

Doorkeeper: "All persons not entitled to the House floor, please retire to the gallery."

Speaker Giorgi: "The House will come to order and the Members will please be in their seats. The House will be led in prayer by Reverend Richard Chiola, Associate Pastor of St. Agnes Church in Springfield."

Reverend Chiola: "Let us pray. God, creator of mankind in Your image, you have endowed us with intellect which can reach and search for truth and a free will able to chose that which is good. Hear the prayer of Your people, Lord and bless these our Representatives with the desire for truth. For You Lord, are truth itself. Bless these men and women with the will for the good of all Your people, for You, Lord, are goodness itself. Thus may your justice be done and Your peace settle upon us. We ask this of You who live in reign forever. Amen."

Speaker Giorgi: "Roll Call for attendance. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in passage of Bills of the following titles, to-wit; House Bills #2632, 3113, 3167, 2986, 1264, 2529, 2695, 2635, 2925, 2929, 2970, 2987 and 3050, together with Amendments passed by the Senate as amended, June 27, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Giorgi: "Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1048, Campbell. 1049, Boucek. 1050, Pechous. 1051, Kent-Tuerk. 1054, Porter."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Matijevich, on the Agreed Resolutions."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, as our Assistant Majority Leader would say; House Resolution 1048, Campbell, talks about the Director of Public Health promulgating rules. House Resolution 1049, Boucek, congratulates Ernest Ross. House



Resolution 1050, Pechous, congratulates Morton West Football team. House Resolution 1051, Kent-Tuerk, congratulates William Fahnestock for a good life. House Resolution, Porter, 1050, congratulates Doctor Ernest McEwen and I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Giorgi: "John, are you sure there is nothing controversial on those? The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed. The 'ayes' have it and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Representative Gene Barnes."

Barnes: "I didn't quite understand, what were those Agreed Resolutions?"

Speaker Giorgi: "We trust that there was nothing in them that was controversial. On the Calendar on page 5, appears Concurrences to House Bill 15. Representative Yourell... out of the record. 16, Yourell...out of the record. Is Von Boeckman in the chambers? Richmond. Representative Chapman. Beatty. Greiman, is not here. Leverenz, is not here. Lechowicz...Lechowicz, concurrence on House Bill 2344. Levin, on 2555...out of the record. Emil Jones on 2619...out of the record. Brady...Gene Barnes. Tipword...out of the record. 2790...out of the record. 2790. 2818, Brady. 2835, O'Brien. 2911, Friedrich. Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Capparelli, Chairman of the Committee on Executive to which the following Resolution were referred. Action taken June 28, 1978, reported the same back with the following recommendation. Be adopted House Resolutions 722, 833, 1053. House Joint Resolution 56, 99 and Senate Joint Resolution 95."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Chapman, do you have that spot on the Calendar on the non concurrence? She has a non concurrence...."

Chapman: "Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker. Page 5, it's almost up at the top there. House Bill 562, we have a technical problem



with this Amendment that, I think we have already....."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Worked out. I move to non concur....."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Chapman moves to non concur to Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 562. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the House does not concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 562. And you requested a Conference Committee Report? Not yet. Okay. Representative Geo-Karis, what reason do you arise?"

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, when Representative Matejek's Bill was called yesterday, I was in transit back and forth, between 6th floor and 3rd, I wonder if I can have leave to be recorded as 'yes' on Senate Bill 1736. It will not change the result."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Journal is already gone but it will be corrected at the end of the Session."

Geo-Karis: "Would you put me on?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Does the Lady have leave to be recorded on... what's that number again?"

Geo-Karis: "Senate Bill 1736."

Speaker Giorgi: "1736, Senate Bill. No objections, leave is granted."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 3392. With Senate Amendments #1 and 2, Representative Kozubowski."

Kozubowski: "Has the Bill been read? Okay. Thank you, very much. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Amendment #1, and I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1, would add 45 awards to the Court of Claims. Totally forty-nine thousand, five hundred, fifty-six dollars and fifty-eight cents. These bring the awards of the court right up to date, June 25, 1978. And I would move to concur."



Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kozubowski, is that the Senate Amendments #1 and 2, or just Senate Amendment #1."

Kozubowski: "Senate Amendment #2, Mr. Speaker, which I also move to concur in a technical Amendment which just goes to correct award number of one award in the Bill. And I would also move to concur in Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kozubowski, moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 and 2, to House Bill 3392. Representative Ryan, on his motion."

Ryan: "Robert, could you hold that for a second?"

Kozubowski: "Sure can. Take it out of the record, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "Take it out of the record. Representative Schlickman, on that same point or...Concurrences, Representative Richmond on House Bill 384. House Bill 384, Representative Richmond, concurrence."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 384, as you can tell by its number was one that was passed very early last year. And has been in the Senate ever since waiting on an Amendment, as I understand it from Senator Berning. And this Amendment although it is not a very important one statewide, it is a little bit involved. And I will...hope that I can explain it to you. I certainly have no objections to it, the Bill was originally municipal league Bill. And they also have no objections to the Amendment. The change involves the village of Lindenhurst in Lake County and the Amendment corrects a situation involves the terms of their trustees. Under the current law they could and did change the village terms to two years. And under the old transition schedule which put it in the posture of electing one trustee for one year and five the next. The village then voted to go back to four year terms with the transition schedule provided for that change doesn't fit the one trustee elected for one year and five the next. This Amendment therefore, amends an obsolete part



of Section 352 of the Municipal Code to provide a transition schedule which allows Lindenhurst to return to the normal schedule of electing three trustees in the odd numbered years for four year terms. I have checked this situation out with the Representatives from that district, Representative Deuster, Reed and Pierce. They all agree that this is a real problem and that this Amendment would take care of it. I move for concurrence."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Geo-Karis on the Amendment."

Geo-Karis: "I speak in favor...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I speak in favor of the Amendment. This just happened in our county and it is ridiculous in the first place. Some strange manner...the way we've passed the legislation, we put up one trustee for election and the other five are elected for the following election. And the intent of the law was really to stagger the term and not have five and one and one another. So I certainly respectfully move for its passage."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Reed on the motion."

Reed: "As the Legislator from the 32nd District, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I urge concurrence. This will solve a very complex problem for us in that particular municipality."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Mahar on the motion. Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I recognize the fact that we're trying to take care of a special situation from one municipality and I think of course this does and will not have an effect in the other municipality. My problem is the problem that I've had with this particular Bill which says that the...if the Mayor vetoes the measure of the council must take action at the next regular meeting. Which is a problem in which they are required to take action and the council in the fact of the Board of Trustee loses a certain amount of their power because it's not...should not really



be necessary for them to be compelled to take action at the next city council or village board meeting. And it's one of those things that is a limitation on the powers of the City Council members and for that reason, while I have no objection to solving Lindenhurst's problems. They don't have five trustees elected for four years at time which was really their problem. They went from four years to two years and back to four years in a two year span. And of course the fact that they now might have to live with five trustees elected for four years is really their problem. But my problem with this piece of legislation is the basic Bill 384."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representativ Richmond to close."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In response to the previous speaker, my good friend, Representative Mahar. I certainly respect your right to opinion on the Bill itself. However, the motion concerns concurrence on an Amendment. The Bill itself passed, I don't recall the number of votes but...how much? With 156 votes, out of this House and so obviously, it was not controversial at the time. I respectfully ask your support for concurrence of this Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Richmond moves that the House concur to Senate Amendment #2, to House Bill 384. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wished? Someone hit Campbell's button. Campbell's button. Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there is 130 'ayes', no 'nays', 2 voting 'present' and the House does concur to Senate Amendment #2, to House Bill 384. Representative Friedrich on 2911. House Bill 2911, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this 2911 started out to be the appropriation for the Attorney General but in the Senate the Department of Law Enforcement



appropriation was amended on to it. There was substantial cuts in the Senate in both matters, in the matter of the Attorney General, it was reduced by five hundred and forty-five thousand, five hundred dollars. And that has been agreed to by the Attorney General. And the Department of Law Enforcement, there was a cut from six hundred and fifty-eight thousand, four hundred dollars and in all frankness, I think this is going to create some severe problems for that department. Three hundred and seventy-six thousand, four hundred is being cut out of the state police budget, one hundred and fifty-five thousand, eight hundred dollars out of internal investigation. However, because of the time problem the director has agreed to concur in these Amendments with the hope that, if the problems are too severe this Body will be willing to come in with the deficiency appropriation to some of those areas. So I move concurrence."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Dan Houlihan on the motion."

Houlihan: "I have a question of the Sponsor, if he would yield?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Continue."

Houlihan: "Did I understand you correctly, Dwight, to say that under these Amendments the Department of Law Enforcement appropriation is in here, into the Attorney General...."

Friedrich: "Yes, it is. It was amended on as an...the whole department appropriation was put in with the Attorney General's office."

Houlihan: "Fine, I have no...."

Friedrich: "And the cuts that were made over there are also part of this."

Houlihan: "I understand. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Matijevich on the motion."

Matijevich: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Yes."

Matijevich: "Is it right now, Dwight, when you say that by



concurring with the Senate Amendment we are now finalizing the Department of Law Enforcement. In other words, the body..if there is a further Amendment on some other Bill that will come in with other monies for the Department of Law Enforcement. You will not support that, in other words...."

Friedrich: "No, Sir, I didn't say that. I just said that the director has agreed to go along with this and then if anything else comes along, it will have to be considered on its own merits."

Matijevidch: "Well, I've been working with the Appropriation Committee in the Senate with the House and they've looked at this very thoroughly and they feel this ought to be the end product. And if this is the Department of Law Enforcement's budget, this ought to be it."

Friedrich: "Well, all I can say is, I don't have any intention of introducing any other Amendment. And I don't know what any other Member will do and when the time comes the person will have to make the argument for any Amendments that occur. I know of none pending, I'll put it that way."

Matijevidch: "All right. Whatever is fair is fair."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Leverenz on the motion."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to help Representative Matijevidch to understand where the Amendment is. The Amendment #50 to House Bill 1456 would replace the cuts that Representative Friedrich pointed out. Severely harmed the Department of Law Enforcement and it was suggested from the Senate that the Amendment be placed on a Bill over here. And I understand that they would concur with that Amendment in the Senate which would replace the drastic deductions that were made in the Bill. That's why we're concurring with what we have at this point for the Department of Law Enforcement in this Bill and Representative Friedrich, do you support those..



that Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Friedrich, moves that Senate Amendments....that the House concur in Senate Amendments #2, 3, 4 and 5, to House Bill 2911. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 135 'ayes', 2 'nays' and 4 voting 'present' and the House does concur to Senate Amendments 2, 3, 4 and 5, to House Bill 2911. Now back to Representative Kozubowski, on House Bill 3392. Representative Kozubowski."

Kozubowski: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move to non concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2, to House Bill 3392."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kozubowski.....Representative Schlickman...on the motion?"

Schlickman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Would you mind explaining Senate Amendment #1 again please."

Kozubowski: "I certainly will, I have once before earlier this morning, Representative Schlickman. But Amendment #1 adds forty-five additional awards totally some forty-nine thousand, five hundred and fifty-six dollars and fifty-eight cents...."

Schlickman: "Okay, now...."

Kozubowski: "Bring the court current to July 25, of this year."

Schlickman: "Okay. These are awards that were granted by the Court of Claims...."

Kozubowski: "That's right."

Schlickman: "...to the introduction of this Bill."

Kozubowski: "That is correct."

Schlickman: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kozubowski, moves that the House do not concur to Senate Amendment #1 and 2, to House Bill 3392. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the House does not concur



to Senate Amendments #1 and 2, to House Bill 3392. Concurrence
Representative Beatty, is he here? Greiman. Leverenz
on House Bill 2219. Representative Leverenz, on con-
currence, House Bill 2219."

Leverenz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would move to non concur in
the Senate Amendments and request a Conference Committee
be appointed."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Totten on the motion."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor indicate
what the Senate Amendments are that we're non concurring
with...."

Leverenz: "Yes. One minute. Senate Amendment #1 would change
a number of grants in the Illinois Municipal Retirement
Fund Article. Senate Amendment #2 is the Chicago Labor
Benefit Fund Article of the Pension Code and Senate
Amendment #3 is an Amendment for the Board of Trustees
with the INRF, which deals with the CETA funding and
prime sponsors."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Okay, that just tells me really what the titles are.
What's the impact of each one of them?"

Leverenz: "As I understand it, there is no actual dollar impact
from the Pension Laws Committee, they have been approved
but we want to straighten out some language."

Totten: "What language do you want to straighten out?"

Leverenz: "Mr. Speaker, take this out of the record."

Speaker Giorgi: "Out of the record. Representative Mahar on
House Bill concurrence of 2985. House Bill 2985, Rep-
resentative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill....I ask for con-
currence on House Bill 2985. 2985 is the ordinary
appropriation for the emergency service and disaster area
and I would ask for the concurrence of Senate Amendments
#3, 4, 5 and 6. Senate Amendment #3 is a Department of
Agriculture FY-79 budget...."



Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me, Representative Mahar, how about Senate Amendment #2?"

Mahar: "I think, I only have 3, 4, 5 and 6."

Speaker Giorgi: "We have a #2, up here with the Bill, Mr. Mahar."

Mahar: "That's a line item change."

Speaker Giorgi: "Do you want to take it out just momentarily?"

Mahar: "Take it out of the record."

Speaker Giorgi: "House Bill 3053, Jack. House Bill 3053. Representative Robinson on House Bill 3053."

Robinson: "I move to concur in the Senate Amendment to 3053. This Bill is on natural gas preferences for customers that serve human needs. I had different language in my Bill defining what those customers were but the Senate has made it clear, both the Republican and Democratic Leadership over in the Senate that they will only accept the language that Senator Bloom, put on the Bill. And so I feel that I'll just send it to the Governor in this shape since the Senate has made it clear in a previous Conference Committee, that they will not go along with any other language."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Keats on the motion."

Keats: "I just wanted to ask a question. What does this Amendment do, I know it changes wording. Does the wording.... perhaps we have an open primary or an initiative process. What is this Amendment, just out of interest, I would like to know what I'm voting on."

Robinson: "I could do that, Representative Keats. But the Amendment says that there will be a...in case of a natural gas shortage that a preference would be given to customers serving essential human needs or law enforcement agencies. That's what the Amendment does."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Conti on the motion."

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there are two identical Bills. Senate Bill 1546 and Senate Bill 3051, is that it...3053. I amended 1546 to be the same



as 3053 that moved out of this House. Because we definitely did define the essential human needs. The way the language is now back into the Senate language...who serves human essential needs is ambiguous. They may mean large food stores, they may mean large food processors, to some it may mean MacDonald stores. May not even include food dealers at all. Regardless of the publicized definition, the intent of the Sponsor rather, to include some of the food handlers, the definition is likely to be challenged by those excluded and resulting in some costly litigation and throwing this right in the hands of the ICC or the Governor to determine which Bill he wants. I move that we should not concur."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Totten on the motion."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the Sponsor could clear up something for me. My Calendar says, House Bill 3053, Senate Amendment #1. My Digest says that on June 22, Senate Amendment #1 to this Bill failed."

Robinson: "I believe that the Digest must wrong. We could ask the Clerk to look into that."

Totten: "Well...."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Totten, are you..."

Totten: "Well, the Digest and the Calendar are conflicting and I really don't know what Amendment we're concurring in and we ought to get it straightened out before we proceed."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Robinson, would you explain the Amendment. Representative Totten, the computer says that the motion failed and then was reconsidered and placed back on the Bill. In the Senate. It was just a technical reconsideration."

Totten: "When was that done?"

Speaker Giorgi: "June 24."

Totten: "Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Ryan, for an announcement."

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



House. We have a former Member...where did he go? We have a former Member of the Illinois House here with us today. Webber Borchers is here with us today. Webber, take a bow."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Robinson, moves that the House concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3053. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Robinson to explain his vote."

Robinson: "Well, let me just explain why this is necessary. There are cases in which central Illinois utilities are running short of natural gas and the housing authorities, the convents in central Illinois came to Committee and requested a Bill by the Public Utilities Committee, which we did vote out. That would say that, in cases that there are a natural gas cutback, that those institutions like, housing, like apartment buildings and convents and so on, would not be cutoff from natural gas. And so that is the reason for the Bill and it is in the shape of Senator Bloom's Bill and this is the only way that both the Republican Leadership...let me make that clear. The Republican Leadership in the Senate and the Democratic Leadership in the Senate has said that they want the Bill in this form, that this is the Bill that they will agree to in the Senate."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 90 'ayes', 43 'nays' and 7 voting 'present'. Representative Conti, for what reason do you arise?"

Conti: "I would like to verify the Roll Call on this. On this one, I would like to verify the Roll Call."

Speaker Giorgi: "Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Beatty, Bianco, Bradley, Brady, Breslin, Rich Brummer, Caldwell, Capparelli, Collins...."



Speaker Giorgi: "Collins, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Deavers...."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me. Representative Bradley wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ewell, Friedrich, Gaines, Hart, Hoffman, Huff, Dave Jones, Emil Jones, Kucharski, Laurino, Leinenweber, Macdonald, Madison, Mann, McAuliffe, McGrew, Mulcahey, Rigney, Sharp, Stearney, Telcser, Terzich...."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Brady would like to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Representative Capparelli would like to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Representative Terzich would like to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Terzich. Representative Breslin would like to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Breslin. I'm sorry, Representative Leinenweber would like to be recorded as voting 'no'. Representative Rich Brummer would like to be recorded as voting 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Vinson, W.D. Walsh, Williams, Wolf and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "How many affirmative is that now, Mr. Clerk? Mr. Conti, there is 96 'ayes', do you persist?"

Conti: "I still want to go ahead with it."

Speaker Giorgi: "You still want a verification?"

Conti: "Yes."

Speaker Giorgi: "Proceed. And Representative Barnes would like to be recorded...Gene Barnes would like to be recorded as voting 'present'. Representative Katz, for what reason do you arise?"

Katz: "Yes, would the Gentleman be good enough to verify me, I have a legislative meeting that I have to go to right this minute."

Speaker Giorgi: "Conti, do you object to verifying Katz? You're verified. Proceed with the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Anderson, Bartulis, Birchler, Boucek, Bowman, Bradley, Brady, Brandt, Breslin, Rich Brummer, Don Brummet,



Byers, Capparelli, Catania, Chapman, Christensen, Cunningham,
Danfels, Darrow, Corneal Davis, Dawson, DiPrima, Domico...."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me."

Clerk O'Brien: "Doyle, John Dunn, Dyer, Ewing, Farley, Flinn,
Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Getty, Giglio, Giorgi, Greiman,
Griesheimer, Harris, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, J.M.
Houlihan, Hoxsey, Jacobs, Jaffe, Johnson, Kane, Katz,
Kelly, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Lechowicz, Leverenz,
Levin, Lucco, Luft, Madigan, Marovitz, Peggy Smith Martin,
Matejek, Matijevich, Mautino, McClain, McLendon, McPike,
Molloy, Mudd, Mugalian, Nardulli, O'Brien, Pechous, Porter,
Pouncey, Reilly, Richmond, Robinson, Satterthwaite,
Schisler, Schlickman, Schneider, Schuneman, Shumpert,
Skinner, Steczo, Stuffle, Taylor, Terzich, Tipsword,
Van Duyne, Vitek, Von Boeckman, R.V. Walsh, Willer,
Winchester, Younge and Yourell."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Sharp would like to be recorded
as voting 'aye'. Representative Mulcahey, did you indicate
that you wanted to be recorded as voting 'aye'? Mulcahey,
'aye'. Representative Macdonald, 'no'. There is quite
a number who want to...should we take another Roll Call
or should we continue in this manner? I think we should
take another Roll Call, Jack. There is too many wanting
to get....there are about ten who want to get on, do you
want to take them or not. Should I take them as they
go? It's up to you. Take another Roll Call, everybody
is in agreement. Dump the Roll Call. The Representative
moves that the House concurs with Senate Amendment #1, to
House Bill 3053. All those in favor will signify by
voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Final action.
Vote 'aye' or vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished?
Representative Robinson to explain his vote. Have all
voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this
question there is 84 'ayes' and 53 'nays' and 6 voting
'present'. And Robinson requests a poll of the absentees.



Representative Madison, for what reason do you arise?
 Wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Madison, 'aye'.
 Representative Huff, wants to vote 'aye'. Just a moment.
 Madison, 'aye'. Huff, 'aye'. Corneal Davis, 'aye'.
 That's Madison, Huff, Corneal Davis and Sharp. Sharp,
 'aye'. Representative Conti, for what reason do you arise?
 What's the Roll Call, Jack? Geo-Karis wants to be recorded
 as voting 'aye'. That makes 89, Conti. 89 'ayes' and
 53 'nays' On this question there are 89 'ayes' and 53
 'nays' and 6 voting 'present' and the Gentleman motion
 to concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House...would you
 please verify 3053 as it is passed. Representative
 Leverenz. The House does concur to Senate Amendment #1
 to House Bill 3053. House Bill 2219, Representative
 Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
 House. I would move to concur in Senate Amendments #1,
 2 and 3, to House Bill 2219."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Schlickman on the motion."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates that he will."

Leverenz: "Certainly."

Schlickman: "Is this the Bill that was called previously?"

Leverenz: "Yes...I can't hear you."

Schlickman: "Is this the concurrence that was called previously
 and you took out of the record?"

Leverenz: "Yes, that is correct."

Schlickman: "And previously you moved to non concur and now
 you're moving to concur."

Leverenz: "I was mistaken earlier, yes. That's correct."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Leverenz moves that the House
 does concur to Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3, to House
 Bill 2219. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those
 opposed by voting 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who



wished? Representative Gene Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Maybe I'm being redundant but I didn't hear what those three Amendments were. I don't mind voting for it, but I don't want to vote in the blind...not at this time of year."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Leverenz, would you quickly explain the three Amendments we're concurring to."

Leverenz: "It may be best done by Representative Terzich because they are Pension Amendments and that they have been approved by the Commission. Representative Terzich, perhaps he can explain your vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, these Bills were previously...or the Amendments also were previously passed by the House under other Bills. They all have been approved by the Commission, Amendment #1 amends the downstate Pension Fund whereby, it provides that a member who is on a leave due to election to a police organization, that his pension benefits will continue. The Amendment provides that the organization pay both the employer and the employee total cost there is no cost to the plan. Amendment #2 with regard to the municipal retirement system, bring it in parity with the IMRF, in accordance with the other Cook County plans. That was previously passed by the House and the third Amendment was the Chicago Labor Fund which provides eligibility under the credit union. This again...there is no cost and it has been approved by the Pension Laws Commission. And the final Amendment was the CETA Amendment which is also savings of approximately three to five million which was approved by the Pensions Law Commission in the House and I would urge support of... concurrence of these Amendments."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Ebbesen on the motion."

Ebbesen: "Yes, would...this is not...does not have that 2 to 3% Amendment anywhere does it, Representative Leverenz?"



Is that House Bill 1803...okay."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 113 'ayes', 21 'nays' and 26 voting 'present' and the House does concur to Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3, to House Bill 2219. Back to Representative Mahar, House Bill 2985. Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2985 contains the ordinary appropriation for the emergency service in the disaster area and to that in the Senate was added the appropriation for the Department of Agriculture. And I want to concur in Senate Amendments #2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. Senate Amendment #2 reduces the emergency service disaster budget by thirty-two thousand, five hundred and seventy-five dollars. Senate Amendment #3 adds the ordinary appropriation for the Department of Agriculture at twenty-five million, three fourteen, three hundred. Senate Amendment #4 makes a reduction of eighty-six thousand, seven hundred and fifty dollars to the Department of Agriculture appropriation for operation, travel and contractual services. Senate Amendment #5 adds two hundred and seventy-four thousand, seven hundred dollars to the department budget for the implementation of the new grain inspection provision. And Senate Amendment #6 makes a technical correction in Amendment #4. Amendment #3 also includes the fact that not more than 50% shall be expended during...before January 1, 1979. And I urge its concurrence."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Leverenz on the motion."

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates that he will."

Leverenz: "Did the Senate eliminate monies that have been previously used for personal use to charter planes, flying from one point to another? To attend parades, etc."

Mahar: "Yes, Representative. Actually the House Amendment eliminate



eleven thousand, eight hundred dollars in the House and the Senate's additional thirty-two thousand included one vacancy and travel."

Leverenz: "Did the Senate also have Erie Jones understand where his home office is, or where is his home office currently? To address itself to the cost of travel."

Mahar: "I was not at the hearing and I'm not sure what questions were directed to Erie Jones as far as his home office is concerned. Presently he's occupying state office building quarters in...of course, Springfield and in some community downstate."

Leverenz: "Well, he is currently listing his home office in Marion, Illinois. Not to be dilatory, I ask if you would take this out of the record for perhaps ten minutes."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Porter on the motion. Porter."

Porter: "Is this coming out of the record or not? He just asked him to take it out."

Mahar: "Yes, I'll take it out of the record for ten minutes."

Porter: "All right, I'll ask him the question...."

Speaker Giorgi: "Back to House Bill 2775, Jane Barnes. 2775, Representative Jane Barnes. Representative Jane Barnes, on House Bill 2775. You wanted to non concur, you said."

Barnes: "No, I was interested in 2775. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "2775."

Barnes: "I would like to move to not to concur with Senate Amendment #1 and I would request a Conference Committee."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is there any discussion? Representative Jane Barnes moves that the House do not concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2775 and that a Conference Committee be....okay. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', the opposed 'nay' and the House does not concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2775. Back to House Bill 2105, Representative Greiman. 2105."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to...that we concur with the Senate Amendment in 2105. What the Senate Amend-



ment does is to conform this to a Bill that was a Senate Bill and deals with exactly the same subject that we passed 144 to 1. This is a permissive Bill which allows school districts to provide special education facilities for children zero through two and is totally permissive. Does not provide any state funds and does not allow for state reimbursements of any kind. Totally permissive at the local level and I would ask that we concur in Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 2105. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Schneider on the motion."

Schneider: "What's the Senate's addition to your Bill? What's their Amendment?"

Greiman: "Well, what their Amendment did was...to conform it to their Bill which was 389. And it justs express it differently. It didn't change the impact of it at all."

Schneider: "Excellent Bill. I move to support the concurrence."

Greiman: "Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Greiman moves that the House concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 21....Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates that he will."

Schlickman: "By the synopsis of Senate Amendment #1, there is a statement that it deletes the provision of tax money may not be used for such purposes. Is that a correct restatement of the Amendment?"

Greiman: "Well, it doesn't change that effect. The impact still remains the same, that we don't get state reimbursement on it, Gene. It just deleted everything after the enacting clause and conformed it to the same kind of rhetoric that was used in the Senate Bill. The impact is exactly the same."

Schlickman: "Well, there will be no state reimbursement but there can and probably will be, local tax monies used...."

Greiman: "That's the whole purpose of the Bill."



Schlickman: "For the funding of this program."

Greiman: "That's the purpose of the Bill. It gives local school districts the option to fund locally, if they care to. They don't have to, right now they cannot do that. They cannot use locally raised funds for those programs. And the whole notion of the Bill is to give them that permissive right. That's what the Bill is about."

Schlickman: "Well, could you just briefly describe the kind of special educational facilities for kids under three that are anticipated by this Bill."

Greiman: "All the facilities that we have now for example, would be available. There are eight or ten classifications that we are mandated for older children but not for the younger children. And school districts have asked that some of them...ask that they have the right...be given a right to provide this kind of education on the theory, a rather well accepted theory by everybody who dealt with the issue. That the earlier you get children into programs the more you will put them in the main stream and the more you will be able to make their life better. These are kids...because of their tender years that are just profoundly handicapped, Gene...."

Schlickman: "Special education....."

Greiman: "Oh, yeah. Pardon."

Schlickman: "This Bill is specially...special education oriented. Thank you very much."

Greiman: "Yes."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Pullen on the motion."

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

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates that he will."

Pullen: "The Amendment indicates that the programs would include programs to identify and ameliorate handicapping conditions. What kind of process would used to identification?"

Greiman: "Well, I'm not a special education specialist by any means but I assume that there are testing and what not



that you have to go through, Penny, before kids could get into the program. As you are aware, because the district that you present this Bill comes from the major institution in your district, Orchard School and Dr. Ferizay, is the one who really got the ball rolling on this, I'm sure you are aware of that."

Pullen: "To establish legislative intent, would you envision that this would allow school districts to mandate the screening of all children or would it be just for those whose parents thought they might be handicapped, who would want them identified."

Greiman: "I don't think it mandates anything. I think that it may indeed give...maybe a tool that would certainly might allow for a broad survey but I don't think that is what the intent of it is. I think the intent is to touch those children that are really profoundly handicapped and identifiable at that early age. You know, there are kids who are not identifiable until a little later on. These youngsters who would be in this program, I would perceive would be kids who are objectively profoundly handicapped and the sooner we get to them the more likely they will be able to lead a wholesome and meaningful life."

Pullen: "I have no problem with the part about the educational program. The problem that I have is with the part identification."

Greiman: "Well, part of their...you know, I think you have to identify if you're going to serve needs. Now I don't envision that this would force any school district... wouldn't force any school district to anything that they didn't want to."

Pullen: "But would it allow them to mandate screening of all children..."

Greiman: "I don't think it would frankly."

Pullen: "Thank you."

Greiman: "I don't think it would."



Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Satterthwaite on the Amendment... on the motion."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, simply to clarify. I think that we have already accepted at least twice in this House this year, the concept of identifying and perhaps providing programs for handicapped children in this under three age group. The Senate Amendment on which we are asked to concur now, really does not change the substance of that at all. It simply cleans up the language a little bit and I think we have already shown that we support this. So I would solicit your support in getting the concurrence."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Greiman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2105. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there is 136 'ayes', 4 'nays', 2 voting 'present and the House does concur to Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 2105. Representative Mulcahey would like to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Back to Representative....excuse me, Representative Waddell, for what reason do you arise?"

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. For the purpose of an introduction. In the gallery in the front are high school students from Urbana High School under the leadership of Mr. Dave Lemmons. Represented by Representative Wikoff, Johnson and Satterthwaite. Would you welcome them please."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Darrow, for what reason do you arise?"

Darrow: "To ask leave to change my vote on that last Bill from 'no', to 'aye'. I was talking to Representative Mudd and hit the wrong button."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Darrow, would like to be recorded



as 'aye' on the last vote. Does he have leave? No objection. Ray Walsh, would like to be recorded as 'aye' on the last vote. Peg Breslin, would like to be recorded as 'aye' on the last vote. Representative Anderson, would like to be recorded as 'aye' on the last vote. Representative Geo-Karis, wants to be recorded....would you come down to the well, please. The Clerk....let's please vote our switches. Representative Byers, what reason do you arise?"

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out to the Members that this creates a lot of work for the Clerk's Office when they add to the roll and I know the Clerk's Office would be very appreciative if everybody would push their button and get on the Regular Roll Call."

Speaker Giorgi: "Very well put."

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 2985. Clerk, do you want to read the Bill. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Back on 2985, Representative Leverenz asked that the Bill be taken out of the record because he had a question with it. And his question has been answered and as I mentioned earlier, I move to concur in Senate Amendments 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. I've explained each one, I'll be happy to answer any question and urge the concurrence."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments....the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I think I want to direct my question to Harlan... or Harold Adams, is handling the ag part of this Bill which is now a piggyback Bill. What did the Senate do, Harold, with regard to the request of new automobiles?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Adams."

Adams: "The expenditure is almost in line with what they first recommended because of the new program that they have in grain warehousing. I don't have the exact figure at my



finger tips here."

Matijevich: "Could you give us a breakdown of where the original budget request because I think that's what John Porter wants too. The original budget request of the Department of Agriculture, what the Senate took out and what they put back in, what the final figures are with the regards to ag."

Adams: "According to the Amendment that is here on the desk, almost every figure was cut a percentage. What they are doing is, raising the percentage...holding it to 5½% above last year. That's the information they gave me, 5½% above last year."

Matijevich: "All right. I was waiting for a staff analysis to that. My personal feeling was, that when we had the Bill in the House at....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Rigney."

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Apparently there was some questions about several of the Amendments that were tacked on in the Senate. My understanding is, Senate Amendment #3 is what we would call the 50% Amendment and I guess that is something that has been put on as a standard feature of all the appropriation Bills limiting expenditures for a personal service, travel and commodity, the 50% during the first six months. The second Amendment or Amendment #4, sometimes referred to as a standard five and five tenths percent Amendment, that amounted to a reduction of eighty-six thousand, nine hundred and fifty dollars. Senate Amendment #5 was the one to implement House Bill 3349 for an additional eighteen grain inspectors and Senate Amendment #6 is the Amendment that merely clears up technical language in the Bill as it pertains to expenditures for grants for soil and water conservation districts."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."



Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the House...Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. My problem with that and I think that when we were working on this in the House Committee, that there were many questions raised with regard to the auditing procedures of the...which were involved in the elevator bankruptcy. What we're doing by now putting the money back for the auditors is we are rewarding them for doing a bad job. And I think that some of the downstaters who were aware that we're really penalizing the smaller farmers that really buy...accepting all this, we're penalizing the small farmers and I don't think we did a good job with that. I don't like to hold a budget up at the closing hours but I think that...our Committee action and the discussion that we had in the Appropriation Committee, we did the more responsible thing."

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

Porter: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just want to make sure that this isn't another budget buster. Would Representative Mahar, yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will."

Porter: "Bill, there is two agencies in here now? The Department of Agriculture and the one that was originally in the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Mahar."

Mahar: "Yes, John. The 1985 was the ordinary appropriation for the emergency service and disaster area. Now the general revenue...the GRF amount of money in that last year was nine thirty-three, eight hundred and this year, as of right now it is eight ninety-four, eight twenty-five. Coming to you on concurrence."

Porter: "So, it is less money than previously?"

Mahar: "Yes, Sir. Less money."

Porter: "And then the Department of Agriculture is 5½% above the previous year...fiscal year. Is that right? Okay."



Thank you very much."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, on House Bill 2985. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 139 'ayes', 12 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #2, 3, 4, 5 and 6, on House Bill 2985. And having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."



Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 2835. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien. 2835."

O'Brien: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker and Members, I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2835. The Amendment is merely an attempt by the Forest Preserve District of Cook County to secure themselves from annexation and condemnation by other local governmental units who are desirous of their land. It's an important measure. Representative Conti has been very interested in this measure and would like to speak on it. But, quite frankly, it's very important to the Cook County Forest Preserve that they put on...be put on an equal footing with all other local governmental units."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On the question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Yes, I wonder if the Gentleman would yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Bluthardt: "You mentioned condemnation and you also mentioned annexation. Does this also include the question of special assessments?"

O'Brien: "That...that's correct, Representative Bluthardt, it does include special assessments also."

Bluthardt: "Does it provide then that they shall be immune from special assessments?"

O'Brien: "That's correct."

Bluthardt: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak against this motion to concur."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Bluthardt: "The Gentleman said they'd like to be...the Forest Preserve District would like to be put on the same footing as other units of local government. Well, if they do, then of course they ought to be assessed for any benefits they receive from other units of local government. That is the law today. Even the State of Illinois recognizes the right of local government to assess the State of Illinois where improvements are made to the benefit of state property. I don't know why the Forest Preserve District should be an exemption, or exception to that rule. It's only fair and proper that where improvements are made to property owned by an individual or a unit of government that



they pay for the benefits they are to receive from that improvement. You know, the special assessment proceedings do give the person being assessed, including the Forest Preserve District, the right to appear in court, the right to file objections, right to insist that those assessing prove that there is a benefit and that the amount being assessed is equal to the amount - or at least close to the amount - of the assessment. And so I think the Bill is bad. I think the Forest Preserve District is trying to get special exemptions that other units of government don't have and I think you ought to reject the motion and vote against it."

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

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just want you to know that this Bill appears on three different Bills. We've killed the Bill several times. I'm not rising today to oppose it again but I am going to rise on a point of personal privilege...because of what we've done to this Bill. Twice before - and it appears on another Bill - that we have what is very typical of some reporters editorializing the news instead of reporting the news. And they've got an editorial here, 'Unfortunately, however, evidently not everyone including the increasing number of public office holders believe this is necessarily a good thing. Some...appears it would not be adverse to whittling down the present system of outdoor sanctuaries or requiring forest preserves districts. There is nobody that's been more for open space than Elmer Conti. Evidence of this disturbing view is apparent in recent action of the Illinois House of Representatives in defeating a Bill that would have protected the forest preserves against such possible threat as real estate speculators, tax hungry local governmental officials.' Now I'd like to have them explain to some 60,000 people why a municipality with over 500 acres contiguous to this municipality had to go condemn an Oak Park Country Club and pay 90,000 dollars an acre to build their high school in a different...in a different community altogether when they've got land laying dormant that's not being used for recreation facilities. I also was against this Bill for the simple reason that we wanted to put a little league ball diamond in this...land that's laying dormant and they refused to give the little leaguers the ball diamond to play ball in this



particular area and then they turn right around and give another municipality a pumping station on the same ground without asking for a referendum or....for the people in the area. This property is laying dormant. I am tired of fighting this Bill. I'm tired of being called a tax hungry local politician because we had to raise our taxes tremendously. Instead of getting 64,000 acres of land that the Forest Preserve owned totalling some 5,000,000,000 dollars in Cook County, we had to go spend 90,000 dollars an acre to build a high school. I won't...I won't oppose this Bill any longer. I'm just tired of fighting it."

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

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Senate Amendment is necessary to maintain the integrity of the Cook County Forest Preserve. As Republican staff analysis pointed out, the essential question is whether one unit of local government could be subordinated to another in the areas of eminent domain and special assessments. The current law gives municipalities a clear advantage in relation to forest preserve districts. This Amendment is intended to place all local government on an equal basis and thereby make municipalities negotiate with Forest Preserve Districts for the sale of property in undertaking local improvement projects. For the sake of the need for open space, I urge an 'aye' vote in concurrence with this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mahar. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien, to close."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in order to clarify some of the questions that have been raised by Representative Bluthardt, the Cook County Forest Preserve District has no problem in paying their fair share of any special assessments but in the last few years they have been required to pay for special assessments that are of no benefit to the Cook County Forest Preserve and are of no benefit to the people that are using that recreation space. So there is no problem with paying for a special assessment for a sidewalk running along with the Forest Preserve District, but to pay for a special assessment for utility lines that run through the Cook County Forest Preserve District is something that they feel is completely out of hand and something that they shouldn't be required to pay for. I also can understand



the concerns of the fine Representative who I admire very much and the Mayor from the 18th District of the State of Illinois. And I can understand his concern for his city but the Cook County Forest Preserve District is more than happy to deal with the Mayor and to see to it that the little leaguers will get the diamond and they will work with the Mayor. But if we begin to take the Cook County Forest Preserve District and take it piecemeal by piecemeal by these local governmental units, we will destroy the integrity of the Forest Preserve District. As Representative Schlickman said, 'We must preserve the Forest Preserve District'. And I move to concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2835."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman has moved to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2835. On that question, all in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt, to explain his vote."

Bluthardt: "No, not to explain my vote, but the question of germaneness of this Bill...this Amendment. The Amendment deals with Chapter 96½ while the Bill deals with Chapter 57½ and I believe that's been ruled germane all twelve years that I've been a Member down here."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish?"

Bluthardt: "I ask for a ruling on the objection, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members, I think the Representative's asking for a ruling on the germaneness is out of order. This Amendment was put on in the Senate. It was found germane in the Senate. It was passed out of the Executive Committee..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Your point is well taken. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 114 'aye', 26 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority...I mean, the House concurred with Senate Amendment #1 is hereby declared passed."



Speaker Lechowicz: "...House Bill 2554, Mr. Yourell. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that the House concur in Senate Amendment #2; which has to do with the delayed effective date, which this House is well aware of; with Senate Amendment #3, which is a cleanup of the vacancy in special elections; concur with Amendment #4...that takes the libraries and the election schedule and shifts them to the spring consolidated; and to nonconcur in Senate Amendments #5 and #7. When we do this we will have two Bills, as you know, one with a two-year delayed effective date and one with a delayed effective date of one year, which is a Senate Bill. I move to concur with the Senate Amendments 2, 3, and 4; and to nonconcur with 5 and 7, to House Bill 2554."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On that...are...is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Bluthardt: "I've forgotten, is 7 the two-year extension? Seven is the Amendment that reduces...down to one year? Amendment #7?And you move to nonconcur in that? ...Thank you, I agree with you."

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

Collins: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't agree with him and I couldn't disagree more strenuously. I have pled with this House before and I come to you once more...to beg of you to remove this two-year extension and I'm not for the one-year extension either. We worked long and hard to put this Bill in the shape that it's in today and it's in good shape. We worked long and hard to bring consolidated elections to the people of the State of Illinois, something that many people have asked for. People need the convenience of consolidated election voting and they need the economies that can be affected through consolidated elections. I... I submit to you that this Bill is in shape right now to be implemented on the original effective date of December of 1978. So turn down this move to concur in Senate Amendment 7. Let's nonconcur...Let's nonconcur in all of these Amendments and take this thing into a... into a Conference Committee and hammer out an agreement to put the



Bill in shape so that we can have consolidated elections on schedule by next...by December 1, of this year, so that for the 1979 elections consolidated elections will be a reality. We'll have the perfect test in 1979 to shake out any bugs if there are any. This Bill is in near perfect shape and I say let's pass it with the original effective date and send it to the Governor for his signature. The people of the State of Illinois want this, they deserve it, and I think it's our duty to give it to them. So, please, nonconcur in Senate Amendment #7 and any other Amendments that you may see fit to nonconcur in. Let's get this thing into a Conference Committee and work it out on the original effective date."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, I'm....I didn't quite understand, did he move to concur or nonconcur in Amendment#3?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He moved to concur with Senate Amendments 2,3 and 4; and not concur in 5 and 7."

Geo-Karis: "Sponsor, please. In any of the other Amendments, I'm trying to find them, is there any provision for...made for...clustered voting precincts in any elections except school districts and ...and library districts?"

Yourell: "No. That's...that's in the nonpartisan, off-year elections."

Geo-Karis: "...For school districts and library districts, only. Is that right?"

Yourell: "All elections other than the general election."

Geo-Karis: "Does that mean primary, too?"

Yourell: "...and the general primary."

Geo-Karis: "You mean you can have..."

Yourell: "The primary is out..."

Geo-Karis: "And general elections are out, right? Primary and general elections...are out?"

Yourell: "Clustering of precincts in House Bill 2554, is in the off-year, nonpartisan elections only."

Geo-Karis: "Well...Are you saying then that that means only school districts and library districts?"

Yourell: "All elections in the nonpartisan year...the off-year elections,



not in the 19....like 1978...er..1980, the general primary and the general election will not have clustered precincts."

Geo-Karis: "In other words, what you're saying is in a primary election, the usual primary election that we have, for state and county officers, and the general election we have, for state and county and...."

Yourell: "There'll be no clustering."

Geo-Karis: "No clustering. Thank you,..."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Totten: "Bus, you explained Amendments 1, 2 and 3; and 7, which we're nonconcurring in. I didn't hear what Amendment #5 was that we're nonconcurring in."

Yourell: "No. We concurred in 2, 3 and 4; and nonconcurred in 5 and 7."

Totten: "Okay. What is 5?"

Yourell: "5 is the ...deletes the ten-year requirement and the Commissioners oath with the Board of Elections Commissioners."

Totten: "Deletes the tenure or ten year?"

Yourell: "Ten years...."

Totten: "Thank you."

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

Levin: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Levin: "Representative Yourell, I'm referring to Amendment #3 which deals with a problem we have in Chicago. In...in my district we had two aldermanic vacancies and it took a federal court decision, as I think you were aware of the fact, in order to call a special aldermanic election. My understanding of Amendment 3, and if you'll correct me if I'm wrong because it is a long and complicated Amendment, is that there would be one opportunity for a special aldermanic election at the two-year mark?"

Yourell: "That is correct."

Levin: "And that if a vacancy occurs subsequent to the time...for that opportunity for an election...there would be an appointment....So that



you could have the situation that a ...for a period of really, in effect, more than two years....you could have the Mayor and City Council filling a vacancy?"

Yourell: "That is correct. For up to two years and some weeks, where the Mayor vacancy...the Office of the Mayor...caused by some reason there would be a vacancy, with the advice - or Alderman - with the advice and consent of the City Council."

Levin: "Okay. May I speak to the ...motion please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Yourell: "I might add, the only city that does not have that is the Mayor-Alderman type. That's the only one, the rest all have it...same provision."

Levin: "Okay."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker...we have the situation in Chicago where we are, at this point, the only local jurisdiction that does not have a mechanism for filling aldermanic vacancies. So this is something that is important to us. I must reluctantly speak against Amendment #3. I think we certainly need to fill...to deal with the problem that we have. Unfortunately, Amendment #3 is not consistent with the agreement that...I understood...had been reached by the various members of the City Council, both regulars and independents. The difficulty with Amendment #3, is that you can get an appointment for up to two years...two-year period. In addition, since there's only an opportunity, during the four-year term, for one special aldermanic election, at the end of two years, you could have the situation where somebody dies or resigns, right after being elected, there's no elected Alderman for a period of two years. The agreement that was worked out between the various Aldermen and the Chicago City Council, was that up to one year, before the end of the term, there be the opportunity for special elections. And only during the last year should there be appointments. I think that Amendment 3 is a stab at a very serious problem that we have but I don't believe that it is a solution. I would point out that if the effective date of this law is two years down the road, we've got plenty of time



to come up with a better solution to this problem. For these reasons, despite the fact, I understand the intent of Amendment and I agree with the intent...I must reluctantly oppose Amendment 3 and urge nonconcurrence."

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

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker...on a procedural point. I think we have at least one controversial Amendment included in the motion to concur. And I would ask to divide the question unless the maker of the motion would agree to ...to modify the motion to nonconcur in 3. Otherwise I will ask that the Chair divide the question and present it to us separately."

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

Yourell: "I have no objection. If you want to divide the question, fine. Let's go with Amendment #2, which is the two year delayed effective date. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2554."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2554. 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 128 'ayes', 17 'nays', and the House does concur in Amendment #2. Now, Amendment #3. Mr. Yourell, please."

Yourell: "Thank you. I now move to concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 2554. This Amendment takes care of the vacancy special election and cleans up that Section of the Bill. I move the concurrence of that Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On that question, the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Robinson."

Robinson: "Well, I'd like to point out to the Members and particularly to those from Chicago, on both sides of the aisle, ...who are interested, that this allows the Mayor of the City of Chicago to select an Alderman who will serve for two years in case of a... in case there's a vacancy. This is a tremendous advantage...a tremendous increase in power if anyone could think that possible, to the Mayor of the City of Chicago. The agreement with Alderman Wilson Frost and Alderman Finson, was that to make sure that there



would not be vacancies, that the...they would allow for a one-year appointment by the Mayor of the City of Chicago, in case of vacancies. Certainly not a two-year appointment. The only reason that the Sponsor said that they are doing it this way is they don't want Aldermen elected in general elections. Well, I see nothing wrong with that. I think we ought to nonconcur and go back to the original agreement that the Mayor of the City of Chicago could only make appointments for one year to aldermanic vacancies."

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

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I thought that all parties had agreed, beforehand, that there would only be a one-year period during which the Mayor could make appointments to fill vacancies. I believe that if you extended it to two years you are usurping the right of the people to choose their own Aldermen. I would point out that the vacancies that we just recently filled in the ...in Chicago, by election, this last ...this past month, would have ... many of them have been around for a long time and the Mayor could have made appointments and it virtually would have locked in the ...the appointments of the Mayor and, I think, had that happened the outcome of at least one of those elections might have been quite different and, I think, that we ought to give the power of election... of selection of the Aldermen to the people, where it belongs. I urge the vote 'no', on this motion."

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

Yourell: "Yes, just in closing, Mr. Speaker, I would remind the Gentleman that this is the first knowledge that I have had of any agreement between anybody and the Gentlemen that he mentioned that do have an agreement certainly I haven't been told that they have an agreement. I don't know anything about it. I would suggest that...no, Dave, he don't know anything about it either, suggest to you that if we're talking about holding an election for a period of ten or eleven or nine months, what we're doing is costing the taxpayers, those of you who certainly are revenue conscious as far as taxes are concerned, ought to realize that to hold a special election in this area, in this instance, would again clutter up the ballot and have some



influence on the other candidates and cost the people of the City of Chicago and other areas a great deal of money. So I again rene... renew my motion to concur in Senate Amendment #3."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 2554. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Beatty, to explain his vote.... This will take 89 votes. Mr. Beatty, please. Would you kindly use Mr. Bradley's microphone."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, for those Representatives who are concerned about the real estate tax and the people in their district, such as in Chicago, who don't like increases, they should consider this. When we hold special elections the funds have to come from the real estate tax and that means an increase in real estate taxes for these special elections. We've just had one recently... and it was expensive and it...you have to balance things out. How important is an aldermanic seat in a city like Chicago, where really one seat doesn't make any difference....where the party...as.... No, I don't want to be an Alderman. I think, Ladies and Gentlemen, the public has spoken, they don't want money wasted on elections, which in some sense they are not so important...such as one aldermanic race in the city. I think that should be considered. We want...we want everything perfect in the world, but I think we have to also worry about the taxes that these things involve. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

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

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, again speaking against this concurrence. I think this House has spoken to the issue of elected officials time and time again. On both sides of the aisle the sentiment has been that the people should be allowed to vote for their public officials; and should fill vacancies by special election, if possible. I just ..I just don't think that any of us want to endorse the principle of appointed officials serving without having gone to the electorate. I hope that this vote on concurrence will stay just where it is and we will nonconcur."

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

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, I think there's some erroneous information. This Bill..



this does not require special election. The election would be filled at the next general election, so it would not cost the taxpayers any additional money because it would not be a special election held under this provision. So you should vote 'no'."

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

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there's an old adage, it's not ours necessarily, but what's good for the ...good for the goose is good for the gander. Everybody else but Chicago can do this now. I don't understand why we want to discriminate against the City of Chicago just because some people have a tough go with Chicago politics. I don't think that's an issue at all. It seems to me that if our Mayors downstate and in the suburbs can already make this appointment for two years, up to the next general election, I see no reason why we can't do the same thing for the City of Chicago. Maybe for 120 thousand dollars seems like a pittance to downstaters for the City of Chicago budget, but if we had to do that for a downstate municipality all of us would be screaming bloody murder if we were discriminated against like this. I urge you to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 77 75 'ayes', 77 'nays', 13 recorded as 'present'; and the House does not concur in Senate Amendment #3. No, you've got to move that we nonconcur, Bus. Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, I now move that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 2554."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All in favor signify by saying 'aye', all opposed ... The motion carries. Amendment #4, Bus?"

Yourell: "Yes. Amendment #4 is the Amendment that switches the...to the spring consolidated election in the odd numbered years, the parks and the libraries, in the election schedule. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 2554."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Amendment #4. All those 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 139 'ayes'.... 142 'ayes', no 'nays', 4 recorded as 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 2554. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I now move that we nonconcur in Senate Amendments #5 and 7 to House Bill 2554."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman now moves that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #5 and 7. All in favor....On that question? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes. I'd like, again, to divide the question. I feel that the House should concur in Senate Amendment #5 and I'd like to speak to that point as soon as the question is divided."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's a little late. The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur in 5 and 7. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'..... What? It's divisible but it's kinda late in coming. I'd like to have the Gentleman who made the original motion...ask if it's okay to divide the motion. Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "...Seems to be some difficulty with these two Amendments. I now move that we nonconcur in Senate Amendment #5 to House Bill 2554."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #5 deletes the ten-year residency requirement for chairman of the Board of Election Commissioners. Ten years is an unreasonably long period of time in a city that's as dynamic as the City of Chicago. The City of Chicago is really the hub of the United States. Many good people are constantly moving in...many more are moving in than are moving out; and we...I think, we would be seriously hamstrung in the selection of a chairman of the Board of Election Commissioners if we have a ten-year residency requirement. This Amendment simply knocks it out. I think we ought to concur with this good Amendment. I urge a 'no' vote on the motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I think you've got it confused. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Now, again, Mr. Speaker, obviously the Gentleman does not understand what we're attempting to do here."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Please listen, Mr. Bowman."

Yourell: "Representative, you've already voted to concur in Amendment #2, which delays the effective date. Now how in the world will this one year have anything to do with the Bill at all....nothing to do with it; that's why we're nonconcurring. We've got a two year delayed effective date on the Bill now...won't take effect. So what are we talking about. That's why we're nonconcurring...in the one year."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye'; all opposed...The House nonconcur...Amendment #5. Now, Amendment #7, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that we nonconcur in Senate Amendment #7 to House Bill 2554."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur in Amendment #7. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye'; opposed... The House nonconcur in Amendment #7. House Bill 2555. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stearney. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Stearney: "May I have leave of the House to be recorded as voting 'aye' on ...on.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "'Aye' on what?"

Stearney: "2835, Representative O'Brien's Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Surely. The Gentleman asks leave to be recorded as 'aye' on House Bill 2835. Any objections? Hearing none, the Gentleman will be so recorded. 2555, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move that we concur in Amendments #1 and 2. These Amendments were offered by Senator Guidice. The basic Bill would add renters to the insurance red lining law. Amendment #1 clarifies the fact that, agents as well as companies are covered by the law. This is consistent with the department interpretation, the Amendment also provides that a person may not be refused auto insurance simply because there is no agents or broker in his geographic location. Amend-



ment #2, clarifies the provision with respect to the auto insurance. To provide that it covers a cancellation on renewal. The effect is that, a persons insurance... auto insurance, he could not be denied it, canceled or non renewed simply because there was no broker in the area."

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

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will."

Schlickman: "What is wrong with having an insurance company not wanting to insure somebody if the insurance company doesn't have an employee to service the claims under that policy."

Levin: "Well, let me say at the outset, this is not my Amendment it is Senator Guidice's Amendment. But I believe that his rationale, I think it is a good one...is that the decisions with respect to insurability of auto insurance should be based on sound actuarial grounds. And not simply on whether or not there is an agent in the area. There have been studies that have been done, for example the Lucas Report which documents that large areas of Illinois do not have agents. Agents have been pulled out. Particularly in the City of Chicago. All this Amendment says, is because of that fact a person should not be denied auto insurance. Certainly, if actuarial basis, that's a proper justification. But this Amendment simply limited to one of the observations from the Lucas Report, that is that brokers and agents have been pulled out large areas of the city and it would just, you know, provide just for that reason. A person should not be denied auto insurance."

Schlickman: "Well, isn't your Amendment #1...did you discuss Amendment #2, by the way?"

Levin: "Yes."



Schlickman: "Aren't the two of them in conflict? On one hand you are saying, that an automobile insurance company cannot deny a policy on the grounds that it has no one in the area to service it. And then in Amendment #2, if I read it correctly, you're saying that a policy can be canceled solely on the ground that an agent or broker is not located in geographical proximity to residence of applicant."

Levin: "I think you are reading it the opposite...."

Schlickman: "Just reverse."

Levin: "To reverse."

Schlickman: "Okay. May I address the Amendment...the motion, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Sir."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, while the intent, I believe...by this Bill is to avoid unreasonable discrimination. I think we are going a bit too far with how an insurance company should operate. Amendment #1 would prohibit an insurance company from not issuing a policy where it can't service it. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if an insurance company can't service a policy it shouldn't have to issue it on that account. I think we are going too far in attempting to regulate how a company should do business and on that account, I would urge a 'no' vote on this motion to concur."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Are you completed, Sir?"

Levin: "Yes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Schlickman, are you completed, Sir?"

Schlickman: "In my deliberate fashion, yes, Mr. Speaker."

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

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to support the position stated by Representative Levin. He's absolutely right that this is



rationale that many insurance companies use. The rationale of a lack of an agent. But rather than on any actuary figures based on individual personal risks. What you have to understand is, that many of the insurance companies will willfully pull the agent out and on the basis of that...used as the basis for not writing the policy. The bottom line result is, that you have thousands of people in that geographical area driving around with no insurance at all. In the area...in this one particular geographical area in Chicago, is bounded by the Dan Ryan Expressway. Where 90% of the accidents takes place in this geographical area. And if you look at an actuary report of the accident that takes place, they involve cars that are not residents of the area. In other words, they involve cars that are traveling from all parts of the suburban area. But the insurance companies will use that as an actuary for the geographical area rather than the individuals who actually reside in that geographical area. And, as Mr. Levin has stated, it comes down to the fact that many individuals cannot get insurance so therefore, they drive with no insurance at all. And I think this Amendment attempts to correct this, it is a good Amendment and it is deserving of its positive vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Holewinski to close on House Bill 2555 and House concurring in Senate Amendment #1 and 2. Mr. Holewinski to close."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I was close to the Gentleman on the other side who raised questions over the practicality in this legislation. I would just pose the following situation. Take an insurance consumer in an urban area going from insurance company to insurance company seeking to get automobile coverage as this Amendment only applies to. And getting the same answers constantly. And that is, we don't write in that area because we have no agents in



that area. What pray tell is that insurance consumer to do? As the necessity of having agents in an area....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mike. Give the Gentleman some attention please. Please continue."

Holewinski: "I think that if you reflect upon this, you will see that really if we had a choice, if the consumer had a choice they would prefer to have someone stationed locally who could service their accounts. But in many cases they just simply do not have a choice, they don't have the opportunity. Most companies aren't set up to deal directly in...at least in some lines, directly with the consumer. And what we're saying is this, don't use that as an excuse. Is that if you're going to write insurance, make insurance available to consumers in Illinois, don't use feeble excuses for not writing a certain area. I think this is good legislation, it plugs up some of the loopholes that were included in prior Acts that we have passed. And I would urge the House to concur in Senate Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House concurs in Senate Amendments #1 and 2. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Harold...Byers...Byers, get me over there will you. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 110 'ayes', 31 'nays', 4 recorded 'present'. The House concurs in Senate Amendments #1 and 2, to House Bill 2555 and is declared as passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti. Mr. Conti, please."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I don't mind on Third Reading or voting on a Bill but on these concurrences If I can't hear what is going on, whether they're concurring or not concurring, I'm going to have to vote 'present' on all of these. These non concurrence Conference Committee always scares me. And I'm going to have to vote 'present' unless we can get some order on these nonconcurrence Bills."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The point is well taken. I would hope that



the Membership would give the respective makers of the motion their undivided attention. House Bill 2619, Mr. Jones, do you want to have that Bill called? Emil. 2619. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Emil Jones."

Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #2, to House Bill 2619. This is the identical Amendment we passed out in House Bill 2819 which received the vote of 173 to 1. And so I move to concur in Senate Amendment #2."

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

Schlickman: "Would the Gentleman please explain the Amendment, other than we had voted for previously."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Jones."

Jones: "What the Amendment does, is require that the...any district with ADA of fifty thousand or more and that is average daily attendance---it only affects the City of Chicago---that those funds generated by fifty one students would be distributed to those students in those attendance centers."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the adopt...Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "I wonder if the Gentleman would yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will."

Walsh: "Don't we have this in the provision of the Bill that we passed yesterday?"

Jones: "Yes, it was in the Bill that we passed yesterday."

Walsh: "Well, then why is it necessary for us to pass this Bill?"

Jones: "Something like a little back up. You know, will."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House adopt Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2619. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think whether you support this or not you should consider on your vote the potential of



Governor's action on the Bill we passed yesterday. I think it might be wiser to vote 'no' and give him fewer options." " Speaker Lechowicz: "Knowing the sponsorship, I don't think you've got too much of a problem. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 137 'ayes', 4 'nays', 4 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2, to House Bill 2619. The Bill is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2691, Mr. Brady. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brady "

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members. House Bill 2691 is the Home Health Care Bill that we passed out of here 164 to nothing. In the Senate we accepted an Amendment at the advice of the Governor's staff which firmly put in a financial cap in the Bill. It said that, regardless of eligibility the department is not responsible for funding services beyond what we appropriated in that given year and that appropriation this year will be six million dollars. That's what the Amendment says, it passed out of the Senate 53 to nothing and I urge your favorable concurrence on this Bill."

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

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, would the Gentleman yield?"

Brady: "Yes."

McClain: "Mr. Brady, if you have more eligibles than money will you prorate it so that all the eligibles will have a prorated sum?"

Brady: "Representative McClain, as I understand it, what they will do is create an eligibility as close to that amount of money as possible. So that what will happen is, it will be a first-come, first-serve basis. If it gets down to the end of the year they will not have available services to give out to additional people even though they fill that eligibility. So it requires that the department will not be sued by people who say, well I fit the



eligibility requirement but you are out of money in this six-month period as a matter of fact to give these services."

McClain: "But your answer to me was then, no, right. I mean..."

Brady: "That is correct. It is not a proration Bill."

McClain: "Then the second issue is, do they get the modified... the eligibility requirement as the year progresses, so maybe it is less stringent at the beginning of the year and then as the year goes on...they run out of money then they will tighten it up?"

Brady: "The effective date of the Bill is, January 1. It gives them six months to try and gear up and prepare the proper rules and regulations, submit them for public hearing with the Joint Committee on administrative review and come back in. I don't feel in the next six-month period they will be able to duplicate that and change it. I would believe that it is one set of rules and regulations they would have."

McClain: "Well, let me ask this. Is this the best you can do?"

Brady: "Representative McClain, I believe that this is the best we can do."

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

Geo-Karis: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will."

Geo-Karis: "This is a Bill, Representative, is it not that will permit in home health care services to people who are not on public aid, who want to keep out of the nursing homes if they possibly can...the senior citizens?"

Brady: "That is correct, Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "And that's still in there, is it not?"

Brady: "Pardon me."

Geo-Karis: "That provision is still in there, is that correct?"

Brady: "That provision is still in there. All the provision are the same as passed out here. All we did was set in the financial cap that we submitted in the fiscal note."

Geo-Karis: "I move for concurrence."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2691? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 158 'ayes', 1 'nay', 1 recorded as 'present'. The House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2691 and is hereby declared passed. House Bill 15, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 15, was adopted in the Senate Committee and as you know, House Bills 14, 15 and 16, were the Bills that we passed out last year Creating the Joint Committee on administrative procedures. Now the Joint Committee after its organization has had the opportunity to work with all of the state agencies and I think we had five or six monthly meetings to date. And some of the problems that we've been running into with the administration of the Joint Committee have dictated to us that certain Amendments were needed and desirable to make the staff work with the Committee...on the Committee more meaningful and to assist the Members of the Committee in coming to conclusions on the proposed rules and regulations submitted by...to the Joint Committee by the state agencies. Amendment #1, to House Bill 15, adopts the expansive definition of agency...and that's, quote, 'To make it essential for uniformity of application.' This is based upon the definition found in the State Auditing Act which specifically excludes the Governor, the Justice and Judges of Supreme and Appellate Courts and both Houses of the General Assembly as well as their respective standing Committees and service Committees. It also aids the uniformity of publication of the computation of rules by establishing a starting point which would be, October 1, 1980, by which each agency shall publish the current



rules applicable to that agency. It also aids uniformity of organization in the structure of the rules by clarifying the Joint Committee authority to adopt rules necessary to establish a statewide system for the codification of the rules of all the state agencies. I move for the... to concur in Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 15."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves the House concur in Senate Amendment #1. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there is 148 'ayes', 2 'nays', 5 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1. Senate Amendment #2, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 15, as amended by Senate Amendment #1 makes several substantive changes. And some of the changes have been suggested to the Joint Committee by the University of Illinois. It removes student and faculty disciplinary and grievance proceedings and capricious grading proceedings from coverage by the Illinois Administrator Procedure Act in a contested case. This change as I indicated to you, was suggested by the University of Illinois. It also removes admission standards of procedures for state colleges and universities from coverage by the Act. This change also was suggested by the University of Illinois. Number three, it restores the phrase 'authorized by law to make rules or determine contested cases' to the Section defining agency in the Act. This phrase was originally dropped as redundant but by this Amendment we're restoring it at the suggestion of the Governor's Office in the interest of compromise. It also requires the Secretary of State to prescribe by rule a uniform codification system for all state agencies by July 1, 1980, and it requires all state agencies rules to be in compliance with the uniform system by July 1,



1984. It would change also the quorum requirement of the Joint Committee to require simple majority of all Members rather than majority of the Members from each House. As you know, there were eight Members appointed from the House and eight Members appointed from the Senate and we feel that there is six Members from the House, there is six Members from the Senate and additional Members from either Body to make a quorum. That's the situation we would like to have in order to proceed with the deliberation of the Joint Committee. I move the adoption of Amendment #2...rather concurrence with Amendment #2 to House Bill #15."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On the question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Would the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will."

Mann: "But, didn't the first part of your explanation of Amendment #2, deal with disciplinary problems of students, isn't that right? Now the way that you explain it, you take the resolution of those problems out of the Administrative Review Act. You in effect...give the institutions the final verdict power in terms of who's right, who's wrong in a disciplinary procedure and something as important as whether or not the student is flunked out or whether the student is censored and kicked out of the university...matters of that importance are removed from any possible appeal by the student or the student's family. Is that correct?"

Yourell: "No, it is not correct. We have not changed that as you know, they do have that opportunity by law. All we're indicating is that in certain contested cases...I would ask you to remember one thing, the Members of the Joint Committee and our staff have had a very difficult experience with the University of Illinois. And they indicate to us on several occasions that they are not a state agency



but rather a public corporation as they are defined in certain areas of the statute. And I don't think we can put in the Administrative Procedure Act the kinds of things that we want to consider as far as faculty disciplinary action and grievance proceedings. Only in contested cases."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Gentleman another question if I may. What do you mean by, only in contested cases?"

Yourell: "Well...as I indicated to you before, all through the Act, the Administrative Procedures Act, we have made exceptions for contested cases. We believe that the agency and in this instance, the University of Illinois, should have the opportunity to make their own decision without coming to the Joint Committee and proposing a rule or regulation that concerns the general operation of the University of Illinois."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "I would like to address myself to the Bill. I do have a conflict of interest....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please continue."

Mann: "I don't have a conflict of interest here but I believe that it will not affect my thinking or my vote. The problem with Amendment #2, is not in its intention but rather in its effect. And I would ask all of you to consider the possibility that a student, whether he be ethnic, composed of an ethnic majority or whether he be....come from a financially modest background. That a student can really not contest discipline or even ejection from the university without going to court. And that will involve large expenditure of funds. I ask that you look at this Bill very carefully, I'm not questioning the intent of the Sponsor but I do think that



while the institutions are not always wrong, they are not always right either and we do not want to penalize certain students...perhaps affect their lives and their careers very profoundly by being ejected from school and not having an opportunity to tell some unbiased agency the circumstance from their point of view. And I urge that you vote 'no' with regard to Amendment #2."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Morgan, Mr. Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I understand the concern the last speaker expressed but with all due respect, I don't believe he understands provisions of Amendment #2. I'm on the Joint Committee and all we're saying in this Amendment is that all the Joint Committee reviews in the first place.... rules that are made by agencies. And all we're doing here is making clear that the Joint Committee does not on a case by case basis have to look at every disciplinary proceeding in the university. That is not our function, we don't do that for any agency. It may well be that we would want to at some point create an appellate agency or an agency that would oversee their decisionmaking. But the Joint Committee has not been a....and as a matter of policy should not be that agency. That's just not our particular job, so I would urge an 'aye' vote on this concurrence."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2, to House Bill 15? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 118 'ayes', 17 'nays', 9 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2, to House Bill 15 is hereby declared passed. House Bill 16, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I...before we start on



Amendment #1 to House Bill 16, address an inquiry and I didn't have the opportunity to do so today. To my colleague on the Joint Committee and I can tell you that he's one of our very astute Members and I have great respect for his opinions and contributions to the Committee. And I would ask him now if we're ready to proceed on Amendment #1, to House Bill 16."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Edgar is not on the floor at the present time. I would like...the Gentleman moves to...the Gentleman from Morgan, Mr. Reilly."

Reilly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry to report that the compromise effort that we had made with the Governor's Office so far has produced nothing. So I would advise to go ahead with concurrence motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's nothing new."

Yourell: "Thank you, Representative Reilly. Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 16, was adopted in the Senate Committee. And what the Amendment would do, would deal with the problems that we're having in the Joint Committee with the number of notices that are applicable to state agencies relating to the hearing period and so forth. What this Amendment would do, would establish a separate forty-five day notice hearing period during which the Joint Committee on administrative rules alone would consider proposed rule making. Currently there is a single forty-five day notice hearing period during which agencies receive input from the public and other interested parties as well as the Joint Committee. In order to implement this two-step notice in hearing procedures, three publications of proposed rules are required in the Illinois Register as opposed to what is happening presently, calling for two. The added publication would be inserted between the forty-five day notice public hearing period and the following five-day Joint Committee on administrative procedures notice hearing record. And I think this is a



service to the public for this requirement and I move for the concurrence of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 16."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2, to House Bill 16? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. I said, #1 and 2. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there 136 'ayes', 12 'nays', 6 recorded as 'present' and the House concurs in Senate Amendments #1 and 2, to House Bill 16. And the Bill is hereby declared passed. The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite. Your light is on Ma'am. Do you seek recognition? Thank you. House Bill 2790, the Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2790. There was some suggestion, I know in the House and in the Senate both, that the effective date was...of this Bill was unusual and they were afraid it would apply in both...or try to apply in both the fiscal year, '78 and '79. This changes the effective date to July 1, 1978, so it assures that it apply only in the fiscal 1979."

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

Kent: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will."

Kent: "Isn't this the Pothole Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes."

Tipsword: "Yes, it is Ma'am."

Kent: "Thank you. It is still...how much?"

Tipsword: "It is still thirty million for potholes and twenty-two thousand, five hundred dollars for the Flat Branch Drainage District."

Kent: "Thank you."

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



Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Tipsword: "Certainly will."

Geo-Karis: "I didn't quite understand the gist of the Amendment, I remember the Bill was originally for twenty-two thousand dollars for the Flat Bush Drainage District...."

Tipsword: "Flat Branch."

Geo-Karis: "Pardon me."

Tipsword: "It is not the Flat Bush, they had it wrong. It is the Flat Branch."

Geo-Karis: "I'm sorry, Flat Branch, Flat Bush, take your choice. But I understand that....anyhow it was in the bush."

Tipsword: "Right."

Geo-Karis: "But I understand that you have an Amendment and it was amended in the House to the call of thirty million dollars, wasn't it?"

Tipsword: "Yes, it was."

Geo-Karis: "Then what is the Senate Amendment, please?"

Tipsword: "The Senate Amendment only change...knocks out the Section on the effective date and says that the effective date is July 1, 1978. The effective date provision previously looked as if it might try to apply in both fiscal year '78 and fiscal year '79."

Geo-Karis: "So this effect date then only applies as of July 1, 1978 and henceforth. Is that right?"

Tipsword: "Therefore, only effective for the fiscal year '79."

Geo-Karis: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2790? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McGrew, to explain his vote."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I look up at the board and I'm just amazed once again to find that the other side of the



aisle seem to decide that today we have an issue that... time is not here, that we cannot spend the money, we don't need any road repair. We heard all that before, right before the Governor announced that he had a slight change of mind, which is usual. And announced once again he was going to indeed have his own Pothole Bill. I suggest to some of the Republicans that are interested in getting reelected again to reconsider this vote. Make sure that we get the necessary votes to concur in the first Amendment, send it to his desk and let him decide that once again we should have this good Bill."

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

Schlickman: "Not to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker, but to ask for a verification if this gets 89 votes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell to explain his vote. Because your light is on. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 91 'ayes', 80 'nays' and the Gentleman asked for a verification. The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword, wants to poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Caldwell...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Caldwell...you are polling the absentees, is that correct, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Polling the absentees."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please continue."

Clerk O'Brien: "Hart, J.M. Houlihan, Madison...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Houlihan, do you want to be recorded on this measure?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Miller and Wolf."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay, the Gentleman...kindly proceed with the verification. Wait a minute. Will all unauthorized persons now remove themselves from the floor and would the Membership kindly be in their own respective seat. And



for what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Boucek. . . Kindly change, Mr. Boucek from 'aye' to 'no'. And Representative Dan Houlihan, asks to be verified now...okay. What are we starting with, 90 now, Jack? 90 'ayes'. Please proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "E.M. Barnes, Beatty, Birchler, Bowman, Bradley, Brady, Brandt, Breslin, Rich Brummer, Don Brummet, Byers, Capparelli, Chapman, Christensen, Darrow, Corneal Davis, Dawson, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, John Dunn, Ewell, Farley, Flinn, Garmisa, Getty, Giglio, Giorgi, Greiman, Hanahan, Harris, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, Huff, Jacobs, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Kane, Katz, Kelly, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leverenz, Levin, Lucco, Luft, Madigan, Mann, Marovitz, Peggy Smith Martin, Matejek, Matijevich, Mautino, McClain, McGrew, McLendon, McPike, Mudd, Mugalian, Mulcahey, Murphy, Nardulli, O'Brien, Pechou Pierce, Pouncey, Richmond, Robinson, Satterthwaite, Schisle Schneider, Sharp, Shumpert...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I ask to be verified."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay."

Clerk O'Brien: "Steczo, Stuffle, Taylor, Terzich, Tipsword, Van Duynes, Vitek, Von Boeckman, R.V. Walsh, Willer, William Young, Yourell and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any question of the affirmative vote. Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Representative Mugalian."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, who?"

Schlickman: "Representative Mugalian."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mugalian. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mr. Mugalian in the chamber? Take him off the Roll Call. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Caldwell, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Caldwell: "How am I recorded?"



Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Caldwell: "Record me 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record the Gentleman as 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jim Houlihan, wants to be recorded as 'aye'. Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mugalian has been taken off?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir, he has."

Schlickman: "Representative Schneider."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Schneider. Mr. Schneider...how is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Schlickman: "Representative Brandt."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Brandt is in his chair."

Schlickman: "Representative Breslin."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Breslin. How is the Lady recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mrs. Breslin in the chamber? Take her off the record."

Schlickman: "Representative Don Brummét."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Don Brummet. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is he back there, I can't see him. Take him off the record."

Schlickman: "Representative Dawson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Dawson is right here."

Schlickman: "Representative Domico."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Domico is in his chair."

Schlickman: "Representative Ray Ewell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ray Ewell. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Schlickman: "Representative Bruce Farley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Bruce Farley is in his chair."



Schlickman: "Where is he?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "In his chair."

Schlickman: "Where?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Right there. Bruce. The Gentleman sitting in Mr. Farley's chair, would you kindly stand. I'm sorry it is not him. Take him off the record."

Schlickman: "Representative Capparelli."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Capparelli is in his chair."

Schlickman: "Representative Flinn."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Flinn, he's in his chair."

Schlickman: "Representative Garmisa."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Garmisa, is in his chair."

Schlickman: "Representative Hanahan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Hanahan. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly take him off the record."

Schlickman: "Representative Jones, Emil."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Emil Jones. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record. Kindly put, Mr. Brummet back on the Roll Call. And Mr. Hanahan, back on the Roll Call and Mrs. Breslin back on the Roll Call."

Schlickman: "Representative Kane."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who?"

Schlickman: "Douglas Kane."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kane. Representative Kane...how is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the Roll Call."

Schlickman: "Representative Katz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Katz. What?"

Schlickman: "The only person verified was Daniel Houlihan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Dan Houlihan and the Speaker were the only ones that I heard was verified. How is the Gentleman recorded?"



Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mr. Katz in the chamber? Take him off the record."

Schlickman: "Representative Mautino."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mautino, I just seen him. Representative Mautino. Kindly...would you put, Mr. Farley back on the Roll Call. And Mautino, is right over here."

Schlickman: "What is the count, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Are you through verifying, Sir?"

Schlickman: "I asked first."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I want to give you an answer. Are you through verifying?"

Schlickman: "I don't know. What's the count?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "102."

Schlickman: "Does this a Constitutional Majority of 177?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I don't think so."

Schlickman: "I didn't recognize myself. Yes, that's it, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison. I don't know why don't you check. The Gentleman from... Mr. Stuffle, from Coles. I don't know, he's checking to see if he was taken off. Mr. Madison. Kindly record Mr. Madison as 'aye'. No, we're not taking any pictures. I'm sorry, John, I can't hear. Put Representative Schneider back on the Roll Call. Mr. Matijevich, for what purpose do you seek recognition."

Matijevich: "Well, I left the House and nobody took me off yet did they?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I don't know."

Matijevich: "Would you check the..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Jack, is Mr. Matijevich recorded on this?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mr. Mautino?"

Matijevich: "Leave me that way."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Mautino, what purpose do you seek recognit:



Oh, Mulcahey. Put Emil Jones back on the Roll Call."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, I just got back, I don't know if I was taken off or not."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That should be 89. Mr. Mulcahey...how is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On this question there are 89 'ayes', 81 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion prevails and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2790. Hereby declared passed. House Bill 297, the Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 297 passed the House last year with overwhelming majority. And what it does is, simply mandates that any Bills or any Executive Branch of Government that orders various mandates on local government, we pay the freight. There was two Senate Amendments and I agree with both Senate Amendments and I urge concurrence of Senate Bill 297."

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

Keats: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While I am in complete agreement with the Bill, I was just wondering what those Amendments might be. I support the Bill, I just wonder about those Amendments."

Von Boeckman: "Well, what Senate Amendment #2 does, I think you might have...do you have a copy of...the run down on it. I'll read it if you want me to. Senate Amendment #2, actually strikes all of the House Bill Amendment...I mean the House Bill 297 and rewrites it so that it is in proper form. What it does, number one, the Bill requires the state to pay the full cost after January 1, 1980, of a new state mandated program or any increase level of service of any existing mandate program. Number two, if the General Assembly fails to make necessary appropriation



to pay for the mandate, the local government or school district is relieved of the burden. Number three, the Department of Local Governmental Affairs is charged with estimating the cost of mandates to units of local government and the Office of Education is charged with the existing cost of mandates for school districts. The Comptroller is charged with the disbursement of funds appropriated to pay the mandates. This is done by the units of local government or school district filing claims of their individual cost within forty-five days of the effective date of the active...creating or extending mandates. In future years the Comptroller would make adjustments based on the preceeding year's...cost and current year's estimated cost. Number five, the Bill also required that when the state makes an optional program mandatory and provides sufficient funding, then the units of local government or school districts which has been providing the service is required to reduce its property tax by the amount it received from the state. It exempts the state from being required to fund the provisions of the federal mandate on local governments or school districts. It requires the state to fund mandates which required a provision of increased level of service in existing programs...

Keats: "Representative Von Boeckman, it sounds good, I think the Amendment makes the Bill better. Thank you. I just wanted to make sure we hadn't snuck in a public aid budget or something like that. Thank you."

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

Martin: "You're right, it is an excellent Bill. I might say, the Senate Amendment changed the date and also said that if a city or municipality or district was already involved in a program and that then the state mandated it; the cost that they were then receiving from the state would have to be directly given to property tax relief. Which is an even superb Amendment on a superb Bill. I urge your



passage."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House...the Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "A question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will yield."

Schuneman: "Thank you. I'm curious, Representative, as to whether the wording of the Senate Amendment...as to how that wording might affect the state mandated programs in workmen's compensation and unemployment compensation. This Legislature, on a regular basis addresses the benefit level in workmen's compensation...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. To respond to that question, the Lady from Winnebago, Mrs. Martin."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker...Mr. Speaker...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, I don't know, she's waving her hands back there. I don't know what she wants. Please continue. Sir. Mr. Schuneman, I'm sorry."

Schuneman: "Well; I'm curious to know if...for example, after 1980, this Legislature should enact legislation increasing the benefits under workmen's compensation or unemployment compensation. Would the effect of this law be that the State of Illinois would then have to pay those increased benefits enacted after January 1 of 1980?"

Von Boeckman: "No, if you will recall where I stated in explanation, that this is a federal program, therefore, the state would not be required to pay the cost."

Schuneman: "Well, workmen's compensation is...."

Von Boeckman: "We're not mandating the state to pay workmen's compensation cost or unemployment benefits to school districts or any local units of government."

Schuneman: "Well but..."

Von Boeckman: "In this Bill."

Schuneman: "Workmen's compensation is a benefit of employees which is mandated by state government. Not the federal government...there are federal law pertaining to it but..."



but we as the State Legislature, mandate the level of workmen's compensation benefits. My question is, would this Bill in its present form cause the State of Illinois to pay for those increased benefits for local units of government."

Von Boeckman: "According to I've been told, no."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to address the Bill. I think this is something, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we should have a definite answer on before we go ahead. We have consistently turned down requests of local units of government to pass local tax revenues for the purpose of paying for workmen's compensation and unemployment compensation insurance. And it seems to me that there is a possibility that this Bill may in fact, run contrary to what the wishes of the House have been in those two areas. I'm, frankly, not satisfied with the response I had from the Sponsor of this motion and I would urge my colleagues to look closely at this. Would you take it out of the record, Mr. Sponsor. Until we had a chance to take a closer look at this?"

Von Boeckman: "I agree."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman...."

Von Boeckman: "Take it out of the record."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Takes the Bill out of the record. House Bill 1470. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is a substantive portion of the pothole program. It is Amendment #1 to House Bill #1470. This Act is a new Act, it changes House Bill 1470 and actually makes the pothole program. This Act would make thirty million dollars immediately available under the existing motor fuel tax distribution formula. The money would be divided on the formula that has been existent all through these years. This is...no strings attached money, the basic purpose of it of course is to repair the roads due to the damage done in the last two winters,



which you know have been...well...very bad weather wise, and we still have these potholes and the thirty million would be borrowed from the General Revenue Fund and deposited in the Emergency Pothole Repair and Road Restoration Fund. Once deposited all the funds would be distributed so that the road work would be completed during the current construction season. To repay the thirty million loan from the General Revenue Fund, the...1/15 would be taken off the top of the monthly motor fuel tax collection and deposited in the Road Fund. It would be earmarked for the General Revenue Fund. So, the loan would be paid back within a year and this transfer monthly of two and a half million a month will continue until the thirty million loan is paid off. Therefore, at the end of the fiscal year, '79, the projected available balance would be the same as contemplated by the Governor. Now the Governor had a program similar to this so that there is no question that the major political parties and anyone cognizant with the weather conditions or the road conditions realize that these road conditions should be remedied. I ask for a favorable vote on this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk. I see your light, Mr. Schlickman, I'll get to you eventually. Mr. Tuerk, your light is on. Fred, your light is still on. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I raise a parliamentary question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, what?"

Schlickman: "I raise a parliamentary question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Epstein. What's your question?"

Schlickman: "Number one, Mr. Speaker, it has already been established to everybody's satisfaction, I believe, that the Speaker can rule on the germaneness of a Senate Amendment to a House Bill. That's number one. Number two....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "If it has not been ruled on in the Senate."



Schlickman: "Oh, that's not so. 1500 wasn't that way."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, it was."

Schlickman: "It came over here as a germane Amendment and the Speaker, a year ago ruled that it was not germane. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would question the germaneness of this Amendment. Not simply on the basis that the Bill as we passed it..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Bill is germane."

Schlickman: "Well, let me finish would you please. I've got some enlightenment for you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm listening for your words of wisdom."

Schlickman: "Thank you. I'm questioning the germaneness not only on the basis that this Bill as it was passed by this House, dealt with the maintenance of grade crossing and comes back dealing with the subject of potholes. But furthermore, when you look at the title of the Bill as it originally passed. It dealt with an Amendment to the motor fuel tax law. The title was completely deleted by this Amendment in the Senate and a new title creating a new Act. I respectfully suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, I've got you on all counts and you've got to rule, not germane, please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Amendment is germane. Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. All of us are familiar with the so-called Pothole Bill. I would like to remind the Members of the House, that the money for the pothole repair comes out of the Road Fund, as I understand. Which comes out of General Revenue which is then to be paid back from the Road Fund. And I think the Members of the House ought to know that this is a boon to local government and will ultimately will hurt... it will hurt the Road Fund. Now, I know how much the Members of this House, the downstaters particularly, are concerned about the condition of the State Road Fund. You ought to be aware that House Bill 1470 and its companion



Bill will hurt...will serve to further deteriorate the condition of State Road Fund. And I might also add, that this next fiscal year the thirty million dollar borrowing from the General Revenue Fund is far beyond the state budget and I would also like you to be reminded that we have added an extra thirty million dollars from the General Revenue Fund from the Education Bill that we just passed a couple of days ago. So, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to oppose House Bill 1470, for the reasons that I stated. It is a far too great of strain on the State General Revenue Fund in the first place, secondly it can cause deterioration of the States Road Fund and thirdly, it is another free ride and another free pass for units of local government. And don't forget that the largest local government unit in the state is the City of Chicago."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the Gentleman's motion to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to this Bill. And to argue against the argument offered by the distinguished Assistant Minority Leader. The truth of the matter is, is that this is a loan program by and between the General Revenue Fund and the Road Fund. The Governor's own estimates indicate that there will be close to a ninety million dollar balance in the General Revenue Fund at the end of the next fiscal year. And there will certainly be enough money in the Road Fund to accommodate this loan with the monthly pay back. I don't think that we should consider this Bill based upon the size of municipalities in this state. I submit that the size of a municipality is not relevant to a discussion on this Bill. This is a Bill which is designed to improve the roads of our state, wherever those roads may lead. If you wish to leave Springfield and travel south, north, east or west, this Bill is



going to help you and help your constituents and I recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I am amazed that the Sponsor of this legislation would accept this kind of Amendment. When this House voted for this Bill the first time, we were voting so that we could have installation, construction or reconstruction of grade crossings. Now as we all know, we've had some very serious problems with grade crossings here in the State of Illinois. Three teenaged sons in one family were killed at a grade crossing accident. I think that the House spoke very clearly in favor of correcting that terrible situation. We obviously want to do something about the very serious problem we have with grade crossing accidents here in the State of Illinois. Illinois, as a matter of fact stands out among the state as having a very severe problem. I repeat, I am absolutely amazed that this sort of irresponsible behavior would take place... where we are talking about potholes instead of grade crossings. We've had Illinois citizens die in grade crossing accidents, I don't think anybody ever died in a pothole."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am really concerned and amazed at the comments that the distinguished Majority Leader made a while ago and given the appearance that the Chicago Democrats are the front runners and the guys that are going to carry the battle for potholes. When he full well knows that there was a piece of legislation that was before his Committee which he used his clout to see that that piece of legislation was killed on those two different occasions which would have brought thirty-six million dollars back to the General Revenue Fund that



could have been transferred to the Road fund that would have paid for the potholes in the State of Illinois. So, I think that the distinguished Majority Leader is talking out of both sides of his mouth now on this issue."

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

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of the Gentleman's motion. The people in Illinois, really are not concerned where the money comes from to repair their roads. Whether it comes from the Road Fund or the General Revenue Fund. They are interested in getting the roads repaired, they are in the worst shape that I've ever seen them in and I'm sure they are in the worst shape you have ever seen them in. They want those roads repaired as quickly as they can. In regards to the statement the distinguished Lady made, from Chicago, regarding the potholes, I'm in sympathy with her problem with the...with her concern for railroad crossings but don't sell potholes short. Where on many occasions we've had cars in downstate Illinois going down the highway and at a rather substantial large hole in the pavement and I'm well aware of a young man and his passenger in a small jeep who got flipped over, just due to a pothole. So, it is a very, very severe problem and I certainly would think that the Members would give every consideration to the passage of this Amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "I move the previous question so that we may proceed with the verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1470? All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword to explain his vote."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I would just like to point out in response to something that was said



in the course of debate. On the day that House Bill 2790 passed this House there was a picture in the paper, here in the Springfield paper of an automobile that had hit a pothole a day before and flipped over and killing the young lady who was the driver. Right here in Springfield. So these are causing fatal accidents throughout the State of Illinois and we certainly need all the help that we can to get them fixed. And I can tell you that the article that was in the paper indicating some 75 or 85% of them had been corrected is surely not correct. All you've got to do is get out and drive around on the highways and you'll soon find out."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Gene Barnes, do you want to be recorded on this? Gene Barnes. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Garmisa, to explain his vote."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote, I'm amazed that the condition of our highways as they are today are being made a partisan issue at this time in the General Assembly. This is not a partisan issue, our roads are in bad shape. We are sorely in need of this Bill to help put some of the roads back in the condition that they have to be. I believe it was someone on the other side of the aisle that said, railroad crossings are important that potholes and the condition of our roads who do cause deaths but railroad crossings do. That is entirely erroneous. The conditions of our highways as they are today, are causing many a death in this state that could be avoided. If we had the proper maintenance to our highways at this time. Our Highway Fund is depleted, we need these funds, we need the conditions of our highway to be restored to a condition that would be just a minimal condition. I implore a green vote up there so that we can have and maintain some safe highways in this state."



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

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If this reaches 89 votes, I request a verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jim Houlihan."

Houlihan: "To explain my vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Proceed."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this issue probably more than any other transcends politics. I suppose I could join maybe, Representative Telcser and give the Body a political harangue. I could probably indicate that there are potholes on my street, are not filled because the ward committeeman is not responsive. I suppose I should make those charges, but this issue goes beyond that. I suppose I could say that the Department Streets and Sanitation is vacuum because it doesn't have professionals in it and that there are politicians running it and giving out favors only for their friends so that they will be voted. But, no. We can't say that because this issue is one of the major issues of the Session, where people problems are going to be solved. And any of you who are voting red ought to reconsider that. Representative Telcser, has on file probably Section 4, of speech 23 and Section 5, of speech 26. But I don't think we should listen to that political rhetoric. I think rather, we ought to refer to Section 5, of speech 34, which is a pro speech. And I think in that light we ought to approve this Bill. We ought not take out our personal feelings on ward committeemen or crass political machine candidates. We ought to be in favor of people programs that help candidates that help individual drivers, children are driving on our streets and they need your help. Children need your help on this Bill, they need it on the one coming up next that Representative Pierce has. It is part of an



important program an important package that this Legislature is considering. And I would urge your 'aye' vote."

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

Bluthardt: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't take the time to explain my vote but I know that you need the time to get your troops together. And we're going to delay this until you get them there. I would like to say this about the Bill, there is no more political phony issue than the pothole issue raised by the Democrats, and by their candidate for Governor. The proof of this is in the fact that the issue was raised in late winter, early spring long before the traditional time for repairing roads. The state didn't have an opportunity to get out there and repair those roads when you already raised the issue. And that will expose the issue for what it is, it is strictly a phony, political ploy. You don't repair roads in the late winter or early spring. You wait until the weather permits the repair. Otherwise, the patch...the hot patch will not adhere to the concrete. All you will have is a bunch of stones on the highway and make it even more dangerous that it would be. So that is the phoniaess of your issue and I would hope that the public will recognize it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Marion-Union, Clyde Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to say that these potholes are not Democrat potholes, they are not Republican potholes, they are people potholes. I'm amazed and I'm behooved at some of those red votes. I know that those red votes have potholes in their district. And those potholes have caused injury. They have caused people to go to the hospital. They have caused deaths...we actually need this money. The people need this money, the people in your district



need this money. We want to repair these potholes and let's get the votes up there so we can do it."

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

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I believe, Mr. Harris is right that it is not a Republican or Democratic potholes. But if he will check with the Illinois Department of Transportation, we have a fine staff of engineers there even though ninety-ninety and seven tenths are Democrats and they have been in there for a good many years. They will not allow us to fix any...or spend any motor fuel tax money until after, May 15, or after October 15th, until the frost gets out of the ground. So any monies or any funds that you are trying to appropriate before May 15, will only come out with the frost and you would have bigger and better potholes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker and Members, I rise to explain my 'aye' vote and to indicate that one of the other Members in explaining his vote alluded to his Democrat ward committeemen of which I am. I would like to point out to that Representative that the reason that the potholes are not fixed in front of his house, is because we have an incompetent alderman in the 43rd Ward...which he supported. I would like also to point our, Mr. Speaker, I would like also to point out that he supported that alderman but alderman failed to support him."

Speaker Lechowicz: "No. On a point of personal privilege, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Not personal privilege...if that's the beginning of a draft. I'm considering it very seriously, Representative."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Just about twenty minutes ago, you supported House Bill 2790...."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Thank you."

Geo-Karis: "To fix up....started with the Flat Branch Drainage District and giving thirty million dollars to potholes. Now these are not peoples potholes, these are political potholes and they are full of holes, that's right. They are so airy they can't even find some of them. But the point involved is, that you already poured some thirty million dollars for them and I think we better take note of the fact that the crossings, railroad crossings are bad. And there have been many many people uselessly killed. And if we're not going to look into that and just make more political potholes and give a darn about the people who cross railroad crossings, well that is fine and dandy. But don't pass these off as peoples potholes, they are not. The people are going to get sick and tired of peoples potholes and one of these days they are going to put those....the people in here who believe in peoples potholes in those holes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Schisler."

Schisler: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In explaining my vote, I don't think my colleagues realize the seriousness of the potholes in the State of Illinois. Specifically in the 48th District. We have the only district in the state without benefit of the four-lane highway. All of our roads are broken up and deplorable and we desperately need this money to repair those roads. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have one pothole that is four miles long. So, I would urge my colleagues to vote for this. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Beatty, asked for a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "E.M. Barnes, Deuster, Ewell, Hart, Kucharski, Meyer, no further."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted



On this question there are 88 'ayes', 79 'nos' and the motion fails. The Gentleman asks leave to have it postponed."



Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 3279, Mr. Pierce. Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duyne,...what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Van Duyne: "How do you...how do you put a concurrence on Postponed Consideration? Huh?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Just did it."

Van Duyne: "Don't you have to go back into...go back in for discussion?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "No. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce, on House Bill 3279."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, we're all familiar with House Bill 3279. It's a circuit breaker, the responsible real estate tax relief for homeowners and renters throughout the state and the middle income categories who's taxes are more than 3½ percent of their income. We have...we have two Senate Amendments adopted, Senate Amendments #2 and 3. I am now moving, and I will move, that...that we concur in Senate Amendment 2. What this does is reduce the cost impact of the program by limiting the reimbursements to 50 percent rather than 60 percent of the taxes over 3½ percent of income by reducing the maximum income eligibility from 30,000 to 25,000 per year by phasing in the increased benefits for senior citizens over 3 years and by making clear that a married person who resides in separate residences, that their grants shall be subject to the limitations applying to a single household and divided equally between the husband and the wife. That's Amendment...Senate Amendment #2 and I'm going to move at this time to concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3279 which this House already passed 112 votes to 40. This is a responsible circuit breaker real estate tax, homeowners and renters relief program for our low and middle income citizens throughout the state, the only substantial real estate tax relief Bill that has a chance of passage, apparently, at this time. I think all of you that voted for the Bill when it passed the House, 112 votes, with bipartisan support would now want to support and vote for me on the concurrence motion. The Illinois Public Action Council through their... through their constituent groups throughout the state worked hard on this Bill. I've worked hard on it. We've tried to cut the cost of it and make it reasonable. We now have the first year costs cut down to a figure of an additional 33,000,000 which can be available from the



funds that President Carter is going to release to the State of Illinois. And the additional funds each year can come from the normal, from five percent of the normal growth in the state's revenue without any additional taxes. And I wouldn't be supporting this Bill unless I was certain it could be paid for without any additional state taxes. We're talking about 33,000,000 the first year after the Senate Amendment. The Senate Amendments reduced the costs of the program. And, Mr. Speaker, I move concurrence in Senate Amendment 2 and then I will move concurrence in Senate Amendment 3."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The...on the question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten. Mr. Totten, please."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, as we're on the related subject of property tax relief, I move under the rules that we first go to Constitutional Amendment Second Reading for the purpose of hearing Amendment to the Constitutional Amendment #44."

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

Totten: "Mr. Speaker...may I finish?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Shut him off. Mr. Telcser."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hey, Eddie, get off that phone. Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker, why don't you finish up with Representative Totten, he wasn't quite concluded."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, I believe we're on House Bill 3279 and if he wants to address that issue afterwards, I'll recognize him for that."

Telcser: "Oh, you will? Oh, fine."

Speaker Lechowicz: "When we get...when we get around to it. House Bill... you want to speak on 3279?"

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, every Member of the House is indeed familiar with House Bill 3279. And let me caution the Members and remind them that voting to concur with Senate Amendments is final action and if the House does concur the Bill will then go down to the Governor. And don't be fooled by a Senate Amendment here or there which gives the illusion of making the Bill a better Bill. This Bill is not a tax relief Bill at all. What this Bill will simply do is let local government get out from under, send the Bill to the state and increase the state income tax. I think those people who support this



legislation ought to come up front and say what they're really doing. What they are doing is increasing the state income tax and that's what they are for if they support this particular Bill. It seems ludicrous also to think that an average taxpayer of families may get back somewhere between 17 dollars and 25 dollars thereabouts in this so-called tax relief program. Any thoughtful person knows that the bureaucratic agency which will have to be created to send this money back will cost the taxpayers far more than the amount of money which they are purported to be able to receive. Now, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this Bill could wind up costing the taxpayers of this State of Illinois up to 400,000,000 dollars. Now I can't imagine that anyone in their right mind could construe that kind of a Bill as being some sort of tax saving. Everyone knows that the way to save taxes is spend less money. There is not one word in this Bill that I'm aware of that causes less money to be spent. And so, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm asking everyone to look very carefully at this piece of legislation. I know that every Member of the House knows full well that this Bill simply shifts the burden from local real estate taxes to a...income tax. Let me also remind the Members of the House that this Bill does nothing to prevent local government from spending more and more money and from continuing to raise the local real estate taxes. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House...."

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

Totten: "That if this Bill becomes law there will be absolutely no savings whatsoever on anyone's real estate taxes. And in addition to that, the taxpayers of the state are going to be faced with a larger income tax bill. This Bill is plain and simple. It is a Bill which will cause the state income tax to go even higher and that, my friends, is what the proponents of this Bill are doing. And I suspect, perhaps, that is what they want to do."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Permission has been requested to have the tv cameras on. Hearing no objections....we'll give it to them for five minutes. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr...thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm a little bit confused by Representative Telcser's



convoluted reasoning on this issue. He speaks of an income tax increase. But what this Bill does is really provide an element of progressivity to the taxing system in Illinois. That...that is a concept, I'm sure, under normal circumstances if this were not a political issue-the good Representative would be supporting. This Bill is not everything everyone would want but no Bill that passes out of here is. It is an exciting concept...one, an exciting beginning, I think it is a good Bill that will mean tax relief in a reasonable way, in a responsible way to people in Illinois. And I would urge you to vote in the affirmative on this measure."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson."

Anderson: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, on two occasions I supported this Bill and I would like to support it again because I'm in favor of it. However, this has become a political football and I'm going to vote 'present' until Representative Totten gets a hearing on his Bill, up or down."

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

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the fact of the matter is that we, the Illinois General Assembly, have failed to adequately address the issue of property tax relief. Are you aware that yesterday Senate Bill 1783 was tabled? A Bill that could have, if certain Amendments were adopted, offered true tax relief to the citizens of the State of Illinois? Are you aware that that Bill will not be called during this Session? Are you aware that we, as Members of the General Assembly, have not offered the citizens of our state any kind of meaningful tax relief? And the program that we have before us right now accomplishes nothing. The results of this program will be a bureaucratic headache. Will create more state jobs that'll only funnel into more state expenditures and a resulting increase in our income tax. This will not be passed on to the average citizen, the taxpayers of our state. There is only one way we can accomplish that and that's through either a freeze on our level of assessment or our multiplier or a reduction in the extension of taxes as supported by Representative Yourell and others. We don't have that opportunity right now to address the meaningful tax relief. The only chance we have is to nonconcur in this Bill, send it to Conference Committee



and hope that they'll be some reasonable minds that can give the people of our state some immediate tax relief instead of a Bill like this where they're trying to promise people back home that they're going to get something when in effect they're not. It's only going to in actuality increase state spending. I urge you to nonconcur in this motion to give true relief to your people back home. You know they're asking for it. You know they're going to demand it. And I hope that you'll follow the wishes of your people back home and nonconcur in this very, very bad Bill and ineffective Bill for true property relief."

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

Kane: "Would the Sponsor yield to a couple of questions?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Kane: "Representative Pierce, there's been a considerable amount of discussion about the cost of this Bill ranging from a 127,000,000 dollars a year fully funded to about 400,000,000 dollars a year. Some of that controversy centers around how many households would participate. As I understand it, your estimate is quite a bit lower than the Bureau of the Budget's estimate. I'm wondering if you could just summarize very quickly how you arrive at your estimate and the how the Bureau arrived at...at its estimate so that we could have some feeling for why there's such a wide range."

Pierce: "I'm not prepared to rationalize the position of the Bureau of the Budget which is probably a political position but I can say how we arrived at our figures. With the Senate Amendments 1 and 2 which ...2 and 3 which we're moving to concur with now the cost has been reduced based on 60 percent participation the first year to 33,360,000 the first year, 61,900,000 the second year, 90,000,000 the third year and 114,900,000 when fully phased in. That's additional dollars. And we...and then finally with 100 percent participation if you wanted to assume that when its finally fully implemented, that would be 165,000,000 if 100 percent participation. Now the Bureau of the Budget did apparently count on 100 percent participation and also took the Chicago area, metropolitan area, income figures to determine the income of the people in the entire state. And the people in the state outside the metropolitan area are...have a lower income figure than those in the



metropolitan area. Now for year one, we show nonsenior rebates of 41,489,000 plus 115,000,000 in senior citizen rebates for a total of 157,000,000. Then we deduct 101,000,000 which the current program in the senior citizen rebates would produce to arrive at a total of 55,000,000. Then we take 60 percent participation and arrive at a figure of 33,000,000. I have these figures that I can turn over to you as prepared to the estimate of cost but ours is based on 60 percent participation the first year and the Bureau of the Budget is based on close to 100 percent participation."

Kane: "I guess what my question was, is that there seems to be a fair amount of argument as to what the base is on the number of households in the state. Do you have any figures on...on what the...I...I understand that you're projecting a 60 percent participation but in terms of number of households."

Pierce: "It's my understanding that it's something like 2,600,000 households in the state...."

Kane: "That's the number that you would participate or is that the total..."

Pierce: "Oh, no, we only...below 25,000...the only participants would be, of course, those with less than 25,000 income and those with less than ... whose taxes are more than 3½ percent of their income. Those renters and homeowners whose taxes are less than 3½ percent of their income wouldn't participate and those people whose income...household income was more than 25,000 would not participate."

Kane: "The...the other...one other question I would ask you. The 101,000,000 that you're reducing from the total claims for...to...to have a net effect, that 101,000,000, does that include just the circuit breaker programs for senior citizens or does it also include the special grant program?"

Pierce: "I believe it...I believe it includes the Governor's budgeted item for this year at our participation figure so it would be the 12....increasing from 10 to 12,000 the income and...and would include the additional grant. Now, of course, the Governor isn't...isn't asking for additional grants for those people between 10 and 12,000 income, you're aware of that. We do provide for that. Under the Governor's program there'd be no additional grants for those with income between 10 and 12,000."



Kane: "But how much of that 101,000,000 goes to the special grant program?"

Pierce: "I haven't got that broken down, I only have the 101,000,000 broken down as the amount if the current program will entail... for the coming year."

Kane: "But if that 101,000,000 includes special grant programs which I understand are about 30,000,000, that 30,000,000 should not be netted out should it since it's not part of the circuit breaker program."

Pierce: "Oh...oh...oh, I might have misled you. With the...with the grant program the total is 118,000,000 so we didn't net out the extra, we only netted out the basic circuit breaker amount."

Kane: "So the 101 is just the basic circuit breaker, does not include...."

Pierce: "Right, I was wrong in my answer to you originally."

Kane: "Okay, thank you very much."



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

Darrow: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Throughout the years that I've been campaigning, my constituents repeatedly tell me they're opposed to the property tax when it goes to pay for an airport authority which they never use, when it goes to pay for a zoo which most of them are too old to use, when it goes to a mental health clinic and things such as that. They're not opposed to paying real estate taxes for police protection, fire protection and services associated with the property. They have consistently told me that these other burdens should be borne by the income tax. Now we hear from the other side of the aisle, criticism that this will take the property tax off some individuals but shift it to the income tax. I feel that's fair, it's equitable, that's what my people back home want. The income tax hits those that can best afford it. It does not hit the senior citizen. It does not hit the young married couple who is just starting out with their first home and can't pay these high real estate taxes. I can't see why the other side of the aisle is opposed to this concept. Most of the people that they represent would be in favor of it. I think they are just being politically foolish about it. Thank you."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's.... reluctance that I rise in opposition and urge that the House vote to nonconcur. You cannot have reduction of taxes until you reduce spending and that means spending at the local level and at the state level. You cannot reduce the level of taxation unless the people in government are willing to cut the existing expenditures and stop the astronomical governmental spending. The areas that have experienced the most rapid growth of spending policies in spending tax dollars in the State of Illinois are local units of government. And, frankly, this legislation...it now pertains...still gives them carte blanche to continue on their wild spending policies and raising taxes at a local level and in turn expecting the state government to reimburse on a circuit breaker basis and therefore could cause a...increase in state taxes to make up for the folly of those in local government. I would suggest that Representative Daniels' position, that he has indicated that this should not be concurred in, that it go to a Conference Committee is the most logical type of approach that we can take if we are definitely interested in giving the citizens of Illinois some meaningful tax relief. And at the same time that means cutting and reducing governmental spending, whether it be at the state level or at the local level. And for these reasons, I would urge that this concurrence not be accepted and that it go to a Conference Committee. And the other alternative, of course, is to consider Representative Totten's Constitutional Amendment which would freeze property taxes in Illinois."

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

Kosinski: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've heard these arguments before. Time is fleeting. 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 Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Pierce, to close."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I don't object to that movement even though most



the speakers were in opposition. We're familiar with this concept. Either we're giving our highest priority to tax relief or we're not. I believe the voters of this state are telling us, 'take what funds you can, what funds we can spare and use that to relieve our real estate taxes on our homes because we're being forced out of our homes because our real estate taxes have gotten to the point where as widows - and they're a lot of 45 and 50-year old widows in this state who don't qualify for senior citizen relief - where as widows we're being forced out of our homes. We're laid off work, we're being forced out of our homes. When we're handicapped because of an accident, we're being forced out of the homes.' And even in normal day-to-day living because home inflation has gone up much, much faster than wage inflation and the home real estate taxes have gone up much more...much faster than income, people are being forced out of their homes. All this Bill says is the Legislature, the General Assembly, is giving a high priority to relieving the real estate tax burden on those citizens who have taxes of more than 3½ percent of their household income. The circuit breaker works. It worked it for senior citizens. In fact, the Governor advocated an increase in...a slight and moderate increase in the senior citizen program in his Budget Message. So he, apparently, thinks the circuit breaker system works. It doesn't cost too much to administer. It's an honest and good system because he urged an expansion in a...in a very modest nature, for senior citizens. It works in Michigan where they have this program. We can afford it from our normal growth in state revenues. It's the only comprehensive, responsible homeowner and tenants real estate tax relief plan here. Proposition 13 in California didn't do anything for renters, only for the landlords. This helps the tenants, 30 percent of their rent will be considered to be real estate tax. It passed the House with 112 votes. It was approved in our Revenue Committee. It was approved in the Senate Revenue Committee and passed the Senate. It's before us. It's endorsed by the Chicago Sun-Times in two editorials. Endorsed by the Southtown Economists and many other papers throughout the state by the Illinois Public Action Council and all their constituent groups. I urge, therefore, Mr. Speaker, without further delay, and I move that we concur with Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 3279."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 3279. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Edgar, to explain his vote. Timer is on."

Edgar: "Thank you, Mr...thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to oppose this concurrence motion. I supported House Bill 3279 when it originally passed the House and well before Comptroller Bakalis took it on his ...one of his package. Since he's been involved an Amendment was added in the Senate which I think all downstaters should be aware of which removes the exemption for farm property. And I know Representative Pierce is a friend of the farmers and maybe he lost control of this. But apparently Comptroller Bakalis is not concerned about the farmers and I think it'd be a mistake to concur with this Bill in the shape it's in, so I urge a 'no' vote."

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

Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and there's a couple of previous Amendments that I voted against this but I do think that the people in Madison, St. Clair County and the areas that I represent are very concerned about the high taxes. I think this, perhaps, there might be a good start, maybe we should see what the Governor thinks about this particular program by putting it on his desk. I also think that we need to approach and to take action on Representative Totten's pending proposal. I think that's one that will also have a lasting effect on keeping down taxes but there's many people...are concerned about rising real estate taxes. And I concur with Representative Pierce on his proposal."

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

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I submit to you that the cynics prostitute the political process when they signal various groups that are to be wooed and won and usually deceived. Why should we limit property tax relief? Why should we say that only that category are entitled to relief? Why do we direct things to senior citizens circuit breaker? Ethnic tax relief? Or poor people's tax relief? Why not have tax relief across the board for all the Americans fortunate enough to live in the State of Illinois? The fatal defect



of this type of shameless wooing of the electorate is the shrinkage. You send the money off to Springfield. You spend a lot of money for paper shufflers to divide it and send it back...a portion of it to the citizenry back home. How much better it would be if we had enlightened leadership at the top of government, namely, the Chief Executive who would say, 'Let's slice the total bill, the total take, 10 percent.' We had a situation here two years ago, three years ago, when General....when Governor Walker, a much....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, there's nothing wrong with your system. The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, to reply to my Republican colleague from Coles, this Bill still covers the farmhouse and the parcel on which it sits. And Representative Pierce has agreed to go on and look(sic) through a Subcommittee of the Revenue Committee at the issue of putting the farmland back in which I, too, support. It's still a good Bill without it. Comptroller Bakalis has not capitulated. The problem with this Bill is not in its factors but in its lack of Republican support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Morgan, Mr. Reilly, to explain his vote."

Reilly: "You need some time?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, your light was on, I'm sorry, do you...."

Reilly: "No. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I had turned off my light. I appreciate being called on. I realize that as I rise in the wreckage, if it even deigns should be called a strategy, the wreckage of the most bankrupt appropriation strategy ever pursued by any major party in any Session of this Legislature. That it's foolish to talk about a rational approach to the state budget...we'll be digressing that issue later. But I would point out to those people who did such a fine job - and I commended them yesterday in person and I commend them now - on the State School Aid Formula. You can't spend the same dollars twice! A lot of you got up yesterday and said that we could afford the school aid package because you had cut the budget. But in the first place, that's not true, you haven't cut the budget. But even if you have you can't spend the same money twice. The same people get up and make the same speech about how



undoubtedly we can find money somewhere for the same causes. The...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You're off, Sir, your....exceeded your time. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman, to explain his vote. Timer's on." Mr. Greiman, please."

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I've been listening, trying to sort out some of the discussions about ...and I hear words like, 'true tax relief' and the 'real way for tax relief, the real way, the true way to help our taxpayers' and I get the feeling then that someplace along the line it's really a matter of pride of authorship. I don't know that there's any true tax relief or untrue tax relief. I know that this Bill is here before us. I know that it affords some tax relief to some citizens of Illinois. And apparently it's a matter of pride. Pride of authorship. And to the Republican Party and to the Governor that opposes 3279, I tell them, 'pride goeth before the fall'."

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

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Pierce has before us, probably, a sincere proposal on his part. But let me tell you that all we're doing here is a reaction to what we've created by the proliferate spending of both local and state government. We wouldn't be addressing this situation if we had some limits on state and local government regarding their ability to tax. This proposal is no more than a license for local government to milk the state because it provides the device whereby local government can impose obligations on the State Treasury. This is the same kind of irresponsibility and manipulation that has gotten us into the mess in the first place. Let's not have that irresponsibility. Let's first address the proposition of limiting which has bipartisan support in this House which the Speaker has committed to have heard and I hope he has it heard today. And for those of you on that side of aisle or...."

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

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, someone has said that this doesn't treat farmland fair. Well, the Political Action Council and the downstate farm groups who have their taxpayer's federation



in the various states have...have indicated now that they are in support of this Bill and they feel that they can live with it and some of the other actions that are going to be taken. So there is no objection to this Bill as amended from the farmers downstate."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, the allegation has been made that this will solve the problem as it has solved the problem in Michigan. Anyone who believes that really ought to take a look at page 2 of the Chicago Tribune today. The title of the article by UPI and of Lansing, Michigan, is Michigan Tax Choice, Two Bitter Pills. Even though they've had this circuit breaker program for several years, there is an Amendment which is being proposed to the State Constitution and it calls for a 50 percent reduction in property tax assessment. Those of you who are voting for this Bill because you think it's going to shut your property taxpayers up have another think coming. The revolution has just begun and this is but a small wave which will be followed by a tidal wave that's going to roll back property taxes in Illinois. This doesn't do it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, to explain his vote."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, everyone of us here knows how to read the board. Everyone of us here could vote each other's switch. And everyone of us here knows why the votes aren't up on the board. Because the Republicans are following the blind leadership of their Governor, that's why. Everybody here knows that the Governor is afraid to give credit to Mike Bakalis for a tax relief now. Everybody knows that! Mike Bakalis is on the floor right now. And everybody is afraid that Mike Bakalis is going to get credit for this. You remember what happened on School Aid? You were against it at night but you know that the deal was made and then all of a sudden you took credit for it. You wanted a joint credit. Forget about the Governor! Vote for tax relief now! They can't wait two years to put it on the ballot they want it right..."

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

Porter: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for



the edification of the other side of the aisle, I'll tell you what the people want. They want their taxes cut, really cut. They want the budget balanced. They want no tax increases and no new taxes and they want a cap put on spending by government at all levels. What they don't want is for the taxes to be taken out of one pocket, put in the other. They don't want...is a Bill, a phony Bill, like this one amid a plethora of phony Bills coming from the other side of the aisle. I urge you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn. No? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Steczo. You want to explain your vote, Terry? Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Well, I hate to see this become a political issue because it's not. I want to explain to everybody that I'm voting 'yes' on this Bill 'cause I gave my word to Dan Pierce and because I think it's a good Bill. But I resent the implication that this is a Bakalis Bill or this is an issue in the gubernatorial race. I'm voting for it because I think it's a good Bill. I'm a Republican and I think it provides tax relief and what the people of the state are asking for is tax relief. But I don't want my 'yes' vote to be interpreted as an anti-Thompson or a pro-Bakalis or any other sort of vote. It's a vote on the issues and what I think's right in the best interest in the State of Illinois and anything to the contrary is wrong."

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

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think we have heard a lot of partisan statements on the subject. I would like to assure the Members of the House that this is not a partisan issue. That the real shakers and movers behind this issue are the citizens, the Illinois Public Action Council has been in the forefront of this. The Illinois Public Action Council is not a...a partisan organization. They have done a considerable amount of research on this package. The debate over the statistics, I think, is misplaced. I don't know where the Governor got his figures but I know that Representative Pierce's figures come from the Illinois Public Action Council which have their endorsement. I think we can trust them as a nonpartisan figure and I think that we can put a green vote on the board for...for



the citizens. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Winnebago, Mrs. Lynn Martin, to explain her vote. Timer's on."

Martin, L: "Some of us on this side of the aisle have voted for this Bill rather consistently in all of its forms because we did not believe it was a partisan issue. But when the other side does not play that ballgame and will not release another meaningful part of tax relief for this state, a limitation on spending, we realize we've been a bit naive and those votes will stay off until the Totten Bill comes out."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all...the Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino, to explain his vote."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's rather amazing to me that the term has been used in debate here for the last twenty minutes and everyone seems to be talking about tax relief but then again there's a lot of red votes on the board. And so I...I don't think there's any way to explain not having tax relief. That's what this is, that's what the people want. And I'd like to express to my Central Illinois colleague...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Do what? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. There will be. On this question there's 93 'ayes' and 61 'nays' and there's been a request for a verification by Representative Simms. And the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce, asks for a poll of the absentees. May I point out to the cameras that the camera light is off and..... Proceed with the verification and calling the absentees. I said it's off. ...The absentees, please."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bartulis. Boucek. Hart. Katz. Lucco. Miller. Mugalian. No further."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Proceed to verify the affirmative."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. E. M. Barnes. Beatty."

Speaker Lechowicz: "One moment, Jack. Kindly, would all unauthorized personnel remove themselves from the chamber? Would the Membership kindly be in your own respective seats? Please proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Birchler. Bluthardt. Bowman. Bradley. Brady. Brandt. Breslin. Rich Brummer. Don Brummet. Byers. Caldwell. Capparelli. Chapman. Christensen. Darrow. Corneal Davis. Dawson. DiPrima.



Domico. Doyle. John Dunn. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Garmisa.
 Geo-Karis. Getty. Giglio. Giorgi. Greiman. Hanahan. Harris.
 Holewinski. Dan Houlihan. J. M. Houlihan. Huff. Jacob. Jaffe.
 Johnson. Emil Jones. Kane. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kozubowski.
 Laurinn. Lechowicz. Leverenz. Levin. Luft. Madigan. Madison.
 Mann. Marovitz. Peggy Smith Martin. Matejek. Matijevich. Mautino.
 McClain. McGrew. McLendon. McPike. Mudd. Mulcahey. Murphy.
 Nardulli. O'Brien. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Richmond. Robinson.
 Schisler. Schneider. Sharp. Shumpert. Steczko. Stuffle. Taylor.
 Terzich. Tipsword. Van Duyne. Vitek. Von Boeckman. R. V. Walsh.
 Willer. Williams. Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Simms, any questions of the Affirmative Vote?"

Simms: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. What is the score that we start out with?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the count, Jack? No change, 93 'ayes'."

Simms: "Okay. Thank you. Representative Abramson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Abramson? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Abramson, is he in the chamber? He's not in his chair, remove him."

Simms: "E. M. Barnes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "E. M. Barnes. Mr. Barnes. How is the Gentleman recorded? He's right here."

Simms: "Representative Brady."

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

Simms: "Representative Dawson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Dawson's here."

Simms: "Representative Ewell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ewell is here."

Simms: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Speaker Lechowicz: "She's here."

Simms: "Representative Farley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Farley is in his chair."

Simms: "Representative Garmisa."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's in...he's in the chamber."

Simms: "Representative Greiman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who was that?"



Simms: "Greiman, the man who made the...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Greiman."

Simms: "Impassioned speech a little while ago."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Greiman. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Greiman in the chamber? Have...take him off
the Roll Call."

Simms: "Representative Hanahan."

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

Simms: "Representative J. M. Houlihan....I see Jim."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's here."

Simms: "Representative Marovitz."

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

Simms: "Representative Capparelli."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's here."

Simms: "Representative McGrew."

Speaker Lechowicz: "McGrew? Mr. McGrew. Put Mr. Greiman back on the
Roll Call. You see him, Tim?"

Simms: "Yeah, thanks, Ted."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. McGrew, how is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mr. McGrew in the chamber? Take him off the record."

Simms: "Mr. Mann."

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

Simms: "Representative Mudd."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mudd is in the chamber."

Simms: "Representative Van Duyne."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Van Duyne. Vince, I can't see, can you step aside?"

Mr. Van Duyne. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Where? How is the
Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take him off the record."

Simms: "Speaker Redmond. I'd like to see if he's here today."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yeah, he...was just here before."

Simms: "Well, I'd like to see him right now."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, do you want to step out here for a second?"

Simms: "Representative.....well, we'll wait for the Speaker. Why don't you take his name off then if he should happen to return today you could put it back on."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's all right, we can wait."

Simms: "Well, no, let's go on and have him removed...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Your first request was to wait for him."

Simms: "Well, we may...we may...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm honoring your first request."

Simms: "Be here until midnight because...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "And we're going to be right here with you, Mr. Simms."

Simms: "There he is. Okay."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, would you say hello to Mr. Simms?"

Simms: "Hi, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's verified."

Simms: "Representative Sharp."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Sharp. He's in his chair."

Simms: "Mrs. Willer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Annie, she's here."

Simms: "Have any more? Representative Emil Jones."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's right here. Any further questions?"

Simms: "Huh?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Bluthardt, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker, change me from 'aye' to 'no', please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly change Mr. Bluthardt from 'aye' to 'no'. On... kindly put Mr. McGrew back on the Roll Call. Let's go, Jack. You through, Mr. Simms?"

Simms: "We've got...no, we've got a couple more inquiries."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, let's go."

Simms: "Representative Robinson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Robinson. Where's he at? He's right over here."

Simms: "Representative Mulcahey. I see him."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mulcahey's here."

Simms: "Representative Giglio."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You already verified him."



Simms: "No, we...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well there he's sitting in his chair yet, too."

Simms: "Oh. Representative Beatty."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Beatty's in his chair too."

Simms: "R. V. Walsh."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's in his chair. Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was an original Sponsor of this Bill and I commit myself for this Bill..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the count, Jack?"

Geo-Karis: "And one of my co-runners on the other side made a political issue of this Bill which I resent. And I will vote for the Bill when it comes back from conference because it's meaningful, therefore, I change my vote to 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On this question there are 89 'ayes', 52 'noes' and the Bill, the House concurs with Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 3279. It's passed. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, what purpose...you seek recognition?"

Matijevich: "Put something else on the board first. Wrap it up. Mr. Speaker...."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side, I now move that we now reconsider the vote by which that Bill passed."

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

Houlihan, D: "I move that that motion lie on the table, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', all opposed.... Motion carries. House Bill 2946. Don't worry about it, Elmer. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise on a point of personal privilege. Anytime I've ever been here my vote on the board has been my own vote. I will never use another Member to give an excuse why I've got to vote a different way. I think that's the cheapest type of politics I've ever seen. You and everybody here has got control of your switch right here. My...my switch is right here. My switches are right here, green and red and present. Nobody else controls that switch but me and when somebody has to get on the floor of the House and blame me for their own shortcomings, I won't take it."



If you don't have the guts to vote the way you want, blame it on yourself don't ever blame it on me, Adeline."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis, on a point of privilege."

Geo-Karis: "A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have sat through this hearing and listened to two things come out. One, my co-runner made it a point to call it the Bakalis Package. I voted, I cosponsored the Bill when Dan Pierce had it before Bakalis ever came into the scene. Two, I happen to be the same ethnic origin as Mr. Bakalis. I've the comments made by both sides here. I want everyone to know, I am a Republican and I would have supported this Bill completely and Dan knows it. But when my co-runner thinks he can force me to my knees by the allegations he makes, he's got the wrong Greek to make it to."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take 2946 out of the record, the Gentleman is not in the chamber right now. House Bill 2818. You want to take a seventh inning stretch or not? House Bill 2818, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members. This Bill in its original form did simply deleted a reference to full fair cash value and inserted in lieu thereof; equalized assessed value. Since that is the terminology used in the community college funding mechanism and all the Senate Amendment did, that was added was find that in another place in the Community College Act. And add that in also, and I urge your concurrence with this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 2818. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Hey, Tommy. Hanahan. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 154 'ayes', no 'nays' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1, to



2818. Is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2707. Take it out of the record. House Bill 2969, Mr. McAuliffe. The Gentleman...Rog... 2979, Mr. Gaines. Mr. Gaines, do you want to call that concurrence? House Bill 2979. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines."

Gaines: "I want to concur #1, 2, 3, 4 and 6, and nonconcur on #5."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, according to the Calendar, there is no #1. It's #2, 3...."

Gaines: "#2, 3...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "#4, 5 and 6."

Gaines: "#4 and nonconcur on #5 and concur on #6."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You want to...."

Gaines: "This is the...it started out...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Wait a minute, Mr. Gaines. Is, Mr. Barnes in the hearing of my voice? I think...."

Gaines: "It started out...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Appropriations II."

Gaines: "This started out as a budget for the Department of Human Resources and then it was added on in the Senate. The Fair Employment Practices Bill. They cut seventeen thousand dollars out of the Human Resources Bill we sent over to the Senate and we'll concur with that. And then they took the FEPC Bill which was still in the House, in the Appropriations Committee and which it had been sponsored by Representative Catania, and they made an extra cut over and above what the House Committee had cut. And that's what we want to nonconcur in. And I wish Miss Catania was here to explain that to you, because it was her Bill originally. But the other matters we will concur in the Senate Amendment. But we'll nonconcur on #5, and concur on the other Amendments. Yes...it takes an extra sixty-four thousand out and above what the House Committee felt was just. Well, we want to nonconcur on that one. We want to make it like the House Committee



said it should be."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendments #2, 3, 4 and 6. And not concur on #5. On that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman. No, okay. On that question, the Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to say that we concur, the staff has given me the....."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Can't hear you, Sam, wait a minute."

McGrew: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I just rise to concur in the motion. The staff is basically in agreement."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten. Mr. Totten, please."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will."

Gaines: "Yes, I will."

Totten: "The Amendment that you're not concurring takes out sixty-four thousand dollars....."

Gaines: "Sixty-eight....sixty-eight thousand, six hundred and fifty."

Totten: "Are you...has the question been divided?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes."

Totten: "Okay. I have no further questions."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #2, 3, 4 and 6? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Marso. It takes 89 votes. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there 147 'ayes', 7 'nays', and 4 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2, 3, 4 and 6. Now the Gentleman moves that the House do not concur to Senate Amendment #5. On that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

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



Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will."

Totten: "Representative, you indicated that this was a cut...a Senate cut of sixty-four thousand dollars...."

Gaines: "Sixty-eight thousand."

Totten: "Sixty-eight thousand. What is the cut for?"

Gaines: "I will yield for Representative Catania, because it was originally her Bill and she is more familiar with it than I am on this part."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania."

Catania: "Mr. Totten, that a cut for five staff positions and it was in addition to a cut that was made by the majority over in the Senate of forty-one thousand, four hundred dollars."

Totten: "Are these new staff positions?"

Catania: "I don't think those are new staff positions...no. And there was a motion filed over here in the House by Representative Houlihan, with regard to those positions. He might want to speak on that, that was, James Houlihan."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does that answer your question, Don?"

Totten: "No."

Catania: "No, I pointed out to Representative Totten that Representative James Houlihan had a motion here in the House on those five staff positions for the FETC and perhaps Representative Houlihan would want to speak about those, because he did have an exchange of...correspondence with the FEPC on those and I think Representative Barnes is also involved."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, you are sort of muddying the water. What it is, is that these amounts were reduced in the House Appropriations Committee and was again further reduced in...were again reduced in the Senate. Addition to that problem in the House Appropriation Committee there was reductions which was a combination of General Revenue and Federal Funds.



Then the Senate went further to reduce the same item by general revenue. The same items by general revenue. This nonconcurrency is necessary to straighten those problems where...the problem area where the reductions were made plus the fact that they have these particular positions... have been reduced more than once in the same budget. For the same reason."

Totten: "Well, you still haven't said what the positions are. You've just said they have been cut further and what was their justification?"

Barnes: "Well, two of the positions...as I can remember and I'm remembering from the Committee were CETA positions that had formerly been on Federal Funds and had been transferred over to general revenue. We reduced those positions.... we reduced those positions in general revenue in the appropriations Committee and put them back over on Federal Fund. That's two of the five. The three additional positions was various positions that I believe were newly requested newly requested positions that was reduced in the House Appropriations Committee. Now to further compound the situation, it went back to....went over to the Senate, the Senate reduced the same amount for these positions all out of general revenue. Well, the positions aren't all in general revenue to start with. But apparently no one in the Senate either did not know that or the staff did not look into far enough to realize the error that had been made. The only way that you can correct an error at this point is nonconcur, go into Conference Committee and make those corrections."

Totten: "Thank you."

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

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer a substitute motion. That we do concur with Senate Amendment #5. And I would like to speak to that substitute motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please continue."



Schlickman: "I said, Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer a substitute motion that we do concur with Senate Amendment #5 and I would like to speak to the substitute motion."

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

Schlickman: "May I speak to my substitute motion?"

Houlihan: "You wait, Representative Schlickman. I'm moving that that lie upon the table."

Schlickman: "Well, I would like to speak to my motion first. By the tradition of the House, after he moves to table then I can close."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes."

Schlickman: "Okay."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Close."

Schlickman: "Do I close now?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "You can close right now."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Amendment #5...."

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

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I think it is fine that he close but I would like to know what he's closing. The motion is to table. If he is closing on the motion to table, he didn't make that motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That is correct and he's closed."

Schlickman: "But the tradition of the House...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question...."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall....Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "The tradition of the House is that, a person who has offered a motion that is being attempted to be tabled has the opportunity of closing. Yes, it is. Now, Mr. Speaker in speaking to my motion which, Mr. Houlihan...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I don't believe the Gentleman referring to the tradition of this House and I think he is out of order. I think Representative Madison made it very clear



that the Gentleman is out of order."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the motion be placed on the table? All in favor of Mr. Houlihan, vote 'aye', all against, vote for Mr. Schlickman, vote 'no'. 'Aye'. Jack...Williams. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh to explain his vote."

Walsh: "Well, just to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that you're being high-handed in listening to Representative Houlihan and Madison who obviously don't know what they are talking about. There can be no information on what is going on here unless you permit the person who makes a substitute motion, to speak on that motion. That is a long standing tradition in this House and you shut the maker of that motion off. You should not have done that and you should in fairness recognize him now for the purpose of explaining why he wanted to make that motion."

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

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, in explaining my vote. Ever since I've know Representative James Houlihan, he has made great noises about fairness and freedom and the opportunity of individual Members to explain their vote and to have their fair contribution to the deliberations of this House. Now, he's trying to gag Representative Schlickman so we are all in the posture of having to vote upon something that hasn't even been explained to us. And I think this is a shameful way for you to exit from the General Assembly, Jim."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 86 'ayes', 54 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion prevails. I am. Mr. Gaines, do you want to proceed with your original motion then. You moved to not to concur on Amendment #5, is that correct, Mr. Gaines? Put Mr. Gaines on please."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur. The staffs of the



House Committee on Appropriations II and the Governor's Office have all told me that they would like to have this nonconcurrred on. So therefore, I move to nonconcur.

Speaker Lechowicz: "On that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Amendment #5 which was adopted by the Senate and it is being presented to us for concurrence.....I said presented to us by the Senate, reduces the number of field examiners by five, to reflect the decrease in a case load backlog. They are not needed. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, look what FEP spend in the fiscal year about to close. One million, four hundred and forty-two thousand, eight hundred dollars. Even with this Amendment by the Senate we would be appropriating to FEP, the sum of one million, six hundred and ninety-five thousand, seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars. Even by this Amendment by its concurrence, we'll be giving to FEP approximately a quarter of a million dollars more than they were able to spend in the fiscal year about to end. I think it is a very responsible Amendment, I think it is one that is fiscally sound, I think it is all the money that FEP needs for its action both legitimate and illegitimate. And I respectfully suggest a vote against the motion to nonconcur."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. As the previous speaker knows full well, it is impossible to know right now exactly how much an agency is going to spend. So we cannot say today exactly how much the total expenditure will be. I suspect it will be very close to the amount that we are appropriating for fiscal year '79. As far as the backlog is concerned, and I think that we need to clear this up right now. We have passed Bills over to the Senate in an attempt to help deal with that



situation, however, technically the FEPC won that case that said that, it may not have a backlog of the cases still going through appeals. And the FEPC right now cannot clearly be said to have a backlog or not to have a backlog. So we would be severely handicapping this agency if we adopted this six-eight thousand dollar cut. We've accepted all the other cuts but we ask you not to concur in this one cut. Thank you."

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

Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I wonder if anybody told the distinguished Gentleman who's objected to this, that twelve hundred of those cases was sent back to EEOC. Sent back to the federal government because they didn't have investigators to handle them. There was a backlog of three thousand cases and I ask you, in the name of those who stood on this floor and said, women had all of their rights...women had everything they need. I tell you that they sent back over twelve hundred cases to the federal government. And this is exactly what I'm asking you...now do you want to deny them the right by cutting out sixty-eight thousand dollars. What's wrong in here. They haven't had every right. And I say, I join with my colleagues over there and say that we should not concur in this Amendment."

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

Madison: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman from Arlington Heights is.....beautiful articulation is only exceeded by the misrepresentations in the statements he made. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, it is true that the FEPC is receiving a quarter of a million dollar more than any.....excuse me, than it was able to spend last year. But what the speaker from Arlington Heights failed to tell you was that there was three hundred thousand dollar that the Governor vetoed



in that budget last, that we overrode the Governor's veto and that the good Governor proceed to impound those funds. Now it would be impossible, Mr...Representative from Arlington Heights, for that Commission to spend that the Governor has put in this pocket and said, you can't spend it. I suggest that we nonconcur with this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #5? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. It's nonconcurring. Nonconcurrance, up there. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "To explain his vote."

Houlihan: "I will...in explaining my vote, pass over Representative Deuster's comments and that of Representative Schlickman and try to address myself to the Sponsor of the Bill. Representative Catania, there has been some discussion about the backlog of cases and I've been informed by staff that the Chairman of the Commission indicates that there is no backlog in her understanding. Now, I think that has to be cleared up because I have a letter from the executive director which indicated that there is a backlog, that they has to be some effort to look into those cases to fine if they are in the same situation as the Supreme Court decision. And I had in fact, an Amendment to restore those funds based on that letter. And that was I think a charitable reading of that letter and I think all of the Members who want to restore these funds... want it to be made very clear that we want these people working on that backlog, bringing that up to snuff and pending a decision by the Supreme Court and pending a review by the Commission as to whether all those cases are similar situated."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there 114 'ayes', 30



'nays' and the House does not concur in Amendment #5.

On the Calendar...on Supplemental Calendar is House Bill 2632. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 2632 is the State Office Education Grant-in-Aid and Operations Bill. In the Senate, the Senate has amended this Bill and I'll go through the Senate Amendment so that each Member understands exactly what they are voting on and then I'll ask for a motion to concur to be granted. Senate Amendment #1 reduces the General Revenue Fund, Operations and Drivers Ed. Fund, operations for Illinois Office of Education. The amount was one hundred and fifty-nine thousand, eight hundred and sixty thousand dollars.... eight hundred and sixty dollars on general revenue and eighteen thousand, seven hundred and eighty-seven, Drivers Ed. Fund. Senate Amendment #2 provides that no more than 50% of the appropriation for personal services, equipment travel, printing, telecommunication, commodities and EDP shall be expended....obligated or contracted for...until January 1, 1979...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. For what purpose...."

Hanahan: "Senate Amendment #3...."

Speaker Lechoiwcz: "Excuse me, Tom. Excuse me, the Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite. What purpose do you seek recognition?"

Satterthwaite: "A point of information please. Has this Amendment been distributed?"

Speaker Lechoiwcz: "Yes, Ma'am. Wait a minute. It has not Ma'am."

Satterthwaite: "May we wait then until it has been distributed?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Surely. Take it out of the record. It on the Supplemental Calendar, Bill. Mr. Brummet, do you want to come up to the rostrum. For the purpose of an introduction, the Assistant Majority Whip, Don Brummet."

Brummer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Don Brummet is going to make



an introduction but I want to first ask....the Clerk to read a Resolution that this House adopted last week honoring our guest today. Will you read this, Mr. O'Brien, please."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1009, offered by Representative Ralph Dunn. Whereas, R. Paul Hibbs, associate professor of speech at Southern Illinois University, called the 'Greatest Speech Coach of All-Time' was honored June 20, 1978, by the National Forensic League as the charter inductee of that Honor Society's Hall of Fame; and whereas, it was a discipline and real love for the rigors of debate that made R. Paul Hibbs that revered laureate of high school speech years ago; and Whereas, in the 1930's his national debate teams were so thorough in research and dedication to detail in analysis of all sides of a national debate question that rebuttals were merely an exercise in futility and during 1930, 1931 and 1932 of those years when the intellects of DuQuoin's finest debaters and orators were unfolded in the classrooms of Rooster, Ohio; Jacksonville, Illinois; Oklahoma City, Oklahoma; and Los Angeles, California and the nation bowed in respect to the teams' great abilities, one of the names on those great teams was that of our beloved colleague in this House, the Honorable Don E. Brummet, Representative from Vandalia, Illinois. And whereas, the National Forensic League is an Honor Society dedicated to the advancement of speech in this country and has named R. Paul Hibbs to its newly founded Hall of Fame "for the top 10 coaches of all time": and whereas, his coaching ability was so great that he turned boys and girls into men and women, a lisp into a tool of expression, and pulled meanings out of words and put arguments into debates that made Darrow and Bryan's 'monkey trial' look like a second rate summer stock production; and whereas, Professor Hibbs's DuQuoin team competed in all the nationals



between 1933 and 1948 and qualified for the national tournament 13 consecutive years by winning the statewide and National Forensic League tournament, going on to win the national once, reach the semifinals two additional times and win many other places in quarter finals and octo-finals; therefore, be it Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the 80th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, that we congratulate R. Paul Hibbs upon his being named to the 50-year-old National Forensic League's Hall of Fame 'for the top 10 coaches of all time' and that a suitable copy of this preamble and Resolution be presented to Mr. Paul...R. Paul Hibbs, National Forensic League Hall of Famer. Adopted by the House of Representative on June 22, 1978."

Brummet: "Mr. Hibbs is represented in the General Assembly by Representative Dunn, Representative Birchler and Representative Richmond. We were fortunate to also have his Senator over here so, I asked him to stop by here for a minute...until the introduction was made. Senator Buzbee, from Carbondale. Fifty years ago this fall, Hibbs and I both came to the DuQuoin Township High School. He as an instructor and I as a student, Hibbs became the debate coach and the first three or four years there were only seven people that came out for debate. So it wasn't difficult to make the team because there was three on the negative and three on the affirmative and this gave us one alternate. I remember the question that we had, one of those years was, shall we adopt the five-day week. Another year was, shall we adopt unemployment insurance. That's been about fifty years ago and we're still debating that today in the General Assembly. I would like to tell you a little bit about this man's record. His debate team won the state championship every year that it was held from 1933 through 1948. There was about four years that was none held because of the war. He has



seven national winners during that period of time. Then Mr. Hibbs saw fit to accept a higher calling and he became Principal of the High School in DuQuoin, he is the author of speech texts and now is an associate professor of speech at SIU. He turned men and women...boys and girls into men and women. He taught them how to face the world. Many of them have gone on to success. I think one of his outstanding successes which some of you Democrats may remember was Gene Wyman who was an international attorney and back a few short years ago, Gene Wyman was written up in Newsweek Magazine as being one of the fat cats of the Democratic Party. His successes weren't limited to the Democratic Party because he also had a Fred Zeina who in the last election that Nixon run was his campaign manager in the northern part of the state. Gene Wyman, also endowed a scholarship at Northwestern Law University in Hibbs's name. On Tuesday of last week, Mr. Paul Hibbs was inducted into the National Forensic League Hall of Fame, in Chicago as the greatest speech coach of all times. It is my honor and privilege to present to you, my coach, my friend, and one of the greatest of Southern Illinois. Mr. R. P. Hibbs."

Hibbs: "Distinguished Members of the Illinois Legislature, this has to be a sufficient red letter...one of a kind day for me. It will look good in my memoirs and I need therefore to thank you not only for the interruption of your time but for what I think a salient and auspicious occasion. Thank you very much."

Brummet: "Mr. Hibbs, I would like to present you this Resolution from the House. And I would like to also introduce three people that we have up in the gallery. Mr. Lewis, started in teaching at the same time as, Mr. Hibbs, in DuQuoin. Stand up if you will. Charlie Brunch is an old friend of mine, he and I started into high school at the same time. And Mr. Lee, is a good friend of Mr. Hibbs and he's



here. Thank you very much."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers. What purpose do you seek recognition?"

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add to, Mr. Hibbs congratulations. The House might also be interested in knowing that Mr. Hibbs is also a successful author from McGraw Hills book company, he is author of a speech textbook that sold a hundred and twenty-five thousand copies, which is not a small thing to do. And I should think that Mr. Hibbs should be noted of his other accomplishments in other areas besides as well as in writing. Congratulations, Mr. Hibbs."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Thank you, for bring that to our attention. Messages from the Senate."

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

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concur with the House in passage of Bills of the following titles; to-wit. House Bills #3202, 2684, 2787, 3374, 2949, 2539, 3177, 5276, 3108, 2730, 3394, 3237, 3233 and 3287 together with Amendments passed by the Senate as amended. June 27, 1978, Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in adoption of their Amendments to Senate Bill 309. Action taken by the Senate June 28, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in passage of Bills with the following title; to-wit. House Bill 1436 passed by the Senate June 27, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with



the House in passage of Bills of the following titles; to-wit. House Bills 3019, 3161, 3168, passed by the Senate June 27, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On Supplemental Calendar, page 1, Supplemental 1, appears House Bill 1264. 1264, on that question the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that the House do noncur with Senate Amendment #1 and 2, to House Bill 1264."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House do not concur. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', all opposed. The House does not concur in Amendments #1 and 2, to House Bill 1264. Now, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Garmisa on a point of personal privilege."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've been a Member of this General Assembly for a good number of years. Never in that time that I've been here have I arisen on a point of personal privilege. This is the first time...that I have spoken on a point personal privilege. But somebody brought to me today an item in a little publication that is called 'The News' that circulated in Oaklawn, Chicago Ridge, Mount Greenwood, Blue Island, Ashland...Alsop, I'm sorry. Evergreen Park, Hometown, Burbank, Hickory Hills and Worth. Now, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that article in that newspaper impugned the integrity of House Transportation Committee. They quote, 'State Representative Herbert Huskey' as saying we had some votes taken by some absentee Members on a Bill in that Committee, and that there are also votes made on that same Bill...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Garmisa. Please continue."

Garmisa: "On that same Bill they claimed that their votes made by their replacements in that Committee. I have the Roll Call of that Bill in front of me, I have showed it to Representative Huskey. That is a deliberate misstatement



and I think I cannot go unchallenged. And I believe it calls for a retraction and an apology from the Representative from that side of the aisle."

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

Yourell: "Well, I'm delighted that the distinguished Chairman of the Transportation Committee has risen on this order of personal privilege. And I would like to suggest to the Members of this Body, that what he has cited as one single instance has been going on for some time, in not only this newspaper but other newspapers in the 8th Legislative District. I would also suggest to the gentleman that the owner and the publisher of this newspaper, is an officer and member of the Republican Organization in Worth Township, which is certainly not in the best ethical conduct of anyone engaged in dispensing the news. I would also suggest to you that the same gentleman is now an employee of the state, working for the Office of Business and Economic Development and anything that he might print in that newspaper, henceforth, would not be in the best ethical tradition of the media. But don't worry, Sparkie, there is only about three hundred editions of this newspaper circulated each week. And it is my understanding they can't even give it away."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten...on this issue. Oh. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huskey on this issue."

Huskey: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am not getting up to apologize on this particular issue. On this particular day, I stood and watched Committee Members replaced and stacked so an RTA Bill could be voted out of that Committee....or defeated.... that was an RTA Bill that passed the Senate, could be defeated in that Committee. And you, yourself Mr. Speaker was present that day when....put on that Committee, the first time I ever saw you, Mr. Speaker, sit on that Committee."



Speaker Lechowicz: "I've been there before, Mr. Huskey, unfortunately you were missing. And I did not vote on it, I was just there as an observer...Mr. Huskey. Okay. Oh, your point is well taken. Let's get back to some business. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. May I have leave to be....change my vote from 'present' to 'aye' on House Bill 2911. It will not change the outcome."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does the Gentleman have leave to be recorded as 'aye' on 2911? Are there any objections? Hearing none, the Gentleman will be so recorded. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On House Bill 1264, I rose because the Sponsor did not explain what the Amendments were that he was not concurring in. And I was not recognized for that purpose. Now that is normally....at least a point that a person can be recognized on and I think it is only fair that the Sponsor explain what he's not concurring on."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well....."

Totten: "I would like to know that and because I don't, I would move that having voted on the prevailing side...I move to reconsider the...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It is no longer in the Body. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Republican who spoke on Transportation Committee, I don't need to rise to defend Representatives Huskey's veracity. I would merely point out that the day in question, Representative Terzich replaced Representative Laurino. Representative Capparelli replaced Representative Barnes and Representative Pouncey replaced Representative Williams. Unfortunately, when the Majority Leader rose to announce excused absences for the Majority Party, none were excused because of illness. Now



there is a rule in the House rules, House Rule 12 (d), which provides appointments of Members to Committees shall be entered on the Journal. A Member may temporarily be replaced on a Committee due to illness. Since no one was ill, no one could be replaced. Now in addition to those three who were verbally replaced and for which we have yet to find a....anything signed by the Speaker if indeed if he really does sign anything. We found a piece of paper which indicated that Representative Terzich was also replacing Representative Giglio. Well, they've had about three or four different ways and that's rather typical for the way that RTA Reform Bills have been treated in this Legislature and we don't expect any difference until the General Assembly changes. I certain know, if the Gentlemen on the other side are objecting we must be coming very close to home in our criticism and I'm thankful to Representative Huskey for zinging the arrow close to the heart."

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 2946. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm going to move to concur with the Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2946. We amended this Bill in the House to extend the two-cent special education building rate beyond the eight-year limitation at the request of many school districts. The Bill originally and still contained Orphanage Act broadening so that schools with...that qualify for Orphanage Act can claim for students both attending schools within the district and students who, because of a handicap...attended school outside the district. What the Fair Amendment did was took two-cents levy and extended that to all special education usages not just building usages. It was an Amendment put on by Senator Brad Glass, that the Senator Sponsor of the Bill, Arthur Berman agreed to and I agree with it. I think it



is a good idea and they make it clear that this shall not count as part of the working cash fund of the school district. It helps the special education programs, it costs the state nothing...the State of Illinois nothing. It is an optional program and the local School Boards that has been in effect these many years that we're now extending for a few more years at least. So that the school districts can qualify to meet the mandate of providing an education for every handicapped child. And therefore, I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2946."

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

Leinenweber: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, would the Gentleman answer a question? Representative Pierce, I don't know if the Membership was paying attention, I was trying to and some how I didn't quite get all that you said. Could you briefly cover Senate Amendment #1 again. Particularly in regard to tax for special educational building program."

Pierce: "Yes. Senate Amendment #1, doesn't increase the tax, doesn't change the tax. All it says is the use that the money is for can in addition for special education building and building maintenance be used for other special education programs. But it makes it clear that it can't count towards the working cash fund...towards the operating tax fund of the district so as to trigger state reimbursement. It will not trigger any additional..."

Leinenweber: "All right. Further question, the tax that presently exists, wasn't this the tax that was passed some eight to ten years ago to enable school districts to levy a tax without a referendum for building programs but it was limited to eight years?"

Pierce: "You are absolutely right. That's the tax...."

Leinenweber: "And you're taking...you're changing the use and also taking off the time limit. Is that correct?"



Pierce: "Right. The House Bill which passed out of here, I can't remember you might have opposed it. The House Bill that passed out of here took off the eight-year limitation and the Senate by Senator Glass's Amendment extends the permitted uses to any proper special education use, but does limit it to special education."

Leinenweber: "All right. Mr. Speaker, if I might address myself to the Senate Amendment #1. It never seeks to amaze me that this Gentleman who is sponsoring this particular motion was the same Gentleman who moments ago was talking about tax relief on the local level for the real estate taxpayers. Now if you will remember, this tax was enacted about eight to ten years ago and was strictly limited for a period of time and for a specific purpose, to enable local school districts to comply with mandates concerning special education building construction. Now by taking off the time limit and changing the purposes we are enabling the school districts...rather than to keep faith with the taxpayers who were assured eight to ten year ago that this tax only lasts for eight years and only for a specific purpose. Now we're taking that off. This is nothing short of an imposition of a real estate tax without a referendum. Now this Gentleman moments ago talked about real estate tax relief, out of one side of his mouth he's asking for tax relief and out of the other side of his mouth he's asking to allow a local school district to raise their taxes of their taxpayers. It doesn't make sense, we shouldn't vote with him on this motion for concurrence."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider on the issue."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Representative Leinenweber was correct. This is the proposal that we had last year that we defeated. It does violate in my judgment the concept in the principle of the original



legislation which dealt basically with structure. Now what you're saying is that we must or we can allow districts to authorize local taxes for special ed. programs. This comes at a time of course when we're going to be considering all the legislation that will bring us into conformity with the Federal Government dealing in 94 142. And I think we don't need to violate the concept of the original legislation which we enacted many years ago and also at the same time lay this kind of cost to the local taxpayer on top of the additional burden that we're bear when we deal with the federal proposal and regulations. So I think special ed. is going to get fine service in Illinois, it always has and thanks in part of course to Representative Pierce. But I don't think we need to extend the taxing facilities of the local base to be of help in this program. I would move that we not support the mover on his motion for concurrence."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think some Members are misinterpreting what is happening in the real world. Some of our school districts have already collected the tax, they have built or used the funds for some building purposes. But they now find that they have some additional money left in this fund that they do not really need to spend for building purposes. The question is, do they have to keep that money in reserve until some future time when they may again need to build with it or can that money be freed out so that they may use it for their other special education needs. In one particular district in my Legislative District, we have a school district that was going out and almost manufacturing a cause for building a new special education building, because they had some funds sitting there. I don't think that is good use of the taxpayers' money. The taxes have been collected, they are sitting there but they are



restricted in their use. If we pass this legislation we will allow the people to use that money in the most effective means and I urge your support."

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

Stearney: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will."

Stearney: "Mr. Pierce, is Representative Satterthwaite correct when she says that some of these school districts have these funds laying idle and they wish to expend them for different purposes?"

Pierce: "I don't know of any. What I know a school district were mandated by this General Assembly to educate every handicapped child and then we failed to reimburse them. What we promised in the statutes to reimburse them for their special education needs. Now...we're allowing them to continue an existing tax, not a new tax. To continue an existing tax and use it for special education purposes. Not just building purposes."

Stearney: "Wait, my question is, is Representative Satterthwaite correct in what she said. That some of these school district have these funds available which they wish to use for other purposes."

Pierce: "I know of none, but she cited one district and she is very accurate in what she says and if she says there is a district....a school district in her district that is in this situation, I'm sure she is right. I know of none in my district...."

Stearney: "Well, Representative...."

Pierce: "I know of none anywhere in the state. You tell me that Representative Statterthwaite knew what she was talking about, sure. She mentioned one district and I'm sure she is correct."

Stearney: "Well, my only question is this. If some of these school districts have these excess funds, what is the purpose of your Amendment or the...the language in this



this Bill extending...or removing the time limitation for which they can collect this tax. That was my only inquiry."

Pierce: "It's for the 99% of the districts that need money to educate these children that haven't been reimbursed by the state and promised under the mandate legislation. And we're given the opportunity on a local option basis to extend their existing tax and use that...not only to build building they may no longer need but to hire...to hire people to teach special education children and to provide books and other material for the special education handicapped children. We put this mandate on them and we never properly funded it. Now we're saying, we're still not going to properly fund but we will allow them to continue an existing tax, if they wish...if they wish. They may continue the existing two-cent levy and then use it for special education purposes other than building."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "This is really amazing. We have here the savior of the taxpayer of an hour ago...now wanting to trample on the taxpayers' head. There is an alternative in the Champaign County District...school district, which of course would not occur to the tax eaters and their allies here. And that would be to refund the money. Abate a tax once in awhile...gee whiz. That's so unheard of course but by the time the election is over and some of us are back and some of us aren't. And some of the new people who are running have raised your conscience about property taxpayers. I suspect that a Bill like this wouldn't stand any chance whatsoever, in this House. True this does not raise taxes, what it does is prohibit a tax cut. So if you want to prohibit a tax cut, by all means vote 'yes'. That will probably increase the circuit breaker grant that your constituents will get in the future if the Governor signs the Sponsor's other Bill."



Which is definitely a cross purpose with this. Or maybe it is directly in sequence with this because the other Bill after all was proposed in order to encourage tax increases at the local level which could be paid for by tax increases at the state level."

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

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

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

All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed. The previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce to close."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I have great admiration for the knowledge that the Gentleman from McHenry. And very rarely does mislead the House, I'm sure that was unintentional. It was verbosity, but when he said this Bill prohibits a tax reduction, he...I'm sure he didn't mean to use that word. Any board....any board, any school Board that is extending this tax has a right under this Bill to un-extend the tax, to remove the tax, to abolish the tax and not extend the two cents. So when...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He admits to his mistake."

Pierce: "Okay. But other than that...other than that, I'm not ashamed of allowing the school districts to levy a mere two cents to carry on the mandate that we imposed upon them to educate handicapped children. Now, Representative Schneider is right 50% of the time, he was right a few minutes ago. This time he is wrong because we haven't properly...the state hasn't properly funded the special education transportation or special education building... or special education personnel..Personnel reimbursement. Personnel reimbursement that we are committed in the statutes to reimburse. We failed them...worse, we have lied to them, we have misled them. So now all we're saying to them, now that we have misled you and haven't properly reimbursed to you we'll allow you to continue a two-cent



tax...a mere two-cent tax if you need it. If you need it for special education purposes. And you don't have to use it for buildings you might not need but you can use it for special education services and teachers and books and materials that you do need. And therefore, I'm not at all ashamed to come before you and allow the school districts to continue this existing tax...if they wish, if they so desire for special education. I'm proud of this Bill, it is a good Bill. Senator Glass's Amendment broadened the scope to all special education uses, it was a good Amendment and I urge concurrence in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2946, which passed this House in a strong bipartisan vote a month ago."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2946? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. To explain his vote, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh. The timer is on."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This in no sense is a substitute tax or a continuation of a tax. It is in every sense a brand new tax. It is very cleverly done and for a new purpose they continue a levy that has been going on. It is without referendum, it is for a purpose altogether different from the purpose that it was originally intended for. Now, Mr. Speaker, I bow to no one in my interest in special education. I want to do everything I can, but everything I can includes including the taxpayer in the deliberations as to whether or not this is a proper expenditure. If this is to be levied, it's a new purpose there should be a referendum. This is really the old Dan Pierce, you know the mantle of tax relief on Dan Pierce, just didn't fit well and he has returned to his old self."

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

Schuneman: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to



inquire of the Chair if the T.V. lights were on during the Sponsor's closing debate? It was just a question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "They have been off, Sir."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider, since his name was mentioned in debate on a point of personal privilege."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Another 50%, that should be important to anybody since Mr. Pierce raised that...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Point of personal privilege."

Schneider: "And that is only a downstate tax, it is not levied in the city they just request that money...we tax. So for an extension of a tax for downstate and not for cities with school districts of over five hundred thousand population."

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

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I didn't mind the Gentleman speaking... breaking the rules and explaining his vote after he spoke in debate but this obviously this concurrence motion..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, that was my mistake. Your timer is on."

Pierce: "For some reason the electrician always has trouble with my button. Now, the concurrence motion is obviously not going to pass and so at this time, I would like to make a substitute motion to nonconcur and we'll send it back to the Senate and maybe they will recede from that Amendment you fellows don't like. Or maybe it will be in Conference Committee but I think failing the handicapped children of our state by not concurring."

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

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment that we're asked to consider now is the same Amendment that was contained and was the total



Glass Bill in the last Session of the General Assembly that passed out of this House with over 125 votes. Now every school district in central Illinois has written to me relative to this Bill, all of the school districts in my district want this opportunity to continue to extend this tax for its ultimate eight years. When it was originally introduced it was for capital improvements only. This only makes it...the school districts to use these monies for other purposes besides capital improvements. I think it is an excellent Bill, it should be passed and we should concur in this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 69 'ayes', 87 'nays' and the House does not concur. Now, the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce, now moves that the House do not concur in Senate Amendment #1."

Pierce: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and you can take a Oral Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 2946. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', all opposed. The House does not concur in Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 2946. 2969, Mr. McAuliffe...is he in the chamber? House Bill 2984, Mr. Bartulis. Bartulis. Mr. Bartulis, you want to put him on."

Bartulis: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is Senate Amendment #2, I move to concur with the Senate Amendment #2 on House Bill 2984."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What about #3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8?"

Bartulis: "I move to concur with all of them. I thought maybe you wanted to take them one at a time."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Why don't you explain them."

Bartulis: "All right. Senate Amendment #2, reduces the appropriation to Mines and Minerals by seventy-seven thousand, one hundred dollars for personal services and thirty-five thousand retirement, two thousand, six hundred in social security nineteen hundred. Abandon Mines and Minerals..."



reclamation council, thirty-seven five. Senate Amendment #3 breaks that lump sum appropriation of federal monies for Department of Agriculture, conservation and environmental protection agency, with their respective cost under the Federal Surface Mining Act of 1977. It makes no dollar change. Senate Amendment #4 adds appropriation of eighty-nine thousand, eight hundred and seventy-nine... eighty-nine million, I'm sorry, eight hundred and seventy-nine thousand for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Conservation. House Bill 2965, introduced level and adds a provision that not more 50% of appropriations in this Act for personal services and travel shall be expended in the first six months of fiscal year '79. Senate Amendment #5 restores ten thousand, eight hundred and eighty-seven of the reduction made in Senate Amendment #2 to the appropriation of the abandon mines, lands, reclamation council. Mines and Minerals appropriation total of three million, eight hundred and eighty-one thousand. Net decrease from introduced level of sixty-six thousand. And Senate Amendment #6 reduces appropriation to the Department of Conservation by the total of three million, five hundred and twenty-three thousand. Senate Amendment #7 adds two items to the conservation budget, adds seventy-one thousand from the game and fish fund to repair the damaged channel, a portion of the Mackinaw River. Funds will be received from a court settlement. Number two, adds six hundred and seventy-nine dollars from the land and water recreation fund to pay for the state share of installation of railroad crossing signals at the DesPlaines conservation area. And Senate Amendment #8 adds twelve thousand from General Revenue Fund to contractual services line item in the executive office. And I move to concur with each Amendment in Senate to House Bill 2984."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On the question, the Gentleman from Cook,



Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for two questions?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will."

Leverenz: "What is the now net amount and the figure on the original amount on the abandon mines reclamation council?"

Bartulis: "It was a hundred thousand and now it is seventy-three thousand. In round figures."

Leverenz: "And the three million dollar....Amendment, I think #6, Department of Conservation...."

Bartulis: "Well, that's the Department of Conservation Bill which they knocked out in the Senate and they put the Amendments on my Bill."

Leverenz: "I see, thank you."

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

Porter: "Will the Gentleman yield, please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates that he will."

Porter: "Junie, I'm sorry, I wasn't listening carefully enough. Could you tell me again what's the total amount of the appropriation in this Bill and what was the comparable figure for the previous fiscal year?"

Bartulis: "On which one?"

Porter: "The one where...."

Bartulis: "This is both Bills now, I mean, I'm handling conservation also."

Porter: "I don't care about the Amendment, I care about the total."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich. John, were you through? Mr. Porter."

Porter: "I haven't got the answer yet, I don't think."

Bartulis: "I don't have that right here with me, John. Just a minute."

Porter: "This is eighty-six million, is that right?"

Bartulis: "No, that's conservation."

Porter: "Well, that's out now."



Bartulis: "Right. It's in the Bill."

Porter: "I'm talking about the Bill, the whole Bill. How much money is the whole Bill as amended?"

Bartulis: "Well this is...what I was saying, this Amendment is a Conservation Bill amended into Mines and Minerals."

Porter: "Okay. What is the entire amount of the Bill with the Amendment in?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "On that question, Mr. Adams."

Adams: "Representative Porter, I think I can answer that for you. This is the original Department of Conservation Bill. The Appropriations I took out approximately...about three million, five hundred thousand out of the original request. This is the total appropriation that is amended into this Bill."

Porter: "Yes, I'm interested in comparing this year's appropriation with last year's."

Adams: "I have it right here. According to my information, we stayed under the...we stayed within the 5½% increase on total budget."

Porter: "On both these departments?"

Adams: "Yes."

Porter: "Okay. Thank you, that's what I'm interested in."

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

Matijevich: "Could you yield? I just make sure I heard the motion properly. Representative Bartulis, you are concurring on all Amendments? Is that true?"

Bartulis: "I'm concurring on all Senate Amendments."

Matijevich: "I'll support that, even though our Committee did make some further cuts on mine reclamation. I'll support that because we never know what happens in Conference. So, I'll support your motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House concurs in Senate Amendments #2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8, to House Bill 2984. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Marco. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted



who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 149 'ayes', 5 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur. Senate Amendments to House Bill 2984 is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2989. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur in the Senate Amendment on House Bill 2989. Senate Amendment #2 reduces the budget for the Pollution Control Board by twenty-five thousand dollars. The line items and amounts reduced are personal services, two thousand, contractual services, three thousand, court reporting cost twenty thousand. For the total agency budget will be six hundred and ninety-three thousand and I move to concur on that Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ma'am, do you want to continue with the other Amendments as well then we'll just have one Roll Call."

Barnes: "Yes, that is what I would like. Senate Amendment #3 has to do with the Environment Protection Agency budget which they added to this Bill. And there are also reductions in this budget. It adds the Hynes Amendment which requires that not more than 50% of the appropriation for personal services, travels and commodities shall be expended before January 1, 1979. I would move to concur in that Amendment. Senate Amendment #4 makes a net reduction in the EPA operations budget by a total of nine hundred and sixty-three thousand, eighty dollars. I would move to concur in that. Senate Amendment #5 adds 9.8 million from the anti-pollution bond fund for health hazard grants for ten projects. Senate Amendment #7 restores a hundred and twenty-four thousand, seven hundred dollars in general revenue to the Environmental Protection Agency for three divisions. Senate Amendment #8 adds two million, six hundred and seventy-three thousand, nine hundred dollars from the Anti-Pollution Bond Fund for the construction



of sewage treatment facilities in the communities of Wyoming and Abingdon. I would move to concur on all Senate Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On the question, the Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to have a question of the Representative would yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "She indicates that she will."

Harris: "Representative Barnes, are the monies included in the Bill for EPA for the operation of the Southern Illinois Lab, located in Marion, Illinois, serving twenty-seven Illinois Counties?"

Barnes: "Yes, Representative, they are. It is a hundred and seventy thousand dollars and they are included."

Harris: "Thank you very much."

Barnes: "You are welcome."

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

Porter: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I apologize for asking so many questions but when we originally started on the appropriation process, I had requested that the Members who present the Bills of the concurrences would compare this year's final figures with the previous year's final figures to the Members can know what kind of an increase there is in the budgets of the various agencies and departments. And so, I don't want to keep jumping up to ask the same question but if the Members could, in making their presentation cover that information I think it would be helpful to all of us. I would like to know what the increase is on a comparable basis between this year and the previous year."

Barnes: "Well, I had that information on my Bill but they just added this Bill to my Bill so, I would have to get those figures for you."

Porter: "All right."



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

Waddell: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, she will."

Waddell: "What were those three categories for the EPA, please and how much?"

Barnes: "The total categories, general revenue is nine thousand three hundred...nine million, three hundred and ninety thousand, five hundred and twenty. For federal, nine million, five hundred and sixty-five, five hundred and the anti-pollution is three hundred and thirty million, three hundred and fifteen thousand and a hundred and fifty-four."

Waddell: "With all due respect to you, I don't think they know what anti-pollution is and I'm going to have to vote against it."

Barnes: "With all due to Representative Deuster, I hope he doesn't mind, it is his Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Peoria, Mrs. Sumner."

Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "She indicates that she will."

Sumner: "Are you doing all the Amendments at once or are we doing them one at a time. And did I hear a Wyoming included?"

Barnes: "Well, I really wanted to accept them all at once."

Sumner: "And then do I understand, there is an appropriation for funds to a project in Wyoming?"

Barnes: "Yes."

Sumner: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Miss Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, I move to divide the question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That is permissible, is there any specific Amendment you have reference to, that you would like to have as a separate issue?"

Pullen: "I would like them all separate please."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #2 be adopted? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay' Marco, 'aye'. This requires 89 votes. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 130 'ayes', 5 'nays'....134 'ayes', 5 'nays', 4 recorded as 'present', the Amendment is adopted. Amendment #3, the Lady moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #3. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'nay'. We have to go separate...let's go. Amendment #3, Jack. Call for the question. Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #3 on 2989? She explained them all. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 113 'ayes', 9 'nays' and the Amendment is adopted. Amendment #4. I just want to point out that this slows down the process quite a bit and if you would like we can bring down...if there is a specific Amendment that you're opposed to, take that one out and vote on that one separately. The Lady want to explain briefly what Amendment #4, while we're waiting for the...."

Barnes: "Well, Senate Amendment #4 for the conservative votes. It is a net reduction." Nine hundred and sixty-three thousand, eighty dollars....Penny."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #4 be concurred in? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Wyvetter Younger, 'aye'. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 145 'ayes', 1 'nay' and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 2989. Amendment #5. Let's get a faster machine. Does the Lady want to explain Amendment #5?"

Barnes: "Amendment #5 adds 9.8 million from the Anti-Pollution Bond Fund for health hazard grants for ten projects."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question has been raised, ma'am, where are they at? Do you have any idea?"



Barnes: "The projects are...the projects sites are Brocton, Hamilton Company in the 54th District County, Fielden, Jersey County the 49th District, Loraine, Adams County, the 48th District, Newman, Douglas County the 52nd District. Nokomis, Montgomery County the 50th District. Orion, Franklin County the 59th District. Pittsburg, Williamson County, the 59th District. Pulaski, Pulaski County the 59th District. Rooma, Randolph County the 58th District. Ullin, Pulaski County the 59th District."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #5 be concurred in. On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten with a question."

Totten: "I have a question, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. On the appropriation which is 4, from the Anti-Pollution Bond Fund. How much of that fund is unissued at this point and where will this bring us in that fund?"

Barnes: "We would have to get you that answer."

Totten: "Well...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Amendment #5 be concurred in? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Marco. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 97 'ayes', 34 'nos' and the House does concur in Amendment #5. Amendment #6, Mrs. Barnes... pardon me."

Barnes: "Amendment #7, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Pardon me."

Barnes: "It is Amendment #7."

Speaker Lechowicz: "According to the Calendar, it is 4, 5, 6. What's 6?"

Barnes: "That was tabled, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay, thank you. Amendment #7."

Barnes: "Amendment #7 restores a hundred and twenty-four thousand, seven hundred in the general revenue to the Environmental Protection Agency for three divisions. This



amount is required to meet the minimum federal match in the air pollution, water pollution and public water supply programs."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Lady from Cook, Miss Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, there is an Amendment #6 in our books which says, adopted."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll call them upstairs. We're working on #7 now. Have you got any questions on #7? The question is, shall Amendment...should the House concur in Amendment #7? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Wyvetter Younge, 'aye'. Take the record. On this question there are 107 'ayes', 20 'nays', 4 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in Amendment #7 on House Bill 2989. And the answer as far as Amendment #6, it was reconsidered in the Senate and tabled and that is why it is not before us. Now Amendment #8, the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Barnes."

Barnes: "Amendment #8 adds two million six hundred and seventy-three thousand nine hundred dollars from the Anti-Pollution Bond Fund to the construction of sewage treatment facilities in the Communities of Wyoming and Abingdon."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Lady moves...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. My same question is, we're voting on something where we don't know the unissued amount of bond funds. We just did 9.8 million from the bond fund now we've got another 2.6 million from the Anti-Pollution Bond Fund and I don't think we should be voting for these unless we know status of the bond fund and specifically what the projects and requests were."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House do concur in Senate Amendment #8 to House Bill 2989? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who



wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 93 'ayes', 42 'no' and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #8 to House Bill 2989 and is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3023, Mr. Greiman. Take it out of the record. House Bill 3062, Mrs. Younge. The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge."

Younge: "I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the House do concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3, to House Bill 3062. House Bill 3062 is a Bill setting up and establishing a fund for an appropriation of amount of one hundred and fifty-six thousand dollars to the Department of Business and Economic Development for an energy park development study. The Amendment, Amendment #1 reduce the amount from a hundred and fifty-six thousand to seventy-eight thousand. Amendment #2 took out the three counties and made an industrial park in Illinois. And Amendment #3, changed the title of the appropriation to go from the Department of Business and Economic Development to the Institute of the Environmental Quality. And I move to adopt all....and to concur in all three Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Lady moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3, to House Bill 3062. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Hey, Larry. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 94 'ayes', 48 'nays', 5 recorded as 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3, to House Bill 3062 and is hereby declared passed."



Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 3077. The Lady from Peoria, Mrs. Summer."

Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur on Senate Amendments 2, 3, 4 and 5 to the...what was originally the Dangerous Drug, or the, yes, Dangerous Drug Commission Bill. Senate Amendment 2 reduces the operating budget. Senate Amendment 3 restores some grant money. Senate Amendment 4 adds the appropriation for the Liquor Commission control...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Ma'am. What point does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins, arise on?"

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I move to divide the question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ma'am, there's....a request for a division of the question, so we'll go on 'em individually on each Amendment. So would you kindly explain Amendment #2 please?"

Sumner: "Yes. Senate Amendment #2 makes a net reduction of 41,600 dollars. It reduces the general offices by forty-seven, six. ...Toxicology Division by eighty-three, three hundred. And increases Information Systems Division by fourteen thousand, three hundred. General Revenue is increased by three thousand, eight hundred and the Federal is decreased by forty-five thousand, four hundred. That's on the Dangerous Drugs."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion on that? Mr. Byers."

Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would rise in support of this cut of some 41,600 dollars and urge an 'aye' vote on Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'nay'. Marco, 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 134 'ayes', no 'nays' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3077. Senate Amendment #3. Have to wait for the machine to click this thing out, okay? The Lady from Peoria, Mrs. Summer, please proceed."

Sumner: "Thank you. Senate Amendment 3 restores a 100,000 dollars to the General Revenue Portion of Grants. It breaks out...purchases of services into six categories."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers."



Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to inform the House that this Amendment adds 100,000 dollars to the Dangerous Drug Commission and the House Appropriations Committee and the staff, we've worked in this in Committee. We took out 230,000, now they're going to put another 100,000 back in. Now what this money is going for, is going to place it where they purchase services to give personnel that work there raises that are not negotiated and in no way connected with the needs of this extra money. And I would recommend a 'no' on this and that we send this part to Conference Committee so they can take this 100,000 dollars back out. They don't need the money and there's a...place where the State of Illinois can save 100,000 dollars by voting 'no' on this Amendment and send this back to Conference Committee so that they can delete the 100,000 dollars from this Committee's budget."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The question is, shall Amendment #...the House concur in Amendment #3? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 100 'ayes', 52 'noes' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 3077. Senate Amendment #4. Sumner, please."

Sumner: "I'm...ah, got it. Thank you, I'll refer these to Representative Sandquist who'll take over on these. Thank you."

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

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill...Senate Bill 3077 (sic) is the ordinary and necessary expenses of the Liquor Control Commission. This was a separate Bill, was heard in Committee but was held up like the others and was added onto this. And all that Senate Amendment #4 does is to add that to the original budget. There is a #5 which comes later. I'd ask support of #4."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jim Houlihan."

Houlihan, J: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think the issue of the Liquor Control Commission Budget ought to be put in the Conference Committee. There has been extensive amount of work between the Appropriations II Committee. A Subcommittee was appointed by the



Chairman and there was also a great deal of work with the Liquor Control Commission. The Committee agreed to transfer a bulk of their investigative work to the Department of Law Enforcement. That...that agreement is embodied in another Amendment to the Senate Omnibus Bill which is on Second Reading. But to do that we must transfer 98,000 dollars from the Liquor Control Commission Budget and Amendments 4 and 5 would only end up transferring...or reducing 50,000 and put us in a position where we could not establish within the Department of Law Enforcement the investigative units. This unit would be similar to the racetrack unit which....is...is existing and found to work very successful. I might point out that the Sponsor of the Bill has been cooperative in working together in reaching this conclusion. And I think we...we have to implement the conclusion and the agreement puts us into a Conference Committee and then make the reduction and add the money onto the Senate Bill that's existing in the House. So I would ask for a 'no' vote on concurrence."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson. Anderson."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will....."

Anderson: "Yes, what is the reason for a 34.4 increase over last fiscal year's budget? We didn't get a chance to talk about this in Committee at all."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Well, first of all. With the Amendment #5, it is not the 34 percent increase. The real reason for this was the devastating work that was done by this House in reducing the Liquor Control Commission Budget over the last three or four years. And there just aren't agents to cover the state without this increase. Now, it is true, as Representative Houlihan said, we did try to work out in Committee to get part of this reduction to go....I mean, part of the agents to go to the Law Enforcement. But as you know we did already adopt the Law Enforcement's Budget. I'm not...I'm not objecting to that that part of it should go there. There was a disagreement as to the amount, the money amount, and that's why there's only 50,000-some taken off in Amendment #5 whereas Mr. Houlihan's Amendment would be some 90,000. But the reason for the Liquor Control Commission



to go up and...the...the Bureau of the Budget completely agrees, you've got to have men to cover this state. We're the...we're the lowest number of employees of any Liquor Control Commission in this whole area. We...you cannot do the work without...without the employees and that's the reason for it. And I think it's very vitally needed."

Anderson: "Well, thank you very much for...explanation. I'm sorry, you know, we didn't have a fair hearing in Appropriations Committee but this year Appropriations has just turned into a sham. We haven't heard a Bill yet here. Everything is amended into everything else and we don't know where we're going. I should point out that we... we did have the hearing there. The Chairman and the Executive Director, they also both appeared in the Senate, at the Senate Hearings and that's why...the reason for this reduction."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Sandquist: "Yes."

Kosinski: "In terms of the philosophy of having the Investigative Division of that Agency under the Department of Law Enforcement, are you in accord with that?"

Sandquist: "I am in accord that there are certain types of investigations that...such as the mirage which can be done by the Law Enforcement and that's why I was working towards that and I agree with that. But the basic everyday work of the Commission cannot be done by such type of...of law enforcement agents and they're needed for the other work."

Kosinski: "Well, further. Are you in agreement with Mr. Houlihan that possibly this should go into Conference so that we could separate the situation, make a determination as to what should occur?"

Sandquist: "My problem is that the Law Enforcement has already been approved and I'm afraid I'm going to lose this if...and not get the addition to the Law Enforcement if we don't pass this now."

Kosinski: "Wouldn't you presume, Sir, that other legislation is coming in front of this House from the Senate which will include certain other entities? Changes in law enforcement, so forth."



Sandquist: "I just don't want...want to lose this right now. I mean, I tried to work it out with the Committee, as you know, and I sat hour after hour waiting for the Committee to act but they did not act and I feel that we must pass this now. I will agree to the reduction in #5 and hopefully that it will be put back in the Law Enforcement in some way but I'm not sure that it will. And I think at this late stage I've got to work to try to pass this so the Liquor Control Commission can have a budget to operate out of."

Kosinski: "It would appear to me, Sir, that this Agency will be budgeted no matter what occurs, it just depends what degree. I think Mr. Houlihan has a valuable point in presuming that we can make a distinction and a separation with...in a Conference Committee on this matter."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we ought to vote to nonconcur. We ought to eliminate all...all appropriations for this what I consider one of the most inept agencies in state government. If they're to be financed they ought to be financed by the Illinois Retailers...Illinois Retail Dealers' Association whose interest they seem to protect more than that of the public. I think it's a bad agency, it ought to be eliminated."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think it's important that someone with a background on the industry stand up and support...Representative Sandquist's recommendation for a concurrence. The State of Illinois, the State of Illinois is the third largest producer of financial dollars in this particular field surpassed only by California and New York, yet, we have the smallest budget in the nation, I believe. There is no rhyme or reason in the position of taking money from this most important Commission and turn it over to Law Enforcement even though I do agree that the Law Enforcement Department does an excellent job. I think it's folly that the budget of this Commission should be cut in lieu of increasing it to have people within that industry that know something about it correcting their own problems and doing their own investigation. What you have here is two agencies answerable to two different people



on the same question. I think it's important that we do concur with this so that this most important industry will know who to go to and who...to get their problems solved from. I move that we concur with....agree with Representative Sandquist's position."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 3077. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. All voted who wished? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. What purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, arise?"

Houlihan, J: "Mr. Speaker, I...I think this issue is very important. Representative Kosinski has raised the problem. Now if we want to verify on this Roll Call or the next one on the 5th Amendment, this Bill ought to go to a Conference Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, we got locked in here. I want to change my vote from 'aye' to 'nay'."

Speaker Bradley: "Pierce wants to be...change his vote from 'aye' to 'no'. Sandquist, could we take another Roll there's been some changes. Do you have any objection? All right, we'll have another Roll Call on this then. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'nay'. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will..... Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 80 'ayes' and 44 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Now, Mr...Mr. Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Take a poll of the absentees."

Speaker Bradley: "I've already announced that...the motion failed.Your correct motion would be to move to nonconcur. Just a minute. Just a minute.If he...Gentleman wants a poll of the absentees, it was not timely but we'll give him a poll of the absentees. Mr. Sandquist, what purpose?"

Sandquist: "Now what's fair is fair. I agreed to dump the other Roll Call so we could have time. To do this short shift is just not fair at all. If you....got the votes, you....got the votes, but let's at least do it right."

Speaker Bradley: "Okay, call the...take...call the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. E. M. Barnes. Bartulis."



Speaker Bradley: "Aye. Bartulis, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Beatty. Birchler. Bradley. Caldwell. Capparelli. Conti. Corneal Davis. Dawson. Deuster. Domico. Ewell. Ewing. Friedland. Gaines."

Speaker Bradley: "Gaines wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Getty. Giglio. Greiman. Hart. Huff. Jaffe."

Speaker Bradley: "Jaffe wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Johnson. Emil Jones. Katz. Kelly."

Speaker Bradley: "Katz wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Kelly. Kornowicz."

Speaker Bradley: "Kelly. Kelly wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'.

Conti wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Geo-Karis wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Hudson, 'aye'. We have to take them rather slow so the Clerk can get 'em. Bluthardt wishes to go from 'no' to 'aye'. Tuerk, 'no' to 'aye'. Friedland wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Pullen wishes to change from 'no' to 'aye'. Vinson wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Mrs. Reed wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Miss...Miss Pullen, we already, did you want to...Mrs. Pullen, from 'no' to 'aye'?"

Pullen: "I did not ask for that, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, turn Mrs. Pullen on."

Pullen: "I'd like to be left as 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "You want to remain as 'no'?"

Pullen: "Yes."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, move her back to 'no'. The Gentleman... what purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor, arise?"

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be changed from 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record Mr. Taylor as voting 'aye'. Mr. Bennett.

Mr. Bennett goes from 'no' to 'aye'. Mr. Birchler wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. McGrew wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Walsh, R. Walsh from 'no' to 'aye'. Flinn from 'no' to 'aye'. Oral Jacobs from 'no' to 'aye'. Pouncey wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Huff 'aye'. Shumpert from 'no' to 'aye'. Doyle, 'no' to 'aye'. Giglio, 'aye'. This question there are 104 'ayes', 34 'noes'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, what purpose do you rise?"



Houlihan, J: "Mr. Speaker, for a verification."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman requests a verification. Mr. Ewing, 'aye'.
Ewing. Mr. Skinner, what purpose do you rise?"

Skinner: "Well, merely to observe that the Gentleman will never get
appointed to the Liquor Control Commission if he keeps asking for
verifications on the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Van Dwyne wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'.
All right, the Gentleman has requested verification. Did we...
did we...we haven't finished polling the absentees so let's conclude
...conclude that."

Clerk O'Brien: "Johnson."

Speaker Bradley: "I'm sorry, Mr. Schneider did request to be recorded
as voting 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Johnson. Emil Jones. Kornowicz. Madison. Marovitz.
Peggy Smith Martin. Mudd. Mugalian. O'Brien. Pechous. Porter.
Richmond. Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Terzich. Vinson. Willer.
Younge. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Persist in the verification, Mr. Houlihan?
Gentleman persists. Mr. Deavers wishes to be...what purpose does
the Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Deavers, arise?"

Deavers: "I...I wonder if I could be verified 'yes', now? I have a
meeting."

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he can. Okay. Call the Affirmative
Roll."

Clerk O'Brien: "Adams. Anderson. Antonovych. Jane Barnes. Bartulis.
Bennett. Bianco. Birchler. Bluthardt. Brady. Brandt. Breslin.
Rich Brummer. Don Brummet. Campbell. Catania. Christensen. Conti.
Cunningham. Daniels. Darrow. Jack Davis. Deavers. DiPrima. Doyle.
Ralph Dunn. Dyer. Ebbesen. Edgar. Epton. Ewing. Farley. Flinn.
Friedland. Friedrich. Gaines. Geo-Karis. Giglio. Giorgi.
Griesheimer. Harris. Hoffman. Dan Houlihan. Hoxsey. Hudson.
Huff. Huskey. Jacobs. Dave Jones. Katz. Kelly. Kempiners. Kent.
Klosak. Kucharski. Laurino. Leinenweber. Leverenz."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Clerk, Mr. Schlickman wants to go on as voting
'aye'." Mr. Abramson wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. We have



to ask Jimmy Houlihan, can Vinson verify? Yeah. Schlickman and Abramson."

Clerk O'Brien: "Leverenz. Luft. Macdonald. Mahar. Margalus. Lynn Martin. Matula. Mautino. McAuliffe. McBroom. McCourt. McGrew. McMaster. McPike. Meyer. Miller. Molloy. Mulcahey. Nardulli. Peters. Polk. Pouncey. Reed. Reilly. Rigney. Ryan. Sandquist. Schisler. Schlickman. Schuneman. Shumpert. Simms. Skinner. Stanley. Stearney. E. G. Steele. C. M. Stiehl. Sumner. Taylor. Telcser. Tuerk. Vitek. Waddell. R. V. Walsh. W. D. Walsh. Wikoff. Winchester. Wolf. Yourell."

Speaker Bradley: "Question of the Affirmative Roll."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, what do we start at?"

Speaker Bradley: "108 'ayes'. And Mr. O'Brien wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. 109."

Houlihan: "Epton."

Speaker Bradley: "In the center aisle. Schoeberlein wishes to be wishes to be"recorded as 'aye'."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I have no further questions."

Speaker Bradley: "Walsh 'aye'. And there are 111 'ayes'....110 'ayes', 34 'noes' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #4 to 3077. Amendment #5, Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that we concur in Senate Amendment #5 which is a reduction now from the budget we just put on. It...first of all, it cuts off 49,500 in personal services which were some of the agents...which would...which could be transferred to the Law Enforcement. It also cuts out 7500 in contractual services which covered a hearing room which other arrangements have been made for hearing. So that is not needed. And then the third reduction is for 2800 dollars in the equipment which would have been needed for the additional agents had they been on there. So I move that we concur in Senate Amendment #5."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman moves the House concur in Senate Amendment #5 to 3077. All in the...Gentleman's motion signify... Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jimmy Houlihan."



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

I would rise also to oppose this Amendment. I think the reduction goes in the right direction and I think it gives us some money to establish a professional investigating unit in the Division of Law Enforcement but I don't think it goes far enough. We had taken out in Committee 98,000 dollars and there was agreement by the Sponsor, by the Chairman of the Commission and by the Executive Director. And the Sponsor of this Bill said that the liquor agents had been cut drastically over the last three years and that's correct. And the reason they've been cut is because you're asking 14,000 a year people to be the major wage earner. We have had people apply to the Liquor Commission who originally were making 20,000 dollars. And they want to work for the Liquor Commission for 14,000 dollars and for one of two reasons, either because they want the field work and they're not going to do their job or because they want possibly to have their own operation and take possible dollars underneath the table. Those are the only reasonable explanations why someone would want to leave a 20,000 dollar a year job. There has been constant and...and very widespread problems with agents within the Liquor Commission. I think Representative Bluthardt was right when he talked about the way that Agency has been run and the problems in that Agency. And the Commissioners have not been able to enforce their cases and one of the reasons is because the investigations have not been done in a professional manner. I would urge the House to reject this Amendment, send it to Conference Committee and we can implement the original reduction. And let me point out that we have Amendments prepared to do what Representative Kosinski had indicated we were going to do. And the only explanation that those would not pass is that the Sponsor would break his word in support of that particular agreement."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? If not, the Gentleman moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendment #5 to 3077. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 121 'ayes', 23 'noes', 2 voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #5 to 3077.



Messages from the Senate."

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

Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with their Amendments to Bill of the following title. Senate Bill 393 and 395, action taken by the Senate, June 28, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Bradley: "House Bill 3124, Kempiners, on 3124."

Kempiners: "This I believe is the Barnes-Kempiners Bill. It is my understanding that what Senate Amendment #1 did, was reduce the appropriation by nine thousand dollars and this appropriation is for the State's Attorneys Appellate Service Commission. And I would move to concur in this Senate Amendment #1 which reduced the appropriation by nine thousand dollars."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3124. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'ayes', opposed by voting 'no'. The Lady from LaSalle, Breslin to explain her vote."

Breslin: "Mr. Speaker, I have a conflict of interest on this Bill and will be recorded as not voting. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "So recorded. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there 148 'ayes', no 'nays' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3124. 3157...Dan Houlihan on... Dan, are you handling 3157? Out of the record. House Bill 3220, the Gentleman from DeWitt."

Vinson: "Take it out of the record, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Out of the record. 3234, Mr. Mahar. Mr. Mahar, do you want 3234?"

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3234 is a supplemental appropriation for the Military and Naval Department to the amount of a hundred and forty-one thousand. When it arrived at the Senate, the Senate added the regular appropriation for the



Military Naval Department. It has five Amendments and I move to concur with all five Amendments. For Representative Porter and others, the appropriation for Military and Naval last year was, three million, nine hundred thousand and this year it is four million 095, or an increase of a hundred ninety-five thousand dollars. Amendment #1 makes some transfers in personal service with no dollar change. Amendment #2 to the Bill amends...is the appropriation for the ordinary expenses for the Illinois Naval Department and the total amount of four million, ninety-five thousand and one hundred dollars. Amendment #3 decreases eighty-four thousand, eight hundred dollars in personal services. Amendment #4 increases the contractual services for utilities...two hundred sixty-six thousand, five hundred. And Amendment #5 deletes a Section which just lists military position that are exempt from the Personal Code and paid for as regular members of the military organization. I urge a concurrence in Amendments #1 through 5."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to concur...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we on this side were under the impression that the Sponsor was going to hold this because we've raised a question that with these Amendments, what he is doing is adding fiscal '79 appropriation to a fiscal '78 transfer. And what it may well do is to invalidate this total appropriation. I think that the Sponsor could withdraw it from the record at this time so that we could resolve that question."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Mahar."

Mahar: "Yes, I respond by...on page 3, of Amendment #2, the Bureau of the Budget has put language in which they say will take care of this and in talking to the Bureau of the Budget, the Senate people and the Parliamentarian, they seem to think that this language is adequate to take



care of the problem of two different budget years. That's the reason why I've...."

Houlihan: "Bill, could you hold this until we can get the Parliamentarian out and see if we can straighten it out."

Mahar: "Yes, I'll hold it."

Speaker Bradley: "Take it out of the record. 3274, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3274 with the Senate Amendment #1 and #2, I would move to concur. Simply stated, Senate Amendment #1 would put a back door referendum in as a provision to the original Bill. And that the working cash fund could only be abolished once every ten years as it was in the original Bill. And Senate Amendment #2, would provide an immediate enactive date, that was put on in the Senate also and I would move to concur."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2....the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the motion. As a background, I would like to point out that I put an Amendment on this Bill in order to help out Triton College... Community College in my district and I've been told and advised that I shouldn't talk against this Bill because it might hurt me. Well, I'll tell you this, if we pass this Bill as it is it is going to hurt all the taxpayers in my district and all the other districts that have community colleges. Look at what we're doing. We're providing by this Bill that any community college that has a working cash fund, and I believe all of them do, can transfer that fund into their general fund or building fund and reestablish that fund later on. Now in the case of Triton College, they have roughly five million dollars that they would transfer into their general fund or building fund, if this were true, all throughout the State of Illinois...and let me point out too, that Triton College



has a authorization of up to roughly eleven million dollars that they could issue in working cash fund bonds, issue them have eleven million dollars...transfer it into general or building account and the taxpayer of that district is going to suffer as a result of that. If you were to multiply....say an average of four or five million dollars in the thirty-five district, community districts throughout Illinois. You would probably have a hundred seventy-five million dollars that the community colleges would receive without a referendum. That would be the taxpayer paying them because they want to come back now and re-issue those bonds, reestablish that account at a later date. So what we're talking about is more than, Danny Pierce's so called Tax Relief Bill...would give us some relief. Otherwise, we're talking about a hundred and seventy-five million dollars that could be made available to community colleges and why are the unions....the community college unions or the school....teachers union in favor of this? Because they see an opportunity to demand more pay increases because that money will be available to them. I think if you're talking about tax relief, you've got to and you must vote against this Bill. Vote against concurrence. I don't mind giving Triton College a opportunity to eliminate their working cash fund so long as they have that front door referendum. The referendum....rear door referendum that is provided by this Amendment would....doesn't even provide for a notice in the newspaper of the adoption any ordinance that would eliminate the working cash fund. It merely provides that the residents of that district could petition if they did so within fifteen days after the adoption of the ordinance for a referendum. I think it is wrong, I think that we ought to defeat it. We ought to take it with a front door referendum or defeat it all together. The whole philosophy is bad."



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

Leinenweber: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Those of us who strongly oppose this particular Bill, when it first came before us on Third Reading...made a technical error in trying to work out a decent compromise with the Sponsor of this Bill. At that time, I believe we did have the votes to kill the Bill, because everybody realized at that time that an assessment where property tax relief is the hallmark that we should not be permitting our local taxing bodies to increase their tax take without local voter approval. We had the Bill beaten and placed on Postponed Consideration and the Sponsor of this Bill worked with those of us who most strongly opposed this Bill and put what we thought was a very reasonable compromise and that was, to permit in those instances where a local taxing body does not need to issue tax anticipation warrants. On one occasion, to be able to transfer those funds which were not immediately needed into their building fund. But...because we knew that each and every taxing district... each junior college district in the state would probably sooner or later avail themselves of this one time big gigantic tax bite, we agreed to support the Bill, or at least not to oppose the Bill, if the Sponsor would not allow a working cash fund to be created without a front door referendum. In other words, after this tax money was eaten up by purposes other than what the tax was levied for...that they could not again create such a fund without going to the people. Because that would in fact be creating a tax increase without a referendum. So, the Sponsor readily agreed to put this Amendment on and it went over to the Senate where it very quietly came off. Now it seems to me, rather poor faith that the Sponsor would now...knowing that the Bill got out only because the agreement with those of us who opposed the Bill, to come now and urge that we concur with the undoing of what the



agreement established. Representative Bluthardt very clearly pointed out the errors in this Bill. That specifically had...and I can tell you one more, most of these districts have not levied their entire amount of their working cash fund because they haven't needed it. There is nothing in this Bill which prevents them from increasing their tax rate in order to bring their working cash funds up to the maximum level. And I can guarantee you they are all going to do that before they take this big giant tax bite. So, once again in the same day, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that the people on the other side of the aisle screamed for real estate tax relief, we find them once again...once again, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, trying to take the money out of the taxpayers' pocket and on the same day they are trying to give it back. That is hypocrisy, Mr. Speaker. I go along with Representative Bluthardt and ask that we defeat this motion for concurrence."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I agree absolutely with Representative Leinenweber and with Representative Bluthardt. This is an act of bad faith, this Bill has no business being before us, if it were not for the Bluthardt Amendment, it would not be here. And the Sponsor knows that. Representative Bluthardt, worked in good faith, worked with him, worked with the lobbyists for the college that Representative Leverenz, is interested in and arrived at a consensus. Now on the basis of that consensus, this Bill was passed. I did not agree with the consensus and I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that I could have beaten this Bill because it was called very late and Representative Bluthardt was not on the floor. Nor were there very many other people on the floor, but I did not attempt to beat it, Mr. Speaker. Because I thought in good faith they had worked together



and they had arrived at a consensus. Now what this Bill does, is this provides without referendum a 7½% increase in the junior college levy. That's the effect of it. Junior colleges may issue bonds up to three quarters of their annual levy for the purposes of establishing a working cash fund. This says they may abolish the working cash fund and then they may restate it instantly. So that the effect of it is, over a ten-year period it is a 7½% increase in the junior college levy without referendum. It is inexcusable, there has been bad faith shown. This House has been stepped on by the Senate... by their Amendment to our Bill and this should be soundly defeated, Mr. Speaker and sent back to a Conference Committee. And I don't care if it ever comes back from the Conference Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm amazed to say the least. When I saw this item on the Calendar, I just assumed naturally the Sponsor of this Bill would routinely move for non-concurrence. Because...and I'm shocked that there would be a motion to concur in this Amendment. Now you remember when this Bill came up on Third Reading in the House, it was beaten. It was beaten soundly and put on Postponed Consideration. And Representative Bluthardt and the Sponsor of this Bill sat down and worked out a compromise that all parties agreed to. And in good faith, we thought, moved this Bill on and passed it from the House and sent it over to the Senate. And now here it is back in its original form...amended in the Senate and this Gentleman who made the deal...who made the deal with Representative Bluthardt, now in apparent bad faith would ask you to concur in that Senate Amendment. I think that this is just dishonesty of the worst sort and I would hope that...forget the merits of the Bill, this kind of bad



faith should be punished and let's turn this thing down and beat it soundly."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Willer."

Willer: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield? Representative Leverenz, as you know this is important to me too. Are the Republicans telling the truth and giving us the straight facts on this? I received a phone call about this, giving an entirely different version from one of the trustees. Now, would you comment on the Republican charges about this, please."

Leverenz: "Well, I would be very happy to Representative. I've here been accused of bad taste...bad faith and by the prior eloquent speakers, I don't know exactly...it seems like the Eddy and Teddy show has fallen apart and it is a tag team of Bluthardt-Collins-Leinenweber and Walsh. However, I would like for you to judge the Bill as it is and I would like to know in return if the telephone call encouraged you to concur with the Senate Amendment."

Willer: "Well, I don't think that I'm being questioned right now. You have not answered my question. I was told that the Senate had....simply put on this back door referendum. Now I gather from the conversation from the Republican side, that when it left the House it had a front door referendum #1 which is...you know, I wasn't told this. Is this true?"

Leverenz: "Well, let me try to recap very briefly, that it is true that I conspired with Representative Leinenweber and Representative Bluthardt and we did put a front door referendum on there. And the Senate which I have little control over, if any. They chose to re-amend the Bill and put a back or side door referendum on it and it has the opportunity to be put to a referendum. The same prior speakers on the other side, when House Bill 2065 came up, did not make these charges and that had no referendum at all. However, you know, this is somewhere between what



the prior speakers endorsed before and what we let out of the House. I don't think that....it's perhaps the Senate that has bad taste or bad faith...as we sent it over there and what we concurred and passed out of the House."

Willer: "Well, I would only suggest then that it goes to a Conference Committee and try and iron it out."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "The Lady was too polite. The word is kill...kill this bad Bill that's slipping and sliding through the General Assembly. What in the devil is a side door referendum? That is what we have here, a side door referendum. Of course nobody is going to be able to find it because we've been looking for front door referendums and back door referendums previously. Side door, what is this hurricane cellar or tornado cellar. Let me read what it was when it left the House. We said, junior colleges you can establish a working cash fund but we're not going to have any of this slipping and sliding like the elementary and high school districts have had over the years. Where they have abolished their working cash fund, reestablish.... transfer the money, they transfer the money first then abolish it and then the next year they reestablish it. They do it every two or three years. We said that they could....if they ever wanted to abolish their working cash fund, what they had to do was never reestablish it for ten years. The Senate Amendment...what does it say, it deletes the provision that if a community college district elects to abolish its working cash fund, it shall not establish another working cash fund. Now if that isn't a breaking of faith with this House, I don't know what it is. This total misrepresentation. The Sponsor has another choice.....you give up yet? The Sponsor has another choice, he can move to nonconcur. And in that way show his good faith to his colleague, Representative Willer... not to mention the rest of us. Who probably didn't trust



him anyway."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz to close the debate."

Leverenz: "Well, I have been most impressed, Mr. Speaker, by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. And at this time would move to nonconcur and ask that a Conference Committee be appointed."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment to House Bill 3274. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no' and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Mr. Skinner, what purpose do you rise?"

Skinner: "I rise to take back all those nasty rotten things that everybody said about Ted."

Speaker Bradley: "House Bill 3296. Representative Campbell, the Gentleman from Vermilion."

Campbell: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when this Bill left the House the immunity clause were for any statements made in good faith. The Senate Amendment deletes several of the definitions and strikes language on page 1, lines 15 through 33, and page 2, lines 1 through 22. And they put in the willful and wanton misconduct clause which is in Section...such as the Medical Practice Act and the rest of the Acts that we have on the statutes. And I would move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3296."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House shall concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3296. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. I'm sorry, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin."

Levin: "A question for the Sponsor."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon."

Levin: "I have a question for the Sponsor."

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will yield."

Levin: "Is this, Representative Campbell, is the immunity Section



stronger or weaker than it was when it passed the House. I know, Representative Bowman had great concerns about this legislation and a number of Amendments."

Campbell: "It simply complies with what is in the statutes now."

Levin: "Can you repeat what the change was in the Senate?"

Campbell: "Puts in willful and wanton misconduct which some of you wanted before."

Levin: "In place of what?"

Campbell: "In place of statements made in good faith."

Levin: "Fine."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 127 'ayes', 9 'nays' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to 3296. House Bill 3327. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3327. I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, that's Senate Amendment #2 on the Calendar. My Digest is incorrect. House Bill 3327 passed the House without a dissenting vote the Bill as amended passed out of the Senate by a vote of 49 to 1. What the Amendment does is basically two things. It prohibits an insurance company from refusing to write insurance purely because the applicant has had a prior cancellation. In other words, they would have to look behind the cancellation and make a judgement based upon cause. Secondly, it requires that when an insured files an appeal with the Department of Insurance regarding the denial of insurance that that insured shall have access to the file...to his or her file in the hands of the insurance company. That is provided to facilitate their preparation of their appeal before the Department of Insurance. I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan."



Houlihan: "I have a question of the Sponsor, if he will yield."

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will yield."

Houlihan: "The Senate Amendment #2 indicates that the Amendment adds four Sections to the Act. But only two Sections are set forth in the Amendment. To my knowledge there were only two Sections added to the Act, those two Sections that I just referred to. There was an earlier Amendment that was withdrawn in the Senate...."

Houlihan: "The Amendment, Mike, reads as follows. By inserting Section 141.01, 143.10, 143.23(a), 143.26 and 155.23. But then it only describes 143.10 and 143.23(a)."

Holewinski: "143.1 was the Section that is the main part of the Bill, that is the portion that prohibits the...."

Houlihan: "I understand that one but it is the other two...."

Holewinski: "Apparently what the Senate did then, and I don't have that Amendment before me...."

Houlihan: "Why don't you take a look at it."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion?"

Houlihan: "Wait...wait."

Holewinski: "That would appear to be a technical error, I'm not sure what damage it does since it refers to nothing... you know, those Sections are not amended in the Act."

Houlihan: "All right, the point that I'm getting at is, that there are no other Sections other than those two Acts as far as substantive language that you're amending in or seeking to concur in on the Amendment."

Holewinski: "That is correct."

Houlihan: "All right. Thank you, I have no further questions."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the House to concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3327. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 150 'ayes', 1 'nay', 4 voting 'present' and the House does



concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3327. Backup here to 3234, Mr. Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 3234 is the appropriation... supplemental appropriation for the Military and Naval Department to which was added the ordinary appropriation for FY-79. And I think it is appropriate to ask for a ruling from the Chair in regard to the legality of placing a '79 appropriation on a '78 supplemental appropriation."

Speaker Bradley: "As soon as the Parliamentarian returns we will make that ruling. What reason does the Gentleman from Cook, Dan Houlihan arise?"

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I join with Representative Mahar in asking for a ruling from the Chair. But I would like to specify my inquiry and first of all, the inquiry refers to Senate Amendment #2, Section 6. The Amendment provides as follows; it states and I'm quoting, 'that Section 1, of this Act shall take effect June 30, 1978. And if this Act becomes law after that date, the provisions thereof, shall be retroactively applied and effective as of June 30, 1978.' My first inquiry, Mr. Speaker, is regarding the validity of that retroactive provision."

Speaker Bradley: "The Chair will rule that the intent is very clear that the supplemental '78 appropriation and the appropriation for '79, are to be included in this particular Bill. There is no Constitutional reason that the Chair is aware of to rule it out of order, on that basis. The effective date that, Mr. Houlihan called to our attention and the retroactive part of the Bill...the effective date clause. It does not have an effective date clause for the Bill but it does have an effective date clause for certain specific Sections of the Bill and that would certainly would raise a question. Nothing further...the Chair to rule on that particular order. On the retroactive effect of the Bill, if it is signed after, June 30th, by the



Governor then the Chair...that issue could be raised and it would be a matter for the courts to decide. Whether the Bill is conflict with the State Finance Act. Further let us say that....that issue cannot be raised right now but the last thing the Chair would like point out is, this Bill was drafted by the Bureau of the Budget and if they are...think this is the way to to it, then the Chair has no reason to rule otherwise. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "So that I understand the Chair's ruling correctly. Your reference to the State Finance Act is specifically Article 8, Section 2....excuse me. On the statutes, referring to Article 8, Section 2 of the Illinois Constitution. or are you?"

Speaker Bradley: "No."

Houlihan: "All right. Well then my further question is this... or my further inquiry of the Chair. Would the concurrence in these Senate Amendments to this Bill be violative of Article 8, Section 2, of the Illinois Constitution? Specifically the provision says that we shall have an annual appropriation and annual budget process for each department of government."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Houlihan, you make an interesting point. However, it is not clear in the Constitution and it has never been decided by the court on that particular point. So the Chair really cannot rule on that point and leave it to the court to decide that issue. When and if the point is raised it is a question really for us not to rule on, it a question for the courts to decide."

Houlihan: "All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My final point on the inquiry to the Chair, is as to the form of the Amendment for failure to be underlined. I take it the Parliamentarian is going to rule as they are in appropriate form."

Speaker Bradley: "It is a new appropriation that is not an Amend-



ment so....it's in the correct form."

Houlihan: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. Now, Mr. Mahar, have you moved to concur in those?"

Mahar: "I would move now to concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, to House Bill 3234 and I've explained them previously."

Speaker Bradley: "And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe."

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Jaffe: "Yes, I want to confine my questions actually to the Department of the Navy. How much are we appropriating for the Department of Navy at the present time?"

Mahar: "Nothing to my knowledge. Now the appropriation for this year for military and naval was in the hands of Representative Wolf, and he might be able to answer that question."

Jaffe: "Yes, I would for this reason. Let me say to you that Representative Wolf, I believe held a press conference in which he said, that there would be no money going to the Navy Department because we actually don't need them anymore. I guess they hadn't been called out for thirty or forty years and I was just wondering if we were restoring that money now."

Mahar: "I have nothing, I have the Amendment before me. I'm looking through it, I see nothing in the appropriation..."

Jaffe: "I think Jake, has the answer to it. I see him rising and maybe he can give me the answer to it."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr.....the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Wolf."

Wolf: "Representative Jaffe, the Senate did not attach that Bill to abolish the naval militia. they tied it up in Rules Committee and to the best of my knowledge it is still there."

Jaffe: "Okay, thank you very much."



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

Brummer: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Brummer: "I wonder if the Sponsor could indicate if there was any decrease in the item for the Illinois Armory Board?"

Mahar: "The only decrease that we have is for personal services of eighty-four thousand, eight hundred dollars. And this is basically a decrease in the lower echelon people amounts to...amount to approximately eleven employees."

Brummer: "It had been brought to the attention of the Legislative Audit Commission previously that the Illinois Armory Board is scheduled to go out of existence in 1981, that its function is to collect the rent to pay...to hold the payoff bonds and that the Illinois Armory Board currently has enough funds to payoff the bonds and has the right to prepay those bonds. Yet I think in that appropriation there were...if memory serves me correct, a hundred and eleven thousand dollars for the...one hundred and thirty-eight dollars for the Illinois Armory Board when they needed some twenty-seven thousand dollars to retire those bonds and go out of existence. I might point out that the Illinois Armory Board has monthly expenses of seventy-nine hundred dollars per month. When it has no worthwhile governmental function, it has the money to payoff the bonds. They are allowed to pay them early and I would suggest that we nonconcur on this in order to have the opportunity to go to conference and remove that unnecessary expenditure of something close to a hundred thousand dollars."

Mahar: "In answer to that, the Armory Board has to abolish itself. It is my understanding they can't find the deeds at the moment and they need money for legal fees. They do have the money to retire the bonds but they need money for legal fees and right now they are trying to find the deed so they can abolish themselves and they do want to



do that."

Brummer: "Well, I would suggest that they would find a way to abolish themselves much faster if we didn't give them the funds. As long as we allow them to continue to exist at the rate of fifty-nine hundred dollars a month, I think they are going to continue to exist and not put themselves out of existence. If they don't have the funds to continue to exist, I suggest that they would payoff the bonds and go out of existence and good government demands that that occur."

Mahar: "Well, if they don't have the money they can't abolish themselves. They don't have the money for the legal fees and they need to find the deed, they need to pay off the bonds. So I think that we're talking about here is something that we all want to accomplish but I don't see any useful purpose in putting this into a Conference Committee for that particular point."

Brummer: "We could give them the legal fees in the Conference Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question please?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Van Duyne: "Mr. Mahar, in our Subcommittee of Appropriations II, it was agreed generally there that they were some four hundred and some thousand dollars short and they were deliberately being under funded and if allowed to proceed that way they would have to come in again as they have yearly for a supplemental in the spring. I was going to an Amendment myself to add....so that they would have their total yearly funding. Have you taken care of that?"

Mahar: "Yes, Sir. That was taken care of in the Senate and I recall some discussion on the supplemental appropriation which dealt with funding the money they were short last winter. Now the Senate, in Senate Amendment #4, put in



two hundred and sixty-six thousand, five hundred dollars to take care of utilities for FY-79."

Van Dyne: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Mahar, moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor would answer a question? Wonder if the Sponsor would answer a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

O'Brien: "Can you tell me, Representative Mahar, if the Illinois Navy is still funded in this Bill and if they are, how much?"

Mahar: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear that."

O'Brien: "Can you tell me if the Illinois Navy is still funded in this Bill and if they are, how much?"

Mahar: "For the Naval Armory, are you talking about?"

O'Brien: "Yes."

Mahar: "Maintenance only of seventy-eight thousand dollars."

O'Brien: "What's their total budget?"

Mahar: "For utilities and janitors, seventy-eight thousand dollars for the naval armory in Chicago."

O'Brien: "What's the total budget for the Illinois Navy?"

Mahar: "Oh. That's it...that's all."

O'Brien: "Seventy-eight thousand dollars?"

Mahar: "Yes, there are no salaries paid."

O'Brien: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to speak to the Bill if I possibly can."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

O'Brien: "I think it is absolutely ridiculous for the Senate of this General Assembly to run this House. We voted a hundred and forty to one, to abolish the Illinois Navy and I think we ought to vote to nonconcur in this measure. And I think the Illinois Navy ought to be done away with right now...today in the Illinois General Assembly. And



I can't support this budget until that action is taken."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? Hearing none, the question is on the Gentleman's motion....Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Yeah, we have a choice. We can let the pipes in the Armory freeze and end up with a building that is not worth anything. Or we can supply the minimum maintenance for the Naval Armory. There is no money in here for the militia, it is just to maintain the building until somebody in Chicago thinks of a better way to use it than it is being used now. I think that's entirely reasonable. Now if you want to kick and fuss to your Senators for tying it up in the Rules Committee, I also think that is appropriate."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Mahar to close."

Mahar: "In answer to the Gentlemen from Chicago, the state still has responsibility for the maintenance of that Armory. Now if the Bill that Representative Wolf had to abolish the Navy, you would still have to appropriate that money this year. So I think it is needed and I agree with you that the Naval Militia should be abolished. In fact, I never did see too much reason for the Navy to begin with. And so, I agree with you on that particular point. I think the money is needed because it is....it does require the maintenance and I would urge that we concur."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, to House Bill 3234. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien. I think you spoke in debate, Sir. Well, you can't explain your vote if you spoke in debate. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Levin, to explain his vote."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, I thought that we gotten rid of the Navy already. We passed a great Bill that Representative Wolf had and here it comes back again asking for money. I urge



that we nonconcur, I think it is about time we got rid of the Navy once and for all."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Peters to explain his vote."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We're not talking about funding the Navy here or funding the Army. We have pieces of property which belongs to the state which must be maintained, which employ people, which employ carpenters, which employ painters and laborers who are not going to get paid and those buildings which are going to fall into further disrepair and disuse. We're not talking about funding the Navy or funding an Army here, we're talking about funding property which the state now owns, should get rid of but until such time to get rid of it, we can't just let it fall apart. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich to explain his vote."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I really don't particularly appreciate some of these comments about the Navy. This is the Naval Militia and if anything maybe we should abolish the Army and the Air Force and what have you. The Navy has contributed a tremendous protection to our country. And they shouldn't be discriminated against. And in addition, the Armory provides a playing field for a croatian soccer team. And we need it maintained, so let's just maintain these buildings if you want to see good soccer played in Illinois."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers to explain his vote."

Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we're maintaining a lot of empty buildings in the Department of Mental Health now and I don't see how we can afford to maintain more and I would think a 'no' vote would be proper on this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from



Cook, Mr. Wolf to explain his vote. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan to explain his vote. Jimmy Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there is some conversation about the Armory having to be maintained. The Armory that actually and I know this for a fact, my running mate, Representative O'Brien, runs there. That Armory is maintained by the Mayor's Commission and there is only one locker room that I'm told that is maintained by the department. One small little locker room and the rest of it is maintained by the Mayor's Commission. And I would... Representative O'Brien pointed that out and he might want to speak on that issue but I think it is very clear that this is a boondoggle."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record: On this question there are 95 'ayes', 56 'nays' and the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Verification on this."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. O'Brien requests a verification of the Roll. What purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Wolf arise?"

Wolf: "In that case, Mr. Speaker, may I still explain my vote?"

Speaker Bradley: "No, I don't think it is timely. Mr. Mahar requests a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Edgar."

Speaker Bradley: "Edgar, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ewell, Garmisa, Hart, Dan Houlihan, Huff, Emil Jones, Madigan, Madison, McGrew, McLendon, Pechous, Pouncey, Taylor, Tipword, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brady wishes to change his vote from 'no' to 'aye'. The Affirmative Roll. Mr. Beatty wishes to change his vote from to 'no' to 'aye'. On behalf of the Illinois River, Mr. Van Duyne wishes to change his vote from 'no' to 'aye'. The downstate portion of the Illinois River, Mr. Mudd changes his vote



'no' to 'aye'. Mr. O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker, I think it is a shame when we can move to abolish the Illinois Navy and then have it thrown back in our faces because the Senate kills it in Rules Committee. Since some of the Members have changed their vote, I will withdraw my request for a verification."

Speaker Bradley: "Thank you, Sir. On this question we have 100 'ayes', 56 'nays' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, to House Bill 3234. On Supplemental Calendar #1, appears House Bill 2529. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would move that we do concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2529. It simply takes the funds that were appropriated for this particular project out of the Road Fund and transfers it to the Transportation Series (a) Fund. And I would move for the adoption."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of..... he moves to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2529. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman on the Gentleman's motion."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Schlickman: "In other words, we're going from a pay as you go basis to a long term indebtedness, is that correct?"

Mulcahey: "Well, that's one way if you want to put it, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Gentleman's motion. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Stevenson, Mr. Rigney to explain his vote."

Rigney: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what Representative Mulcahey is asking for here is what is sometimes known as the Freeport Bypass. The City



of Freeport has waited many years, rather patiently to have a bypass constructed around a major city in northern Illinois. A community of about twenty-seven thousand people. Thus far we have not succeeded in getting that job done, now we do have some interest and some commitment from our current Secretary of Transportation and at least some commitment that something is going to be done within the next couple of years. What, Representative Mulcahey and what those of us from the 35th District are asking for, is basically the twenty-seven million dollars that is going to be needed to complete about...I think about ten miles of highway that will be surrounding the City of Freeport. And we ask for your 'yes' vote on this issue."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell to explain his vote."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, I'm going to rise in support of this Bill. I don't think that any community is too small to be neglected and simply because they aren't the largest community in the world does not mean that they don't have the need. I think you have to look at these things in terms of need, necessity and basic fairness and I'm going to vote 'aye' and ask that others, if they just considered it on the basis of its merit."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham to explain his vote."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It anguishes me to have to rise against this unconscionable raid on the public till. Everyone would like to have a twenty-nine million dollars expenditure in their area. But we have to recognize that the poll about the highway men referred to robbers instead of highway builders. In this particular instance, when this matter was before the Committee, I reported to you before that both the Sponsor and the Mayor were invited to tell whether they would



support the tax increase that was obviously and patently required for the expenditure. And neither of them showed any inclination whatever. It is a meaningless gesture in futility to ever speak about building roads without me willing to say, here am I, I will support the necessary tax increase that is involved. Every Member of the House needs to recognize that so we can have a meaningful road program in Illinois. Let's quit appropriating money that we don't have to build roads that we wish to have but haven't the nerve to support by the increase of taxes required. You should be voting 'no' if you intend to be fiscally responsible. in this and all the Bills that appear."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there 99 'ayes', 64 'nays' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1....the Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms, requests a verification of the Roll. Mulcahey would like to Poll the absentees. Poll the Absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Friedrich, Gaines, Hart, Hoffman, Kucharski, McAuliffe, Pechous, Peters, Schuneman....no further."

Speaker Bradley: "Call the Affirmative Roll. McAuliffe, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Adams, E.M. Barnes, Beatty, Birchler, Bowman, Bradley, Brady, Brandt, Breslin, Rich Brummer, Don Brummet, Byers, Caldwell, Capparelli, Chapman, Christensen, Darrow, Corneal Davis, Jack Davis, Dawson, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, John Dunn, Ewell...."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "May I be verified as 'aye'?"

Speaker Bradley: "Can the Gentleman be verified? Indicates that he can. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Farley, Flinn, Friedland, Garmisa, Getty, Giglio, Giorgi, Greiman, Hanahan, Harris, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, J.M. Houlihan, Huff, Jacobs, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Kane, Katz, Kelly, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Kozubowski,



Laurino, Lechowicz, Leverenz, Levin, Lucco, Luft, Madigan, Madison, Mann, Margalus, Marovitz, Peggy Smith Martin, Matejek, Matijevich, Mautino, McClain, McGrew, McLendon, McPike, Mudd, Mugalian, Mulcahey, Murphy, Nardulli, O'Brien, Pierce, Pouncey, Pullen, Richmond, Rigney, Robinson, Satterthwaite, Schisler, Schneider, Sharp, Shumpert, Steczo, Stuffle, Taylor, Terzich, Tipsword, Totten, Van Duyne, Vitek, Von Boeckman, R.V. Walsh, Willer, Williams, Younge, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Question....questions of the Affirmative, Mr. Simms. Mr. Schlickman, for what purpose do you arise?"

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, at the request of the Minority Leader, I would like to introduce to the House a man who is acknowledged as the finest State Attorney General in the United State, William J. Scott. And the A.G. would like to say something."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed, Sir."

Attorney General Scott: "I just wanted to say, thank you very much for the Resolution that you....a very dear friend gave me and it means a great deal to me, particularly at this time in my political life. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Simms."

Simms: "What's the score to start off with?"

Speaker Bradley: "99."

Simms: "All right. Representative Beatty."

Speaker Bradley: "Beatty."

Simms: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Bradley: "He's not in his seat. Is the Gentleman in the chambers? How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the record."

Simms: "Representative Brummer."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Brummer. He's not in his seat...."

Simms: "Representative Capparelli."



Speaker Bradley: "Just a minute, let's see....how did Representative Brummer...how is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Simms: "Representative Darrow."

Speaker Bradley: "Darrow is in his seat."

Simms: "Representative Capparelli."

Speaker Bradley: "Capparelli, is right here by the well."

Simms: "Representative Jack Davis."

Speaker Bradley: "J. Davis is standing next to his seat."

Simms: "Representative John Dunn."

Speaker Bradley: "John Dunn...he was here a minute ago. He is not in his seat....how is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Simms: "Representative Kane."

Speaker Bradley: Kane...all right, Mr. Brummer and Mr. Dunn have returned. Put them back on the Roll. Mr. Kane is not in his seat, how is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll and Mr. Kosinski, would like to be verified now, if he could please."

Simms: "All right."

Speaker Bradley: "Okay, Mr. Kosinski. Further questions?"

Simms: "Yes, Representative Kornowicz."

Speaker Bradley: "Kornowicz....how is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the call...Roll. Mr. Kane... Mr. Kane has returned...Mr. Beatty has returned. So put them back on the Roll. Okay, Representative who?"

Simms: "Representative Pullen."

Speaker Bradley: "Pullen."

Simms: "Penny Pullen."

Speaker Bradley: "She is not in her seat. How is she recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'aye'."



Speaker Bradley: "Take her off the Roll."

Simms: "Representative Margalus."

Speaker Bradley: "Margalus...he's not in his seat. Is he in the chambers? How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Simm: "Representative Madison."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Madison is not in his seat. How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Simms: "Representative Byers."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Byers is in the center aisle."

Simms: "Okay, thank you. Representative O'Brien."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative O'Brien is in the side aisle."

Simms: "Representative Schneider."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Schneider, is not in his seat. How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Simms: "Representative Stuffle."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Stuffle is standing right by the well here. Mr. Schneider has returned, put him back on the Roll."

Simms: "Representative Taylor."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Taylor is in the side of the side door."

Simms: "Representative R.V. Walsh."

Speaker Bradley: "R. Walsh. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Take R. Walsh off the Roll."

Simms: "Representative Emil Jones."

Speaker Bradley: "Emil Jones. I think that's him in his seat."

Simms: "I'm sorry, Representative Byers was standing in front of him. Yes, Representative Vitek, is there."



Speaker Bradley: "Vitek is in his seat."

Simms: "Representative....."

Speaker Bradley: "R.V. Walsh has returned. Put him back on the Roll."

Simms: "I don't have any further questions."

Speaker Bradley: "No further questions? On this question there are 99 'ayes'...95 'ayes', 64 'nays'...65 'nays' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to 2529. On the Calendar under concurrence appears House Bill 2707, Mr. Terzich will handle.....what does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brady, arise?"

Brady: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side, I wish to reconsider the vote by which this Bill passed."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to reconsider the motion on concurrence #1 to....House Bill 2529. On that question the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan...Dan."

Houlihan: "I move the motion lie on the table."

Speaker Bradley: "He moves that that motion lie upon the table. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Gentleman's motion is tabled. On the Calendar appears House Bill 2707, Mr. Terzich, will handle the Bill for Mr. Kornowicz."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2707 is the tax relief program for the....for a hundred thousand senior citizens of the State of Illinois. Senate Amendment #1 provides a cap of six hundred and fifty dollars as stated by Representative Skinner. And I would urge adoption of Senate Amendment....with concurrence to Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 2707."

Speaker Bradley: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is on the Gentleman's motion the House concur in Senate Amendment #1. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Chuck, can get on there. Have all voted who wished? Have all



voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 132 'ayes', 14 'nos' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2707. Under concurrences on the Supplemental #2, appears House Bill 2539. The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a motion for concurrence on the Bill that I had filed earlier for awarding grants to county jails. The Amendment is in the Senate basically increase the local share from ten to sixty percent. So, it will cost less money to the state and I would recommend a favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2539. All in favor signify by...."

Dunn: "Wait a minute. I move to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2."

Speaker Bradley: "#1 and 2. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting....The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "We don't have copies of this Amendment, how do we know what we're voting on. I would object."

Speaker Bradley: "Not being distributed...they haven't been distributed, Mr. Dunn, we'll take that out of the record. On the Calendar on page 4, appears House Joint Constitutional Amendment #25. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I'm going to renew my motion to adopt the report on the proposed Constitutional Amendment, House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #29. I think that everybody is in agreement now and I don't think there is any opposition to it."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yes, Sir. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I've made all my apologies after my outburst yesterday. And I have recommitted all the promises and I



would like to see that this thing is voted out. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that....."

Yourell: "Larry. Have you recalled all the Roll Calls of the veteran's organizations yet?"

DiPrima: "Threw them in the wastebasket."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from...."

Yourell: "I called my organizations, they were expecting them."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Gentleman's motion to adopt the report. All in favor of that motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative McClain, would you come up here for a minute. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 163 'ayes', 4 'nays' and the House does adopt the report on the House Joint Constitutional Amendment #29. On Supplemental #1...on the Calendar under concurrences, consideration postponed is House Bill 3231. On Senate Amendment #2, the Gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the Senate Amendment that was attached to House Bill 3231 which is just really a clerical thing to reappropriate a hundred and eighty-seven thousand dollars that was voted by this House and the Senate in last years Session. For the roof repairs at the John A. Logan College. I ask your support in concurrence of this Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is on the Gentleman's motion to concur on Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3231. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished?"



The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen to explain her vote.

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would just like to point out that this was our consideration postponed because it has something more in it than what the Sponsor said. And I urge everyone to take a look."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing to explain his vote."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I believe this has in it that court authority which we refused to approve the last time and why this matter was on consideration postponed. I think we all ought to take a look at before we put the green votes up there to approve it. Nobody had a chance to question the Sponsor before we went to this vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 100 'ayes', 46 'nays' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3231. On the Calendar...what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes arise?"

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I see that you were going to do it but I would appreciate it, it is a little easier to follow because we have three Calendars. If you say which Calendar we are on."

Speaker Bradley: "Excellent point, Sir. All right, now we're on Supplemental #1, is House Bill 2635. Mr. Tuerk, the Gentleman from Peoria. We've cut off your mike evidently permanently, so could you use Mr. Bluthardt's."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 2635 when it left the House was the appropriation for two hundred and twenty-eight million dollars for the teachers retirement pay out. What the Senate did was amend...with Amendment #1, was add the distributive formula appropriation amounting to one billion, three hundred and sixty-eight thousand dollars. I would move for concurrence."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, the question is on the Gentleman's motion...the Gentleman from Cook,



Mr. Brady on the...."

Brady: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to know what that amount is... put in for the distributive formula amount."

Tuerk: "One billion, three hundred and sixty-eight million, eight hundred and sixty thousand dollars."

Brady: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the House concurring in Senate Amendment #1? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Mr. Byers to explain his vote."

Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it is not very often that you get a chance to vote against a billion dollars and here is a chance for the people to get their conservative union rating way down, you get a billion dollars plus at one shot."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there 139 'ayes', 12 'nays' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2695. 2925, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brady. 2925, Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members. Mr. Speaker, I think there is someone trying to gain attention for a point."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Stearney, would like to be recorded as voting 'no'...he's been taken off. All right, the Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword, what purpose do you arise?"

Tipsword: "I believe you just said that we just concurred with 2695 and we didn't, I don't believe."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, we better back up here a second and correct the record. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2635. Not 2695. Mr. Tipsword, would you come down to the well for just a second. We'll proceed with House Bill 2925."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaekr, House Bill 2925 allowed the City of



Chicago to extend one tax levy, one levy with two extensions rather than two tax levies. It passed out of the House 151 to nothing. At the request of the Civic Federation there was a technical Amendment change, Amendment #1 in the Senate which changed one line...a sum equivalent to. We just pulled that out and a couple of other word changes that they felt were necessary. They also endorsed and supported a second Senate Amendment, the Civic Federation, that is. It says, in each year the County Clerk shall extend taxes at a rate sufficient to produce the full amount of the two partial levies attributable to that tax year. What that does allow is, Chicago then can go ahead and assess at a tax rate against the levy rather than against last year's assessed valuation. But if in fact, that should drop the levy will change. So they are budgeting against an exact figure every year and not deficit budgeting should their assessed valuation go down. All other school districts in the state budget against an estimated assessed valuation and they get involved in overpayments. This will never mean an overpayment to Chicago but it will mean, if their assessed valuation decreases they will not be in a deficit budget. They will get the money that is coming to them. I urge your support and concurrence on these two Senate Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the House will concur in Senate Amendment #1 and 2, to House Bill 2925. Discussion? None. On the Gentleman's motion, all in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 142 'ayes', 1 'nay', 12 voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2, to House Bill 2925. 2929...out of the record."



Speaker Bradley: "2986, the Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff. I'm on...we're on Supplemental #1 now until I change. I'll announce...."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with the Amendments #2, 3 and 4 on House Bill 2986. These Amendments, these three Amendments reduce the appropriation of various line items clear up to 88,400 dollars on one. And it does restore Amendment #3, that's #2....does restore the...reductions made from administrative division and currency exchange division. And Amendment #4 does ask appropriation of 6,000 dollars....165. And this Bill now is reduced down to 95,300 dollars less than the Governor's recommendation. And I would move to concur with these three Amendments. Senate Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendments #2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 to House Bill 2986. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify....Mr. Neff."

Neff: "...4."

Speaker Bradley: "Only 4, Sir?"

Neff: "Yeah, 2, 3 and 4."

Speaker Bradley: "He wishes to concur in Senate Amendments 2, 3 and 4 to House Bill 2986. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. This question, there are 142 'ayes' and 2 'nays' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 2, 3 and 4 to House Bill 2986. Mr....Gentleman from Henderson, Mr. Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now I move to nonconcurwith Amendments #5 and 6. These are the Insurance Bill....Appropriations Bills, Department of Insurance Appropriations Bills and at this time, I would refer this over to Representative Epton."

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

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I concur with Representative Neff. He's quite correct. Senate Amendments 5 and 6 would definitely make the Department of Insurance nonworkable. It takes away over a million dollars from their budget, and as a matter of fact, the Senate Sponsor has indicated that they did make an error and they are perfectly willing to have it go to a Conference Committee."



So I would move to nonconcur and refer to a Conference Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "On that...on the question, Mr. J. Houlihan."

Houlihan, J: "Representative Epton, you say this takes away a certain amount of money from the Department of Insurance?"

Epton: "It takes away almost 1,100,000 dollars from the original appropriation."

Houlihan, J: "I am sorry, I may not be following the legislative history. I thought we had passed the appropriation for the Department of Insurance."

Epton: "We...we passed it over to the Senate at six million, one. They, in turn, reduced it by a million, one hundred....almost a million, two hundred thousand. In discussing it with the Senate Sponsor, he also indicated that it...that was a mistake in their Amendment and they have no objections to nonconcurring and a Conference Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Byers."

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Byers: "Representative Neff, who offered those Amendments, 5 and 6, in the Senate to cut that appropriation money out?"

Speaker Bradley: "Turn Mr. Neff on."

Neff: "....Not, but I do not have it."

Byers: "You don't know who offered the Amendment? Was it a Democrat or a Republican?"

Neff: "I do not know."

Byers: "Maybe Mr. Epton knows."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Epton."

Epton: "Yes, Senator Carroll and Senator Rupp. Senator Carroll introduced the first Amendment, Senator Carroll, Senator Rupp the second Amendment and they both agreed, they were unaware of the import of the combined efforts."

Byers: "Are you saying they now...Representative Epton, that Senator Carroll and Senator Rock want these two Amendments removed from this Bill then?"

Epton: "They want it to go back to Conference Committee for an adjustment."

Byers: "Upward or downward?"

Epton: "Well, they...they didn't indicate to me that...what they would



do, they simply indicated that reduction was in error, that it was too excessive."

Byers: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keats."

Keats: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question, will the Sponsor yield? In this case, Mr. Epton."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Epton. He indicates he'll yield."

Keats: "We are appropriating how much money to the Department of Insurance, total?"

Epton: "The original appropriation that went out was approximately 6,100,000 dollars. This reduction took it to approximately 5,000,000 dollars."

Keats: "Okay, now why are we appropriating any money? Isn't it being funded via the domestic insurance company starting next year?"

Epton: "Well, that certainly has not been resolved and in any case, as explained to you on several occasions, Representative, the appropriation process still lies with this House regardless of what other Bills or funding procedure is followed, this House and the Senate will determine how much money they will get which is exactly what is happening in this case."

Keats: "So what you're saying is, our appropriation, we may not necessarily be paying this ourselves, the domestic insurance companies may be paying it but we still have to appropriate this amount?"

Epton: "Mr. Keats, I find it difficult to find with your education that you don't understand English. I said nothing of the sort. I indicated that we retain the power of making this appropriation. We determine how much money they will get, period. I'll try and spell it out. We, w e, determine, d e t e r m i n e, et cetera."

Keats: "Okay, is it not true that Senator Rupp's Amendment removed 71 jobs of people that it was felt were not doing anything in the Department of Insurance?"

Epton: "I'm not sure I understand. Is that a question, a statement or an assumption?"

Keats: "Well, in your case, I suppose I should tattoo it right on the back of my hand and show it to you since you have a hard time understanding, these 71 jobs were removed."



Epton: "I prefer the tatoo method, why...let's try that."

Keats: "Is it not true, is it or is it not true?"

Epton: "It is not...it is not..."

Keats: "Question...is it not true, 71 jobs were removed because it was felt they weren't doing anything?"

Epton: "It is not true."

Keats: "Thank you very much."

Epton: "You are very welcome."

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

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen and those of you who have any sense of proportion in regard to the spending of the taxpayers' money need to look at this several moments before you're stampeded into voting a nonconcurrence for a budget that remains bloated even after the very sensible reduction made by the Senate. The Sponsor is deliberating making the wrong motion. He should be making a motion to concur and the Department of Insurance would be fortunate in the amount of taxpayers' dollars extracted. Some of you may not have heard when we gave you the figures yesterday as to the increase in the number of payrollers in the Department of Insurance. They had a 196 on the payroll last year, they're going to add...then they went to 200 and this year, the coming year, they want 289 people. Now if you would project that same rate of miraculous growth to all of the employees throughout the state, the payroll would be over 180,000 people on the public payroll which is already the greatest...greatest employer in the state. As we pointed out in connection with another Bill yesterday, the Department of Insurance is about to become a prime employer in this state. Their number of employees will skyrocket but you stay that unhappy day by following the Senate's lead where a Republican Senator Rupp removed 79 from the payroll yesterday by a Bill that he introduced. The Sponsor doesn't challenge these figures. He says give us a Conference because there we will give all the money that the Department of Insurance can spend. That might well be true. But it's more than the taxpayers can pay even with reductions. I urge you to vote 'no' on a motion to nonconcur to vote 'yes' on a motion to concur that will follow immediately after the first vote."



Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Inquiry to the Chair, Mr. Speaker, so we are clear on what we are doing. Is the...is the motion to nonconcur with 5 and 6 at the same time?"

Speaker Bradley: "Yes."

Barnes: "Could I ask a division of that question, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Bradley: "Gentlemen requests a division of the question. On that point, Mr. Schlickman?"

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I know this is extraordinarily unusual but on behalf of the Minority Leader, I would like to do introduce a former House Member, former State Comptroller and now attorney...Deputy Attorney General and a...about to be Appellate Court Judge in the Second Judicial District, George Lindberg. And Mr. Lindberg has advised me that the Cubs won in the tenth inning, 9 to 8, with Ralph Burris the winning pitcher. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Yes. Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I...I merely... I didn't hear whether or not we were dividing this issue and if we are I would like to speak to one of the Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, we'll say you asked for a division, so we'll take the first one, number..."

Barnes: "Number 5."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #5."

Barnes: "May I...may I speak to that issue, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Bradley: "You certainly may."

Barnes: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if I could have just a little...little order, Mr. Speaker? I think that the Members of the House, I think to concur with the Gentleman from Lawrence's Bill, that the Members of the House should take a real close look at Amendment #5. I think that's the reason, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I ask for a division of this question. It was my understanding, and what took place in the Senate, that Amendment #5 would be concurred with here in the House. I realize that the...the other Amendment which we can discuss later on will give the Department some problems. But Amendment #5 in fact as indicated by the Gentleman from Lawrence... Lawrenceville is, I think, a genuine, honest attempt to cut away some of the



bloated...bloated fat that has appeared in this budget over some years. Now if we don't do that at this time we're simply fooling ourselves. We've been working very diligently here I believe in trying to cut away the increase in excess baggage in many of these budgets that I think that our constituency in this time...in this time and period is really wanting us to do, to take a hard look. Here in the case of the Department there were some positions as indicated by another Gentleman from the other side of the aisle where these functions would not...was not really being carried out in a most judicious manner. And that was the reason for the Senate, that was the reason for the Senate reducing this Amendment in Amendment #5 because the Department simply could not justify carrying those bloated positions any longer. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, you take a very close look at #5. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, we should concur...we should concur in Amendment #5."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I appreciate the fact that the Chairman of Appropriations II has asked for a division. It was my understanding that there would be a concurrence on Senate Amendment #5 and we grudgingly agreed to nonconcur and support that on...on Amendment #6. On the...I talked to the Chairman of the Appropriations I Committee in the Senate and he told me that the Republicans were about as firm as the Democrats in making significant cuts in the Department of Insurance. If we allow the nonconcurrence on both Senate Amendments #5 and #6 we put ourselves, I think, in a very difficult posture in trying to follow through with those cuts. I think many of you were in the debate on the, quote, fair share funding proposal and part of that debate centered around the ballooning budget for the Department of Insurance. I would steadfastly oppose the motion to nonconcur on this Amendment but I will support the motion to nonconcur on Amendment #6. And I would hope that you who are concerned about your conservative rating, some of whom...some of whom have been asking for a division only for that purpose, I would ask that you support...vote against the motion to nonconcur on Senate Amendment #5."



Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I support the motion to nonconcur in Amendment #5 because I believe that while the Department may not need the entire increase they certainly need a good part of it and more than Amendment #5 provides. We unfortunately had the situation in the past where the Department of Insurance has been willfully underfunded and the last couple of years we've had a great increase in the kinds of functions and responsibility - particularly consumer responsibility - that the Department has had. I think that this increased funding is necessary to protect the consumer. And I would like to see a nonconurrence so we can restore at least some of the money to the Department's budget so that the consumer can be better protected in the areas of insurance redlining, in the areas of Blue Cross, in the areas of supplemental Medicare insurance and many, many other vital areas."

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

Collins: "Well, Mr...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I may be concerned by what my conservative rating is as one Member suggested but I'm a lot more concerned about the solvency of the Illinois insurance companies and proper administration of this Department. And I suggest to you that a lot of this debate today is remaining acrimony from yesterday's debate, certain Members speaking for certain small companies in the state trying...serving special interests. And then... then a very real misunderstanding in the Senate that...that was unfortunate and is being ironed out. This Department, I think, today is headed up by one of the finest...two administrators that we ever have been fortunate enough to have in this state government. And I'm a little tired of people making a whipping boy out of this Department when people are truly trying to do a proper job in the administration of this Department, this very vital Department, people who are trying to make certain that Illinois insurance companies remain solvent and that Illinois policyholders are...are served properly and are protected from fly-by-night operations. I...I worked in the insurance industry and I'm very sensitive to the fact that over...in just recent years Illinois lead the country in insolvencies in insurance companies. And I'm proud of the strides that have been made in Illinois and I'm proud of the strides that are continuing to be made by the present administration



of the Insurance Department. I urge every one of you to support Representative Epton in his motion to nonconcur."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from...Mr. Cunningham on a parliamentary inquiry."

Cunningham: "Will the Chair entertain a motion to concur? My parliamentarian, Ann Lousin, says that this is proper. Can you cite it anywhere in the book that says it's improper? The theory for it being it's better to proceed on the affirmative note rather than the negative note in all matters in life."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, I suppose that...what we usually...what we usually do, Mr. Cunningham, is take a vote on the Gentleman's motion and if that fails a substitute motion would be proper at that time. I suggest we go along with the tradition of the House and...unless you'd like to break that tradition, give the Gentleman - the maker of the motion - the opportunity for that motion to go up or down."

Cunningham: "I don't want to violate the tradition of the House but I cited the principle of affirmative action, you recognize that that's in the vogue in all directions. My question was, will the Chair entertain a motion to concur?"

Speaker Bradley: "No."

Cunningham: "And if happily, the answer is yes."

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

Cunningham: "...I make that motion."

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

I think there's a lot of misunderstanding about what's going on here right now. There have been allusions made to the other Insurance Bill that was discussed yesterday, which was Senate Bill 1725, and on that particular issue the Sponsor of this Bill and I happened to be on opposite sides of the question. But on this question we're on the same side. The Department of Insurance needs additional personnel. If you expect our Department of Insurance to do an adequate job of financial examination of companies you have to give them some tools to work with. Now one of the previous speakers indicated that this Department has been increasing drastically in numbers of employees. That is absolutely false. There has been no great drastic increase in employees. In fact, he indicated that in one year they had 196 employees and the



next only 200. But, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we should definitely support the Sponsor in his effort to nonconcur in this case so that we can go back to the Senate and get some kind of an understanding whereby we can add additional personnel to the Department of Insurance to do the very thing that many Members on this floor have asked the Insurance Department to do and that's to conduct proper financial examinations of insurance companies. I support Representative Epton in this motion."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by saying....all in favor of the motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.. And the Gentleman, Mr. Epton, to close debate...with Mr. Neff's permission, is that all right, Sir, on..... Mr. Epton."

Epton: "Thank you....thank you, Mr. Speaker, Representative Neff. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I certainly hesitate to interject any logic into this discussion but at the risk of boring you, let me just simply say that these had nothing to do with old physicians or bloated departments or what have you. This is a motion to nonconcur which the Senate Sponsors agree, which the House Sponsors agree, it will in no way raise the Department's appropriation. As a matter of fact, I've been assured by the Senate that in all probability there will be a reduction but they do feel that these amounts are much too large. They made a mistake. They're ready to admit it and why we insist that it has to do with a bloated department or other things is simply irrelevant which, of course, at this time of the year sometimes is the order of business. Again, I ask you to nonconcur in Amendment, Senate Amendment #5 and thereafter, in Senate Amendment #6."

Speaker Bradley: "The board indicates that we're on concurrence and that's what we're on and the motion is to nonconcur. And all in favor of the Gentleman's motion to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #5 will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The motion is to nonconcur. Yes, we're on the Order of Concurrence and the



motion is to nonconcur. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 119 'ayes' and 25 'nays' and the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #5 to 2986. What purpose... the Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer, arise?"

Brummer: "Do you have a nonconcurrency lettering that you could put on the board?"

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, but the..."

Brummer: "Well, the motion was to nonconcur, why don't we have a nonconcurrency motion..."

Speaker Bradley: "I explained it twice, Mr. Brummer, we....are on the Order of Concurrences and the...that order the Gentleman motion... the Gentleman moved to nonconcur. On...on the Order of Nonconcurrences which we'll have later, the proper....Senate Bills with House Amendments, you...we'd go to the Order of Concurrences. Now. Mr. Neff on Amendment #6."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Amendment #6, I move not to concur and also will refer this to Representative Epton."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #6 to 2986. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #6 to House Bill 2986. On Supplemental #3, the time is incorrect, it indicates that it is 6:45, the Clerk wishes we point out to you that it is 5:45 P.M. Calendar. On the Calendar on concurrences appears House Bill 3050. The Gentleman from DuPage, Speaker Redmond, on 3050."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3050 is the appropriation for the General Assembly, Sponsored by myself and Representative Ryan. Senate passed three Amendments, one, Amendment #1 is 3% of the appropriation for Committee expenses in the amount of a hundred and sixty thousand dollars and purchases on contracts in the amount of ten thousand. Amendment #2 adds twenty-five hundred dollars for expenses of Senate Committees and twenty-five hundred for expenses of House Committees. And Amendment #3 adds funds for



the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate for the study of the budgeting process as it relates to the General Assembly and that is in the amount of a hundred thousand dollars. I move that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1, 2 and 3, to House Bill 3050."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, on the Gentleman's motion."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, would you yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yes."

Houlihan: "The increase for the budgeting, is that for staff... is that our usual staff budget or is that an increase supplemental to the staff appropriation?"

Speaker Redmond: "That's a supplemental. That's to continue the studies that we've underwent with Donald Saner and Associates' when we had the gentleman from the State of Washington here to show us how the appropriation process worked, see if we could have a better financial management."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Wolf to explain his vote."

Wolf: "Mr....."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Totten, wishes to be recorded as 'aye' over there. Mr. Wolf, to explain his vote."

Wolf: "I was just trying to get maybe by....somewhere an explanation of the Sponsor....could tell me. Does this have the 5.5% cut as well as the other one...is the same?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Speaker. Speaker Redmond."

Speaker Redmond: "A sufficiently larger cut. The original suggestion was in the amount of one million, five hundred thousand dollars. It ends up...the figure that you see. So it is substantially greater than the 5% cut."

Wolf: "It is greater than 5.5?"

Speaker Redmond: "No, no, no. The reduction over what was sought was sufficiently greater than 5.5."



Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there 154 'ayes', 3 'nays' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, and 3, to House Bill 3050. On the Calendar on the Supplemental #1, appears House Bill 2929. Pardon me, 2157...3157. On the Regular Calendar, page 6, appears House Bill 3157. What purpose does Mr. Skinner arise?"

Skinner: "A point of parliamentary inquiry. I have just received a corrected second Conference Report on House Bill 841 and I was not aware that there was anything in our rules that allowed a third Conference Committee Report. This is indeed a third Conference Committee Report. When would it be timely to...for me to challenge the legitimacy of bogus report."

Speaker Bradley: "I understand that there was no...there has not been any action taken on the second...this is a corrected version by the Committee. Evidently they did it in the proper form."

Skinner: "Well, there was only no action taken because we caught them in the slippery thing they were trying to put over."

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

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, the second Conference Report was filed and, therefore, left the jurisdiction of the Conference Committee. I join with the Gentleman from McHenry in objecting to the legitimacy of what purports to be a corrected Conference Report. It's out of order."

Speaker Bradley: "We're not to that point right now, when we get...I would suggest that you make that point when we get to that Conference Committee Report. That would be the proper time. The...House Bill 3157. Speaker Redmond."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3157 amended the Various Practice Act of physicans, dentists and other health care providers. It provides for grounds of suspension and revocation, the



original language of the Bill specified that disciplinary action could be taken against a licensed professional for certain grounds and the Senate Amendment limits consideration to fraudulent activities. And I believe that the Amendment puts the Bill in the form that was originally intended when the legislation was drafted. And I move that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3157."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, the question is on the Gentleman's motion. All in favor of the motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Lady from Cook, Mr. Chapman to explain her vote."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like encourage Members to vote 'yes' on the concurrence to House Bill 2157. This is an extension of legislation that we approved and the Governor signed last fall, which strengthens the capability of the Department of Public Aid to pursue welfare fraud. I urge a 'yes' vote on this proposal."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. Mrs. Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, I looked at House Bill 3157 and that relates to certain acts relative to revocation of license of physicans, nurses, etc. What's this got to do with fraud situation. Would somebody enlighten me as to what the concurrence is on. I mean, I have got it...."

Speaker Bradley: "Speaker Redmond."

Speaker Redmond: "The subject matter of the Bill is an effort to curtail welfare fraud and it enumerates certain grounds for possible suspension on the grounds of fraudulent activity."

Geo-Karis: "Is this the one that allows them to take away their



licenses if they have been fraudulently....fraudulent vender so to speak?"

Speaker Redmond: "If they have been guilty of fraudulent activity, yes."

Geo-Karis: "In other words...."

Speaker Redmond: "It's a grounds for suspension, there is a hearing...it's not automatic."

Geo-Karis: "If a doctor is suspected of providing fraudulent service, he can lose his licenses. Is that right?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I think it has to go more than suspected. I think it has to be established and proven that he was guilty."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you."

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

Waddell: "If this reaches the 89...call for verification."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Take the record. Okay. On this question there are 91 'ayes', 72 'nays'... Mr. Walsh, R. Walsh, wishes to go from 'no' to 'aye'. We have 92 'ayes'. Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a conflict here. I would like to go from 'no' to 'present'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman voting 'present'. All right, any other changes? Mr. Waddell, we're up to 91, do you persist? 92, Sir. Would you believe, 93. All right, the Speaker requests a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Gaines, Hart, Kelly, Pechous, Polk....."

Speaker Bradley: "Polk, votes 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "No further."

Speaker Bradley: "Call the Affirmative Roll."

Clerk O'Brien: "E.M. Barnes, Beatty, Birchler, Bowman, Bradley, Brady, Brandt, Breslin, Rich Brummer, Don Brummet, Byers, Caldwell, Capparelli, Chapman, Christensen, Darrow, Corneal Davis, Dawson, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, John Dunn, Dyer, Ewell, Farley, Flinn, Garmisa, Getty, Giglio, Giorgi, Greiman, Hanahan, Harris, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan,



J.M. Houlihan, Huff, Jacobs, Jaffe, Emil Jones, Kane, Katz, Kornowicz, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leverenz...."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Waddell....could Dan Houlihan be verified please? He's down here. Fine."

Clerk O'Brien: "Levin, Lucco, Luft, Madigna, Madison, Mann, Marovitz, Peggy Smith Martin, Matejek, Matijevich, Mautino, McClain, McGrew, McLendon, McPike, Mudd, Mugalian, Mulcahey, Murphy, Nardulli, O'Brien, Pierce, Polk, Pouncey, Richmond, Robinson, Satterthwaite, Schisler, Schneider, Sharp, Shumpert, Steczo, Stuffle, Taylor, Terzich, Tipsword, Van Duynes, Vitek, Von Boeckman, R.V. Walsh, Willer, Williams, Younge, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Questions of the affirmative. Will you turn Mr. Waddell on."

Waddell: "E.M. Barnes."

Speaker Bradley: "He's here."

Waddell: "Brandt."

Speaker Bradley: "He's in his seat."

Waddell: "Capparelli."

Speaker Bradley: "Capparelli, is standing next to his seat."

Waddell: "DiPrima."

Speaker Bradley: "DiPrima is in his seat."

Waddell: "Garmisa."

Speaker Bradley: "Garmisa is in his seat."

Waddell: "Hanahan."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon."

Waddell: "Hanahan."

Speaker Bradley: "Hanahan, is not in his seat. Is he in the chambers? How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Waddell: "Jaffe."

Speaker Bradley: "Just a minute, we better take him off then. Remove Hanahan from the Roll."

Waddell: "Jaffe."



Speaker Bradley: "Representative Jaffe is not in his seat.

Is he in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Remove Mr. Jaffe. Mr. Hanahan has returned,
put him back on the Roll."

Waddell: "Katz."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon."

Waddell: "Katz. Did you take Jaffe off?"

Speaker Bradley: "Oh, Katz. Mr. Katz is not in his chair.
How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll. Mr. Schneider. Turn
Mr. Schneidier on."

Waddell: "Did you take Jaffe off?"

Speaker Bradley: "Jaffe is off and Katz is off. Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "I would ask, Mr. Waddell, to be verified and he
said, okay."

Speaker Bradley: "Is that all right, Mr. Waddell?"

Schneider: "Thank you, Bruce."

Speaker Bradley: "Is that all right, Mr. Waddell?"

Waddell: "Kornowicz."

Speaker Bradley: "Kornowicz is not in his seat. How is he
recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Waddell: "Kosinski."

Speaker Bradley: "Kosinski...is not in his chair. How is he
recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll. Here he comes back,
leave him on the Roll. Further questions? Mr. Waddell,
Mr. Katz is in front of the well and has returned, we'll
put him back on. Further questions?"

Waddell: "Polk."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon."



Waddell: "Polk."

Speaker Bradley: "Polk...he's not in his seat. How is he recorded? Polk."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Waddell: "Pierce."

Speaker Bradley: "Pierce...is not in his seat. How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Waddell: "McPike."

Speaker Bradley: "McPike...he's not in the chamber. How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Here he is, he just came in."

Waddell: "Mann."

Speaker Bradley: "He's in his seat."

Waddell: "Mahar."

Speaker Bradley: "He's in his seat."

Waddell: "Madison."

Speaker Bradley: "Madison...he's not in his seat. How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll. Mr. Jaffe has returned, put him back on."

Waddell: "Lechowicz."

Speaker Bradley: "Lechowicz, is in the chamber."

Waddell: "Okay. Shumpert."

Speaker Bradley: "Is in the rear of the chambers."

Waddell: "Von Boeckman."

Speaker Bradley: "Is in the aisle."

Waddell: "Farley."

Speaker Bradley: "Farley, is in his chair."

Waddell: "Are you sure this time?"

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon me, Sir."



Waddell: "I said, are you sure this time."

Speaker Bradley: "On Farley? We're positive."

Waddell: "Okay. Flinn."

Speaker Bradley: "Flinn is in his seat."

Waddell: "Kelly."

Speaker Bradley: "Kelly is not recorded."

Waddell: "Schisler."

Speaker Bradley: "Schisler...how is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Waddell: "McGrew."

Speaker Bradley: "McGrew is in the aisle."

Waddell: "McClain."

Speaker Bradley: "McClain is in his seat."

Waddell: "And Madigan."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon, Sir."

Waddell: "Madigan."

Speaker Bradley: "Madigan is not in his seat. Is he in the chambers? How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "I believe he is in his office and we'll have him out in just a second. Further questions while.... here is Mr. Madigan."

Waddell: "That's it."

Speaker Bradley: "What purpose does, Mr. Ebbesen arise?"

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker, I went from 'no' to 'present' because I hadn't had a chance to look at the Bill. So, I would like to be voted as 'aye' on this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman wishes to change his vote from 'no' to 'aye'. Record, Mr. Ebbesen as voting 'aye'. Further questions, Sir? Mr. Matijevich, what purpose do you arise?"

Matijevich: "Have you announced...."

Speaker Bradley: "No, Sir, I haven't announced that it is 89 'ayes', 70 'nays' and the House does concur in Senate



#2 to House Bill 3157."

Matijevich: "And having voted on the prevailing side by which the House has concurred, I move to reconsider the vote by which we did all that."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Giorgi."

Giorgi: "I move that motion lie on the table."

Speaker Bradley: The Gentleman moves that that motion lie on the table. All in favor of Mr. Giorgi's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and that motion lies on the table. All right, on Supplemental #1 appears House Bill 2929, Mr. Ewing. Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to move to concur in Senate Amendment # 1 and 2, to House Bill 2929."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendments #1 to House Bill 29....all in favor....the Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Would the Gentleman kindly explain the Amendments?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Senate Amendment #1 takes out of the Bill....this is the hold harmless Bill for the school aid. That portion of the Bill which would give the Department of Local Governmental Affairs the right to reduce or withhold the state share of the supervisor of assessment's salary if they did not conform with the new farm land tax law. That's been taken out by this Amendment...#1."

Speaker Bradley: "We're on Supplemental #1. Mr. Ewing."

McClain: "Excuse me, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Ewing, I didn't...."

Speaker Bradley: "What reason does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan airse?"

Houlihan: "We would ask the Sponsor if he could take this Bill out of the record momentarily and we'll get back to it...."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Ewing. Take it out of the record. House Bill 2987. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to put this into two motions. I would like to move



to concur in Amendments #2, 3, 5 and 7. I would then like to move that we nonconcur in Amendment #4."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman kindly explain the Amendments."

Jones: "Now this is the appropriation for the Illinois State Historical Library and Amendment #1 reduces the personal services by nineteen thousand dollars. Amendment #2 puts the Department of Administrative Services into this appropriations Bill for the State Historical Library...."

Speaker Bradley: "Now just a minute, Mr. Jones, I think you... Senate Amendment #1, you explained. Your motion is #2 and 3, so that much be...."

McClain: "Well, Mr. Speaker...."

Speaker Bradley: "Is that correct? There is no one."

Jones: "There is no Amendment #1."

Speaker Bradley: "Okay. You're explaining....first Amendment then you were explaining was Amendment #2."

Jones: "Amendment #2 reduces the personal services by nineteen thousand dollars in the State Historical Library. Amendment #3 puts the administrative services department into the appropriation for the State Historical Library. #4, makes many reductions in the appropriation for the administrative services and #5 is the addition of a hundred and fifty thousand dollars for auto liability, insurance...."

McClain: "Mr. Speaker."

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

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd make a motion to divide the question and handle each Amendment separately."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to dividethe question. Proper motion, we'll take them one at a time. Amendment #2, the Gentleman moves that the House concurs in Amendment #2 to House Bill 2987. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'.



Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished?
The Clerk will take the record. On this question there
are 146 'aye', no 'nays' and the House does concur in
Amendment #2 to House Bill 2987. Amendment #3."

Jones: "The Department....Administrative Services into the
State Historical Library appropriation Bill. Support the
concurrency."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion to
concur with Amendment #3. All in favor of the Gentleman's
motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'.
Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished?
The Clerk will take the record. On this question there
are 130 'ayes', 6 'nays' and the House adopts Amendment
#3 to House Bill 29.....Senate Amendment....concurs with
Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 2987. Amendment #5.
All right, let's take....the Gentleman moves to nonconcur
on Amendment #4."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #4 reduces the administrative
services appropriation by almost....a million, four
hundred and ninety-seven thousand. I move we nonconcur
in Amendment #4."

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

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.
I thought I was going to have to avoid this debate this
year but the only reason for nonconcurring in Senate
Amendment #4 and I think we ought to concur. Is that
there is no agreement on IIS, Illinois Information Service.
I've been on the floor of this Session before...other Sessions
and all of us know that the Illinois Information Service
is strictly a political tool for Governors. And they
have also used IIS as a political tool for Legislators.
And I have screamed in the past Session that, at least
do not broaden IIS to be used by the Legislature. However,
what is happening now is...that the Governor wants his
money back for IIS. I...in the Committee when Director



Puckorius, was in the Committee room, I said, would you agree that....to the situation where after every broadcast...you would place at the end of the broadcast, this broadcast is paid for by the taxpayers of the State of Illinois. And he had first said, yes, I would until he found out...you know, everybody stared in disbelief because they knew that any director surely couldn't agree to that. Because he would probably get fired the next day..... when he got the vibes from the Governor's Office and he said, well, I sorry I cannot agree to that. So I'm saying, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House and I had an Amendment but we never got to it. I had in fact an Amendment that would have added that language and there is some question about whether you can add substantive language to an appropriation Bills. But as long as the taxpayers have the wool pulled over their eyes....as long as the taxpayers really believe that the Illinois Information Service, rather than being paid for by taxpayers it is really a....."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Matijevich...one minute. What purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti arise?"

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm trying to find out what he's going to ask us to do but...Mr. Houlihan can probably inform us. What speech is this, 34 or 36?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Matijevich, please proceed."

Matijevich: "Elmer, when I get to joke 99, just laugh...all right. We're on 84 now. But, I'm very serious, I bring this up every year but I'm serious about it. I would really like to wipe out the whole IIS budget and that is serious. Whether it takes a speech or not, I don't care. I don't think any Governor needs to have his own propaganda machine paid for by taxpayers. If you're going to have a propaganda machine, take it out of your political funds. But not out of the funds paid for by taxpayers. And I realize that the Governor will have some support by



Legislators who know that the IIS is now being used to help Legislators. And I think that's wrong too. I'm one Legislator who won't use it, will never use it, don't want to use it and I think that it pulls the wool over the eyes of the taxpayer. And when any of the Legislators or the Governor's Office, if at the end of any broadcast they said, paid for by taxpayers...you let me find out who will use it. None of them will use it. Because right now they are pulling the wool over the eyes. We ought to concur with this Amendment and leave the budget as it is, the way the Senate put it out. The only reason for the nonconcurrence and you'll find out, is to bring back the money for IIS. The Governor is the man behind that, let's tell it like it is to the people. The Governor ought to stand up and shout from the second floor, that he wants the taxpayers to pay for his election. Why he's got enough funds, hell he's got every millionaire in Illinois contributing to his fund. He doesn't need the taxpayers to pay for it on top of it. Hell, every corporation in Illinois is funding his campaign. Why in the hell does the little taxpayers have to pay for it. He's got enough money rolling in, even said that. It's rolling in. He doesn't need anymore. So I would urge you to defeat the motion to nonconcur."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipword."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I agree entirely with Representative Matijevich. And I would certainly like to remind those who agree with Representative Matijevich, that in spite of the screwy way the board is being run this year this is a motion that we're going to be voting on for nonconcurrence in spite of the fact that it says concurrence up there. So the way to vote in order to agree with Representative Matijevich is to vote red. Even though it says concurrence on the board, that's not what you're voting on."



Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Matijevich may be right and he may not be right. I happen to feel that he is not right. But I'm going to sponsor the Department of Administrative Services Bill and I would like to point out to, Mr. Matijevich that, in his Committee we cut three hundred and seventy-seven thousand dollars out of this budget. Three hundred and seventy-seventy thousand dollars and IIS was part of it. But now the Senate has cut one million, four hundred and ninety-seven thousand dollars. All we're asking, Mr. Matijevich, is go back to a Conference Committee and straighten out some of these other areas where there is some serious deep cuts that were made so we can keep the Department of Administrative Services in operation. Don't be blinded by one issue. Now, Mr. Bakalis is entitled to use IIS, lots of Democratic Legislators use IIS. Please, Mr. Matijevich, support us, let's get it back to a Conference Committee and put some of these other important programs in there. One is forms management, you are my Joint Sponsor on forms management. It will save the State of Illinois millions of dollars. Please, Mr. Matijevich, help me, support me, help us get it to a Conference Committee."

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

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I think the prior speaker stated the case very well. The point is, the IIS helps protect the people's right to know what we're doing in state government. Every year since this agency has been created we've heard about the partisan use of this particular agency. But, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, my own Speaker, Speaker Redmond, I'm told has used the IIS. And I'm sure, Mr. Speaker that when Mr. Redmond used the IIS, it was not for partisan purposes but he was simply letting the people of this state know something about the legislative business which you and I



conduct. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this agency has been cut. It has been cut, I assume by agreement from Members of both sides of the aisle. It is absolutely pointless...it's pointless to cut the very heart out of an agency that was created for the people of this great state. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I want to repeat what other Members have said. Anyone, Republican or Democrat, has the right to use the Illinois Information Service. And although I have no personal knowledge, I would guess indeed Legislators from both side of the aisle have used this service. I would imagine that Constitutional officers of both parties has used this service. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the only rational, sound move is to support the Gentleman's motion to nonconcur. We ought to save this very useful state agency, whose budget has been trimmed to a sensible level. And so, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think Members of both parties ought to vote to nonconcur with this Amendment so we can go back to a Conference Committee and come to some sort of agreement."

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

Katz: "I guess it is the time in the Session for funny stories. And the funny story I just heard was that we are funding IIS in order to satisfy the public's right to know. Now that's a joke if I ever heard it. What are all of the corps of the press doing down there. They are down there representing the public, believe me that state employees pay to aggrandize public officials are contributing nothing to the enlightenment of the public but trying to keep the press from knowing what the facts really are. Now, I want to point out to those Gentleman on the other side that we over here have been totally consistent with regard to our position. When a Democratic Governor abused the Information Service, we voted to handle that....against



Democratic Governor who had abused that service. Where is that same objectivity that same understanding of the public's right to know on the other side of the aisle. Why should we fund the incumbent Governor's political campaign with public funds. On the one hand I hear all of the talk on the other side about proposition 13 and wanting to save state funds. How about saving state funds by eliminating that hoard of public relations people that are involved in this particular matter. How about reducing the taxpayers burden by letting them use the press for informing them about what is going on in the government rather than using the lackies paid for by state funds to obfuscate from the public the facts that are going on in state government. I support wholeheartedly Representative Matijevich's proposal and I urge the Gentlemen on the other side to be consistant as we have and eliminate this wasteful expenditure of public funds and more than wasteful this attempt to public funds to fund a public campaign in Illinois."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Vermillion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, those were fine Democrat speeches and led off by the County Chairman of the Democrat Party of Lake County. But I think there is a pretty good suggestion here and he doesn't even know what he is talking about. This needs to go back to Conference Committee because we're talking about a billion four hundred and ninety-seven thousand dollar cut and only a hundred and four thousand of that is in IIS. What he's doing here, he may not be aware of it, is cutting off a hundred and sixty-four thousand, three hundred dollars for union mechanics. I don't know how, Representative Hanahan and those others of you who are supporting organized labor are going to explain this to your union mechanics. It has nothing to do with IIS, it has to do with administrative services. And I think if you realize what these cuts were



you would be concerned about sending this back to a Conference Committee to get some of these other things straightened out...besides IIS."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Farley."

Farley: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question."

All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Jones, to close the debate."

Jones: "I renew my appeal to nonconcur in Amendment #4, because talking about here...the discussion about IIS has been repeated. It is only a hundred and four thousand dollars out of almost a million and a half that is being cut and so, all this debate ought to be put into the Conference Committee where they...details can be worked out. And I renew my motion that we do not concur in Amendment #4."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. The question is on the Gentleman's motion to nonconcur. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion to nonconcur will vote 'aye', those who oppose will vote 'no'. And if the Parliamentarian is within hearing distance would he please come to the podium. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen to explain her vote."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to point out that IIS is only 10% of this cut. It's not as if we're asking you to concur with an Amendment that put it back it, go ahead and fight IIS in the Conference Committee and if you don't win there fight it on the floor again when the Conference Committee comes before us. I don't like IIS either, but this goes a lot deeper than IIS. That's not the issue in this vote. The issue in this vote is the rest of what's being cut not IIS. You can get at IIS in the Conference Committee Report. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes to explain his vote."



Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, very briefly and I hear the other side of the aisle crying so loudly about a hundred and four thousand dollar cut. Let me suggest to the Ladies and Gentlemen, if it goes to Conference Committee and that is what your major concern seems to be about. You're saying you're cutting this too much. Let's have some indication from that side of the aisle that if this goes into Conference Committee that hundred and four thousand dollar cut will remain there. That's what this is all about apparently, so if you feel that so much other...so many other dollars are in jeopardy here why not some indication that if this Bill goes to Conference Committee the hundred and four thousand dollar reduction...that all of us...all of us agree should be taken out...will remain on this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester to explain his vote."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to reiterate that the House cut...I'm the Sponsor of the Administrative Services Bill, Mr. Speaker. Could I speak on it?"

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Winchester: "The House cut three hundred and seventy-seven thousand dollars and the Senate come along and cut a million four hundred and ninety-seven thousand dollars. There is a lot of other important things in this piece of legislation besides IIS. Give us a chance, let us go to a Conference Committee as reasonable people and sit down and work this out through the agency...won't be suffering as bad as we're going to be if we don't non-concur with this Amendment. And I again reiterate what Representative Friedrich said, to those of you who support unions. There is a negotiated raise of a hundred and sixty-four thousand dollars in this Bill for the mechanical union people. And you're cutting the hundred and sixty-



four thousand dollars out. Let's be reasonable people, let's be sensible people. Let's go to a Conference Committee hash out our differences, we can settle and deal with IIS at that time. But not on just one issue, one issue. So let's wipe out an agency of state government. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 84 'ayes', 78 'nos' and the motion carries and the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 2987. Senate Amendment #5, Mr. Jones. Dave Jones. Dave Jones. Dave Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we now have Amendment #5 and I move that we concur in Amendment #5. And Amendment #7 if they still want them separated we'll still take them one at a time."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Jones, moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #5 to 2987. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much...."

Jones: "This is a hundred and fifty thousand dollars for auto liability insurance."

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Barnes: "Representative, my question is and perhaps my Digest is wrong here. Representative Jones, perhaps my Digest is wrong here but according to what I have here. This Amendment should embodied...a plus twenty thousand dollars. But I believe you said something about a hundred and fifty thousand. Would you explain that...perhaps I am wrong and I would like to stand corrected. Would you explain?"

Jones: "I'll read the Amendment. On page 6, line 1, line 3, by deleting three hundred and forty-three thousand, six hundred and inserting in lieu thereof; four hundred and



thirteen thousand, two hundred and on page 6, line 4, by deleting four hundred and forty-six thousand, three hundred and inserting in lieu thereof; five hundred and thirty-six thousand seven hundred."

Barnes: "Mr. Jones, out of..."

Jones: "Those two added together would make the hundred and fifty thousand."

Barnes: "Okay, but out what funds are those coming from? General revenue or roads?"

Jones: "The first is general revenue and the second is out of road fund."

Barnes: "How much road fund?"

Jones: "Ninety thousand, four hundred."

Barnes: "Ninety thousand, four hundred. Thank you very much."

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

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Jones, would you answer a question please? Why road fund, why the change from general revenue to road fund?"

Jones: "This is the insurance for the automobiles used by the agency."

McClain: "Well...but, not all the time. Sometimes you take it from general revenue sometimes road funds. Why the switch now to road fund in this Amendment?"

Jones: "What was the question please?"

McClain: "Well, auto insurance had been taken out of general revenue and now you're replacing it with Senate Amendment #5, transfer that from general revenue to road fund? Why?"

Jones: "Only that part for the automobiles."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #5 to House Bill 2987. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying...by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 62 'ayes' and 43 'nays'. The Gentleman's motion fails. Mr. Jones, do you wish to non-



concur?"

Jones: "Mr....Parliamentarian, there is a question about whether it's in proper form. On #7...."

Speaker Bradley: "We're on #5 right now and we have not concurred in that Amendment. What's your posture on Amendment #5?"

Jones: "Put enough green votes on this to concur."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, you've only got 62 green lights."

Jones: "We need to concur in #5."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr....the Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "On what basis are you apparently holding that 89 votes is required. This is not final action, since there is a nonconcurrence in the prior Amendment. So you cannot argue with final action. All that would be required is a simple majority."

Speaker Bradley: "Not in this motion, in concurrence motion it takes 89 votes and that's...."

Cunningham: "Whereabouts in the books do you find that, Sir?"

Speaker Bradley: "Final action, it takes 89 votes."

Cunningham: "It isn't final action because there has to be a Conference reported on the prior Amendment. That's the reason."

Speaker Bradley: "On this motion on the concurrence, it is final action, Sir. On Senate Amendment #5. They could recede over in the Senate. Mr. Jones, you did not receive 89 votes for the...."

Jones: "Take the record, Mr...."

Speaker Bradley: "We've taken the record. The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipword, what purpose do you arise?"

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker, actually on these Bills where you've got more than one Amendment and you're nonconcurring with one of them...even though you concur with the others and it is final action in those Amendments. One of them is taking it to a Conference and the Conference while they can't recede from those Amendments....can amend them."



So it is foolish to be going through these one at a time if you're going to nonconcur with any one of them."

Speaker Bradley: "All the Chair can do is address themselves with the motion when the Members make it."

Tipsword: "But if there is a nonconcurrence on any one of them he may as well make it and not act on any of the others because they can amend them in a Conference Committee. They can't recede from them but they can amend them."

Speaker Bradley: "The Chair agrees with you but the Gentleman made the motion to....the Gentleman's motion fails and we have already ruled that. Why doesn't the Gentleman move to nonconcur and you'll be in a Conference Committee. You've got a nonconcurrence on one of them already. The Bill is going to go to a Conference Committee."

Jones: "I renew my motion to concur...take the record on the results."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, you've lost that motion, Mr. Jones."

Jones: "Okay. Can we go to Amendment #7?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman wishes to go to Amendment #7 and on that....the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side on Amendment #5 to House Bill 2987, I move to reconsider the vote by which it failed."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman has moved to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #5 failed. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and we're back to reconsideration of the Amendment. Back to, Mr. Jones. Now, Mr. Jones moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #5 to House Bill 2987. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 83 'aye', 50 'nos' and the House does not concur. Mr. Jones. Mr. Jones."



Jones: "Poll the absentees please."

Clerk O'Brien: "Adams, Beatty, Bradley...."

Speaker Bradley: "Adams, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bradley, Brady, Brandt, Caldwell, Corneal
Davis, Dawson, DiPrima, Domico, Ewell...."

Speaker Bradley: "Ewell, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Farley, Gaines, Garmisa, Greiman, Hart, Holewinski,
Dan Houlihan, J.M. Houlihan, Huff, Jaffe, Katz, Kornowicz,
Lechowicz....Lechowicz, 'no'. Madigan, Madison, Marovitz,
McLendon, Molloy...."

Speaker Bradley: "What purpose does the Gentleman from Cook,
Mr. Barnes arise?"

Barnes: "No."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. Mr.
Barnes."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mugalian, Mulcahey, Nardulli, Pechous, Richmond,
Schlickman, Shumpert, E.G. Steele, Van Duynes, Willer,
Yourell...."

Speaker Bradley: "Willer, wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Yourell, wishes to be voted....recorded as
voting 'aye'. Mr. Flinn. Mr. Flinn, turn Mr. Flinn on."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, in the interest of saving time and if I'm
not out of order. I would like to move that we suspend
the appropriate rules for the rest of this Spring Session
that when a....one Amendment fails to get concurrence
and that the Bill has to go back to the Conference
Committee that we automatically do not take up any other
Amendments and send the whole Bill back."

Speaker Bradley: "We don't....I don't think we have a rule that
says that....that's going to happen automatically. Except
if a Member persists in continuing with their concurrences."

Flinn: "I think the Speaker should rule then, Mr. Speaker, that
there is no point in taking any further Amendments up
and that would not be unfair to the Sponsor or to the Bill."



Speaker Bradley: "Let's resolve this one...I have indicated that time and time again this afternoon. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich arise?"

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I think the policy of that is that the Senate could recede from the Amendment and then the Bill would be in final form."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Garmisa wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Leverenz wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Mr. Farley, what purpose do you arise? Mr. Farley wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Mr. Mulcahey, 'aye'. Garmisa, 'no'. Brandt, 'aye'. How many is that? On this question there are 89 'ayes', 53 'nos' and the House does concur with Amendment #5 to House Bill 2987. Mr. Jones."

Jones: "Amendment #7, could we ask for the same Roll Call for Amendment #7 and get it in its proper posture...."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman asks for the same Roll Call. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane. Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Parliamentary inquiry. I think that last Roll Call was a motion to reconsider. Not an adoption to the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "No, we had already had adopted the reconsidered motion...by voice vote."

Kane: "By voice vote? How can you have a motion to reconsider on a voice Roll Call."

Jones: "Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman. Mr. Speaker, may we now move on Amendment #7?"

Speaker Bradley: "#7, Mr. Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Chairman, Members of the House, I move that we concur in Amendment #7 which is an amount of a hundred thousand dollars to appraise and operate the youth center at Geneva. Roll Call please."

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

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would have sworn just a moment ago I heard the Gentleman say that there was a problem with the form



of Amendment #7. Now tell me he doesn't want to go to a Conference Committee at all, when he tells me he wants to concur to this Amendment. He would like to see the Senate recede to that other Amendment and get all his money back.....all of it back. Which I think is irresponsible in the first place but I would like to question the form of that Amendment because....let's be honest about it, just two minutes ago, Representative Jones, you told us there was a problem with the form of Amendment #7. Now, I don't think you ought to say something on the floor of the House if it is not true. And now you're going to concur with an Amendment where there is a problem with the form of it? We want a legal Bill don't we?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Jones."

Jones: "I withdraw the motion and let it go to the Conference Committee and work it out there."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman withdraws his motion. Okay. Mr. Jones moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #7. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the House nonconcur with Senate Amendment #7. Supplemental Calendar #3...so that we can go to some of these motion that are going to end up in a Conference Committee. Senate Bill 309, Dan Houlihan. Senate Bill 736, Mr. Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I move to nonconcur to Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 736. I would like to have a Conference Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur to Senate Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 736 and on that motion, the Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, isn't the correct motion a motion to not recede? The Senate nonconcurred."

Capparelli: "Then I move not to recede Amendment #6."

Speaker Bradley: "You want to recede from Senate Amendment..."

Capparelli: "No, not to recede. I refuse to recede Amendment #6"



to Senate Bill 736 and I ask for a Conference Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman refuses to recede....the House refuse to recede from Senate Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 736 and a Conference Committee be appointed. And on the order the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keats."

Keats: "Mine is a technical question. What is the Amendment?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Roger, this is the....the Amendment 736 back to the original state before we admended it to #5 on the sales tax provision for machinery."

Keats: "Wasn't it in original shape a far better Bill? Didn't the Senate just gum up the works on it?"

Capparelli: "No, not really because you voted for the Amendment #5."

Keats: "Yes, but I voted...but I preferred Terzich's Bill."

Capparelli: "I see."

Keats: "I would move to not recede on Amendment #6."

Capparelli: "Okay, just to clarify it then, this Amendment would put the Bill in the same shape as Representative Terzich's Bill originally which passed out of the House."

Keats: "No, not exactly."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman refuses to....moves to refuse to recede. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Conference Committee will be appointed. On Supplemental #3, Senate Bill 393, Mr. Hoffman. 395....1555, Mr. McClain. The Gentleman from Adams."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to refuse to recede from Senate Amendment #.....House Amendment #1 which they nonconcurrred with in the Senate and ask for a Conference Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to refuse to recede from Senate Bill 1555 and ask for a Conference Committee. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries."



1562. Lynn Martin."

Martin: "I want to refuse to recede."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady moves to refuse to recede from Amendment #1 and ask for a Conference Committee. Mrs. Martin, is that...all in favor of the Ladies motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion....adopted. Conference Committee will be appointed. Senate Bill 1672, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move that the House do not recede from Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 15, to Senate Bill 1672 and a Conference Committee be appointed."

Speaker Bradley: "Any discussion? All in favor of the Gentleman's motion will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Conference Committee will be appointed. 1725, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Epton."

Epton: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that the House refuse to recede from our Amendments #1, 2, 3 and request an appointment of a Conference Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, this is the terrible House Amendment that went on here previously. We had a motion to reconsider on this and then we had a major Roll Call or verification on the Roll Call on the passage here. The Senate has apparently seen the errors of our ways here, we could solve this entire issue by receding."

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

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would offer a substitute motion of concurrence....or to recede."

Speaker Bradley: "You're not the Sponsor, Sir. The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham. Turn Mr. Cunningham on."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to rise in support of a very fine Resolution offered by the Representative



from Rock Island. That we do recede....and we would appreciate your enlightenment by showing us in the book where that type of logical procedure is forbidden. This isn't the typical situation where you argue that the Sponsor of the Bill, owns the Bill. This isn't the principal Sponsor of the Bill that made the original motion not to recede. This is the individual in the House side who just went up to the well and grabbed a particular Bill. The Bill belonged to somebody named, Pate Philip over in the Senate, he's the principal Sponsor of the Bill. And the position of Representative Darrow, is very logical, it would save a lot of time, it would get a meaningful Roll Call by the Members of this House on a question that won't go away. And that is, whether the State of Illionis wants to willfully embark upon a program of driving small domestic insurance companies from its limits. Now, I ask the Speaker for one honest moment and forget the Statefarm Association, to recognize Representative Darrow's motion to recede that we might have a vote on it."

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

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought his comment there was totally out of order and I think the Gentleman ought to apologize to the Speaker on that. Mr. Cunningham."

Speaker Bradley: "Let's go with the Gentleman's motion. Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, one would think that the voice of golden rule would at least attempt to live by that rule. I have never heard such nonsense as far as on the floor of the House in my life. The request for Conference Committee comes from the Leadership of both sides of the aisle in the Senate. We had a good deal of debate on this subject and cooler hasn't prevailed and said, let's sit down in Conference Committee and try and iron out a problem that obviously is dividing a lot of people. As



I say, the request comes from the Leadership of both sides of the aisle. I would hope the Leadership on both sides of the aisle in this House would concur. Let's refuse to recede, let's go with the Conference Committee and see if we can act like reasonable people and come up with a compromise."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Epton, moves to refuse to recede from Senate Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1725. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. Everybody will signify in favor of Mr. Epton, will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 85 'ayes', 50 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion carries and a Conference Committee will be appointed. On the House Calendar...or Supplemental #1, #1 appears House Bill 3167. Mr. Houlihan on 3167."

Houlihan: "Is this on 3167, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Bradley: "3167."

Houlihan: "This will be on the Order of Concurrence, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon."

Houlihan: "This will be on the Order of Concurrence?"

Speaker Bradley: "On Order of Concurrence, House Bill 3167."

Houlihan: "All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 and 2, to House Bill 3167. Amendment #1 does two things. It deletes reference to the interest ceiling for which the Illinois Industrial Development Authorities revenue bonds may be sold. Instead the authority is granted the authority to issue the bonds in such manner as it shall determine. This elimination of the interest ceiling is consistent with that of other state created revenue bonding authorities which operate without interest ceiling. Such authorities are as the state toll highway authority, the industrial pollution



control financing authority, the health facility authority and the educational facility authority. Secondly, Senate Amendment #1 establishes a maximum limitation of ten million dollars for any single loan for an industrial project. Now this will not hinder the authority for making industrial development loans and point of fact for the past eight years the largest loan issued by this agency or this authority was less than a hundred fifty thousand dollars. Senate Amendment #2 is a technical Amendment which was requested by the US Small Business Administration, technically what it does is allow the authority to make loans and accept guarantees from individual corporations and governmental agencies. And I move the adoption of Senate Amendments #1 and 2, to the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman moves that the House concur....the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann. Mr. Mann, turn Mr. Mann on please. Discussion? Hearing none, the Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2, to House Bill 3167. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 144 'ayes', no 'nays' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2, to House Bill 3167. On Supplemental #2 appears House Bill 2539 in the Order of Concurrence. Mr. Dunn, the Gentleman from Macon."

Dunn: "I move that the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2, to House Bill 2539."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves....the Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman kindly inform the Membership what the Amendment does?"

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, there



were two Amendments put on in the Senate. One Amendment changed the ratio of local to state participation and increased the local participation share from 10% to 60%. The second Amendment changed the date which...which affects the date for which those who are eligible for debt service can apply and move that date up to, October 1, 1975."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen."

Dunn: "I ask that we concur...that the House concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."

Speaker Bradley: "Mrs. Pullen, on the Gentleman's motion."

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Pullen: "Does this have anything to do with the state paying some portion of jail construction?"

Dunn: "This is House Bill 2539, which is a Bill that I filed early, has to do with that subject matter. That's correct."

Pullen: "Sir, a fellow was shouting when you said what it had to do with. Could you repeat that please?" Did you say jail construction?"

Dunn: "Yes. This is House Bill 2539, the subject matter of that Bill is a program to set up grants for those who have been mandated by the state to make improvements in their jails. And those who have been mandated and only those who have been mandated are eligible for help."

Pullen: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich arise?"

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Two of the best friends I ever had just walked in. They are both former Members, one of them I had the privilege of once nominating for Speaker of the House. He only got one vote and it was mine and I was proud of that vote. That was Toby Barry, right here. And the



other fellow is another friend that I consider my best friend, Joe Fennessey, right here he is, Joe, everybody."

Speaker Bradley: "What purpose does the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce arise?"

Pierce: "I just want to remind, Representative Matijevich, that I once nominated him for Speaker of the House and he only got one vote...mine."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Leinenweber, what purpose do you arise?"

Leinenweber: "I have a couple of appeals pending down in the third district court and I would like some more time to get my brief filed. I wonder if I can get that today."

Speaker Bradley: "Judge Barry. Mr. Leinenweber, would you please repeat the question."

Leinenweber: "I would like some more time to file a brief on a case I have down there, can I have it?"

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "First, Mr. Speaker, how many votes does this take?"

Speaker Bradley: "89 to concur."

Telcser: "Isn't this...isn't this a new authority for bonding?"

Speaker Bradley: "No. The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaekr, Members of the House, by concurring and that is what the motion is, that we concur on this Bill. You're taking state funds to build county jails. St Clair County just went through the agony of building a new court house and jail, Clinton County, Marion County, Jefferson County, and we did this with the money within the county. Now these guys are coming back and wants to the state to pay for theirs. There is nothing right about that and let them build their own jails."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think you should give due consideration that there are some counties in the State of Illinois that have taken their own funds and revenue sharing funds to build a new jail.



Now how you expect to compensate these counties that have already gone to this extent. Let's face it, if you concur with this you're going to have to make some provision to compensate those counties that have gone ahead and complied."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I know that there might be some argument on this, however, I think that the Members have to consider two points. One is, that we pass Bills out of here with more bonding authority than this one here has in it. It gives the Governor the option of taking this Bill which provides for lesser amount of bonding authority. It also does no more...no more than we're doing for school construction. We have mandated programs that mandate the safety code and for schools and that's how they get school construction money. We have people passing bond referendums for school construction. We have a mandated program that mandates that we build county jails. This is to contribute on a formula basis, to those counties mandated. And it gives the Governor an option of taking a lesser program to accomplish this if he so chooses. I recommend that we do concur in this motion to give the Governor that option."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. One of the problems that we get into here in the Legislation is...in establishing precedents and this Bill attempts to establish the precedent that the State of Illinois is going to build county jails. Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you that there are many counties who have already solved their own problems. My own county is one of them. At the present time we're in the process of constructing a new county jail and I assure you that if we're going to give state money to counties who have not met their responsibilities, that we are certainly going to have to go back and reimburse those



counties who have already met their responsibility. This is a sad precedent, Mr. Speaker and we should fail to concur in this Amendment." I suggest to you that before we're through with this, this is going to cost the State of Illinois well over a hundred million dollars and we should not start this precedent. I urge a 'no' vote on this motion to concur."

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

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there is just one big...big difference involved in many of these counties where you have already built county jails. We built a county jail many many years ago but the thing is deteriorated to point where the state and I repeat, the State of Illinois has indicated by mandate that it has to replace its jail. It has come into our county and many other counties in this state and said, that the county has to build a jail. And therefore, I think it is the responsibility of the state to help pay for part of that jail. Now what this Bill says is, the counties will pay for 60%, the state will pay for 40%. Now I think that's a fair share, it's a good shake for the counties and it is a good Bill for the State of Illinois. If the state is going to mandate let it put its money where its mouth is. And that's the indication of this Bill. I would ask for your support."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."

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

DeKalb County finds itself in the same situation as Peoria County, you've already...you've had yourself a jail and the state came in and said, build a new one. They said the same thing to us in DeKalb County and with our own money we're building it, Representative Tuerk. Now we're not asking the state for anything, I think this is about the most ridiculous piece of legislation...to throw this responsibility upon the state, it belongs to



counties. Our taxpayers are willing to pay for our own jail and if Peoria County needs one and wants one, even though the state has said they should pay for it. Besides you're carrying....excuse me, Representative, but you're carrying a appropriation that came back from the Senate and its got 1.6 billion dollars on it, maybe you can add it in there. But I think it is a poor concept and this Bill ought to be resoundly defeated."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser....oh, fine. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn to close the debate. Turn, Mr. Dunn on please."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We're talking now about a Bill that passed this House once before, we're talking about an appropriation which is on the Governor's desk at the present time. As the Bill first passed out of this House it provided for a 90% state share. That state share has now been reduced to 40%, the cost to the state is much much less. This is a less costly Bill, we need your vote, we need your help. Those of us in counties that have this problem have no other way to solve it, those of you who have jails under construction are eligible to apply for help with your debt service. There is something here for all of you who have this problem. Those of you who don't are very fortunate and you ought to be commended. But for those of us who have the problem, we need your help and I would ask again that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 and 2, to House Bill 2539. I need a green vote."

Speaker Bradley: "All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman



Knox, Mr. McMaster to explain his vote."

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

We're getting carried away with this thing, the Gentleman from Decatur and probably one of those or two of them from Peoria are saying, they have been mandated by the state to build these jails. My God, they were probably mandated back in 1965, that's when they started mandating us back in Knox County. And the City of Galesburg in Knox County joined together and built a jail. So this mandate isn't something that came along all of a sudden. I don't know if these guys are so anxious to help their county why didn't they do it ten years ago. But let's remember one more thing about this piece of legislation. Mr. Dunn said that we passed the appropriation Bill to provide this money last night, but what he isn't telling you is, that there is no god damn way you can spend that money unless we pass this Bill. So, I urge a 'no' vote on this. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from....have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer to explain his vote."

Brummer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. This is an extremely important Bill, it is a Bill to fulfill the mandate of the State of Illinois. The State of Illinois has mandated the construction of these jails, we can only do so by providing partial funding or otherwise, a 100% of it is going to have to come from local real estate taxes. This will help to relieve the pressure on local real estate taxes which everyone seems to be conscious of after proposition 13. If you want to try to prevent a major local real estate tax increase, you would vote for this to fulfill the state mandate that they have imposed on the local counties. We need more green votes."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider to



explain his vote."

Schneider: "Thanks a lot. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, some of the lesser quality people came over and pressed my button from green to red. I would like to be returned to green please."

Speaker Bradley: "You're still open, I think."

Schneider: "Oh, thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn, to explain his vote."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Maybe the point didn't get made quiet clear enough. This Bill has been changed so that it is less costly to the State of Illinois. It is a much less costly version than that which passed this chamber previously. It less costly than introduced, there is an appropriation which has been approved by both chambers and is on the Governor's desk. This Bill went out here before, it is a much needed program, a badly needed program and it is a program that arose only because of a mandate by the State of Illinois. Had there been no mandate there would have been no program. Since there was a mandate we have need for the program. If we can bond to build brand new prisons, we can also finance this project to take care of the people who might find themselves in jail overnight just once or twice. They might just be held there overnight; we need to have decent facilities to take care of those people. This is a reasonable program, it is a good concept, it is one that we need in the State of Illinois and if your county is not mandated now it may well be mandated in the next few days, weeks or months. Because the Department of Corrections has an on-going review program to review all the county jails in the State of Illinois. And if your county is mandated and if you have to make improvements and you can't get the money from the state, you're going to have to go back home to get it and when you do that,



the only way you can get it is to raise property taxes. We need a few more green lights up there. This put this Bill over and send it to the Governor."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Mahar to explain his vote."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Not to explain my vote, if this reaches 89, I would like to ask for a verification."

Speaker Bradley: "That has already been requested. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt...to explain your vote."

Bluthardt: "Well, I sure would like to. If I understand it and I know we're getting a little fuzzy and maybe ought to go home. But if we refuse to concur this goes back to the Senate, if they recede from this Amendment then we have the state financing 90% of the cost. If we agree with the concurrence the state will only finance 40% of the cost. So it seems to me that the better gamble is to concur and at least save the taxpayers some percentage of the cost. I think that those voting red are in error and they ought to vote green."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 94 'ayes', 68 'nays'. Mr. Telcser, do you persist?"

Telcser: "Yes."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Dunn, requests a poll of the absentees. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty arise?"

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Gentleman leave to be verified. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Poll the absentees."

Clerk Hall: "Jack Davis, Flinn, Hart, Dave Jones, Klosak, Levin, Madison, Molloy, Mugalian, Pechous, Schoeberlein, R.V. Walsh and Willer."

Speaker Bradley: "Call the Affirmative Roll."



Clerk Hall: "E.M. Barnes, Bartulis, Beatty, Birchler, Bluthardt, Bowman, Bradley, Brady, Brandt, Breslin, Rich Brummer, Don Brummet, Byers, Caldwell, Campbell, Capparelli, Catania, Chapman, Christensen, Darrow, Corneal Davis, Dawson, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, John Dunn, Dyer, Ewell, Farley, Gaines, Garmisa, Getty, Giglio, Greiman, Hanahan, Harris, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, Jim Houlihan, Huff, Jacobs, Jaffe, Johnson, Emil Jones, Kane, Kelly, Kornowicz, Kosinski...."

Speaker Bradley: "The Chair would like to have your attention for a minute or thirty second. We've had so many people coming up and wanting to move their Bills that we are going to be here probably until at least 7 o'clock. So if you want to get some food, you better order some food in and we've got Senate Bills, Second Reading that have to be addressed yet this evening. So we'll be here until at least eleven."

Clerk Hall: "Laurino, Lechowicz, Leverenz, Lucco, Luft, Madigan, Mann, Marovitz, Peggy Smith Martin, Matejek, Matijevich, Mautino, McClain, McLendon, McPike, Mudd, Mulcahey, Murphy, Nardulli, O'Brien, Pierce, Pouncey, Reilly, Richmond, Robinson, Satterthwaite, Schisler, Schneider, Sharp, Shumpert, Steczo, Stuffle, Taylor, Terzich, Tipsword, Tuerk, Van Duyne, Vitek, Von Boeckman, Wikoff, Williams, Younge, Yourell, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Question of the affirmative. Mr. Pechous wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Mr. Telcser, turn Mr. Telcser on."

Telcser: "Representative E.M. Barnes."

Speaker Bradley: "E.M. Barnes....is Mr. Barnes back there? He's not in his seat. How is he recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll. Mr. Walsh, Mr. R. Walsh wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. And Mr. Flinn wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Mr. Telcser."



Telcser: "Representative Birchler."

Speaker Bradley: "He's in his seat."

Telcser: "Representative Brandt."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Brandt. How is he recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Telcser: "Representative Breslin."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Breslin is in the chambers."

Telcser: "Representative Brummet."

Speaker Bradley: "Brummet."

Telcser: "Representative Brummet."

Speaker Bradley: "He's not in his seat. Is he in the chambers?
How is he recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Telcser: "Representative Byers."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Byers...is not in his chair.

Is he in the chambers? How is he recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Remove him from the Roll."

Telcser: "Representative Capparelli."

Speaker Bradley: "Capparelli is in his chair."

Telcser: "Representative Domico."

Speaker Bradley: "Domico...Representative Domico. How is he
recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Telcser: "Representative Ewell."

Speaker Bradley: "Ewell...his coat is here, he can't be far
away. Here he is in the door."

Telcser: "Representative Giglio."

Speaker Bradley: "Giglio is in the aisle."

Telcser: "Representative Hanahan."

Speaker Bradley: "Hanahan...Mr. Brandt has returned. Mr.
Hanahan is not in his chair. Is he in the chambers? How



is he recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Telcser: "Representative Harris."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Harris is in his chair."

Telcser: "Representative Jaffe."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Jaffe...how is he recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Telcser: "Representative Johnson."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Johnson...there he is, he's
on your side."

Telcser: "Representative Kelly."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Kelly is in the chambers."

Telcser: "Representative Kornowicz."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Kornowicz....he's not in his
seat. Is he in the chambers? How is he recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Telcser: "Representative Kane."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Kane is in Mr. Jaffe's seat."

Telcser: "Representative Laurino."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Laurino...Mr. Telcser, Mr.
Barnes has returned we'll put him back on."

Telcser: "All right. What about Representative Laurino?"

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Laurino...how is the Gentleman
recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Telcser: "Representative Mann."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Mann...Representative Mann is
in his chair."

Telcser: "Representative Marovitz."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Marovitz....He's in the doorway."

Telcser: "Richmond."



Speaker Bradley: "Representative Richmond....Representative Richmond...."

Telcser: "Domico came back."

Speaker Bradley: "Put Domico back on. And Representative Richmond is not in his chair. Is he in the chambers? How is he recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Telcser: "Representative Schisler."

Speaker Bradley: "Tipsword is in the center aisle."

Telcser: "No, Schisler."

Speaker Bradley: "Schisler is in his seat."

Telcser: "Representative Stuffle."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Stuffle is in his seat."

Telcser: "Representative Van Duyne."

Speaker Bradley: "Van Duyne is by the well there."

Telcser: "Representative Von Boeckman."

Speaker Bradley: "He's in his seat."

Telcser: "That's all I had, Mr. Speaker. Wait a second, Representative Kosinski here?"

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon."

Telcser: "Representative Kosinski."

Speaker Bradley: "Kosinski is...."

Telcser: "Here he is, he's over here."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. McGrew wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Any other additions? Mr. Leverenz, what purpose do you arise?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Leave him on the Roll. Mr. Schoeberlein wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Willer...she wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Further questions? What's the count, Mr. Clerk? On this question there are 93 'ayes', 68 'nos' and the House does concur



in Senate Amendments #1 and 2, to House Bill 2539. On House...on the Calendar...the Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, having voting on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote by which House Bill 2539 passed."

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

Lechowicz: "I move that motion lie on the table."

Speaker Bradley: "All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion is tabled. What purpose does the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis arise? Mr. Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, I was off the floor on the last Bill. Could I be recorded as 'no' to sort of protect my...."

Speaker Bradley: "Too late, it was a verified Roll, I'm sorry. The...on the Calendar on Supplemental #2...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, a point of information. Sometime earlier today approximately at noon, a lot of people came up to me and asked me how long we were going to be working. I told them approximately eight o'clock and I would like to keep my word on that issue. Now I strongly advise that we wind down between eight and eight-thirty or else you are going to be very lonely here."

Speaker Bradley: "House Bill 2949, Corneal Davis wishes...on Supplemental #2 wishes to put a motion. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Davis. For what purpose does the Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen arise?"

Ebbesen: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't hear a response to that last suggestion."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, the Chair announced that we would be here possibly until eleven, there has been so many people coming up and wanting their Bills called and we've got Senate Bills, Second Reading. And one of the Gentlemen who came up was, Mr. Davis on...."

Ebbesen: "Well my...Mr. Speaker..."



Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Davis on House 2949. Turn, Mr. Davis on."

Davis: "Please. Thank you...thank you. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to move that we concur in Senate Amendment...to 2949 of Senate Amendment #2, 3 and 4. Senate Amendment #2 corrects Sections number from 4 to 3, that's all it does. It corrects it from 4 to 3 and adds an additional. Senate Amendment #3 says that in the provision that unless the tenant may pay for services if who is required to do so...fails to make a payment. It simply says that the...unless he can pay for that service. Senate Amendment #4 says that in addition to payment of past due cost of water, gas, electric service owned by the lessor for restoration of service requires a Security deposit if such a deposit is required by the utility in accordance with the rules and regulations of the Illinois Commerce Commission. These Amendments are agreed to by the utility company and the Senate and I would move that we concur in them."

Speaker Bradley: "On the motion, the Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendments #2, 3 and 4...is that right?"

Davis: "Yes, right."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti on the Gentleman's motion."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, not only on the Gentleman's motion. But I worked real hard in public utilities all year long to try and get a decent Bill out of that Committee. Representative Davis cooperated 1000% with us and our Committee. Now he is asking us to concur and not to concur, I don't know what he's asking us to do. When you're here for twelve hours you're getting a little whippy. I haven't heard what the Bill is going to do. There is so much commotion going on, now are we going to work ten hours today or twelve today or how long until we can made arrangements...just how are we going to work?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman....."



Conti: "I want to vote intelligently on this."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman's motion is to concur in Senate Amendments #2, 3 and 4, on House Bill 2949. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Out of courtesy of the Dean of the House, I'm going to be voting on this measure. But on subsequent measures I'm going to be voting 'no' and asking for a verification."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Just a matter of inquiry of the Chair, would you like me to call on concurrence 2695?"

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon, Sir?"

Tipsword: "Would you like for me to call 2695 on concurrence?"

Speaker Bradley: "Well, let's get this settled first. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion....or if you wish, the Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 104 'ayes', 3 'nos' and the House concurs in Senate Amendments #2, 3 and 4, to House Bill 2949. On the.... On the regular Calendar appears House Bill 3053...all right, 3023, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "I have lost a few Bills for extraneous reasons. I think I'll take it out of the record for a few minutes."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "Well, having thought that I have lost some Bills for other reasons, I decided we would pass this for a few minutes."

Speaker Bradley: "3220. On the Supplemental #2 appears House Bill 3108. Is that the one, Mr. Mautino...3177."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3177, I move that we do not concur and I recommend a Conference Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman's moves to nonconcur. Any discussion? All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify



by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Gentleman's motion prevails. Now Senate Bills, Second Reading. On the Calendar on Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1456."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1456, a Bill for an Act making appropriation to the State Board of Education. Second Reading of the Bill. This Bill has been read a second time previously and next Amendment was Amendment #14."

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

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, it might have taken me a little while to get past the bar and get my licenses but I'm not quite this slow...I'll take this Bill out of the record."

Speaker Bradley: "On the Supplemental appears House Bill 3108, it is Supplemental #2. Mr. Bartulis."

Bartulis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. On House Bill 3108, I do not wish to concur with Senate Amendment #3, I believe it is."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #3 and asks for a Conference Committee. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and we nonconcur. On #3, Supplemental #3 appears Senate Bill 393 and the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on Senate Bill 393, I would ask for leave to do the same on Senate Bill 395. I move to nonconcur and request that a Conference Committee be appointed."

Speaker Bradley: "You move to refuse to recede and a Conference Committee. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Conference Committee will be reported. Senate Bill 395."

Unknown: "This is the green hornet."

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



Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would make the same motion on Senate Bill 395."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to refuse to recede Senate Amendments #1 and 3, to Senate Bill 395. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed. The 'ayes have it and a Conference Committee will be appointed. On the Calendar on Supplemental #4, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In respect to Senate Bill 250 of which I am a Cosponsor with Representative Sandquist and on Senate Bill 252, 253 and 255. At the request of the House Sponsors of those Bills I would move that the House refuse to recede from the House Amendments to these Senate Bills and that all four of these Bills be placed in a Conference Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "The motion was to refuse to recede and put in a Conference Committee. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion...he mentioned all four Bills, 250, 252, 253, 255... 771? Or just this first four?"

Houlihan: "Just the first four."

Speaker Bradley: "Okay. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Conference Committee will be appointed. House Bills, Third Reading appears House Bill 3403. The Representative from Cook, Mr. Matula. Read the Bill."

Matula: "Thank you...thank you...."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3403, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Illinois Racing Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

Matula: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3403 transfers sixty-six thousand, six hundred dollars out of personal services into the contractual services and commodities line item. This allows the payment of unanticipated expenses resulting from the emergency move of the Boards laboratory from Fillmore Street



Forest Park during January, 1978. The move was necessary because of broken water pipes and lack of heat in the Fillmore State Laboratory. Therefore, I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Friedland."

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Friedland: "Mr. Sponsor, is this a good Bill?"

Matula: "Yes, it is."

Friedland: "Mr. Sponsor, is this your first Bill?"

Matula: "Yes, it is."

Friedland: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to reiterate this is the Gentleman's first Bill. I would try to help him pass his first Bill in this House. Mr. Speaker, I would also like to remind you that I intend to persist in my original statement."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "I just have an inquiry of the Chair. Is the Senate going to be in Saturday?"

Speaker Bradley: "I'm not able to answer that, I don't know if they will be or not. Further discussion? The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 148 'ayes', 2 'nays' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. What purpose does the Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson arise?"

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege. This Bill is now considered, is that right? Final action on that Bill? This afternoon on House Bill 3279, notwithstanding my party's position to the contrary, I voted in



favor of that Bill and gave the Democrat candidate for Governor an opportunity to talk about tax relief. I'm rising on a point of personal privilege to ask that you, Mr. Speaker, now go to the Order of Constitutional Amendments, Second Reading to give our Sponsor, Representative Totten, an opportunity to present an alternative form of tax relief and let the people decide on that as well."

Speaker Bradley: "Senate Bills, Second Reading. Would anybody like to call theirs? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move that we adjourn until ten o'clock tomorrow morning. Allowing some time for the Clerk for perfunctory duties."

Speaker Bradley: "We will stand in perfunct...we will stand adjourned until ten o'clock tomorrow morning and we'll allow five minutes for perfunct for the Clerk. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the House stands adjourned."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in adoption of their Amendments to the Bills of the following titles to-wit; Senate Bills #1725, 1672, 1562, 1555, 736, 255, 253, 252, 250 and 771. Action taken by the Senate, June 28, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. No further business the House now stands adjourned."



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	1.
1	10:01	Speaker Giorgi	House to order	
		Reverend Chiola	Prayer	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Clerk O'Brien	Messages from Senate	
		Speaker Giorgi		
2		Matijevich	Agreed resolutions	
		E.M. Barnes		
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Clerk O'Brien	Committee reports	
		Speaker Giorgi		
3		Chapman	HB 562, SA #1	
		Speaker Giorgi	House non concurs?	
		Geo-Kairs	Yes on SB 1736	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Kozubowski	HB 3392, SA #1 & 2	
4		Speaker Giorgi		
		Ryan	Hold it?	
		Speaker Giorgi	TOOR	
5		Richmond	HB 384, SA #2	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Geo-Karis	In favor	
		Speaker Giorgi		
	10:25	Reed	Urge concurrence	
		Speaker Giorgi		
6		Mahar		
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Richmond		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	2.
		Speaker Giorgi	House concurs	
7		Friedrich	HB 2911 SA #2,3,4,5	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Houlihan, D.	Question	
		Friedrich		
		Speaker Giorgi		
8		Matijevich	Question	
		Friedrich		
		Speaker Giorgi		
9		Leverenz		
		Speaker Giorgi	House concurs	
		Kozubowski		
10		Speaker Giorgi	House nonconcurr	
		Leverenz	HB 2219 SA#1,2,3	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Totten	Question	
	10:32	Leverenz	TOOR	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Mahar	HB 2985 SA# 3,4,5,6	
11		Speaker Giorgi	TOOR	
		Robinson	HB 3053, SA# 1	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Keats	Question	
		Robinson		
		Speaker Giorgi		
12		Conti	Move nonconcur	
		Speaker Giorgi		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	3.
		Totten	Question	
		Robinson		
		Speaker Giorgi		
13		Ryan	Introduction	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Ryan	Explain vote	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Conti	Verify roll	
		Speaker Giorgi	Poll absentees	
14		Clerk O'Brien		
		Speaker Giorgi		
15	10:48	Clerk O'Brien	Affirmative roll call	
16		Speaker Giorgi	Dump roll, house concurs	
		Leverenz	HB 2219, CA#1	
		Schlickman		
17		Speaker Giorgi		
		Barnes, E.M.		
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Terzich		
		Speaker Giorgi		
18		Ebbesen		
		Speaker Giorgi	House concurs	
		Mahar	HB 2985, SA# 2,3,4,5,6	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Leverenz	Yield	
19		Mahar		
		Speaker Giorgi		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	4.
		Porter		
		Mahar	TOOR	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Barnes, J.	HB 2775, SA#1	
	11:05	Speaker Giorgi	House nonconcur	
		Greiman	HB 2105, SA#1	
		Speaker Giorgi		
	11:07	Schneider	Question	
20		Greiman		
		Speaker Giorgi		
21		Schlickman	Yield?	
		Greiman	Discussion	
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Pullen	Yield?	
22		Greiman	Discussion	
23		Speaker Giorgi		
		Satterthwaite	Supports	
		Speaker Giorgi	Concurs in SA #1, HB 2105	
		Waddell		
		Speaker Giorgi		
		Darrow	Change vote	
24		Speaker Giorgi		
		Byers		
	11:15	Speaker Lechowicz		
		Mahar	Moves concur in SA#1,2,3,4,5	
		Speaker Lechowicz		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	5.
25		Matijevich	Yield?	
	11:15	Adams		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Rigney		
26		Matijevich		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Porter	Yield	
		Mahar		
27		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs SA#2,3,4,5,6	
28		O'Brien	HB 2835 SA#1	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Bluthardt	Yield	
		O'Brien		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
29		Bluthardt	Speak against	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Conti	PPP	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Schlickman		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
30		O'Brien	To close	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Bluthardt	Questions germaneness	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		O'Brien	Out of order	
32	11:30	Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs	
		Yourell	HB 2554 SA#2,3,4,5,7	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

6.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Bluthardt	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
33		Collins	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
34		Geo-Karis	Questions
		Yourell	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Totten	Yield
		Yourell	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
35-36		Levin	Yield
		Yourell	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Bowman	Divide question
		Yourell	Okay. SA#2
		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs
		Yourell	SA#3
		Speaker Lechowicz	
37		Robinson	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
	11:45	Bowman	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
38		Yourell	To close
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Beatty	Explain vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	7.
		Collins	Explains vote	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
39		Byers		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		McClain	Urge aye vote	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Yourell	Move to nonconcur	
40		Speaker Lechowicz	House nonconcur	
		Yourell	SA#4	
		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs	
		Yourell	SA# 5 & 7	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Bowman	Divide question	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Too late	
		Yourell	Move to nonconcur #5	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Bowman		
	11:54	Speaker Lechowicz		
41		Yourell	Responds to Bowman	
		Speaker Lechowicz	House nonconcur	
		Yourell	SA #7	
		Speaker Lechowicz	House nonconcur	
		Stearney	Leave to vote aye, 2835	
42		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 2555 SA#1,2	
		Levin		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
43		Schlickman	Yield	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	8.
		Levin		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
44		Huff		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
45		Holewinski	To close	
		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs	
		Conti	Asks for order	
46		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Jones, E.	HB 2619, SA#2	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Schlickman	Explain?	
		Jones, E.		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Walsh, W	Discussion	
	12:07	Jones, E.		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
47		Stuffle		
		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs	
		Brady	HB 2691, SA#1	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		McClain	Yield	
48		Brady		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Geo-Karis		
		Brady		
49		Speaker Lechowicz		
50		Yourell	HB 15, SA#2	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	9.
		Speaker Lechowicz		
51		Yourell	HB 15, SA#2	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Mann	Yield	
52	12:16	Yourell		
53		Mann		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Reilly		
		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs	
54		Yourell	HB 16, SA#1	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Reilly		
		Yourell		
		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs	
		Tipsword	HB 2790, SA#1	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
55		Kent	Question	
		Tipsword		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
56		Geo-Karis	Yield	
		Tipsword		
		Speaekr Lechowicz		
57		McGrew		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Schlickman	Verification	
	12:30	Speaker Lechowicz	Poll absentees	
		Clerk O'Brien		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	10.
58		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Clerk O'Brien	Affirmative roll call	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Schlickman	Questions affirmative roll	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Caldwell	Vote aye	
59		Speaker Lechowicz		
60		Schlickman		
61		Matijevich		
62		Speaekr Lechowicz		
		Mulcahey		
		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs SA#1	
		Von Boeckman	HB 297, SA#2	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Keats		
63		Von Boeckman		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Martin, L.		
64		Speaker Lechowicz		
65		Schuneman	Question	
		Von Boeckman	TOOR	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
66	12:51	Beatty	HB 1470, SA#1	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Schlickman	Parliamentary question	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
67		Schlickman	Questions germaneness	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	11.
		Speaker Lechowicz		
68		Telcser	Oppose	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
69		Madigan	Support	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Catania		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
70		Winchester		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Bradley		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		SkinnerMPQ		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
71		Tipsword	Explain vote	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Garmisa		
72		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Mahar	Verification	
	1:05	Speaker Lechowicz		
73		Houlihan, J.	Explains vote	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Bluthardt	Explains vote	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
74		Harris	Explains vote	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Conti	Explains vote	
		Speaker Lechowicz		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	12.
		O'Brien	Explains vote	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Houlihan, J.	Rebuttal to O'Brien	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
75	1:12	Geo-Karis		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Schisler	Explains vote	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees	
76		Speaker Lechowicz	Motion fails, PPC	
		Van Duyne	Inquiry	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
78		Pierce	HB 3279 concur on SA#2,3	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Totten	Motion to go to constitutional amendments	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
79	1:20	Telcser	Explains vote	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
80		Holewinski		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Anderson		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
81		Daniels		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Kane	Yield	
82-83		Pierce		
84		Speaker Lechowicz		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	13.
		Darrow		
84		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Simms		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Kosinski	MPQ	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
86		Pierce	To close	
87		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Edgar	Oppose	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Byers	Explain vote	
	1:38	Speaker Lechowicz		
88		Cunningham	Explain vote	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Stuffle	Explain vote	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
89		Reilly	Explain vote	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Greiman	Explain vote	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Totten	Explain vote	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
90		Tipsword		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Skinner		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Matijevich		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	14.
		Speaker Lechowicz		
91		Porter		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Johnson		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
92		Bowman		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
	1:50	Martin, L.		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Mautino		
		Speaker Lechowicz	Simms verification	
		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
93		Clerk O'Brien	Affirmative roll call	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
94-95		Simms	Questions of affirmative	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Clerk O'Brien		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Bluthardt	Change to no	
96		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Geo-Karis	Vote no	
		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs SA#2	
97		Matijevich		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Madigan	Move reconsider vote	
		Houlihan	Motion lie on table	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	15.
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Matijevich	PPP	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
	2:05	Geo-Karis		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Brady	HB 2818, SA#1 concur	
98		Speaker Lechowicz	Concurs	
99		Gaines	HB 2979 concur in #1,3,4,6, nonconcur #5	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Gaines	Explains	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Totten	Yield?	
		Gaines		
		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 2979	
100		Totten		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Catania		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Totten		
101		Barnes, E.M.		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
102		Schlickman	Substitute motion	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Houlihan, J.	Move to table	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Schlickman	To close	
		Madigan		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	16.
	2:19	Speaker Lechowicz Schlickman Speaker Lechowicz		
103		Houlihan, J. Speaker Lechowicz Walsh, Wm. Speaker Lechowicz Deuster Speaker Lechowicz	He's out of order	
104		Gaines Speaker Lechowicz Schlickman Speaker Lechowicz	Houlihan's motion fails	
105		Catania Speaker Lechowicz Davis, C. Speaker Lechowicz		
106		Madison Speaker Lechowicz Houlihan, J.		
107		Speaker Lechowicz Hanahan Speaker Lechowicz Satterthwaite	House nonconcur #5 HB 2632, SA#1 Amendment distributed?	
	2:30	Speaker Lechowicz	TOOR	
108		Brummet		
109		Clerk O'Brien	HR 1009	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	17.
110		Brummet		
		Hibbs		
111		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Byers		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
112		Clerk O'Brien	Messages from Senate	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
113		Garmisa	HB 1264, SA#1	
		Speaker Lechowicz	House nonconcur	
		Garmisa	PPP	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Yourell		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
114		Huskey	Responds	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Daniels	HB 2911, change to aye	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Totten	Question on HB 1264	
115	2:48	Skinner		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
116		Pierce	HB 2946, SA#1	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Leinenweber	Question	
117		Pierce		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
118		Schneider		
		Speaker Lechowicz		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	18.
119		Satterthwaite		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
120		Stearney	Yield	
		Pierce		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
121		Skinner		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Taylor	MPQ	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
122		Pierce	To close	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Walsh, Wm.	Explain vote	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
123		Schuneman	Inquire of chair	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
	3:05	Schneider	PPP	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Pierce	Move to nonconcur	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
124		Yourell		
		Speaker Lechowicz	House nonconcur	
		Pierce		
125		Bartulis	HB 2984, SA#2,3,4,5,6,7,8	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
126		Leverenz	Questions	
		Bartulis		
		Speaker Lechowicz		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	19.
		Porter	Yield	
127		Bartulis		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Adams	Answers Porter	
		Porter		
		Speaekr Lechowicz		
		Matijevich	Yield	
		Bartulis		
128		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs	
129		Barnes, J.	HB 2989, SA#2,3,4,5	
	3:14	Speaker Lechowicz		
		Harris		
		Barnes, J.		
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Porter	Yield	
		Barnes, J.	Discussion	
130		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Waddell	Yield?	
		Barnes, J.	Discussion	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Sumner	Yield?	
		Barnes, J.	Discussion	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Pullen		
131		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs SA#2 & 3	
		BARNES, J.	Explains SA#4	
		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	20.
		Barnes, J.	Explains SA#5	
	3:25	Speaker Lechowicz		
		Totten	Yield?	
		Barnes, J.		
		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs	
		Barnes	SA#6 was tabled	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
133		Barnes	Explains SA#7	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Pullen	Inquiry	
		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs	
		Barnes	SA#8	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Totten		
134		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs	
	3:30	Younge	HB 3062, concur #1,2,3	
135		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs	
		Sumner	Concur	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Collins	Divide the question	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Sumner	Explains #2	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Byers	Supports	
		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 3077, House concurs #2	
		Sumner	Explains #3	
		Speaker Lechowicz		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	21.
136	3:35	Byers	Opposes	
		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs	
		Sumner	Refers to Sandquist	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Sandquist	Explains SA#4	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
137		Houlihan, J.	Opposes	
		Speaker Lechowicz		
		Anderson	Yield?	
138		Sandquist		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Kosinski	Yield	
139		Sandquist		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Bluthardt		
		Speaker Bradley		
140		Mautino	Supports	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Houlihan, J.		
		Speaekr Bradley		
		Pierce	Aye to nay	
		Speaker Bradley	New roll call. #4 fails	
		Sandquist	Requests poll of absentees	
		Speaker Bradley		
141		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees	
142		Speaker Bradley		
		Pullen	No	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	22.
		Speaker Bradley		
		Taylor	Change to aye	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Houlihan	Verification	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	Continues absentees	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Deavers	Leave to be verified	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	Affirmative roll call	
143		Bradley		
		Houlihan, J.	Questions affirmative roll	
		Speaker Bradley	House concurs #4	
		Sandquist	SA#5	
		Speaker Bradley		
144		Houlihan, J.	Oppose	
	4:01	Speaker Bradley	House concurs	
145		Clerk O'Brien	Messages from Senate	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Kempiners	HB 3124, SA#1	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Breslin		
		Speaker Bradley	House concurs	
		Vinson	TOOR	
		Speaker Bradley		
146		Mahar	HB 3234, SA#1-5	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	23.
		Speaker Bradley		
147		Mahar		
		Speaker Bradley	TOOR	
		Leverenz	HB 3274, SA#1,2	
		Speaker Bradley		
148		Bluthardt		
149		Speaker Bradley		
150		Leinenweber	Asks defeat	
		Speaker Bradley		
151		Wash, Wm.		
		Speaker Bradley		
152	4:20	Collins		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Willer	Yield	
153		Leverenz		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Skinner		
154		Speaker Bradley		
		Leverenz	Move to nonconcur	
		Speaker Bradley	House nonconcur	
		Campbell	HB 3296, SA#1	
		Speaker Bradley		
155		Levin	Question	
		Speaker Bradley	House concurs	
		Holewinski	HB 3327, SA#2	
		Speaker Bradley		
156		Houlihan, D.	Question	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	24.
		Holewinski		
157		Speaker Bradley	House concurs	
		Mahar	HB 3234, SA#1	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Houlihan, D.		
158		Speaker Bradley	Not out of order	
		Houlihan		
159		Speaker Bradley		
		Mahar	Move to concur SA#1-5	
		Speaker Bradley		
	4:44	Jaffe	Yield	
		Mahar		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Wolf		
160		Speaker Bradley		
		Mahar		
161		Brummer		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Van Duyne	Yield	
162		Mahar		
		Speaker Bradley		
163		O'Brien	Question	
		Mahar		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Skinner		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Mahar	To close	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	25.
		Speaker Bradley		
164		Levin	Explain vote	
		Peters		
		erzich		
		Byers		
165	4:54	Speaker Bradley		
		Houlihan, J.		
		Speaker Bradley		
		O'Brien	Verification	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Wolf		
		Speaker Bradley	Poll absentees	
		Clerk O'Brien		
166		Speaker Bradley		
		O'Brien	Withdraws	
		Speaker Bradley	House concurs in SA 1,2,3,4,5	
		Mulcahey	HB 2529, SA#1	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Schlickman	Question	
		Mulcahey		
		Speaker Bradley		
167		Rigney		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Ewell		
		Speaker Bradley		
168		Cunningham		
		Speaker Bradley	Simms request verification	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	26.
		Clerk O'Brien	Affirmative roll call	
		Speaker Bradley		
169		Clerk O'Brien	Affirmative roll call	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Schlickman	Introduct Bill Scott	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Bill Scott		
		Speaker Bradley		
170-171		Simms	Questions	
172		Speaker Bradley	House concurs	
		Brady	Vote to reconsider	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Houlihan	Move motion lie on table	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Terzich	HB 2707 SA#1	
173		Speaker Bradley	House concurs	
		Dunn, J.	HB 2539, SA#1,2	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Schlickman	No copies	
		Speaker Bradley	TOOR	
		Jaffe	HJCA#29	
		Speaker Bradley		
174		DiPrima		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Yourell	Yield	
	5:18	DiPrima		
		Speaker Bradley	House adopts report	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	27.
		Richmond	HB 3231, SA#2	
		Speaker Bradley		
175		Pullen	Explain vote	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Ewing		
		Speaker Bradley	Concurs	
		Barnes		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Tuerk		
		Speaker Bradley		
176		Brady		
		Tuerk		
		Speaker Bradley	SA#1, HB 2635	
		Byers	Explains vote	
		Speaker Bradley	Concurs 2695?	
		Brady	HB 2925	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Tipsword	2695	
		Speaker Bradley	Correct record 2635	
177		Brady		
		Speaker Bradley	Concurs HB 2925	
178		Speaker Bradley	2986	
		Neff		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Neff		
		Speaker Bradley		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
179		Epton	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Houlihan, J.	
		Epton	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Byers	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Neff	
		Speaker Bradley	
180		Epton	
		Byers	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Keats	
181		Epton	
		Speaker Bradley	
182		Cunningham	
		Speaker Bradley	Divide question
		Barnes	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Bradley	
183		Barnes	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Matijevich	
184		Speaker Bradley	
		Levin	
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	29.
185		Collins		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Cunningham		
		Speaker Bradley		
186		Schuneman		
		Ebbesen	MPQ	
		Speaker Bradley		
	5:51	Epton		
187		Speaker Bradley	Nonconcur SA#5 2986	
		Brummer		
		Speaekr Bradley		
		Neff	Nonconcur SA#6	
		Speaker Bradley	Nonconcur	
188		Speaker Redmond	HB 3050, SA#1,2,3	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Houlihan, J.	Yield?	
		Speaker Redmond		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Wolf	Explain vote	
		Speaker Redmond		
189		Speaker Bradley	House concurs	
		Skinner	Parliamentary inquiry	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Schlickman		
190		Speaker Redmond	HB 3157	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Chapman	Explain vote	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	30.
		Speaker Bradley		
		Geo-Karis		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Speaker Redmond		
		Geo-Karis		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Waddell		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Ebbesen	Conflict	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	Poll absentees	
		Speaker Bradley		
192		Clerk O'Brien	Affirmative roll	
193		Speaker Bradley		
		Waddell		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Schneider	Verified	
194-195		Speaker Bradley		
		Waddell		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Ebbesen	Aye	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Matijevich		
196		Speaker Bradley	Concur	
		Matijevich	Reconsider vote	
		Speaker Bradley	Motion lie on table	
		Giorgi	Motion lie on table	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	31.
		Speaker Bradley		
	6:18	Ewing	HB 2929, SA#1&2	
		Speaker Bradley		
		McClain	Explain?	
		Ewing		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Houlihan, D.	TOOR?	
		Speaker Bradley	TOOR	
197		Jones, J.D.	HB 2987, concur #2,3,5,7 #4 nonconcur	
		Speaker Bradley		
		McClain	Explain?	
		Jones, J.D.		
		Speaker Bradley		
		McClain	Move to divide question	
198		Speaker Bradley	House concurs #2	
		Jones, J.D.	#3	
		Speaker Bradley	House concurs #3	
		Jones, J.D.	#4	
		Speaker Bradley		
199		Matijevich		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Conti		
		Speaker Bradley		
200		Matijevich		
		Speaker Bradley		
	6:29	Tipsword		
		Speaker Bradley		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	32.
201		Winchester		
		Speaker Bradley		
202		Telcser		
		Speaker Bradley		
203		Katz		
		Speaker Bradley		
204		Friedrich		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Farley	MPQ	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Jones, J.D.	To close	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Pullen	Explain vote	
		Speaker Bradley		
205		Barnes, E.M.		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Winchester	Explain vote	
		Speaker Bradley	House nonconcur in #4	
		Jones, J.D.	Amendment #5	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Barnes, E.M.	Yield	
207	6:45	Jones, J.D.		
		Speaker Bradley		
		McClain	Yield	
		Jones, J.D.		
		Speaker Bradley		
208		Jones, J.E.		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	33.
		Speaker Bradley		
		Cunningham		
		Jones, J.D.		
		Speaker Bradley		
209		Tipsword		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Totten	Move to reconsider vote	
		Speaker Bradley		
210		Jones, J.D.	Poll absentees	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Flinn	Move to suspend rules	
211		Speaker Bradley		
		Friedrich		
		Speaker Bradley	House concurs SA#5	
		Jones, J.D.	Same roll call?	
	7:00	Jones, J.D.	#7	
		Speaker Bradley		
212		Matijevich	Question	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Jones, J.D.	Withdraw motion	
		Speaker Bradley	House nonconcur	
		Capparelli	SB 736, #6	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Brummer		
213		Speaker Bradley		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	34.
		Keats	Question	
		Caparelli		
		Speaker Bradley	House refuses to recede	
		McClain	SB 1555, HA#1	
214		Speaker Bradley	House refuses to recede	
		Martin, L.	SB 1562, HA#1	
		Speaker Bradley	House refuses to recede	
		Telcser	SB 1672, HA...1 etc	
		Speaker Bradley	House refuses to recede	
		Epton	SB 1725, HA#1,2,3	
		Speaker Bradley	House refuses to recede	
		Brummer		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Darrow	Sub. motion	
		Speaker Bradley		
215	7:09	Cunningham		
		Speaker Bradley		
		McClain		
		Speaker Bradley		
216		Collins		
		Speaker Bradley	House refuses to recede	
217		Houlihan, D	HB 3167, SA#1,2	
		Speaker Bradley	House concurs	
		Dunn, J.	HB 2539, SA#1,2	
		Speaker Bradley		
		McClain	Question	
218		Dunn, J.		



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	35.
		Speaker Bradley		
		Pullen	Yield	
		Dunn, J.		
		Speaker Bradley		
219	7:19	Matijevich	Introduction	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Pierce		
	7:20	Leinenweber		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Telcser		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Friedrich		
		Speaker Bradley		
220		Hoxsey		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Mudd		
		Speaker Bradley		
221		Schuneman		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Tuerk		
		Speaker Bradley		
222		Ebbesen		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Hoffman	MPQ	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Dunn, J.	Explain vote	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	36.
		Speaker Bradley		
223		McMaster		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Brummer		
224	7:30	Speaker Bradley		
		Schneider	Explain vote	
		Speaker Bradley		
225		Dunn, J.		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Mahar	Verification	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Bluthardt		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Getty	Leave to be verified	
		Clerk Hall	Poll absentees	
		Speaker Bradley		
226		Clerk Hall	Affirmative roll	
227-228		Speaker Bradley		
229		Telcser	Verification	
230		Speaker Bradley	HB 2539, SA#1,2	
		Dunn, J.	Move to reconsider vote	
		Lechowicz	Move lie on table	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Davis, J.		
		Lechowicz		
231		Speaker Bradley		
		Davis, C.	HB 2949	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Ebbesen	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Davis	
232		Speaker Bradley	
		Conti	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Lechowicz	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Tipsword	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Greiman	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Mautino	
233		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	SB 1456
		Speaker Bradley	
		McClain	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Bartulis	HB 3108 concur
		Speaker Bradley	
		Hoffman	SB 393
		Speaker Bradley	
234		Hoffman	SB 395
		Speaker Bradley	<i>the app</i>
		Friedland	
		Speaker Bradley	
235		Matula	HB 3403

*Houlihan -
SB 250, 252
253 + 255*

*BRADLEY - RE FUSE
to recede*



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>	38.
		Speaker Bradley		
		Lechowicz		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Tipsword		
236		Speaker Bradley		
		Johnson		
		Speaker Bradley		
		Madigan	Move to adjourn	
		Speaker Bradley		
		Clerk O'Brien	Perfunt	

