in fact a Republican



Amendment because taking the phones out would be certainly in the Governor's best interests. And I would agree with my friend, Lynn Martin, that if you want Proposition 13 vote for this. The request by the Lieutenant Governor was 45 percent for senior citizen action centers greater for fiscal '79 than fiscal '78; 45 percent greater. The Senate...the Senate cut it then the Senate cut the program for the Senior Legislative Forum so that the Governor could bring senior citizens to Springfield despite the fact that they're going all over the state listening to senior citizens in the Department of Aging. This is one of the worst budgets around. It...it's the budget of someone who really isn't working for the senior citizens at all and I would suggest that we take it back, send the Lieutenant Governor a message that if he's going to save for senior citizens, work for senior citizens. And I'm going to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Hoxsey, to explain her vote. Timer's on."

Hoxsey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to comment that political rhetorics that goes on here in criticism of the Lieutenant Governor's budget would indicate to me that since this is one of his responsibilities of the office that he must be doing a pretty darn good job. And from what I hear from the senior citizens in Illinois they certainly think he is too."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, when I first heard about the duties of Lieutenant Governor I thought perhaps he might be a great liasion between the Governor and the RTA but then again I'm...I like the RTA a little too much for that. Perhaps what we ought to do is introduce a commission to study the duties of the Lieutenant Governor's Office. Now, Mr. Hanahan, we could do that without any appropriation and it would be very, very worthwhile undertaking and I bet that if the commission tried hard enough, the commission could find some duties for the Lieutenant Governor that would keep him out of trouble and out of the Governor's hair. So perhaps we should introduce such a commission, Mr. Speaker, but I don't know."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Tom Miller."



Miller: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, a little bit earlier in the debate we got a little economic advice from the Honorable Chairman of House Appropriations I Committee. I respect that man's judgment on many matters but I think we all ought to keep in mind that this particular Gentleman also has the distinction of receiving the award from the Illinois Conservative Union for being the biggest spender in the Illinois House of Representatives. And if we followed his advice all the time right now we'd be bankrupt to the tune of about 7,000,000,000 dollars."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mr. Chapman, to explain her vote. Timer's on."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I wanted to explain my vote by saying that I'm doing this for the Governor. I think the Governor needs all the help he can get. And I'm so disappointed that we didn't have an opportunity to adopt Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1575 which would have removed the appropriation for telephones from the Lieutenant Governor's appropriation Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Greiman: "Well, not...not to beat a bag of bones but I...I did put the Amendment in with certainly a measure of sincerity..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Point of order by Mr. Walsh. What's your point, Sir?"

Walsh: "The Gentleman spoke in debate, Mr. Speaker, he's not permitted to explain his vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "No...no...I'm afraid you're incorrect there, Sir. He posed a question, he did not speak in debate. Please continue Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "...Me...Mr. Walsh, as usual, is in his customary posture of being in error. I...I put the Amendment in because of a sincere feeling that the telephone should be controlled. It's a serious instrument. We...we...although it does a lot of good things, it's a marvelous convenience. In the hands of some it can do a lot of mischief. You know, we have absence telephone calls and the wrong kind of phone calls. And I felt that the Governor, as Mrs. Chapman said, needs the kind of protection from his friends. And if the Republicans won't rise to the occasion, many of us on this



side of the aisle really care, really care about the Governor and don't want to have him done in by Mr. McNeal. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?"

Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 123 'ayes', 28 'noes', 12 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1576."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1576. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Office of the Governor. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Hoo. Hoo. All together...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let's have a little decorum on the floor. Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "You're right, very little. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Senate Bill 1576 is the ordinary and contingent expenses for the fiscal year '79 budget for the Office of the Governor. There's 2,251,082 dollars in it and I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Collins: "I was just curious as to whether Representative Greiman offered the same Amendment to this budget."

Speaker Lechowicz: "This is the Governor's budget."

Ryan: "Not that I know of."

Collins: "Well, maybe Representative Conti and a few others would like to...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Margalus. The question is, shall Senate Bill 1576 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 152 'ayes', 3 'nays'...3 'nays', 4 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1577."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1577. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Judges' Retirement System. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Reilly."



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

Senate Bill 1577 appropriates 6,200,000 dollars for the Judges' Retirement System. This is based on the gross payout plan and... and appropriates it on that basis. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1577 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 145 'ayes', 11 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1581."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1581. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense of the State Employees' Retirement System. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Jones."

Jones, J.D.: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the...the appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Employees' Retirement System in a total amount of 1,204,200 dollars which is a twelve percent reduction from last year. I solicit your affirmative vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1581 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 155 'ayes', 7 'nays', 5 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1587."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1587. A Bill for an Act making appro.... certain reappropriations to the Capitol Development Board for permanent improvements and grants. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser. All right, we'll get back to it. Read Senate Bill 1611."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1611. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Office of the Auditor General. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is the



annual appropriation for the Auditor General. There were some cuts made in this Bill. There were some cuts made in the Senate. I have the figures for the various line items if you'd like to have them otherwise I'd appreciate your favorable vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Bill 1611 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 146 'ayes', 13 'ayes'... 146 'ayes', 13 'nays', 4 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Kindly record Gene Barnes as 'aye' on that Bill. The...yes, Sir. And also Representative Brummer as 'aye'. Moving right along on the Calendar on...let's see...Senate Bill 1710. Page 5."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1710. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Capitol Development Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker...thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1710 appropriates...it's appropriation for school construction funds of the Capitol Development Board for school construction in school districts with a population of less than 500,000. This appropriation is for seven schools in Illinois who enjoy the unique position of levying themselves to the statutory limitations and still cannot come up with the money to fund their...to fund their...the buildings enough.....for space to house their children. One of these schools is going to have 65 percent of its...of their pupils housed out of their own district next year. This passed out of the Senate with a vote of 50 to 0 and I ask you for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in both of these appropriations it's the most important and significant thing that each Legislator does in the time that he's down here. I think that the amount of money that's being appropriated in each instance should be recited by the Sponsor. In this instance it's 10.6 million



dollars but there's some indication that the plans are not approved. The Illinois Office of Education has indicated that the price may be somewhat higher. It sailed through the Committee because we think it's a worthy project but we wanted each of you to be aware of the amount of money being considered."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Hoffman: "Where...what has happened to the debt service aspects of this Bill?"

Van Duyne: "Senator Carroll took it out in the Senate, he felt that it would dilute the Bill too much."

Hoffman: "Would you repeat that please?"

Van Duyne: "Senator Carroll took that out in the Senate."

Hoffman: "Do you know if there are, or there is another Bill which has the debt service in it?"

Van Duyne: "I think that Representatives Mudd and Stuffle have...have taken care of that in another Bill."

Hoffman: "Fine. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Senate Bill 1710 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Lady from Winnebago, Mrs. Lynn Martin, to explain her vote."

Martin, L: "No, Speaker, I don't want to explain my vote I have..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay."

Martin, L: "Questions for the Sponsor on a 10,000,000 dollar appropriation. Such as, are these school districts at the top of their tax limits. Such as: were these from townships where they were not at the preferred assessed level before House Bill 990. And I think you might have found the answers relatively interesting. I'm not suggesting these groups didn't have needs but the local schools don't seem to be fulfilling those needs and come to us for rescue. Maybe that's a good idea, I don't know, but I think that debate ended rather quickly. My light was on and I would have liked those questions answered."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn, are you seeking recognition? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record."



On this question there's 109 'ayes', 47 'nays', 6 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1841. Oh, pardon me. Before we get to that order, Mr. Clerk. The Lady from Cook, Miss Pullen, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, I was in a Conference Committee during a couple of Roll Calls and I wonder whether I could be added as 'aye' to Senate Bill 1577 and Senate Bill 1581?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady have leave for that request? Hearing no objections the Lady will be so recorded. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, before...you called that Bill rather quickly. I had a question for the Sponsor too and that was whether this was in the budget? I discovered afterwards that it was not and that's my vote is 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "But it did receive a 108 votes...47 and was declared passed. Senate Bill 1841."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1841. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Capitol Development Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the Senate Bill 1841 which makes an appropriation to the Capitol Development Board for grants to the counties and municipalities who are eligible for grants under the substantive jail improvement legislation that we passed out of this House. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten. The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Well, this is another of those Bills that's not in the budget. It's a 20,000,000 dollar should...that should have the lowest possible point on the totem pole as far as priority is concerned. You cannot make the same arguments for this that was made for the prior Bill in regard to education. I have seven of the counties that are involved that would collect substantial sums of money; namely, forty percent of the construction costs for jails that were constructed



since 1970. Let no one confuse himself in this matter by believing that this has only a prospective operation because it is...the Bill as amended specifically provides that the Department of Corrections can make repayment to those counties that have already made the decision to spend the dough. Now there's no justification for that. You could argue if they had a substandard jail which is another provision under the statute that it would be permissible to make some contribution. But why saddle the harassed taxpayers of the State of Illinois with forty percent of the cost that's already been contributed by the local taxpayers for the improvements that they chose to make. This is the best Bill that you'll have this afternoon to save 20,000,000 dollars in the name of fiscal responsibility. I would urge each of you to vote 'no' and remember the fact that I have seven of these jails in my district."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter."

Porter: "Well, I think Representative Cunningham said it. This is a great one to improve your ranking on if you're concerned about that 20,000,000 unbudgeted dollars that the state shouldn't have any responsibility for. I urge an 'aye' vote also (sic)."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1841 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn, to explain his vote."

Dunn, J: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill that was...this is, first of all, an appropriation Bill. The substantive legislation which is the basis and backbone of this program previously passed this House with 95 votes on a verified Roll Call. Yeah. Yeah. There was substantial endorsement and approval of the program at that time so I can't understand why anyone would be unwilling to cast an 'aye' vote now. The program for those who may not recall is a program that is designed to alleviate the burden that many of our local counties have across the State of Illinois. They have been mandated by our State Department of Corrections, a mandate from state government to local governments to improve the conditions in their county jails. These are standards that they must comply with and if they don't get any help from the State of Illinois they're going to have to get the help locally



and the only place for them to get it is to raise property taxes. The purpose of this Bill, therefore, is to keep property taxes down. To have the State of Illinois come forward and when the State of Illinois mandates something, to pay for it, to help pay for a fair share of the mandate. The substantive Bill, the companion Bill to this legislation, has been amended in the Senate provide that the local entity shall pick up 60 percent of the cost. The State of Illinois will only be picking up 40 percent of the cost. The portion that the state picks up will only be for that...for those portions of any proposed improvement which are designed to meet the minimum standards of the State of Illinois. For example, if your people back home decide to put colored tv sets in their jail, that's up to them. They have to pay for that. But if they do something to meet the state mandate...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to a close."

Dunn, J: "...ought to get some help from the state. We need some more 'ayes' votes so I'd appreciate a favorable Roll Call here so we can proceed with the business of the House."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Sponsor of this Bill pointed out that the substantive legislation did carry 95 votes. this should carry at least 95 in order to provide the money to supplement that enabling act. Now what he has said is true. The State Department of Corrections has commended the various counties and mandated certain things to be done. It has to coincide with those mandates. I think the state needs to provide the funds. It is providing in this Bill 40% only. I think it's a fair and equitable approach to the whole problem and I think it needs the support of this House in order for the various Bills to meet the minimum standards provided by the State of Illinois."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I was trying to fathom the reason that Representative Cunningham was so strident in his opposition to this piece of legislation having said that there seven jails in his district



and then it occurred to me that in those seven jails might be a large number of Mr. Cunningham's former clients and maybe that's why he didn't want them out. But I actually feel that...that Representative Cunningham's clients should be allowed to breath fresh air while they're in the jail, and more, while they're out. Maybe they'll patronize Mr. Cunningham again. But in any event, for those reasons, I'm going to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Don't worry about it Roscoe. The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think some of the criticisms of the program earlier rested around the fact that counties might be enticed in some way into building a facility they really didn't need. That was not true before, it's certainly not true now and I think particularly with the provision that 60 percent of the funding has to come from the local community means that nobody is going to go into a venture of this sort without a great deal of thought and consideration ahead of time plus the fact that the Department of Corrections is forcing these standards upon us. The Governor has indicated that he's very much in favor of funding mandated programs of the state. I think this is one way that we can declare to our citizenry that we are going to follow that direction and provide some assistance at least in funding this mandated program. And I urge a few more green votes up there."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just wanted to indicate that the County of DeKalb would qualify for some of these funds, they're building a new jail and the state has come in but the money's not there. It's a great idea and I...and the taxpayers in the County of DeKalb are willing to take care of their own problems with their own dollars. And not that this is not a great idea but the money is just not there. And some of you people that are voting green up there ought to reconsider this and I'm sure if you don't it's not only this particular appropriation Bill which totals 20,000,000 dollars, when it gets to the Governor's desk he not only will have one but two Bills to...to veto."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
 Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 90 'ayes',
 77 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the
 Constitutional Majority...what? ...Declared passed. On the Order
 of the Supplemental Calendar, Consideration Postponed, is Senate
 ...Senate Bill 1680. Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, thank you very much, I would move to return
 Senate Bill 1680 to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of
 addressing ourselves to Amendment #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman asks leave to have the matter brought back
 to Second Reading. Objections have been raised. The Gentleman moves
 that we bring the Bill, Senate Bill 1680, back to Second Reading.
 A point of parliamentary inquiry by Mr. Skinner. What's your point?"

Skinner: "If this gets moved back to Second Reading, may I assume that
 we will consider the Amendment that was printed and on the desks
 when the Bill was moved to Third Reading illegally last week?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Don't have the slightest idea."

Skinner: "Well, you're the Speaker, Mr. Speaker, you kept fast gavels..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's up to the Sponsor."

Skinner: "One....no, it is not up to the...it is not up to the Sponsor
 once he takes it to Second Reading. There are at least five Amend-
 ments sitting on Second Reading to be considered. Unfair on the
 last one, how about being fair on this one?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "...Problem.... The Gentleman from McLean, Mr.
 Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I...in my motion to take it to Second Reading
 said specifically to address ourselves to Amendment #1. At this
 late date, this is the last day I can get that Bill out of the
 ...out of this chamber and the Gentleman knows that and I'm
 specifically requesting we bring it back to address ourselves to
 Amendment #1, period."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman moves, all in favor vote 'aye', all opposed
 vote 'nay'. On the question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, in all due respect to Representative Bradley,
 but it seems to me that if Representative Bradley takes this Bill
 back to Second Reading, to use the vernacular, it's fair game."



And I don't see how he can make a motion to take it back to Second simply to consider one Amendment that he likes as opposed to the rest of the Amendments that may or may not be there that he doesn't like. And I would raise that point of order, Mr. Speaker, and it's simply on my part just in...in...in an attempt to be fair. I mean, I don't even, I haven't seen the Amendments and I don't know...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish?"

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I'm asking for a ruling of the Chair as to the propriety of that kind of motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I believe the question is going to be moot in a very few seconds here."

Madison: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jim Houlihan. Jim Houlihan. Mr. Robinson."

Robinson: "Well, I'd like a ruling from the Chair. I...I have one of the Amendments that is filed and I'm going to withdraw it but I'd ...I'd like to know if this is moved back to Second whether all the other Amendments can be heard."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I believe I heard the Gentleman's motion quite clearly...."

Robinson: "I'm asking the Chair, I'd like a ruling by the Parliamentarian if I could."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, it's really not germane..."

Robinson: "Well, I'm going to change my vote and vote 'yes' if the Parliamentarian's...."

Speaker Lechowicz: ".....Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 72 'ayes', 76 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion does not prevail. Motion failed. No. Okay. On the Calendar...yes, Mr. Abramson, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Abramson: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like leave to be recorded as voting 'aye' rather 'no' on 1576 and 1577. My switch seemed to be malfunctioning at the time."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...Were they verified, Sir?"

Abramson: "No. It won't change the outcome."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections to hearing...Gentleman will be so



recorded. On the Calendar on page 6, there's Senate Bills Second Reading, Senate Bill 1456."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1456. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the State Board of Education. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2. Campbell. Amends Senate Bill 1456 as amended and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Campbell, on Amendment #2. Mr. Campbell, you gonna move the adoption of Amendment #2 or what's going on here? Let's go. We got a lot of Amendments on this Bill."

Campbell: "I was taken by surprise and I was looking..fumbling through my papers, I didn't know which Bill this was going to be called on."

Speaker Lechowicz: "1456, you want to withdraw the Amendment?"

Campbell: "I would withdraw Amendment #...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "2."

Campbell: "2."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3. Campbell. Amends Senate Bill 1456 as amended and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Campbell."

Campbell: "I will withdraw #3."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Amendment #3 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4. Campbell. Amends Senate Bill 1456...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman....Mr. Campbell."

Campbell: "I withdraw #4."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Amendment #4 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5. Geo-Karis. Amends Senate...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis. Amendment #5."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if you'll just give me a moment because I...we've got so many Amendments on this Bill I don't know whether it's coming or going, I'm trying to find my 5."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Nice. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, on an inquiry."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, inquiry of the Chair. The presiding officer of this House indicated to me earlier that we would be going to the Order of Constitutional Amendments Second Reading. Do you know whether he still intends to do that?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I would kindly advise you to talk to the Speaker. We're on Second Reading, Senate Bills Second Reading. It's my intention to through...through that process and if he wants to come back and call that proposal, he may do so. But it's my intention to get this thing in pretty good shape so we can get out of here Friday. Is the Lady ready with Amendment #5?"

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this relates to the Department on Aging budget and needless to say I've practically aged right along with it. I would like to tell you that Amendment #5 changes the amounts that are set in Senate Bill 1456...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Ma'm, would kind....there is some unauthorized people on the floor, kindly remove yourself from the chamber. Would the Doorkeepers kindly make sure that the rules of the House are observed? All unauthorized personnel remove themselves from the chamber. Please continue, Ma'm."

Geo-Karis: "All right. We'd like to tell you that...would you like to have the Clerk read the Amendment? It's a two page Amendment. Or do you want me to read it? In the Department of Aging Budget, as payable from the General Revenue Fund, we have substituted in this Amendment the sum of 382,864 dollars which is the difference of 18,564 dollars. And then under state...contributions to employees, to State Employees' Retirement System, we have substituted the sum of 30,300 dollars which is the difference of 1900 dollars. In the state's contribution to Social Security, we have substituted the sum of 22,500 dollars which is 1400 dollars more. And in the contractual services we have substituted the sum of 67,300 dollars which is 7,000 dollars more. Under equipment we have substituted the sum of 4400 dollars and which gives us 2800 dollars more. And under electronic data processing we've substituted the sum of



58,800 dollars which is 15,200 dollars more. The total difference that we made in cuts in...in additions, rather, is about 46,864 dollars. And although the analysis for all.....shows no change to federal monies, the 46,864 dollar cut in the General Revenue Funds that is now present in Senate Bill 1456 results in a net loss, and I'd like you all to hear this, a net loss of 140,592 dollars in federal money for a total cut of 187,456 dollars in the Senior Citizen...the Department of Aging Budget. This is because our General Revenue Fund...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ma'm. Ma'm, let me just point out to the Membership that at the present time there are 50 Amendments offered to this Bill, 5-0. And if you want to get out of here at a decent hour, kindly make your presentations and hopefully we'd one proponent, one opponent and proceed. Ma'm, would you kindly bring your remarks to a close?"

Geo-Karis: "The next cut, really, if you accept our Amendment, is that correct, is about 80,000 dollars because...75% of it is reimbursable under Title 20 of the Federal Government otherwise we are going to lose about 140,592 dollars in federal money if you accept the Department of Aging as now is set forth in Senate Bill 1456 without my Amendment. And I...the Senate has already cut 20,000 of it to begin with and I ask for your favorable consideration on Amendment 5 for the Department of Aging Budget."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative McClain on the Amendment."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we would stand in opposition to this...adoption of this Amendment. In fiscal year '74 the Department of Aging had 34 employees, '75, 40, '76, 47, '77, 55 and '78, 77. And now in fiscal '79 they're requesting 94 which is an increase of 17 new positions. Now we feel that those are new positions that are not necessary for the good functioning of the Department of Aging which is an admirable department. So therefore the reduction that we put forth on the Department of Aging was a reduced sum of 46,864 dollars which is .1 percent change in their budget with a total of 18,564 dollars personal services; 1900 retirement; 1400 in social service, social security; 7,000 in contractual; 2,800 in equipment; 15,200 in EDP;



the contractual equipment in EDP all are reflective of their fiscal '78 expenditures. So the increase would be...if you adopt this Amendment they are increases over '78 expenditures. We stand in opposition."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Gaines on the Amendment."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Amendment. The previous speaker talks about why there's need for additional employees. Part is because it's a new federal program as the Sponsor of this Amendment has pointed the majority of this money will be reimbursed under Title 20. And for the first time under this Administration the Department of Aging has gone in to the City of Chicago and they're doing some very good work particularly in my district. And much of these funds are due to the fact that the Department of Aging is now reaching out to reach all the senior citizens and not just a few who are the pets of certain organizations that have been going on for a long time. Now the average person who is a senior citizen is now attempting to be reached by this Department. And I feel that since the majority of these funds will be reimbursed that we should vote 'yes' on this Amendment 'cause Miss Geo-Karis certainly would not be for something if it were a wasteful budget."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Geo-Karis to close."

Geo-Karis: "I am in a predicament here...a very...and I appreciate the kindly remarks from the prior speaker. In the face of peace and unity and hoping that this Bill when it goes back to the Senate will be restored the way it is, I'm going to withdraw the Amendment in view of the time factor."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Lady asks leave to withdraw the Amendment. Any objections? Leave is granted, the Amendment is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6. Ewing-Hoxsey. Amends Senate Bill 1456 and so forth."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Ewing on Amendment #6."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment adds 149,900 dollars to the Department of Correction Budget. It provides for staffing and equipping the 50...50 person units



at Pontiac Penitentiary, two new 50-person units at Dwight Correctional Institution and two 50-person units at the Sheridan Correctional Institution. Without the restoration of the 149,000 dollars we can't operate these new units. And I would ask for your favorable consideration of this Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is on the adoption...Representative Schneider on the Amendment. The question is on the adoption of Amendment #6 to Senate Bill.... Representative McClain on the Amendment."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We would stand in opposition to Mr. Ewing's motion to reinstate the...this sum of money. What we're really talking about is replacing people, replacing vacant positions that have been vacant for four months or longer into the facilities at Pontiac and Dwight and the equipment for Sheridan. Because of that we would stand in opposition to this Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Ewing to close."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've been very candid with you. We all know that we're building onto these institutions and expanding them. The last speaker was completely incorrect. This money is to staff these new units. Now we can build 'em and we can let 'em sit there as monuments to something or we can put the money out so that we can put the prisoners in 'em. Now we'll just do as you like....I would ask for your...approval of this Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is on the motion by Representative Ewing to adopt Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 1456. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. 'Noes' have it and the Amendment fails. In intend....Roll Call. Well, all right, we'll ask for a Roll Call on Amendment #6. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'.All voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 41 'ayes', 78 'nays' and the Amendment fails. Any further questions?"



Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7. Winchester-Harris. Amends Senate Bill 1456 as amended by House Amendment 1 and so forth."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Winchester on Amendment #7."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #7 restores 81,600 dollars to Senate Bill 1456 for the restoration or the bringing back of eight critical vacancies that we have there for the Vienna Correctional Center. And I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Jim Houlihan on the Amendment. Representative McClain on the Amendment."

McClain: "Thanks, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we would stand in opposition again to this Amendment. His request actually replaces funding for nine vacant positions, eight clerical and one Correctional Supply Supervisor I. All positions have been vacant in excess of four months therefore because of that we would ask you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Houlihan on the Amendment."

Houlihan, J: "I wonder if the Representative who spoke in opposition would indicate why he didn't speak in opposition to the boondoggle that was passed out of here for the museums tacked onto the Secretary of State's appropriation? A 60 percent increase and now you're worried about eight positions which are direct people service positions, positions which are very necessary. I think that that's irresponsible and I don't it's a very rational program to be cutting important people service program positions and then put on a boondoggle of 60 percent, that's 6,000,000 dollars."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Winchester to close."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, 81,600 is to fund eight positions, they are critical positions. One is a licensed sewage plant operator which is required by the Environmental Protection Agency. And the second position is a nurse which is a critical position and six clerical, they're small jobs. They may have been vacant for four months. It's not the institution's fault. There was a job freeze and these jobs just didn't get cleared through the Department of Personnel. I think they're very important to the operation to the Vienna Correctional Center and I would certainly appreciate a favorable



vote. And I would like to have a Roll Call...a Roll Call vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Winchester moves that Amendment 7 be adopted to Senate Bill 1456. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. All voted...have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 43 'ayes', 75 'nays', 2 voting 'present' and the Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8. Jack Davis. Amends Senate Bill 1456 as amended and so forth."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Jack Davis on Amendment #8."

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

In the, I think, commendable fashion that the Democratic Party has ...has sought to cut some of these budgets they've gone along rather nicely and obviously we're trying to restore of them and some of them has some merit. And I certainly don't want to accuse them of ...of being too hasty in their judgments but in Amendment #8 I feel perhaps they have been. The ISL forms for the Department of Corrections...the Department of Corrections at Stateville indicated a reclassification of 59 positions. The Democratic staff apparently identified some of these new positions and cut 130-odd thousand dollars from personal services in Amendment #8. And we're asking that 104,000 dollars of that money be restored to the budget simply because the people that are going to be cut from this budget are already on board and are being reclassified and if cuts...if any cuts have to be made they'll probably have to be made in the area of medical services or technicians or dietary staff. And we all know how bad things are at Stateville because Representative Peggy Martin has told us that that is the case and she's absolutely right, things are bad there and the last thing in the world we want to do is find ourselves in a situation where further staff cuts are made in Stateville Correctional Center. So I would urge the adoption of Amendment #8."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative McClain on the Amendment."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we would also stand in opposition to this Amendment. In the second revised ISL forms that we received....the second revised



ISL forms that we received from the Department revised 4-24-78 they listed all these positions as new positions. Because of that we would stand in opposition to this Amendment which would replace the money for the new positions. We would urge you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Jack Davis to close."

Davis, J: "Well, Mr. Speaker, that's simply not true, Representative McClain, and the people from Department of Corrections can graphically demonstrate that to you; in fact, I'll send them over to you as soon this Amendment's adopted. The truth of the matter is we're going to cut medical people, these people are already on board and ...and I don't think anybody wants to see any more service cut because the Federal Judges are sitting there telling us we gotta add 'em in. So we're...we're being contrary to our position and I realize what you're trying to do, Representative McClain, but in this case, I...I respectfully suggest the Democratic Party's wrong. So I would urge you to adopt Amendment #8."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Jack Davis moves that Amendment #8 be adopted to Senate Bill 1456. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. 'Noes' have it and the Amendment has failed. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #9. Lynn Martin-Roman Kosinski. Amends Senate Bill 1456 as amended by deleting Section 12.02 and so forth."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kosinski on Amendment #9."

Kosinski: "I think it was Miss Martin's intention to present the Amendment for..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Lynn Martin on Amendment #9. Repr..."

Kosinski: "Evidently she's not in her seat, Mr. Speaker, I'll take the Amendment. This Amendment #9 which adds to the Illinois Law Enforcement Commission an amount of 514,787 dollars. This divides this money for criminal justice planning over twenty - repeat - twenty regions throughout the State of Illinois. The allocation formula was arrived by subtracting the dollar amount Part B Planning Funds received by each region in 1975-76 from the dollar amount planning funds received in 77-78. In other words, the regions are only requesting the amount...of the reduction...the amount of the



reduction. There are twenty regions involved all up and down the state and I ask for an acceptance of this Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Lynn Martin to augment Representative Kosinski. She's gone. She left. Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thanks, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we would accept this Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kosinski to close."

Kosinski: "Thank you, Mr. McClain, for accepting the Amendment. I solicit all your votes."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is on Representative Kosinski's motion to...to adopt Amendment #9 to Senate Bill 1456. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', it's not your Amendment is it? All right. Okay, Representative...the Gentleman asks for a Roll Call. Oh, he accepted the Amendment, Gene, there's no need to...oh...you still persist in a Roll Call. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. And Representative Simms, 'aye'. On this question there are 97 'ayes', 37 'nays' and 1 voting 'present'. And this motion having received the proper number of votes is declared passed....adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #10. E. M. Barnes. Amends Senate Bill 1456 as amended in Section 10.02 and so forth."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Eugene Barnes on Amendment #10."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is a merely a technical Amendment, there was a typo in the Bill. This Amendment corrects that typing error. It was a...error that was typed in at one million, three and it should have been three million, three. I would move for the adoption of Amendment #10."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kent on the Amendment."

Kent: "Speaker...thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is so vital to the veterans' home in Quincy that I wanted to be correct. I wonder if it could be amended on its face as it deletes the wrong total and I want that...no, it isn't, this is vital to the care of people. So if you could amend it on its face to correct to...from three... three thousand one hundred...well, it's from one thousand...one million, three hundred and seventeen thousand to three million,



one hundred and ninety-eight...three hundred."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is that to Representative Gene Barnes'.....Representative Gene Barnes."

Kent: "This is just technical if you could correct it on its face."

Barnes: "It is a technical error and...and I have no problem with Mrs. Kent 'cause we're trying to correct it. As I understand and so we can make sure that it is right this time. When they typed it it should have been 3,317,000 and they typed...whoever typed it, typed 1,317,000..."

Kent: "Yes."

Barnes: "What we're trying to change it back, is to 3,317,000, that's what this Amendment does."

Kent: "Yes. Yes. That's...that's what I want but I don't want it to be wrong on the...on its face when it gets there so they cut it out and that's what I'm trying to correct."

Barnes: "Okay. Okay. I...I agree with...I agree."

Kent: "Cause this is an Amendment that's vitally needed."

Barnes: "Okay."

Speaker Giorgi: "Do you need leave to change the Amendment on its face? Gentleman requests...."

Barnes: "...Just...just...okay. The figures are there and they have been corrected, Mr. Speaker, but I would move the adoption of Amendment #10."

Speaker Giorgi: "All right, just a moment. Representative Leinenweber on the Amendment."

Leinenweber: "Well, I just wonder whether or not that might possibly be the all time record typographical error. Have there ever been any higher, you've been here longer than I have."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative McClain on the Amendment."

McClain: "We accept the Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Barnes moves for the adoption of Amendment #10 to Senate Bill 1456. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #11. John Dunn. Amends Senate Bill 1456 as amended by deleting Section 13.01 and so forth."



Speaker Giorgi: "Representative John Dunn on Amendment #11."

Dunn, J: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, at last this is the community coalition Amendment. You have a chance to vote on it. This is an Amendment that would provide an appropriation of 2,000,000 dollars for community based programs of the developmentally disabled. It would provide 1,000,000 dollars for community based programs for special residential alternatives. It would provide 2.5 million dollars for the mentally ill in community based programs and 2.5 million dollars for alcohol treatment programs at the community level. A total of 8,000,000 dollars, this is presented in this Bill as a direct appropriation from the General Revenue Fund and of course it is the spirit and intent of this Amendment to shift funds in the Mental Health Budget from the institutions to the local community agencies. As you will recall, the Mental Health Budget passed out of here earlier today; it was cut by 3,000,000 dollars. By adopting this Amendment there will be a net increase of 5,000,000 dollars in the Mental Health Budget, a budget which can well afford to be increased at the local level in this amount. And I urge a favorable vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kempiners on the Amendment."

Kempiners: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, I think that the words of a Gentleman ought to be repeated. This is a 5,000,000 dollar increase on a budget which we've already passed out of here and which is headed for the Governor's desk. I think that if you look at both the House Republican and Democrat staff reports on the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Appropriation Bill you will find that what we sent to the Governor's desk meets the recommendation of both staffs; both Democrat and Republican staffs. This is a 5,000,000 dollar add-on. It's not needed. For those of you who are concerned about the alcoholism line item there's an Amendment coming down the road that would increase that line item by 1,000,000 but every other line item that this Gentleman mentioned has been increased. The grants for the local agencies have steadily increased over the past seven years. I don't think this is needed. I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative McClain on the Amendment."



McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This is a bad time, Representative Barnes goes to the Senate and I can't find Representative Madigan so I imagine on something like this maybe every Member ought to just vote the way they'd like and I...we have no position on it."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative John Dunn to close."

Dunn, J: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In closing I would just like to remind the Members that the Mental Health Budget passed out of here earlier today in the form of a motion to concur. We had no chance to consider anything like this at that time. This is the kind of thing we're looking for in community based programs to provide taxpayer dollars for...to follow the patient. As you know, in recent years we have seen a shift of patients leaving the mental institutions and coming home. This is the way it ought to be. We now have roughly 80 percent of patients at home so they only have roughly 20 percent of the taxpayer dollars there. We have roughly 20 percent of the patients in the mental institutions and we have 80 percent of the taxpayer dollars in those institutions. It's time that we made a shift of funds to follow these patients. Because of pressure of this type of Amendment over the past years we have seen some gradual increases in grants to the community agencies but they are not adequate. This money is badly needed at home in the four categories that I have mentioned and your agencies all across the State of Illinois, back home in your districts will be very grateful to you if you vote for this Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative John Dunn moves for the...for the adoption of Amendment #11 to Senate Bill 1456. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', nays, 'no'. We'll have to take a Roll Call. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Satterthwaite on the... to explain her vote for one minute."

Satterthwaite: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, earlier today when we passed a package of Bills to make major revisions in the Mental Health Code there was a lot of discussion about dumping of patients out of mental health institutions into communities without



appropriate services. The reason that has happened in the past is because the amount of money going into the community services has been grossly inadequate. No one has really indicated that there's a problem of putting people into community services if there are funds that follow them to provide for the backup that they need in order to make a transition into the community. This is the way in which we can make that transition. Put those dollars into the community so that the patients can be better served there. As we sent the Mental Health Bill out of here earlier today, we deleted 3,000,000 dollars from mental health services. This is a way we can put it back in. Everyone knows that the Governor has a veto pen. If he wants to do something about the difference between the 3,000,000 that we cut out and the 8,000,000 that we put back in he can make those adjustments on this portion of the Bill. He can decide which of these should stay in and which of them should go or how much should go into the particular line items as designated in this Amendment. But I don't think there is anybody in the State of Illinois including the Governor who wants the Mental Health Budget to go out of the Legislature 3,000,000 dollars below the amount the Governor has indicated will be available for mental health services. The services are badly needed. Let's give them the money so they can fund them."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk.

On this question there are 66 'ayes', 82 'nays'...Representative Dunn to explain your vote."

Dunn, J: "No...just poll the absentees if you will, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "Okay. The Gentleman requests just a quick poll of the absentees.The absentees."

Clerk Hall: "E. M. Barnes. Beatty. Bennett. Brandt. Deuster. DiPrima."

Speaker Giorgi: "DiPrima votes 'aye'."

Clerk Hall: "Doyle. Ewell. Flinn. Hanahan. Hart. Hoffman. Huff.

Jacobs. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kucharski. Laurino. Lucco. McLendon.

Mulcahey. Pouncey. Richmond. Schoeberlein. Shumpert. Taylor.

Williams. Younge. And Yourell."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any questions, Representative Dunn? Representative

Mulcahey, like to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Okay, Representative



Laurino would like to be recorded as voting 'aye'. No, I'm sorry, 'no'. McLendon, 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. There are 68 'ayes', 83 'nays' and this motion...this Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #12. Madison. Amends Senate Bill 1456 as amended on page 35 and so forth."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Madison on Amendment #12."

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

Amendment #12 makes a reduction of 13,275,000 dollars in the AFDC line...grant line item in the Department of Public Aid's Budget. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Department of Public Aid has had a steady decline in the number of AFDC caseloads since January of 19...I'm sorry, since March of 1976 from a high of 228,000-plus cases down to a present level of...in May of 1978 of 216,000 cases. And yet with that steady decline, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Public Aid has for fiscal year '79 budgeted 725,000,000 dollars for the AFDC line item based on a caseload that starts at 220,000 cases in July of '78 and goes to 224,000 cases in June of '79. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is obviously an over-budget of 400,000 cases per month...,4,000 cases per month in the AFDC line item and that money is not necessary, the trend has been down. Even if we reduce the starting month to 216,000 cases we still by this Amendment allow it to rise to 220,000 cases at the end of fiscal year 1979. And I move for the adoption of Amendment #12."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is there any discussion? Representative McClain on the Amendment."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, it's a good Amendment. We would adopt ..we would ask you to adopt it."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Campbell on the Amendment."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Amendment. First of all, I think all of you know that we should commend the Department of Public Aid and our appropriations process because we didn't have to come in with a deficiency the last time, so they did a real good job of projecting the caseload the past year. And we have every reason to believe that they're going to do a good job



and have estimated the right, the proper caseload for the...for this coming year. And if you will note that based on the five percent increase there will also make a few more people eligible so they do have a good estimate and a good hold on the projected caseload of this year. But this Amendment would reduce by 13,000,000 ...by 13,275,000 the Department's ability to adequately fund the anticipated AFDC caseload during fiscal year 1979. There is no justification for this reduction. The only argument which could be used to explain the proposed reduction is a projection of the caseload well below what has been estimated in the Department's fiscal '79 budget. The Department sees a caseload remaining relatively stable and believes the five percent increase in the grant level will even bring about a slight increase from the caseload. A reduction of 13,275,000 would severely endanger the ability to finance the five percent cost of living without having to request a deficiency appropriation next Session. The estimated average AFDC caseload for fiscal year '78 was 219,000. The estimated '79 average caseload without the five percent increase is 219,000. And the estimated fiscal year of '79 average caseload with the five percent increase is estimated to be 223,000. A reduction of 13,000,000 would result in 712,000,000 available leaving the Department far short of the resources it believes necessary to finance the Governor's proposed five percent increase for cost of living. And I ask you to vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Madison to close."

Madison: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, and to my good friend the prior speaker, let me just say that out of his own mouth has...he indicated the reason why this reduction should be made. He indicated to you that the Department expects that the caseload level will remain relatively stable. Well the caseload level at the present time, as of May 1978, is at 216,000 cases. It has been going down steadily since May of 1976, two years, Mr. Speaker, of every month being a decrease in the ADFC caseload. Sure there is an average caseload of 219,000 cases for fiscal year 1978 but it is because the caseload started in fiscal year '78 at 223,000 cases and reduced down to 216,000 cases. This Amendment



takes into...into consideration the fact that there may be leveling out of case and that it may even increase. But the budget starts the increase at 220,000 cases when right now the level is at 216,000. Mr. Speaker, it was the same rationale in last year that Representative Dunn used to reduce the AFDC line item by 6½ million dollars and the Department still, Mr. Speaker, they still lack 36,000,000 dollars in the AFDC caseload...in the AFDC line item. This is a good Amendment. It is a responsible Amendment. It says to the Department of Public Aid, if you anticipate a rise in the caseload although that goes contrary to the trend we will start the rise at the present level of 216,000 cases. You've got 13,000,000 dollars over budget and that is at best conservative, it's probably overbudgeted by 25,000,000 dollars. And I move for the adoption of Amendment #12."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Madison moves that Amendment #12 be adopted to Senate Bill 1456. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Ryan...Representative Ryan, for what reason do you rise? To explain your vote?"

Ryan: "No, I want to verify this Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it's very interesting to me when I look at all of those red fiscal conservative votes up there who always talk about the amount of money that should be saved and the amount of money that this caseload should be reduced by. It's interesting that the very red votes that are up there are in a large measure of people who are always concerned about their rating in the Conservative Union. You want a good rating in the Conservation Union, then you vote for this Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "All voted who wish? The board's still open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 79 'ayes', 70 'nays', 1 voting 'present'. And this... motion...this Amendment is adopted to Senate Bill 1456. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #13. Madison. Amends Senate Bill 1456 as



amended...."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me....well, I was....he did ask for a verification. The Gentleman did ask for a verification but I thought he was having a conference on not asking for a verification. Representative Madison."

Madison: "Speaker, would you poll the absentees?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Madison requests a poll of the absentees."

Clerk Hall: "Beatty. Bradley. Brandt. Daniels. Ewell. Flinn. Friedrich. Gaines. Geo-Karis. Hanahan. Hart. Hoffman. Dan Houlihan. Jacobs. Jaffe. Keats. Kelly. Kornowicz."

Speaker Giorgi: "Hold it a minute, Mr. Clerk, Representative Kelly wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Kelly, 'aye'."

Clerk Hall: "Kucharski. Leverenz. Lucco. Madigan. Richmond. Schuneman. Tuerk. Willer. And Yourell."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Leverenz would like to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Representative Katz would like to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Katz. Katz and Leverenz."

Madison: "Katz from 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Katz from 'no' to 'aye'. Are there any other changes? Representative Ryan, do you persist in your verification request? 82 'ayes' and 69 'noes'."

Ryan: "What's the count, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Giorgi: "82 'ayes', 69 'nays'. I'm sorry, Representative Flinn, 'aye'. 83 'aye'."

Ryan: "Speaker, I...I'll withdraw."

Speaker Giorgi: "Gentleman withdraws his request for a verification. On this question there are 83 'ayes', 69 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #13. Madison. Amends Senate Bill 1456 as amended on page 36 and so forth."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Madison on Amendment #13."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, before I deal with Amendment #13. If the Chair will...will allow me, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Giorgi: "Continue on your point of personal privilege."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, in regard to the next ten Amendments that I have



filed to this Bill, my name has been maligned up and down this state by the medical industry and it's been on the basis of misinformation that has been fed to medical providers whether they be physicians, hospitals, dentists, podiatrists, chiropractors. You name it, Mr. Speaker, the various associations and societies have spread malicious information relative these Amendments in an attempt to malign my name. And I resent it, Mr. Speaker, I don't blame the doctors for their hundreds and thousands of phone calls that I have received both in Springfield and back in my district telling me what a bad guy I am for introducing these Amendments. It has been misinformation. I resent it, Mr. Speaker, and I want the record to show that I resent such a...such a misuse of my integrity in terms of these Amendments."

Speaker Giorgi: "Thank you. Let the record show it. Mr. Leinenweber on the same point?"

Leinenweber: "Well the previous speaker prides himself apparently for knowing something about the rules of this House. That's not a proper point of personal privilege and he ought to know it. If he has any grief...the people outside the presence of this House he can take it up with them directly."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Madison on Amendment #13."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #13... Mr. Speaker, Amendment #13 makes a reduction of...."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me, Mr. Madison, excuse me. Representative Campbell, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as Amendments 13 through 22 being offered by Representative Madison deal with related subjects I wonder if we couldn't address ourselves to those on one Roll Call?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Mr. Madison, do you agree with his surveillance

Madison: "I prefer, Mr. Speaker, to deal with them one at a time."

Speaker Giorgi: "Continue on Amendment #13."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #13 makes a reduction in...of 226,100 dollars in the medical line item for chiropractors. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the line item for chiropractors in the fiscal year 1978 budget was for 80,000 dollars.



That is based on the estimated expenditures for fiscal year 1978. The department has budgeted 342,000 dollars for this line item. Mr. Speaker, even if we take into consideration, and we did in preparation of this Amendment, taking consideration the Medicaid rate increases that have been negotiated. This budget, this line item is fat to say the least, Mr. Speaker, it is fat by at least 226,100 dollars and the chiropractors at...has a...in the past, Mr. Speaker, the chiropractors have had an average payment for fiscal year...fiscal year of '78 of \$23.41 (sic). It now...it's now budgeted by the Department at \$45.82. We think that with the Medicaid rate increase it should be responsibly at \$28.40 and that the number of payments at 4080 cases would allow a recommended level in the chiropractors line item of 115,900 dollars or a reduction of 226,100 dollars. And I move for the adoption of Amendment #13."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is there any discussion? Representative Madison... Representative Campbell on the...Amendment #13."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, before I address to this Amendment I want to say that I have utmost respect for the Sponsor of this Amendment and his sincerity and although I disagree with him and am on the opposite side I'm not one of those who has maligned him in any way. Now in addressing myself to not only this Amendment but Amendments 13 through 22, which reduced several medical assistant appropriations, this is apparently based on the mistaken notion that the budget submitted would cover more than 12 months' worth of expenditures. On the contrary, the budget request reflects our best estimate of the amount that will be required to meet the legitimate claims against the program during the fiscal year 1979. The 40,000,000 dollars, the 43,000,000 reduction contemplated by these Amendments would have two obvious effects. The moderate rate increases proposed for various types of providers could not be afforded. The likelihood of a deficiency appropriation becoming necessary would be increased substantially. Reducing the appropriation in this fashion is comparable to arguing that if we could save money by delaying the payment of bills. Money is obviously not saved by such a tactic, it is merely spent



a few weeks later thus creating the impression of a higher available balance at the...at the expense of the responsible payment practices. Rate increases proposed for the next year are moderate at the best particularly when considered in the context of rate freezes of several years' duration that certain provider types have...have had to contend with. The consequence of not funding these increases will be...will be further erosion of provider participation increasing difficult...difficulties of plans in securing the care necessary for health and well-being. Driving mainstream providers out of the program has further consequence of leaving the door open for exploitation by medicaid rip off artists. And I ask all of you... one other point that I would like to make. As I said before, I have great respect for the Sponsor but I think he's wanting to move forward and he has his automobile in reverse and he's moving backwards because he's going to end up hurting the very people that he wants to help. And I ask you to vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative McClain on Amendment #13."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we would support Mr. Madison's motion to adopt this Amendment. If adopted and the total increase of payments were successful this year for chiropractors, there would be a 55 percent increase on the average for chiropractic services. On that it's been our position that the increase ought to be phased in and not all in one year. Therefore, we think a 55 percent increase is too much in one year and we would urge you to adopt Mr. Madison's motion to accept this Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Gene Barnes on the Amendment."

Barnes: "Thank you very...much, Mr. Speaker. Just to concur with Representative McClain, I think that in this period of time and this year of appropriations a bit of sanity should prevail here. I realize that we're trying to upgrade the profile of the medical providers but I think that a 55 percent increase is about all any of us can justify to anyone anywhere at anytime. 55.3 percent that's embodied in this Amendment I think is sufficient I don't care who it is."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Madison to close."



Madison: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House and to my...my very fine colleague, the Department's spokesman on Public Aid. Let me just say that once again, Mr. Speaker, out of his mouth has he condemned the Department. Let's talk about best estimates, Mr. Speaker. The Department had a budget in 1978 for chiropractors of 185,000 dollars. The estimated expenditures for fiscal year 1978 is 81,000 dollars, Mr. Speaker, indicating that the chiropractors' line item will lapse 100,000 dollars and yet the Department in its best estimates having negotiated a rate increase of chiropractors of 21.3 percent proceeds to increase the allocation of last year's appropriation, not the expenditures of 55 percent. If we consider, Mr. Speaker, the fact that only 80,000 dollars was spent last year in this particular line item, the increase is not 55 percent, the increase is fourfold. It's 400 percent, Mr. Speaker. That is the Department's best estimate, I think not. And I would suggest that we consider the fact that there's 226,000 dollars overbudgeted in this line item. It ought to be reduced by that amount. And I move for the adoption of Amendment #13."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Madison moves for the adoption of Amendment #13 to Senate Bill 1456. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? (Tape difficulty). Representative Bowman to explain his vote for one minute, please."

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I hope that everyone was listening when Representative Madison closed. I mean, after all, the Department itself overbudgeted last year. We can, you know, easily demonstrate that with the facts and figures presented by Representative Madison. A 100,000 dollars is going to lapse out of this line item in the...at the end of this particular fiscal year. And so what is the Department's response to this? To come in and ask for another 100,000 dollars on top of that. So, good, we can lapse 200,000 dollars at the end of next year. What...what do they want to do, tie all the public aid recipients in knots with their...the chiropractic...with chiropractors? I think we ought to put this Amendment on."



Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Matijevich to explain his vote for one minute."

Matijevich: "Only to say that I think that the Public Aid Budget and Public Welfare has been kicked around the state for a long time and the people that take the brunt of the abuse when we talk about public welfare are poor people. Let's tell...let's tell it like it really is, that the providers are the ones that make out on poor people. This is the year of the provider. The Governor this year is going to take care of the medical service providers, make no mistake about it. And make no mistake about it, those are the same people that contribute heavily to Governor Thompson's campaign fund. That's why we're going to take care of providers this year. I think that we ought to phase it in. We can't do it all in one year. The taxpayers can't afford it and I wholeheartedly support Jesse Madison on his Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Madison to explain his vote for one minute, please."

Madison: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the chiropractic lobby is much stronger than I thought but let me just suggest to you, particularly those of you who are always telling me how much money is poured down the tube for welfare, let me just suggest to you that this Administration has negotiated approximately a 21 percent increase for chiropractors in that line item. This reduction does not at all disturb that negotiated rate increase. It...I repeat, it does not disturb that rate increase. I wish somebody explain...would explain to me why the Department would negotiate an increase of 60,000 dollars in a line item with the chiropractors and then proceed to put 260,000 dollars in the line item honoring the rate increases. Mr. Speaker, there's going to be a lapse of 200,000 dollars in this line item. Somebody ought to tell the Governor to tell somebody what he plans to do with the extra 200,000 dollars after he has given the chiropractors their rate increase, what is he going to do with the 200,000 dollars? I think an 'aye' vote is a responsible 'aye' vote. The Conservative Union is watching, Ladies and Gentlemen. An 'aye' vote is the responsible vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Mann to explain his vote for one



Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out two statistics that may have some bearing on how the Members vote on this piece of legislation. One is that we spend a billion dollars a year for medical providers in the State of Illinois. That's money that is usually regrouped under the total budget and that's the money we usually talk about going to the recipient. But, no, a billion of ...of over that two billion goes to the medical providers. And, secondly, of all the fraud that has been uncovered, one-third of the fraud has been in the medical provider. Now it seems to me that the medical providers are adequately funded. They have made millions out of this program. Many of them are the ones who have committed the fraud. And for us to resist a modest cut like this one I think is wrong. I think it's very, very wrong. And what it's just going to lead to is additional gratuities for our providers and they don't need them."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there's 74 'ayes', 91 'nays' and 1 voting 'present'. And this motion failed. Representative McClain."

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, courtesy of the House, I think we ought to pull this Bill out of the record at the time. Could you read it a second time and put it on Third and we'll bring it back tomorrow for the rest of the Amendments but I think...it's 7:20 now. I'd just take the Bill out of the record if that's all right."

Speaker Giorgi: "It has been read a second time and it's..."

McClain: "I'm sorry, Representative Kozubowski would like to work on it tonight, so...."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman requests that the Bill be held... Representative Bradley, for what reason do you rise? Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what we'd like to do this evening would be to read those appropriations Bills that are on the order of...or the Senate Bills Second Reading, read 'em a second time this evening so that... and leave them on the Calendar on the Order of Second Reading. That way tomorrow we could come back, work on the Amendments, move 'em to Third and pass 'em tomorrow. Before we do that, though, included in the...what we'll be doing tonight, Representative



Friedland has a substantive Bill on Second Reading that was read a second time yesterday. We'd like to go to that and we'd like to go to a Postponed Consideration on one Bill. So we're going to be here for a few minutes yet and that is the program though. So I would suggest we read those appropriation Bills a Second time, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative McClain again to clarify the point he's making."

McClain: "Zeke, if we'll just move the Bill to Third, we'll be coming back and handle the rest of the Amendments. We'll just move the Bill to Third."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Parliamentarian informs me it should be just read a second time and held. Now is that the understanding of the rules? It doesn't...."

McClain: "Well, I...I'd just...soon move it to Third and bring it back tomorrow but...tomorrow we'll have a hundred Amendments if we leave it at Second. Maybe someone will forget it if we move to Third."

Speaker Giorgi: "I understand there's an agreement with the Republican Leadership on this move. Representative Van Dwyne, would you like to say something to this point? Representative Van Dwyne."

Van Dwyne: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask you a question."

Speaker Giorgi: "Go ahead."

Van Dwyne: "What would be the posture of this Bill if...if the Sponsor of the Bill refused to bring it back off of Third Reading? I have an Amendment #32 that I want to get on."

Speaker Giorgi: "Well, he's agreed with the Democratic and Republican Leaderships to bring it back to Second but we haven't moved it to Third yet until we're sure that we have to move it to Third. Now does this Bill have to be moved to Third Reading? Just read a second time and held, is that correct? And tomorrow will be the third time it's read. Okay. So that Bill is read a second time and held on Second. Now, Mr. Bradley, proceed with your intentions."

Bradley: "I just suggest we read the other appropriation Bills a second time if they have not been already been done."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Tipsword on this point."



Tipsword: "Just a point of inquiry. It was discovered today that there's an....a Senate Appropriations Bill that was overlooked by Appropriations II although they held a hearing on it and didn't get a chance to move the Bill or they did move the Bill. They overlooked moving it then. And I have a motion to discharge and I wonder if it should be handled today or can it...tomorrow soon enough?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Mr. Tipsword, why don't we go through with these... reading of these Bills a second time to get this technicality out of the way and then we'll...you can talk to the Speaker on your situation. Read the Bill the second time, the Appropriations Bills."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 1469. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Department of Registration. Second Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1583. A Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Board of Vocational Rehabilitation. Second Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1592. A Bill for an Act making certain appropriations to the Teachers' Retirement System. Second Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1595. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expense of the University Civil Service Merit Board. Second Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1601. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Capitol Development Board. Second Reading of the Bill.

Senate Bill 1864....."

Speaker Giorgi: "Now there was a request...."

Clerk Hall: "...Appropriations ordinary and contingent expense of the Bureau of the Budget. Second Reading of the Board...or the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "That completes the Appropriations Bills, is that correct? Representative Friedland with his Bill was supposed to be called. 1827, is that correct? Representative Friedland on 1827. On the Order of Second Reading, Senate Bill 1827. It was read yesterday. It was read yesterday. Proceed on then 1827's Amendment. Are there... Taking off the Amendment, just a moment."

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #4. Campbell-Jacobs. Amends Senate Bill 1827 by deleting all of Section 14 and so forth."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have we taken care of the Committee Bills and any motions? Committee Amendments and any motions? This is floor



Amendment #4?"

Friedland: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Friedland on Amendment #4."

Friedland: "No, Mr. Speaker, thank you. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd request leave to table Amendment #2 which was adopted in Committee and Amendment #6 will redo that."

Speaker Giorgi: "Move that Amendment #4 from the table. Representative Friedland's motion is to table Amendment #2. Is there any discussion to that motion? No discussion? Does the Gentleman...all in favor signify by saying 'aye' and the opposed 'no'. And the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment #2 is tabled. Any further motions to Committee Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: Amendment..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Floor...Floor Amendments."

Speaker Hall: "Amendment #3 was withdrawn. Amendment #4 is offered by Representative Campbell."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Campbell on...to Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1827."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've defeated a Bill on this House floor on three different occasions on the regulation of the license of ambulance services. There was some question about this particular Bill as to whether this might do this. And Amendment #4 simply addresses it and says that nothing in this Act shall permit them to regulate and license ambulances. Now I ask for your favorable support. I talked to the Sponsor, I know of no objections."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Friedland. Friedland."

Friedland: "I have no objection."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Campbell moves that Amendment #4 be adopted to Senate Bill 1827. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #...Amendment #5. Daniels. Amends Senate Bill 1827 as amended on...by deleting all of Section 9 and so forth."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Daniels on Amendment #5. Representative Friedland."



Friedland: "Mr...thank you, Mr. Speaker, I spoke with Representative Daniels and he has agreed to withdraw that Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Conti on this Amendment... Representative Friedland, would you like to move to table the Amendment ...inasmuch as you have the agreement?"

Friedland: "Yes. Yes."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Friedland moves to table Amendment #5 to House...Senate Bill 1827. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is tabled. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "Amendment #6. Friedland. Amends Senate Bill 1827 on page 1, line 17 and so forth."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Friedland on Amendment #6."

Friedland, "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #6 redoes Amendment 2 which was adopted in Committee and it clarifies some errors in the drafting and would urge your favorable consideration."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Friedland moves for the...the adoption of Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 1827. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Representative Chapman on Amendment #6. Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, I just have a question. With the adoption of Amendment 4, is Amendment 6 in order?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Chapman, the Parliamentarian has looked at that Amendment already and he says it is in order. He...he renews his motion to adopt Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 1827. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and Amendment #6 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Hall: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Giorgi: "Third Reading. Representative Kempiners on a parliamentary inquiry. Representative Kempiner."

Kempiner: "You read lips pretty good, Mr. Speaker. I have an appropriation Bill that's a House Bill and it's on the Order of House Bills Third Reading and I realize that time is really short and I was just wondering what will be the status of these Bills if we... we do not go to this order of reading and pass them today?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Yeah, we're planning...the appropriation Bills are



exempt from the rules anyway. We're trying..."

Friedland: "I understand that but...we've got...."

Speaker Giorgi: "Just a moment, Mr. Houlihan...Mr. Kempiners, Houlihan wants to enlighten us. Representative Houlihan on this point."

Houlihan, J: "I was going to try to help Representative Kempiners but if you can handle, Zeke, go ahead. Go ahead."

Speaker Giorgi: "Mr. Houlihan, I didn't hear your remarks. What were they again?"

Houlihan, J: "That's all right, go ahead, go ahead."

Kempiners: "Mr. Speaker, I think he made a derogatory statement about you but I'm not that swift, I don't know that I interpreted it correctly. Basically, what I want to know, Zeke, is if we don't go to this order of business today and we went to it tomorrow and even if I pass it tomorrow, there would not...if we adjourn on June 30, would not be enough time to pass this in the Senate. What I'm concerned about is keeping this Bill alive to see what happens with the substantive Bill which is on Third Reading over in the Senate."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kempiners, if we pass it tomorrow it can be read a first time in the Senate tomorrow and there's enough days to pass the Bill in the Senate."

Kempiner: "So...okay, so it's exempt from the rules so it won't die tonight and we'll go to this order of business tomorrow morning?"

Speaker Giorgi: "That's correct."

Kempiner: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Okay, let's go back to reading Mr. Friedland's Bill for the third time and he wants to place it on its passage. Representative Friedland on Senate Bill 1827. Senate Bill 1827 which has been read a third time."

Friedland: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I ask leave to suspend Rule 35(c) so that we can consider important measure at this time."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Parliamentarian informs me you don't need to suspend the Rules, to read the Bill a third time and he can it on its passage."

Clerk Hall: "Senate Bill 1827. A Bill for an Act to establish Pre-Hospital



Emergency Medical Services Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Friedland on Senate Bill 1827."

Friedland: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1827 would establish the Pre-Hospital Emergency Service Act. In other words, this is the emergency medical services from the scene of an emergency, an accident between ...where the accident occurs enroute to a hospital. And it's supported by numerous associations and I'd urge favorable consideration of this measure."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative James Houlihan on this Bill? ...Your light's on. Representative Schlickman on..on Senate Bill 1827."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Indicates he will."

Schlickman: "I'm sorry, I thought you used the word 'free', you mean, 'pre'. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Friedland moves that Senate Bill 1827 pass. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted wish? I don't have my numbers up here. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there 157 'ayes', no 'nays' and none voting 'present'. And this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Levin, 'aye'. On Supplemental Calendar #1 on page 1, dated...Supplemental Calendar #2. At the top of the Calendar on Consideration Postponed appears Senate Bill 1680. Senate Bill 1680. Representative Bradley on Senate Bill 1680. On Senate Bill 1680, Mr. Collins? On Senate Bill 1680, Supplemental Calendar 2?"

Collins: "Yeah, Mr..."

Speaker Giorgi: "On this Supplemental Calendar 2."

Collins: "Who has Supplemental Calendar #2 other than you?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Everybody has."

Collins: "Oh, no, I don't. I don't. Oh, no, I don't."

Speaker Giorgi: "I have..."

Collins: "Nobody does...nobody does over here."

Speaker Giorgi: "There they are. Why don't you...make yourself... avail yourself of one?"



Collins: "Mr. Speaker, apparently you've given it to your side of the aisle and neglected us again."

Speaker Giorgi: "Would somebody run a Calendar over here to Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Oh, no. Oh, no, no. I'm..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative..."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I'm one of 83 those have..."

Speaker Giorgi: "They're out. They're out. They're out. Representative Bradley on Senate Bill 1680. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I appreciate your being...calling this one more time. We're not going to ask to take it back to Second Reading, we'll go up or down with it one way or the other. I talked with Senator Rock and Senator Hynes and they have agreed that we will put this into a Conference Committee, we will take out the clustering Amendment that ...that one of the Representatives is so interested in. We'll take out the clustering and...in the Conference Committee and we'll go ahead and...with the Bill, up or down. Everybody knows what's in the Bill. We discussed it and debated it this afternoon. I can't do any more than give my word and Senator Rock and Senator Hyne's word that the clustering Amendment will come out of the Bill in the Conference Committee and brought back for your consideration. I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote on it...1680."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kelly on Senate Bill 1680. Representative Kelly. Excuse me, Mr. Kelly, for just a moment. Representative Skinner on...on...what is your point of order on the Supplemental Calendar Senate Bill 1680?"

Skinner: "The point of order is when a Page asks for a Calendar, the original Calendar that was distributed at 9:30 this morning, won't do. Do you want to hand us yours so we'll have a copy?"

Speaker Giorgi: "...Your point...your point is not well taken. Mr. Kelly on Senate Bill 1680..."

Skinner: "How about it?"

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to support Representative Bradley on reconsideration of this Bill. He has given the word of not only himself but of Senator Rock and Senator Hynes that the clustering Amendment would be removed in a Conference Committee. Now that is good enough for me because of another



proposal that's being left in that Bill that I think is very important which is the referendum advisory vote on the Equal Rights Amendment which will be in November. Now I'll tell you, this is an important subject and there are many people in the House of Representatives and in the Senate that are on the hook on this issue. And this would give you your opportunity to get off of that hook so that you do not have to be pressured by the leadership of your party or by individuals who are not constituents of your district. The people should be given an opportunity to vote and I ask you to join me in supporting Representative Bradley's House Bill 1680."

Speaker Giorgi: "As I...I'm going to recognize everyone...that's.... and I've indicated to people I'm going to recognize 'em. On Senate Bill 1680, your point of order...on Senate Bill 1680? State your point."

Robinson: "As a point of order I want to make it clear that I'm...I want a verified Roll Call. I want a verification if it gets 89 votes."

Speaker Giorgi: "Just...I have...all your lights ...on, you'll be recognized. Representative Capparelli for a quick announcement. What is your announcement, Capparelli?"

Capparelli: "Mr. Speaker, Executive Committee will meet tomorrow at 9 o'clock and included in tomorrow's Resolutions are 56, House Joint is 99, HR 833 and HR 1053, HR 722 and SJR 95. Please be prompt. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Bluthardt on Senate Bill 1680."

Bluthardt: "First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would still like to see that Supplemental Calendar #2 and I hope you get printed before the debate is over. It seems to me that's highly unusual and...and very improper to be calling a matter on Consideration Postponed on the same day in which the original vote was taken. You know, who's kidding who when you're talking about putting the ERA referendum on this Bill? It's not going to last half way across the aisle when it gets in the Senate. Bingo, it's going to be taken off, so don't kid yourselves about that. There are other bad features, not only the clustering feature but the feature of changing



the position of the officers running, or the candidates running for office. I don't think that the Governor ought to be listed below the candidate for Congress. There are many bad features about this Bill. It ought to be defeated."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Telcser on Senate Bill 1680."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 1680 reminds me of an incident of an election that took place in Chicago some years back. I think some of the more experienced old-timers in the House may remember the Sixth Ward had a special aldermanic election and fellow by the name of Muir was running. Now, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House...."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Telcser, just for a moment. The Majority Leader would like the floor. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Will all due respect to the outstanding Assistant Leader who's always very erudite and glib and articulate, please confine your remarks to the Bill at hand. We....(tape difficulty)...your stated history in Chicago politics."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Telcser, attempt to discipline yourself to the Bill...Senate Bill 1680."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Majority Leader is absolutely correct. The history of politics, machine politics in Chicago is indeed shaded and grim. And, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, clustering precincts is nothing new because in that special election the Board of Election Commissioners decided to open...if my memory serves me right, only four polling places in the entire ward. There was one polling place open in each of the four far corners of the ward. Well fortunately the voters of the Sixth Ward rose in arms, they were angry, they were upset and they marched to the polls and a great upset took place. Mr. Muir won and served one term in the City Council. And that's been the history of clustering precincts in the City of Chicago. Not too long ago, Mr. Speaker, the City Council voted not to hold a special election in two wards in Chicago and it took a Federal District Court order to see to it that the people in those two wards were represented. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I could see clustering precincts in those two elections taking place. I say to you,



Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is one of the worst Bills I've seen during this Session. It's a power grab for a few County Clerks who if given the opportunity will manipulate an election or two. And so, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I hope that 1680 receives less votes than it received earlier today."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Collins on Senate Bill 1680."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Representative Telcser hit the nail right on the head. And while elections may be run and have been run in Chicago in such a manner, I think it's time that this high-handed approach comes to a stop in this House. Now this Bill has been thoroughly debated. Representatives Bluthardt and Telcser pointed out how bad the Bill was, there are many bad features. But let's not forget this whole situation was born in bad faith as I tried to explain to the House today. And once again we're seeing an example of the denial of rights of Members. This afternoon it would have been very easy to take this Bill back to Second Reading with nearly unanimous consent and all certain Members asked was their right to offer Amendments to this Bill and vote them up or down. They were denied that. Now the Republicans are being treated again to the same high-handed treatment they've been getting for the last month, ramming a Bill through, no Calendar on the desk and an attempt to sneak this very shabby, shoddy Bill through. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that not one Republican Member should vote this Bill whether he likes it or not and certainly none of those Members who this afternoon attempted to add their Amendments this Bill should support this very bad concept. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I know a certain segment of this House has lost all sense of decency if they ever had one at all. But let's...some of us proceed in an honorable and decent fashion and good start to that would be to kill this very bad Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Mugalian on Senate Bill 1680."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, isn't there a three hour rule for Consent Calendar? I've just seen a copy of the Calendar #2...."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Mugalian, that's solely...."

Mugalian: "...540."

Speaker Giorgi: "That's solely for concurrences, Mugalian. Solely



for concurrences in a conference committee. This is just a Postponed Consideration. Representative Geo-Karis on Senate Bill 1680."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a travesty on justice. I have begged the original Sponsor of this Bill in this House to keep that Amendment of clustered voting off. Clustered voting, as I explained earlier today, will allow the election authorities to put four precincts in one polling area and if you have 800 people per precinct, that's 3200 people. You say if 40 percent of the people will vote, or even 20 percent of 3200 people is 700 votes. And if you don't think there's going to be a problem trying to get parking and what have you. I don't understand we have to keep it into this Bill. First of all, the House Committee Amendment removes the clustered voting out of this Senate Bill and then there was a motion to table that House Amendment #1 and it succeeded on a verified Roll Call by two or three votes. I prevail upon you - and those of you who are independent - this is a bad Bill. That clustered vote Amendment is sad. We have that now in House Bill 2554 to try it out for park districts and school district elections. Let's see how it works out before you attempt to put clustered voting zones in the Election Code. It is illegal at the present time. The Clerk of the Lake County was notified by letter from the State Board of Elections, though that her thoughts might be honorable, the concept was illegal at the present time... the State Board of Elections. I prevail upon you to vote 'no' on this Bill with this Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Walsh on Senate Bill 1680."

Walsh, Wm: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've heard a lot about the Amendments that have been added to this Bill and a lot about the tactics that the Majority Party has used to get us to the Bill. I don't see why on earth on the tactics question you did not find someone who was willing to move to vote to reconsider this. If you're going to pass it you'll have to find somebody who'll change their vote. Why you did this beats me. But, Mr. Speaker, let me submit that the Bill when it started out wasn't much good. It's an attempt to evade a...a court decision



which found that parties should be on the ballot by lots. We are with this Bill attempting to evade that decision and to put the two major political parties first and second as the lot would determine between those two but any other political parties we're going to leave out in the cold. Now I suggest to you that that is wrong. We're evading what the court said really should be done and the court was right. Then we've added these Amendments and made the Bill increasingly bad. Your tactics add to the stench and I suggest that we ought to vote 'no'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Leverenz on Senate Bill 1680."

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

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall the main question be put?"

Representative Geo-Karis on a parliamentary inquiry."

Geo-Karis: "I'd like to have a...a verified Roll Call once this Bill..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Mr. Robinson already requested that. All in favor of Mr. Leverenz's motion to cut debate signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And Gentleman...Representative Bradley to close."

Bradley: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We're not trying to get around anything such as Representative Walsh might suggest. We're doing just exactly what the courts suggested we must do, we're providing that...within...after 30 days after the primary there...a lottery will be held for the two major political parties. A major political party and those are the only two that are major political parties, that's why the other party can't even...walk into and be included in the primary. They will hold...and they will submit names for office sometime in August as they always do . and at that time another lottery will be held for them. That was the original intent of the Bill. Other things have been added to it as we've discussed all day long. Again I reiterate, Adeline Geo-Karis, that in the Conference Committee that we will take the clustering out of the Bill and bring it back here and address ourselves to 1680 again. Because...today is the last day that we can bring a Bill such as this out of this House, that's why we had to move to Postpone Consideration at this time. We've done that on other...on other times and other years when



I've been here. I simply ask an 'aye' vote on 1680 at this time.
Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall Senate Bill 1680 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Representative Skinner to explain his vote for one minute on 1680."

Skinner: "Right. I'm voting against this Bill not because of what's in it but because of what's not in it. There was an opportunity in this Bill to have an open primary in the State of Illinois. That has been refused...that's has been...not even considered. But I don't think that's what the Democrats really want to avoid in here. I mean the Chicago Democrats. I think what they really want to avoid are two proposals for advisory referendums. One which would be...ask the people whether we should limit property taxes on residential property in the State of Illinois to one percent of market value. The second of which would ask whether the people of the State of Illinois want to continue massively financing the Regional Transportation Authority. That's the real reason this Amendment is not going back to Second Reading for consideration."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Robinson, you want a verification? Representative Bradley on the...on this...taking the record."

Bradley: "Poll the absentees, there's 22 of them up there."

Speaker Giorgi: "Would you please poll the absentees? On the question of the Roll Call, Mr. Ryan? I recognized you on the question of the Roll Call solely, I have other...."

Ryan: "I just...I just wanna...I just want to point out the time on the Calendar that we just received, Mr. Speaker. It's...it's...it's got the date on it and the time is 5:40 p.m. and it's now ten minutes to eight by my watch."

Speaker Giorgi: "Mr. Ryan, I must...."

Ryan: "I don't understand, if this...if this was printed and available by...at 5:40 why we get it at ten minutes to eight."

Speaker Giorgi: "Mr. Ryan, it's the Pages, it's the job of the Pages. You wish to be recorded, Mr. Walsh? He wants to be recorded as voting 'no'."



Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to point out also that if this gets 89 votes I'd like to verify it."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kane would like to be recorded as voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? I'm sorry, 'aye'. Well, I read it wrong. All right. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. What is it? Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Beatty."

Speaker Giorgi: "Just a moment, Mr. Clerk. Representative Greiman would like to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Greiman, 'aye'. Representative Chapman. Representative Chapman. Chapman."

Chapman: "I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, that I would have an opportunity in explaining my vote to ask why all of the people who ever since 1972 have wanted a referendum before the public on the Equal Rights Amendment are voting 'no' today. Almost every single one who have urged a referendum on the Equal Rights Amendment are voting 'no'. I cannot understand this...."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative...Representative...."

Chapman: "Surely I don't question their sincerity...."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Conti, for what reason do you rise?"

Chapman: "But I do wonder...."

Conti: "Point of order. I'd like to know what Bill we're on, the ERA or 1680?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Senate Bill 1680. Continue with the Roll Call of the absentees, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Byers. Caldwell. Christensen. Deavers. Ralph Dunn. Ewell. Gaines. Getty. Hanahan. Hart. Hoffman. Klosak. Kornowicz. Madison. Peggy Smith Martin. McGrew. Mugalian. Pierce. Schuneman. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Totten to explain his vote. Representative Totten. He doesn't want to explain his vote. Representative Christen...wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Representative Christen (sic) wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'. I am taking the record. Representative Stuffle wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Stuffle, 'aye'. Representative Mudd wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'. We're taking the record as soon as this is completed. What's the count, Mr. Clerk?"



....(Tape difficulty) wants to change from 'no' to 'aye'.

On this ques....Representative Beatty, for what reason do you rise?
Representative Beatty."

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Beatty recorded?"

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

Beatty: "Would you record me as 'aye', please?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Beatty wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Representative Ewell wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Representative Ewell. On this question there are 85 'ayes'. Representative Mann, for what reason do you rise?"

Mann: "I'd like to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to explain my vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "The...the....Representative Caldwell, for what reason do you rise?"

Caldwell: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Giorgi: "How is Representative...."

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

Caldwell: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Giorgi: "And Representative Pierce seeks recognition. For what reason does Representative Pierce seek recognition?"

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, vote 'aye'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Pierce wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'. How many votes? Representative Katz, for what reason do you rise? On this question there are 88 'ayes' and 71 'nays' and the...the move failed. On the same Calendar appears Senate Bill 1510. Representative Tipword on a motion. Representative Tipword on Senate Bill 1510. Senate Bill 1510."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen...."

Speaker Giorgi: "Motion."

Tipword: "This is a motion to discharge the Appropriations II Committee on appropriation for the Illinois Industrial Development Authority. This is an authority that...that was established in 1970 in which we gave them 1,000,000 dollars for grants...for loans that they could make throughout the State of Illinois only in areas where there was especially high unemployment. The loans could only be given



for that part of industrial financing that could not be covered by private financing. This group has taken that million dollars into these high unemployment areas throughout this state, in every part of this state, and has created over 2,000 new jobs. They have lost not one single cent. They have increased that million dollars to a total of approximately a million three to a million four. They have almost all of it loaned out at the present time and are here for an additional 500,000 dollars in loan funds so that they meet some additional loan obligations that they can now make, that cannot get otherwise...and not otherwise get financing and hopefully create another thousand jobs in very high unemployment areas in the State of Illinois. This Bill was heard by Appropriations II. It was unanimously well received in Appropriations II on that day but regrettably it was never...never was able to be brought to a vote and was overlooked by Appropriations II Committee. I think this can be affirmed both by the Chairman and by the minority Members of Appropriations II. I am asking that it might be discharged and brought out here to the floor of the House so that we can give this very worthwhile agency this additional help so that they can help increase job opportunities in the State of Illinois. And I would move that you vote for this discharge."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Schlickman on the motion. Representative Schlickman on the motion."

Schlickman: "No, that was pushed in error, I'm sorry, Mr..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Barnes on the motion. Gene Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, just briefly to...to agree with Representative Tipword relative to this Bill. This Bill was heard in Approp. II, there was no opposition there and through a series of simply...simply being overlooked, we did not have the ...didn't...this Bill didn't have the opportunity for a vote in the Committee. And I would support Representative Tipword on his motion and would urge all the Members to do so. This Bill was not controversial. It had firm recommendations by both the Minority and the Majority so I would urge you to support this motion."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is...Senate Bill's motion to discharge the Appropriations II Committee and advance to Second Reading, the



Second Legislative Day, Senate Bill 1510. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 134 'ayes', 8 'nays' and 1 voting 'present' and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Would you read the Bill a second time?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1510. A Bill for an Act to make an appropriation for the purposes of the Illinois Industrial Development Authority. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Madigan. Third Reading."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No floor Amendments."

Speaker Giorgi: "Third Reading on this last Bill. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning and allow a couple of minutes for the Clerk to perform some perfunctory duties."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any discussion? The Gentleman moves that we adjourn. All in favor signify by saying 'aye' and those opposed 'no'. The House is adjourned except for a few moments for the Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has concurred with the House, passage of Bill of the following title, to wit: House Bills 2691, 3023, 3053, 3062, 2984, 2989, 562 and 2818 together with Amendments. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 27, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Introduction and First Reading of Bills. House Bill 3413. Polk. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Pension Code. First Reading of the Bill. No further business, the House now stands adjourned."



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
2.			
5		Speaker Redmond	
5		Barnes, Jane	HB 2981-SA #2
5	10:25	Speaker Redmond	House nonconcurr
5		Leinenweber	
5		Speaker Redmond	
5		Madigan	
5		Barnes, J.	
5		Speaker Redmond	
5		Walsh, Wm.	
5		Speaker Redmond	
5		Houlihan, J.)	
)	
6		Speaker Redmond)	
6		Madigan	
6		Speaker Redmond	
7		Satterthwaite)	
)	
7		Barnes, J.)	
7		Speaker Redmond	
7		Leinenweber)	
)	
7		Barnes, J.)	
7		Speaker Redmond	
8		Klosak	
8		Speaker Redmond	House concurs SA #3
8		Daniels	Leave to change vote
8		Speaker Redmond	HB 3006
8		Getty	Hold it
8	10:31	Speaker Redmond	Out of record
8		Matejek	HB 2894-SA #2



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
1.			
1	9:30	Speaker Redmond	House to order
1		Father Allen	Prayer
1		Speaker Redmond	
1		Clerk O'Brien	Agreed Resolutions
1		Speaker Redmond	
2		Giorgi	Reads Resolutions
2		Speaker Redmond	
2		Daniels	
2		Speaker Redmond	
2		Clerk O'Brien	HR 1039
2		Speaker Redmond)	
3		Van Duyne)	
3		Friedrich)	
3		Speaker Redmond)	
3		Hudson	
3		Speaker Redmond	
3		Geo-Karis	
3		Speaker Redmond	
4	10:05	Clerk O'Brien	Message from the Senate
4		Speaker Redmond	
4		Madigan	Excused absences
4		Speaker Redmond	
4		Friedrich	Nonconcur in Sen Amend 1,2,3
4		Speaker Redmond	
4		Barnes, Jane	HB 2775
5		Speaker Redmond	
5		Madigan	Hold 2775



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
3.			
8		Speaker Redmond	
9		Conti)	
9)	
9		Matejek)	
9		Speaker Redmond	House concurs
9		Cunningham	Introduction
10		Speaker Redmond	
10		Kane	HB 3197-SA #1
10		Speaker Redmond	
10		Ryan	
10		Speaker Redmond	House concurs
11		Dunn, R.	HB 3235-SA #1,2,3
11		Speaker Redmond	
11		Anderson)	
11)	
11		Dunn, R.)	
11		Speaker Redmond	
11		Kempiners)	
11)	
11		Anderson)	
11		Speaker Redmond	
12		Dunn, J.	
12		Kempiners	
13		Speaker Redmond)	
14	10:47)	
14		Dunn, J.)	
14		Edgar)	
15)	
15		Kempiners)	
15		Speaker Redmond	
15		Barnes, E. M.	Rise to concur
15		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
4.			
16		Houlihan, J.	
16		Speaker Redmond	
17		Satterthwaite	
17		Speaker Redmond	
17		Peters	
17		Speaker Redmond	
18		Skinner	
18		Speaker Redmond	
18		Dunn, R.	
18		Speaker Redmond	House concurs SA #1,2,3
18		Ebbesen	Leave to vote aye
18		Speaker Redmond	
18,19		Harris	HB 2891-SA #1
21,22		Speaker Redmond	
22		Polk	
22	11:00	Speaker Redmond	
23,24		Brady	Support
24		Speaker Redmond	
24		Hoffman	Support
24		Speaker Redmond	
25,26		Stuffle	Support
26		Speaker Redmond	
26		Conti	Support
26		Speaker Redmond	
27		Madigan	Urge aye vote
27		Speaker Redmond	
28		Cunningham	Aye vote



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
28		Speaker Redmond	
29		Jones, E.	Support
29		Speaker Redmond	
30		Kane	
30		Speaker Redmond	
30		Keats	Moves previous question
30		Speaker Redmond	
31		Schlickman	Parliamentary inquiry-germane?
31		Speaker Redmond	
31		Stuffle	Parliamentary inquiry
31	11:30	Speaker Redmond	Keats ques-ayes have it.
32		Schlickman	Questions germaneness
32		Speaker Redmond	
32		Stuffle	Responds
32		Speaker Redmond	Amendment is germane
33		Schlickman	
33		Speaker Redmond	
33		Harris	To close
33		Speaker Redmond	
34		Daniels	Explains vote
34		Speaker Redmond	
34		Bradley	Explains vote
34		Speaker Redmond	
36		Tipsword	Support
36		Speaker Redmond	
36		Sumner	Support
36		Speaker Redmond	



<u>6.</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	37		Pierce	
	37		Speaker Redmond	
	37		Ebbesen	
	37	11:45	Speaker Redmond	
	37		Ewell	Support
	38		Speaker Redmond	(HB 2891)
	38		Geo-Karis	"
	38		Speaker Redmond	
	38		Richmond	"
	38		Speaker Redmond	
	39		Bennett	"
	39		Speaker Redmond	
	39		McMaster	"
	39		Speaker Redmond	
	40		Peters	
	40		Speaker Redmond	
	40		Flinn	
	40		Speaker Redmond	
	41		Gaines	Votes no
	41		Speaker Redmond	
	41		Mudd	
	41		Speaker Redmond	
	41		Bluthardt	
	41		Speaker Redmond	
	41		Jones, J. D.	
	41		Speaker Redmond	
	42	11:55	Campbell	Votes aye



	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	Speaker Redmond	
	Matijevec	
	Speaker Redmond	House concurs
	Getty	HB 3006 - SA #2, 3
	Speaker Redmond	
	Leinenweber)	
)	
43	Getty)	
43	Speaker Redmond	
43	Houlihan, D.)	
)	
44	Getty)	
44	Speaker Redmond	
44	Matijevec	
44	Speaker Redmond	House concurs
44	Van Duyne	
44	Speaker Redmond	
44	Clerk Hall	SB 238-3rd Reading
44	Speaker Redmond	
45	Porter	
45	Speaker Redmond	
45	Taylor)	Inquiry of Chair
)	
45	Speaker Redmond)	
)	
45	Porter)	Responds
45	Speaker Redmond	
45	12:08 Taylor	Support
45	Speaker Redmond	
45	Huff	
45	Speaker Redmond	SB 238 passed



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
8.			
45		Clerk O'Brien	SB 250-3rd Reading
45		Speaker Redmond	
46		Sandquist	
46		Lechowicz in the Chair	
47		Houlihan, D.	
47		Speaker Lechowicz	
48		Darrow)	
)	
49		Sandquist)	
49		Speaker Redmond	
50		Keats)	
)	
51, 52		Sandquist)	
52		Speaker Lechowicz	
53		Huff	
53		Speaker Lechowicz	
53		Yourell)	
)	
54		Sandquist)	
54		Speaker Lechowicz	
54		Dawson	Moves previous question
54		Speaker Lechowicz	
54	12:27	Sandquist	To close
54		Speaker Lechowicz	
54		Bowman	Question-pass
54		Speaker Lechowicz	
54		Kelly	Explains no vote
55		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 250 passed
55		Adams	Leave to vote yes on 238
55		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
9.			
55		Stanley	Recorded as aye
55		Speaker Lechowicz	
55		Clerk O'Brien	SB 252-3rd Reading
55		Speaker Lechowicz	
55		Pullen	
55		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
56		Clerk O'Brien	SB 253-3rd Reading
56		Speaker Lechowicz	
56		Beatty	Yield to Marovitz
56		Speaker Lechowicz	
57		Marovitz	
57		Speaker Lechowicz	
58,59		Schlickman	
59		Speaker Lechowicz	
60		Leinenweber	
60		Speaker Lechowicz	
61,62		Marovitz	To close
62		Speaker Lechowicz	
62		Vinson	Explains vote
62		Speaker Lechowicz	
63		Beatty	Explains vote
63		Speaker Lechowicz	
63		Madison	
63		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 253 passed
63		Clerk O'Brien	SB 255-3rd Reading
63		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
63		Clerk O'Brien	SB-309-3rd-R



10. <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
63		Speaker Lechowicz	
63		Houlihan, D.	
63		Speaker Lechowicz	We'll get back to it
63		Clerk O'Brien	SB 386-3rd Reading
63		Speaker Lechowicz	
64		Mugalian	Sponsor
64		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 386 passed
64		Clerk O'Brien	SB 309
64		Speaker Lechowicz	
64		Houlihan, D.	SB 309 Out of record
64		Clerk O'Brien	SB 386
64		Speaker Lechowicz	
65		Hoffman	Explains SB 386
65		Speaker Lechowicz	
65		Keats	
65		Speaker Lechowicz	
65		Clerk O'Brien	SB 309
65		Speaker Lechowicz	
66	12:56	Houlihan, D.	Explains SB 309
66		Speaker Lechowicz	
66		Wolf)	
66)	
66		Houlihan, D.)	
67		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 309 passed
67		Clerk O'Brien	SB 388-3rd Reading
67		Speaker Lechowicz	
68		Hoffman	
68		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>11.</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	68		Polk	
	68		Speaker Lechowicz	
	68		Waddell)	
	68)	
	68		Hoffman)	
	68		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 388 passed
	68		Clerk O'Brien	SB 393
	68		Speaker Lechowicz	
	68		Hoffman	SB 393
	68		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 393 passed
	69		Clerk O'Brien	SB 395
	69		Speaker Lechowicz	
	69		Hoffman	Explains SB 395
	69	1:05	Speaker Lechowicz	
	70		McClain)	
	70)	
	70		Hoffman)	
	70		Speaker Lechowicz	
	70		Tuerk)	
	70)	
	70		Hoffman)	
	70		Speaker Lechowicz	
	71		Katz)	
	72)	
	72		Hoffman)	
	73		Speaker Lechowicz	
	74,75		Pierce)	
	76)	
	76		Hoffman)	
	76		Speaker Lechowicz	
	77		Levin	Supports
	77		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
12.			
77	1:25	Van Duyne	Moves previous question
77		Speaker Lechowicz	
78		Hoffman	Closes on SB 395
78		Speaker Lechowicz	
78		Pullen	Explains vote
78		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 395 passed
78		Hoffman	Leave to move to SB 1055?
78		Speaker Lechowicz	Leave granted
78		Simms	'No' on SB 395
79		Speaker Lechowicz	
79		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1055
79		Speaker Lechowicz	
79		Hoffman	Explains SB 1055
80		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 1055 passed
80		Clerk O'Brien	SB 736
80		Speaker Lechowicz	
80		Capparelli	Back to 2nd?
80		Speaker Lechowicz	Leave granted
80		Totten	Parliamentary Inquiry
80		Speaker Lechowicz	
80	1:30	Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #5
81		Speaker Lechowicz	
81		Ewing	Explains Amendment #5
81		Speaker Lechowicz	
82		Mugalian)	
)	
82		Ewing)	
82		Speaker Lechowicz	Amendment #5 adopted



13.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	82		Speaker Lechowicz	Motion to hear on 3rd passed
	82		Clerk O'Brien	SB 736-3rd Reading
	82		Speaker Lechowicz	
	83		Schlickman	
	83		Speaker Lechowicz	
	83		Capparelli	Explanation
	83		Madigan	On SB 736
	84		Speaker Lechowicz	
	85		Mugalian	Explains no vote
	85		Speaker Lechowicz	
	86		Friedrich	Explains vote
	86		Speaker Lechowicz	
	86	1:45	Matula	Explains vote-support
	86		Speaker Lechowicz	
	87		Terzich	Explains vote
	87		Speaker Lechowicz	
	87		Geo-Karis	
	88		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 736 passed
			Speaker Redmond in the Chair	
	88		Brummer	
	88		Speaker Redmond	
	88		Richmond	
	89		Robert Heckenkamp	
	89		John Alber	
	89		Clerk O'Brien	HR 1052
	89		Speaker Lechowicz in Chair	Resolution adopted
	89		Ebbesen	Leave to vote aye on 736



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
14.			
89		Speaker Lechowicz	
89		Friedrich	Same request
89		Speaker Lechowicz	
89		Clerk O'Brien	SB 825-3rd Reading
90		Speaker Lechowicz	
90	1:55	McGrew	
90		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 825 passed
91		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1455-3rd Reading
91		Speaker Lechowicz	
91		Hoffman	
91		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
91		Caldwell	Aye
91		Speaker Lechowicz	
91		Collins	No
91		Speaker Lechowicz	
91		Leinenweber	
91		Speaker Lechowicz	
91		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1562-3rd Reading
92		Speaker Lechowicz	
92		Martin, L.	
92		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
92		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1617 - 3rd Reading
92		Speaker Lechowicz	
92		Jones, J. D.	
93		Speaker Lechowicz	
93		Skinner	
93		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
15.			
93		Speaker Lechowicz	
93	2:05	Clerk O'Brien	SB 1630-3rd Reading
93		Speaker Lechowicz	
93		Telcser	
94		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
94		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1672-3rd Reading
94		Speaker Lechowicz	
94		Telcser	
94		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
94		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1680 - 3rd Reading
94		Speaker Lechowicz	
94		Matijeovich	
94		Speaker Lechowicz	
94		Conti	
95		Speaker Lechowicz	
95		Robinson	SB 1680 -wants moved back
95		Speaker Lechowicz	
95		Bradley	Corrects Robinson
95		Speaker Lechowicz	
95		Robinson	
95		Speaker Lechowicz	
95		Bradley	Speaks on Bill
95		Speaker Lechowicz	
96		Bowman	
96	2:14	Madison	
96		Speaker Lechowicz	
96		Daniels	Question



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
16.			
96		Speaker Lechowicz	
96		Bluthardt	
97		Speaker Lechowicz	
97		Bradley	Proceeds with Bill
97		Speaker Lechowicz	
97		Friedrich	
97		Speaker Lechowicz	
98		Bluthardt	Against
98		Speaker Lechowicz	
99		Geo-Karis	
99		Speaker Lechowicz	
99		Leinenweber	Votes no
100		Speaker Lechowicz	
100		Kelly	Support
100		Speaker Lechowicz	
100		Conti	Against
100		Speaker Lechowicz	
101		Matijeovich	Support
101		Speaker Lechowicz	
102		Collins	Against
102		Speaker Lechowicz	
103	2:25	Robinson	Against
103		Speaker Lechowicz	
103		Rigney	Moves previous question
103		Speaker Lechowicz	
104, 105		Bradley	To close
105		Speaker Lechowicz	



17.			
<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
105		Griesheimer	Explains vote
105		Speaker Lechowicz	
105		Houlihan, J.	Clerk record, etc.
105		Speaker Lechowicz	
106		Skinner	
106		Speaker Lechowicz	
106		Geo-Karis	Point of personal privilege
106		Speaker Lechowicz	
107		Stanley	
107		Speaker Lechowicz	
107		Bradley	Polls absentees
107		Speaker Lechowicz	
107		Skinner	Dilatory
107		Speaker Lechowicz	
107		McPike	
107		Speaker Lechowicz	
107		Deavers	Record me no
107		Speaker Lechowicz	
107	2:40	Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
107		Speaker Lechowicz	
107		Bradley	Postponed Consideration
107		Speaker Lechowicz	
108		Madigan	Point of interest
108		Speaker Lechowicz	
108		Daniels	
108		Speaker Lechowicz)	
109		Stanley)	Postponed Consideration



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
18.			
109		Speaker Lechowicz	Introduction
109		Tom Hansen	
109		Speaker Lechowicz	
109		Keats	Point of clarification
109		Speaker Lechowicz	
109		Madigan	
110		Speaker Lechowicz	
110		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1725-3rd Reading
110		Speaker Lechowicz	
110		Epton	
110		Speaker Lechowicz	
110, 111		Cunningham	Vote no
112		Speaker Lechowicz	
113		Martin, L.	
113	2:55	Brummer	
113		Speaker Lechowicz	
113		Schuneman	Oppose
114		Speaker Lechowicz	
114		Huff	
114		Speaker Lechowicz	
114		McBroom	Moves previous question
114		Speaker Lechowicz)	
115		Epton)	
115		Speaker Lechowicz	
116		Collins	Urge aye vote
116		Speaker Lechowicz	
117		Satterthwaite	Explains vote



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
19.			
117		Speaker Lechowicz	
117		Porter	Explains vote
117		Speaker Lechowicz	
117		Madison	"
118		Speaker Lechowicz	
118		Keats	
118		Speaker Lechowicz	
118		McPike	Green vote
119		Speaker Lechowicz	
119	3:10	Levin	Explains vote
120		Speaker Lechowicz	
120		Friedrich	"
120		Speaker Lechowicz	
120		Houlihan, J.	"
121		Speaker Lechowicz	
121		Waddell	"
121		Speaker Lechowicz	
121		Mann	"
121		Speaker Lechowicz	
121		Walsh, Wm.	"
121		Speaker Lechowicz	
121		Bowman	"
122		Speaker Lechowicz	
122		Huff	Vote aye
122		Speaker Lechowicz	
122		Daniels	
123		Speaker Lechowicz	Poll absentees



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
20.			
123		Clerk O'Brien	
123		Skinner	
123		Speaker Lechowicz	
123		Vitek	Aye
123	3:20	Speaker Lechowicz	
123		Ewell	Votes aye
123		Speaker Lechowicz	Verification
123,124		Clerk O'Brien	Affirmative Roll Call
124		Speaker Lechowicz	
124		Wolf	Votes aye
124		Speaker Lechowicz	
124		Keats)	Questions Affirmative Roll
125		Speaker Lechowicz)	
124		Speaker Lechowicz	
125		Kozubowski	
126		Speaker Lechowicz)	
126		Keats)	
126		Clerk O'Brien)	
126		Matula)	
126		Speaker Lechowicz)	
126		Keats)	
126		Clerk O'Brien)	
126		McClain	Point of verification
126		Keats	
127		Speaker Lechowicz	
127		Polk	Record me aye
127		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
21.			
127		Katz	Change to present
127		Speaker Lechowicz	
127		Keats	What's the count?
127		Speaker Lechowicz	98
127		Keats	Cancel verification
127		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
127		Cunningham	
127		Speaker Lechowicz	
128		Friedrich	Point of order
128		Speaker Lechowicz	
128		Collins	
128		Speaker Lechowicz	
128		Clerk O'Brien	
128		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 1760-3rd Reading
128		Levin	
129		Speaker Lechowicz)
)
130		Houlihan, D.) Question
130	3:40	Speaker Lechowicz	
130		Madigan	Parliamentary Inquiry Am 1,2
130		Speaker Lechowicz	
130		Clerk O'Brien	
130		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 1760-Out of record
130		Clerk O'Brien	Conference Committee
131		Speaker Lechowicz	
131		Levin	To close
131		Speaker Lechowicz	Bill lost
132	3:46	Clerk O'Brien	SB 1786-3rd Reading



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
22.			
132		Speaker Lechowicz	
132		Matejek	
132		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
133		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1859-3rd Reading
133		Speaker Lechowicz	
133		Edgar	
133		Speaker Lechowicz	Passed
133		Clerk O'Brien	SB-1861-3rd Reading
133		Speaker Lechowicz	
133		Houlihan, J.	
133		Speaker Lechowicz)	
133)	
133		Stiehl)	
134		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1861-3rd Reading
134		Speaker Lechowicz	
134		Geo-Karis	
134		Speaker Lechowicz	
134		Mann)	
134)	
134		Geo-Karis)	
134		Speaker Lechowicz	
134		Houlihan, J.)	
135)	
135		Mann)	
135		Speaker Lechowicz	
135	3:56	Speaker Lechowicz	SB 1861
135		Matijevec	
136		Speaker Lechowicz	1861 passed
136		Geo-Karis	Point of personal privilege
136		Speaker Lechowicz	



23.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	136		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1605
	136		Houlihan, D.	Move to suspend Rule 35-G
	136		Speaker Lechowicz	Objections raised
	137		Robinson)	Question
	137		Speaker Lechowicz)	
	137		Houlihan, J.)	Clarify status of Bill
	137		Speaker Lechowicz)	
	137		Houlihan, J.	
	137		Speaker Lechowicz	
	137		Greiman)	Explains vote
	138		Speaker Lechowicz)	
	138		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1395-3rd Reading
	138		Speaker Lechowicz	
	138		Jones, D.	Leave to suspend Rule 35-G
	138		Speaker Lechowicz	
	139		Greiman)	
	139		Speaker Lechowicz)	
	139	4:04	Houlihan, J.	Steamrolled, etc.
	139		Speaker Lechowicz	Motion carries
	139		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1442-3rd Reading
	139		Speaker Lechowicz	
	139		Griesheimer	
	140		Speaker Lechowicz)	
	140		Polk)	
	140		Griesheimer	To close
	140		Speaker Lechowicz	



24.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
140		Griesheimer)	
)	
141		Matijevich)	
141		Speaker Lechowicz	Postponed till Fall Calendar
141		Pierce	HJCA #21
142		Speaker Lechowicz	
142		Leinenweber	
143		Speaker Lechowicz	
143		Miller	No copy
143		Speaker Lechowicz	
143		Pierce	To close
144		Speaker Lechowicz	
144		Mugalian	
144		Speaker Lechowicz	House adopts report
144	4:17	Jaffe	
145		Speaker Lechowicz	
145		Madison	Parliamentary Inquiry
145		Speaker Lechowicz	
146		Collins)	Questions
)	
146		Jaffe)	
146		Speaker Lechowicz)	
)	
147		DiPrima)	
147		Speaker Lechowicz	
147		Houlihan, J.	
148		DiPrima	
148		Speaker Lechowicz	
148		DiPrima)	
)	
148		Matijevich)	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
25.			
149		Speaker Lechowicz	
149		Huff	
149		Speaker Lechowicz	
149		Simms	
149		Speaker Lechowicz	
149,150		Mugalian)	
)	
150		Jaffe)	
150	4:30	Speaker Lechowicz	
150		Jaffe	To close on HJCA #29
151		Speaker Lechowicz	
151		Waddell	Explains no vote
151		Speaker Lechowicz	
151		Ewing	Explains vote
151		Speaker Lechowicz	
151		Lucco	Explains vote
152		Speaker Lechowicz	
152		Bowman)	Parliamentary Inquiry
)	
152		Speaker Lechowicz)	
152		Davis, C.	Explains no vote
152		Speaker Lechowicz	
152		Mann	Explains aye vote
153		Speaker Lechowicz	
153		Jaffe	Explains no vote
154		Speaker Lechowicz	
154		Darrow	Explains vote
154	4:40	Speaker Lechowicz	
154		DiPrima	Explains vote



Page	Time	Speaker	Information
26.			
154		Speaker Lechowicz	
154		Huff	
154		Speaker Lechowicz	
154		Johnson	Explains vote
155		Speaker Lechowicz	
155		Kane	Explains vote
155		Speaker Lechowicz	
155		Anderson	Explains vote
155		Speaker Lechowicz	
155		Byers	Explains vote
156		Speaker Lechowicz	HJCA #29
156		Pierce)	Parliamentary Inquiry
)	
156		Speaker Lechowicz)	
156		Jaffe	Parliamentary Inquiry
156		Speaker Lechowicz	
156		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
156		Speaker Lechowicz	
156		Cunningham	Aye
156	4:50	Speaker Lechowicz)	
)	
157		Huff)	Point of order
157		Speaker Lechowicz)	
)	
157		DiPrima)	Requests verification
157		Speaker Lechowicz	
157		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Affirmative Roll
158		Speaker Lechowicz	
158		Totten	Leave to be verified
158		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
27.			
158		DiPrima	
158		Speaker Lechowicz	
158		Simms	Leave to be verified
158		Speaker Lechowicz)	
158,159		DiPrima)	Questions Affirmative
		Clerk O'Brien)	
159		Speaker Lechowicz	
159		O'Brien	No
159		Speaker Lechowicz)	
159		DiPrima)	Continues questioning
159		Clerk O'Brien)	
159	5:00	Matijeovich	Point of order
160		Speaker Lechowicz	
160		Stanley	No
160		Speaker Lechowicz	
160		DiPrima	Sorry for outburst
160		Speaker Lechowicz	
160		Johnson	
160		Speaker Lechowicz	
160		DiPrima)	Continues Affirmative
161		Speaker Lechowicz)	
161		Clerk O'Brien)	
161		Speaker Lechowicz	
161		Johnson	
161		Speaker Lechowicz	
161	5:05	Jaffe	
161		Speaker Lechowicz	HJCA #29-Postponed Consideration



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
28.			
161		DiPrima	Apology
161		Speaker Lechowicz	
161		Schlickman	
162		Speaker Lechowicz	
162		Kane	Parliamentary Inquiry
162		Speaker Lechowicz	
162		Clerk O'Brien	Reads SB 1465-3rd Reading
162		Speaker Lechowicz	
162		Bluthardt	Explains SB 1465
162		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 1465 passed
162		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1531
162		Speaker Lechowicz	
163	5:10	Bradley	Explains SB 1531
163		Speaker Lechowicz	
163		Houlihan, J.)	Yield?
)	
164		Bradley)	Discussion
165		Speaker Lechowicz	
165		Hoffman, G.)	Yield?
)	
165		Bradley)	Discussion
165		Speaker Lechowicz	
165		Pullen	Opposes
166		Speaker Lechowicz	
166		Cunningham	Explains aye vote
166		Speaker Lechowicz	
166		Ebbesen	Moves previous question
167		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
29.			
167		Mann)	
167		Bradley)	
167	5:20	Speaker Lechowicz	
167		Bradley	To close on SB 1531
168		Speaker Lechowicz	
168		Martin, L.	Explains vote
168		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 1531 passed
168		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1535-3rd Reading
168		Speaker Lechowicz	
168		Wikoff	Explains SB 1535
169		Speaker Lechowicz	
169		Skinner)	
169		Wikoff)	
169		Speaker Lechowicz	
170		Bowman	Explains vote
170		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 1535 passed
170		Ryan	
170		Speaker Lechowicz	
170		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1556-3rd Reading
170		Speaker Lechowicz	
170		Brandt	Explains SB 1556
170		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 1556 passed
171		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1558-3rd Reading
171	5:30	Speaker Lechowicz	
171		Bluthardt	Explains SB 1558
171		Speaker Lechowicz	
171		Collins	Opposes



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

30. <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
171		Speaker Lechowicz	
171		Cunningham	Opposes
172		Speaker Lechowicz	
172		Matijeovich	Supports
172		Speaker Lechowicz	
172		Flinn	Opposes
172	5:35	Speaker Lechowicz	
172		Bluthardt	Closes on SB 1558
173		Speaker Lechowicz	
173		Robinson	Explains vote
173		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 1558 passed
173		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1570-3rd Reading
173		Speaker Lechowicz	
173		McAuliffe	Explains SB 1570
173		Speaker Lechowicz	
173		Porter)	
)	
174		McAuliffe)	
174		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 1570 passed
174		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1575-3rd Reading
174		Speaker Lechowicz	
174		Stiehl	Explains SB 1575
175		Speaker Lechowicz	
175		Greiman	Point of personal privilege (Return to 2nd)
175		Stiehl	Objects to taking it back
175	5:40	Speaker Lechowicz	
175		Stiehl	Continues explanation



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

31.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	175		Speaker Lechowicz	
	175		Barnes, G.)	
	176		Stiehl)	
	176		Speaker Lechowicz	
	176		Mugalian)	
	176		Stiehl)	
	176		Speaker Lechowicz	
	176		Cunningham	
	177		Speaker Lechowicz	
	177		Matijeovich	Supports
	178		Speaker Lechowicz	
	178		Boucek	Moves previous question
	178		Speaker Lechowicz	
	178		Stiehl	Closes on SB 1575
	178		Speaker Lechowicz	
	178		Leverenz	Explains present vote
	178		Speaker Lechowicz	
	178		Marovitz	Explains vote
	179	5:50	Speaker Lechowicz	
	179		Hoxsey	Explains vote
	179		Speaker Lechowicz	
	179		Mann	Explains vote
	179		Speaker Lechowicz	
	180		Miller	Explains vote
	180		Speaker Lechowicz	
	180		Chapman	Explains vote
	180		Speaker Lechowicz	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
32.			
180		Greiman	Explains vote
181		Speaker Lechowicz	
181		Walsh	Point of order
181		Speaker Lechowicz	
181		Greiman	
181		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 1575 passed
181		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1576-3rd Reading
181		Speaker Lechowicz	
181		Ryan	Explains SB 1576
181		Speaker Lechowicz)	
)	
181		Collins)	
)	
181		Ryan)	
181	5:55	Speaker Lechowicz	SB 1576 passed
181		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1577-3rd Reading
181		Speaker Lechowicz	
182		Reilly	Explains SB 1577
182		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 1577 passed
182		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1581
182		Speaker Lechowicz	
182		Jones, J. D.	Explains S B 1581
182		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 1581 passed
182		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1587-3rd Reading
182		Speaker Lechowicz	Out of record
182		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1611
182		Speaker Lechowicz	
182		Friedrich	Explains SB 1611
183		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 1611 passed



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
33.			
183		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1710
183		Speaker Lechowicz	
183	6:00	Van Duyne	Explains SB 1710
183		Speaker Lechowicz	
183		Cunningham	
184		Speaker Lechowicz	
184		Hoffman)	
184)	
184		Van Duyne)	
184		Speaker Lechowicz	
184		Martin	Opposes
184		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 1710 passed
185		Pullen	
185		Speaker Lechowicz	
185	6:05	Porter	
185		Speaker Lechowicz	
185		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1841-3rd Reading
185		Speaker Lechowicz	
185		Dunn	Explains SB 1841
185		Speaker Lechowicz	
185		Cunningham	Opposes
186		Speaker Lechowicz	
186		Porter	
186		Speaker Lechowicz	
186		Dunn	Explains vote
187	6:10	Speaker Lechowicz	
187		Tuerk	Explains vote
187		Speaker Lechowicz	



34. <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
187		Mann	Explains vote
188		Speaker Lechowicz	
188		Satterthwaite	Explains vote
188		Speaker Lechowicz	
188	6:15	Ebbesen	Explains vote
188		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 1841 passed. Consid. Postponed
189		Bradley	Return SB 1680 to 2nd
189		Speaker Lechowicz)	
)	
189		Skinner)	Parliamentary Inquiry
189		Speaker Lechowicz	
189		Bradley	Amendment #1
190		Speaker Lechowicz	
190	6:20	Madison	Point of order
190		Speaker Lechowicz	
190		Robinson	Wants ruling
190		Speaker Lechowicz	Motion does not prevail-fails
190		Abramson	
190		Speaker Lechowicz	
191		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1456
191		Speaker Lechowicz	
191		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #2
191		Speaker Lechowicz	
191		Campbell	Withdraws Amendment #2
191		Speaker Lechowicz	
191		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #3
191		Speaker Lechowicz	
191		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #4



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
35.			
191		Speaker Lechowicz	
191		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #5
191		Speaker Lechowicz	
191		Geo-Karis	
192		Speaker Lechowicz	
192		Totten	Inquiry
192		Speaker Lechowicz)	
)	
193	6:25	Geo-Karis)	Explains Amendment #5
193		Speaker Giorgi in the Chair	
193		McClain	Opposes Amendment #5
194		Speaker Giorgi	
194		Gaines	Supports
194		Speaker Giorgi	
194		Geo-Karis	Withdraws Amendment #5
194		Speaker Giorgi	
194		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #6
194		Speaker Giorgi	
194		Ewing	Explains Amendment #6
195		Speaker Giorgi	
195		McClain	Opposes Amendment #6
195		Speaker Giorgi	
195		Ewing	Closes on Amendment #6
195		Speaker Giorgi	Amendment #6 fails
196		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #7
196		Speaker Giorgi	
196		Winchester	Explains Amendment #7
196		Speaker Giorgi	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
36.			
196		McClain	Opposes Amendment #7
196	6:35	Speaker Giorgi	
196		Houlihan, J.	
196		Speaker Giorgi	
196		Winchester	Closes on Amendment #7
197		Speaker Giorgi	
197		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #8
197		Speaker Giorgi	
197		Davis, J.	Explains Amendment #8
197		Speaker Giorgi	
197		McClain	Opposes Amendment #8
198		Speaker Giorgi	
198		Davis, J.	Closes on Amendment #8
198		Speaker Giorgi	Amendment #8 fails
198		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #9
198		Speaker Giorgi	
198	6:40	Kosinski	Explains Amendment #9
199		Speaker Giorgi	
199		McClain	Supports
199		Speaker Giorgi	
199		Kosinski	Closes on Amendment #9
199		Speaker Giorgi	Amendment #9 adopted
199		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #10
199		Speaker Giorgi	
199		Barnes, E.	Explains Amendment #10
199		Speaker Giorgi	
199		Kent	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
37.			
200		Speaker Giorgi	
200		Barnes, E.)	
)	
200		Kent)	
200		Speaker Giorgi	
200	6:45	Leinenweber	
200		Speaker Giorgi	
200		McClain	Supports
200		Speaker Giorgi	Amendment #10 adopted
200		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #11
201		Speaker Giorgi	
201		Dunn, J.	Explains Amendment #11
201		Speaker Giorgi	
201		Kempiners	Opposes
201		Speaker Giorgi	
202		McClain	Opposes
202		Speaker Giorgi	
202		Dunn, J.	Closes on Amendment #11
202		Speaker Giorgi	
202		Satterthwaite	Explains vote
203		Speaker Giorgi	
203		Dunn, J.	Poll absentees
203		Speaker Giorgi	
203		Clerk Hall	Polls absentees
203		Speaker Giorgi	Amendment #11 fails
204		Clerk Hall	Amendment #12
204		Speaker Giorgi	
204	6:55	Madison	Explains Amendment #12



38.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	204		Speaker Giorgi	
	204		McClain	Supports
	204		Speaker Giorgi	
	204		Campbell	Opposes
	205		Speaker Giorgi	
	205		Madison	Closes on Amendment #12
	206		Speaker Giorgi	
	206		Ryan	
	206		Speaker Giorgi	
	206		Madison	
	206		Speaker Giorgi	Amendment #12 adopted
	206		Clerk Hall	Amendment #13
	207		Speaker Giorgi	
	207		Madison	Polls absentees on #12
	207		Speaker Giorgi	
	207		Clerk Hall	Polls absentees
	207	7:02	Speaker Giorgi	
	207		Ryan	Withdraws request for verifi
	207		Speaker Giorgi	Amendment #12 adopted
	207		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #13
	207		Speaker Giorgi	
	207		Madison	Point of personal privilege
	208		Speaker Giorgi	
	208		Leinenweber	
	208		Speaker Giorgi	
	208		Madison	Explains Amendment #13
	208		Speaker Giorgi	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
39.			
208		Campbell	
208		Speaker Giorgi	
208		Madison	Continues
209		Speaker Giorgi	
209	7:10	Campbell	Opposes
210		Speaker Giorgi	
210		McClain	Supports
210		Speaker Giorgi	
210		Barnes, G.	Supports
210		Speaker Giorgi	
211		Madison	Closes on Amendment #13
211		Speaker Giorgi	
211		Bowman	Explains vote
212		Speaker Giorgi	
212		Matijeovich	Explains vote
212	7:16	Speaker Giorgi	
212		Madison	Explains vote
212		Speaker Giorgi	
213		Mann	Explains vote-support
213		Speaker Giorgi	Amendment 13 fails
213		McClain	SB 1456-Out of record
213		Speaker Giorgi	
213		Bradley	
214		Speaker Giorgi	
214		McClain	
214		Speaker Giorgi	
214		Van Duynes	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
40.			
214		Speaker Giorgi	
214		Bradley	
215		Tipsword	
215		Clerk Hall	Reads Bills
215		Speaker Giorgi	SB 1827-read 2nd time prev.
215		Clerk Hall	Amendment #4
215		Speaker Giorgi	
216		Friedland	
216		Speaker Giorgi	
216		Clerk Hall	Amendment #5
216		Speaker Giorgi	
217		Friedland)	Withdraws Amendment
)	
217		Speaker Giorgi)	Amendment tabled
217		Clerk Hall	Amendment #6
217		Speaker Giorgi	
217		Friedland	
217		Speaker Giorgi	
217		Chapman	
217		Speaker Giorgi	Amendment adopted-3rd Reading
217		Kempiners	Parliamentary Inquiry
217		Speaker Giorgi	
218		Houlihan, J.	
218		Speaker Giorgi	
218		Kempiners	
218		Speaker Giorgi	
218		Friedland	SB 1827-motion
218		Speaker Giorgi	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
41.			
218		Clerk Hall	SB 1827-3rd Reading
219	7:30	Speaker Giorgi	
219		Friedland	
219		Speaker Giorgi	
219		Schlickman	
219		Speaker Giorgi	SB 1827 passed
220		Collins)	
220		Speaker Giorgi)	
220		Bradley	SB 1680-3rd Reading
220		Speaker Giorgi	
220		Kelly	
220		Speaker Giorgi	
220		Skinner	Point of order
220		Speaker Giorgi	
220		Kelly	
221		Speaker Giorgi	
221		Robinson	Possible verification
221		Speaker Giorgi	
221		Capparelli	Announcement
221		Speaker Giorgi	
221		Bluthardt	
222		Speaker Giorgi	
222		Telcser	
222		Madigan	
222		Speaker Giorgi	
222	7:40	Telcser	
223		Speaker Giorgi	



42. <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
223		Collins	
223		Speaker Giorgi	
223		Mugalian	
223		Speaker Giorgi	
224		Geo-Karis	
224		Speaker Giorgi	
224		Walsh, Wm.	
225		Speaker Giorgi	
225		Leverenz	Moves previous question
225		Speaker Giorgi	
225		Geo-Karis	
225		Speaker Giorgi	
225		Bradley	To close
226		Speaker Giorgi	
226		Skinner	
226		Speaker Giorgi	
226		Bradley	
226		Speaker Giorgi)	
)	
227		Ryan)	
227		Speaker Giorgi	
227		Chapman	
227		Speaker Giorgi	
227	7:52	Conti	Point of order
227		Speaker Giorgi	
227		Clerk O'Brien	Poll absentees
227		Speaker Giorgi	
228		Beatty	Record me aye



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
43.			
228		Speaker Giorgi	
228		Mann	Explains vote
228		Speaker Giorgi	
228		Caldwell	Vote me aye
228		Speaker Giorgi	
228		Pierce	Vote aye
228		Speaker Giorgi	
228		Tipsword	SB 1510 motion
229		Speaker Giorgi	
229		Barnes, E. M.	
229		Speaker Giorgi	
230		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1510-2nd-No C.A.
230		Speaker Giorgi	3rd Reading
230		Madigan	Move adjourn
230		Speaker Giorgi	Adjourned
230		Clerk O'Brien	Message from Senate Adjourned



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES