

1.

Doorkeeper Koehler: "Attention Members of the House of Representatives, the House will convene in 15 minutes. All persons not entitled to the House floor please retire to the gallery. Attention Members of the House of Representatives, the House will convene in 5 minutes."

Speaker Redmond: "The hour of 11 having arrived, the House will come to order. The Members will please be in their seats. We'll be led in prayer this morning by Jack O'Brien, the Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Let us pray. Lord, bless this House and all those that serve and work here. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis and Representative Kosinski are in the chamber. Representative Kosinski, the father of Senator Kosinski...General Scott's stand-in is here. Former Representative 'Tiny' Ross is walking down the center aisle, Rock Island, the colleague of Judge Paul 'Renk'. I see he's been appointed to the Merit Commission. The Gentleman from St. Mary's, South Bend, Indiana, Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "My wife is from St. Mary's, Mr. Speaker. On the Order of baseball scores, yesterday activity left the magic numbers, you can see over by Representative Steczko's desk, at 85 with Philadelphia, the magic number was Pittsburgh by virtue of a double-header loss to St. Louis is 83, and St. Louis is 84. St. Louis and Philadelphia are 8½ games behind, Pittsburgh is now 10 games behind, the World Champion Cubs."

Speaker Redmond: "Do you have...do you have any statistics on the south side teams that's also in first place."

Leinenweber: "Cubs."

Speaker Redmond: "Did they win last night? Are they in second place? Representative Daniels at Representative Byers' phone."

Byers: "Well, those of us that have been following the White Sox for a number of years are quite offended in the discrimination that's being shown on this House floor. And, Mr. Speaker, we would ask in the future that when scores are announced, particularly by Representative Leinenweber or Schlickman, that the Sox be included in that set of scores. Because we're going to find ourselves a very good World Series between the Cubs and the Sox this year."



Speaker Redmond: "What kind of uniforms will they wear? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "I would simply like to comment that the Gentleman from DuPage is as much out of place as the White Sox."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, we had a gentleman here from Ohio the other day, the President of the Senate, and I complimented him on having a three-day week for the Legislature; but I think there's some other things we could compliment Ohio on. And that is their unemployment compensation program. In Ohio a recipient of unemployment must meet regularly face-to-face with a state employment interviewer, explain how hard he's looking for a job and why he can't find it, follow job leads suggested by the interviewer, provide a written record of his search for work and sign in person for his check. In Illinois, they don't have to even go to the office, they don't have to register with the State Job Service, and they don't meet with anyone...have to meet with anyone associated with I.B.E.S. As a result, we have a billion dollar rip-off in Illinois. So I think we might take a page out of Ohio's books."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Yes, I'd like to remind the Gentleman that he's not in the State of Ohio. That we're a much more progressive state, except in one area. The State of Ohio happens to have state operated workmen's compensation, where the insurance companies don't rip-off the business communities; and 97 cents out of every dollar of premium paid goes to the injured worker, not 50...40 cents to the insurance companies in the State of Ohio. If you want to emulate something, emulate something good, something for the people. And don't be emulating some reversal of progress by saying something about unemployment insurance. Let's talk about workmen's comp. in Ohio. 97 cents is paid to the injured worker out of every dollar of premiums. What do you have here in Illinois?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "I'd like to join the Representative from the other side of the aisle in complimenting the State of Ohio. The State of Ohio was



one of the first states to ratify the Equal Rights Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I think Friedrich's remarks...Representative Friedrich's remarks ought to be directed to the second floor. The second floor is now in charge of the Department of Labor, and now is in charge of finally setting out the crooks that are rampant throughout the unemployment system. A Tribune series was pretty good in some parts, I read it entirely. And it was erroneous in many parts. And when you've got 2 to 300,000 people seeking unemployment compensation, you're going to find some fraud. It not only asked Thompson to go to Chicago in some of the areas where fraud is prevalent, give some immunity and get some convictions. It's their Department now, it's their problem."

Speaker Redmond: "They also traditionally have the best team in the Big Ten, don't they? Representative...Representative Keats on the floor? Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr...Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've been to Columbus, and I've seen their Capitol Building. It's Greek renaissance, and they're very proud of it; but I don't think it's nearly as fancy and nice as the one we have in Illinois. And I met the Speaker of the House, and he is incomparably a lesser individual than the Speaker of our House of Representatives. So I think we Illinoisans should be proud to be here in this state."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stanley."

Stanley: "As a former Ohio buckeye myself, I might remind our...link to the Golden Age of Greece over here on my right that Ohio is a fine place, and it also has the finest football team in the country, and that's Ohio State."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman from 'Dennison', Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Here, here, now you're talking. I just wondered, Mr. Speaker, if this whole dissertation couldn't be capped by having Representative Geo-Karis lead us in the Ohio State 'Fight' Song. How about that?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen objects. Not because he's the Parliamentarian, but because he's a music lover. On the Order of Concurrence, House Bill 992, Representative Stanley. Representative



Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, would the record show that Representative Kornowicz is excused because of illness?"

Speaker Redmond: "The record will so indicate. Are there any excused absences on the Republican side. McAvoy...Representative Deavers."

Deavers: "Yeah, would the record show that Representative McAvoy is absent because of illness."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Pages have been doing some work with our name plates. And I want to say that the Democrats and Republicans both got a bad deal. I got Bill Walsh's name plate, and I guess he's got mine. So you got a raw deal. But at least they got Madigan and Ryan switching, they kept two Irishmen together. Tom Hanahan's got Cissy Stiehl's and Teddy Lechowicz has got Cal Skinner's. I don't know who else has whose..."

Speaker Redmond: "Cal Skinner protests. 992, Representative Stanley. Out of the record. 1040, Representative Friedland. Representative Friedland, are you ready to proceed on Concurrence 1040? Friedland? 1040. Japanese newspapers please copy. Representative McLendon. Japanese newspapers please copy."

McLendon: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the two Senate Amendments, I request your concurrence in, were a reduction in the annual appropriation for the Office of Commission of Savings and Loan: And it's an Agreed Amendment, and I...both Amendments are agreed. I'd urge your concurrence."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1040. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 119 'aye' and no 'nay'; and the House does concur in the Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1040. 1098, Representative McMaster's on the floor? McMaster? Von Boeckman? 1406, Hanahan. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move to nonconcur



with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1406. This is the Amendment that was drafted in error for the Minimum Wage Law and I would ask for a Conference Committee to be set up if the Senate does not...if they recede like I expect them to."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deavers."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker, would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Deavers: "Tom, I've got the Amendment in front of me; and our staff states that there's nothing wrong with it. Now, would you point out to me what's wrong with it?"

Hanahan: "Yes, if you read the Amendment as the original Bill...fit it to the original Bill, have your staff listen now so that they can understand...they don't get goofed up over there...the Bill now as passed by the House of Representatives would set back all employees in the motion picture and in the restaurant employment to 40 hours. And then it says with the Amendment in 1978 they would go to 44 hours. And now the way it is interpreted under law would be that everyone upon signing of this Bill on October 1st, when it took effect, everyone in these two categories would go to 40 hours for time and a half until 19...December of 1978, and then they would start at 44. It's just a technical error and it must be corrected. Otherwise, you know, as far as I'm concerned I'd like it this way; but I...I have to admit it's in error and I should be taking care of it in Conference."

Deavers: "Our staff states that really the only thing this would be... it would take about six months of time, and you're correct on this first six months; but we don't feel that's any problem. And, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a substitute motion that we do concur with the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "I think your staff should learn how to read pretty well. What is the first date on the Amendment for it to take effect at 44 hours? What...what is the date on that Amendment? Doesn't it say December 31, 1978?"

Deavers: "Correct."



Hanahan: "Now, is that six months or is that a year and a half from now?"

Deavers: "You're using effect...excuse me...you're right, 178. We'll concur with you."

Hanahan: "Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hanahan has moved that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1406. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it and the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment 1 to 1406. 1423, Representative O'Brien. O'Brien on the floor? Out of the record. 1429, Madigan. Is Representative Madigan on the floor? 1429? Out of the record. 1468, Yourell. Out of the record. 1508, Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 1508 amends the Community College Act, which as it passed the House provided for an extension of the charge-back..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan, D.: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if Representative Bowman would be kind enough to take this out of the record for a moment. That file is being reviewed here now."

Bowman: "Anything that the good Representative requests, I'd be happy to accede to."

Speaker Redmond: "Out...out of the record. 1593, Representative Deavers. Representative Deavers, 1593."

Deavers: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that we concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 to House Bill 1593. Senate Amendment #1 adds \$78,200 in General Revenue for the Nature Preserves Commission. Amendment #2 adds \$10,000,000 in federal funds for the Adult Conservation Corps Program. #3 adds language to the appropriation for the Illinois Prairie Pass Corporation. Amendment #4 adds \$22,500 for personal services, \$5,000 for contractual services, \$600 for travel, \$5,000 for commodities from General Revenue and \$160,000 for dredging equipment on Lake De Pue. And #5 makes technical changes in the Bill to make the Bill compatible with the many Amendments which have been adopted. I move for a favorable Roll Call."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan, D.: "A question of the Sponsor if he'll yield."

Deavers: "Yield."

Houlihan, D.: "What's the total amount in the increase of this appropriation as the result of the Amendment?"

Deavers: "Out of the General Revenue Fund approximately \$280,000."

Houlihan, D.: "Is that money in the Governor's budget?"

Deavers: "I have a letter from the Bureau of the Budget that they would concur in the..."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further, Representative Houlihan?"

Houlihan, D.: "No."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "What is the Nature Preserve Commission?"

Deavers: "Well, I think if I could I'd yield to Representative Mautino, he's an expert on that area."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino, did you say?"

Deavers: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Is he on the floor? Maybe Ebbesen knows what it is. The Nature Preserve Commission. Representative Adams."

Adams: "I think the...what you're looking for, the Nature Preserves, if I understand what they're trying to do, they are taking areas such as old cemeteries and so forth that have prairie grass that were there when the prairies were first broken, and that's the only place they have areas like that that have the natural grass. And they are taking some of those over, and possibly that's what they're doing with this budget."

Schlickman: "Well, is this a legislatively created Commission?"

Deavers: "I don't think they're creating a Commission. They already have people working in this area. I know they contacted me when I was County Chairman and we did dedicate two cemeteries...12 cemeteries that have been abandoned to this group."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further?"

Schlickman: "Sure, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to know what the Illinois



Nature Preserve Commission is. I want to know if it's statutorily created and to whom it's accountable."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deavers."

Deavers: "They're an ongoing Commission, I don't recall exactly, Gene, when they were established; but they've been in the budget for the last five years that I've been here. The reason I wanted Mautino to answer...in the House we amended them out of the budget completely and the Senate put it back in. The Department is for leaving them in, the Governor is for leaving them in. And mainly it's an advisory Commission to the Department of Conservation; and I think along the lines that Harold Adams just explained to you."

Schlickman: "Is this by Amendment #1?"

Deavers: "This is Amendment #1."

Schlickman: "Yeah, I'm going to ask for a division of the..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipword."

Tipword: "If I might, Mr. Speaker, just about, I believe, the middle of last week, the report of a Nature Preserve Commission was placed on our desks. I think you have it there. It apparently is a Department of Conservation inspired Commission, not legislative. And I made some inquiries at that time, the best I can find out it is...it is a non-aid Commission. They are public members that are generally appointed to the Commission. What Representative Adams indicated is apparently absolutely correct. Their obligation is to try to locate areas of...throughout the State of Illinois that are as the state first was when the first settlers came here, the same flora and fauna is still existing in those areas; and as he said, some of those areas are old pioneer cemeteries, where the general situation was not disturbed and it continues to have the flora that was there at the time the settlers first came here. They have, as you will note, from looking through that report, there are many, many nature preserve areas throughout the state that they have been instrumental in either acquiring, or upgrading or preserving. And it apparently is just exactly what it says. It is a Commission of the Department of Conservation to seek and preserve those natural places that exist in the State of Illinois."



Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Byers."

Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in looking over this, I think we should nonconcur; and I agree with Representative Schlickman to at least have a division of the question on this. I think once again we find here the constant administration, spending money for machinery and bricks and mortar; but we don't have enough money to fully fund the School Aid Formula, and they've added almost \$200,000 for equipment here that could go for schools and the boys and girls in the State of Illinois. And I feel that...that that part should go back to a Conference Committee and come out. So I would join Representative Schlickman in asking for a division of the question."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, I think that the previous speaker is in error. I think that if you look back on this Commission, you will find out that some of the things that they have been interested in are things that are right down in his district. And I think that this group has a very definite important part to play in the State of Illinois and to preserve those things such as the gooseberry, the Volo Bog and down in his area some of the diggings that are going on. And these are the people that are the scientists and the people that are behind this in giving their time free of charge and the Department of Conservation does need this and I would recommend that we concur."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Adams."

Adams: "Yes, speaking on this issue, I would say that if we're going to talk about school children, these things are very important for them to learn what the country was and what we should do to preserve it. And I, for one, think this is a very needed thing also for our kids to do in the summertime. If we don't teach our children what things were and how to take care of our land, then we're going to be in trouble also. So I would like to recommend that we concur with the Senate Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Deavers: "Yes."



Darrow: "You know, on Amendment #4, you're talking about purchasing a hydraulic dredge. Is this a...is this dredge being purchased with bond money?"

Deavers: "Capital Development Bond funds, correct."

Darrow: "When did we begin using bond money to buy equipment? I thought that that was something that we chastised the Walker Administration for trying to do...I thought we used bond money only for land acquisition and capital development."

Deavers: "If you'd like to talk to me privately, I think we could probably take care of that Amendment."

Darrow: "I have no further questions other than to point that out to Representative Schlickman and the other people on the floor. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Schlickman, what Amendment specifically do you have...care to have divided out or do you want them all? Do you want them all?"

Schlickman: "1 and 4."

Speaker Redmond: "1 and 4. Representative Deavers has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1593. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. 1. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 114 'aye' and 1 'no'; and the House does concur in the Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1593. Representative Deavers has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1593. Those in favor vote 'aye', the opposed vote 'no'. Have to take a minute here. We work faster than the computer. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "During all the discussion, I lost count of which was which. Would Representative Deavers, while we're waiting for the board to clear, just briefly explain #4?"

Deavers: "#4 adds \$22,500 for personal services, retirement and social security; \$5,000 for contractual services, \$600 for travel and \$5,000 for commodities from general revenue, and then \$160,000 for dredging equipment from Capital Development Bond funds in order to dredge Lake De Pue. And I'm...I'm sure that's inconclusive, that once we buy the dredge we're going to use it for more than just



Lake De Pue."

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

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Byers: "Representative Deavers, what good is it going to do to buy the equipment if you don't have any money appropriated to run it after you get it? Where's that going to come from?"

Deavers: "The money is in there."

Byers: "You mean that this budget has got a little fat in it?"

Deavers: "I wouldn't say that, Harold, just like you and I, we're both a little overweight."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes, E.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I believe I correctly, correct me, Representative, if I'm wrong, heard you reply to the Representative from the Rock Island area that there was funding in this Bill, bond authority, to purchase rolling stock. As I understand bonding, it can't be used for that purpose and that is one of the things that we highly chastise, highly chastise the last administration for attempting to do. Now, was that correct?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think I can throw a little light on this. This money for this dredging equipment by the time they get ready to use this we'll be into the next fiscal year, by the time we order it, get delivery. And at that particular time, within the Department of Conservation appropriation, I'm sure they'll have adequate money to pay for the people who are going to operate the dredge. And this is a good Amendment, and I would move...encourage the Members of the House to support the Amendment and let's get on with the business of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you...thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, stand in support of concurrence on this



Amendment. As many of you know, there has been legislation introduced for dredging in every area of the State of Illinois. I think it's time that the Department of Conservation had a dredge that they can use on a year round basis. It's a very minimal expenditure for a very good piece of equipment, and I solicit your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 4 to House Bill 1593. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 109...110 'aye' and 17 'no'; the House concurs in Senate Amendment 4 to House Bill 1593. The Gentleman has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendments 2, 3 and 5 to House Bill 1593. Any discussion? While we're waiting for the computer to catch up with us, former Representative Lou Capuzi is in the middle aisle, and former Representative Chuck Taylor... Chuck Taylor over here. Lou Capuzi...Lou Capuzi has lost 45 pounds... 47 pounds. Pretty soon he's going to fit in Ted Lechowicz' clothes. The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 2, 3 and 5 to House Bill 1593. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 147 'aye' and no 'nay'; and the House concurs in Senate Amendments 2, 3 and 5 to House Bill 1593. 1594, Representative Simms. Take that one out of the record. 1595, J. David Jones."

Jones, J.: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do concur in the Senate Amendment to House Bill 1595."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor describe the Amendment, please?"

Jones, J.: "...some reductions in the State Fair appropriations. And that reduction...it amounts to \$56,000. It's been accepted by the parties concerned."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1595. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all



voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 142 'aye' and 1 'no'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1595. 1599, Representative Kempiners." Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the ordinary and contingent expense appropriation for the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. The Senate added four Amendments; and I'm going to move to concur in all four Amendments. And basically what they did was return the budget back to the condition it was in when it was introduced in the House of Representatives; and then surgically reduced it by approximately by \$4.4 million, working in concert with the Department. The total budget as it now stands with the four Senate Amendments amounts to \$404,256,678; and I would ask House concurrence in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4."

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

Hart: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, he will."

Hart: "Senate Amendment #2, I've received a lot of calls on it, does that take away local grant money? What is the effect of Senate Amendment #2?"

Kempiners: "Senate Amendment #2 increases the Department's budget by \$1,682,700, basically, with federal funds. I think that's the one you probably received the phone calls about was Senate Amendment #1, which restored the budget as in the House. We took \$7,000,000 from the operations part of the budget and gave it to community grants, and used a meat-ax approach. It was totally unacceptable. Senate Amendment #1 reversed that, and put that money back where it was. Senate Amendment #2...additional federal funds and puts that into the budget. And then Senate Amendment #4 reduced the budget by \$4.4 million, as I indicated, for facilities and administration."

Hart: "Well, my regional or local Mental Health Association have urged us to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #2. I've received several telephone calls of an urgent type nature. Are they misinformed



Senate Amendment #1 was cut in the community mental health program... grants?"

Kempiners: "Yeah, it did eliminate the Amendment that we cut it and add...what they did was just meat ax \$7,000,000 out of the operations and some downstate and Chicago institutions and just added it to the community grant."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, then I could just speak briefly on that Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Bowman: "Unfortunately, Senate Amendment #...unfortunately Senate Amendment #1 does something which I think should be done and also does something which I think should not be done. And I think it would be appropriate to have this go to a Conference Committee; and I would urge nonconcurrence, and I support Representative Hart's request for a division of the question."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you ready for the question? Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Will the Sponsor yield? I'm still not clear on what happened."

Kempiners: "I'll yield."

Darrow: "According to Amendment #1, the mental health facility in my district would have an increased amount of money; but then according to Amendment #4, it would receive less money than originally proposed. Now, can you explain why that is?"

Kempiners: "Okay, basically, what the Amendment did was that the Amendments that were added in the House took away some jobs and positions. Those were restored in Amendment #1. What Senate Amendment #4 did was eliminate some jobs, not jobs, because with the Senate Amendment #4 we're in a position where no existing job is removed. Also we had some instances where we had some new positions created in order to meet federal requirements. Those remain. Where we have some jobs which have been vacant for a long period of time, and I believe it's 18 months, Amendment #4 removes those positions because the vacancies have not been filled."

Darrow: "Well, can you give me some general idea..."

Kempiners: "I...Representative Darrow, excuse me, I'm informed that the 18-month figure I used is not correct; but basically they are job



about the effects of it or what?"

Kempiners: "Well, they...they are misinformed if they're saying Senate Amendment #2; but I think they are also misinformed in...in making those phone calls asking for more money. And let me explain why. I think we've had a lot of agencies and people who have come to us seeking more money, and I'm not saying that they don't legitimately deserve more money or need more money; but when you look at the appropriations from the past four or five years, what's happening in the budget as it stands now is that we are giving the community agencies a total increase of 13.7 percent of spending, actual spending, from fiscal year '77 to what is proposed in this fiscal year '78 budget. Now, with regard to total appropriations, we're giving them an 18.8 increase, which I think is pretty healthy in the year of austerity. Now, I don't deny the fact that some of these community agencies need more money; but we've had a lot of agencies and groups coming to us and saying we need more money. And we've got to be fiscally responsible. And I think that this is a fiscally responsible approach. The total increase for this, the Department in operation, is basically 4 percent. So the community agencies really are getting a very hefty increase this fiscal year over last fiscal year."

Hart: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like a division of the question on this matter. I'm concerned about the Senate Amendment #1. So I would like to have the question divided at least so that we could vote on that Amendment separately from the others."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Hart raised a question that I think is important. Much of the communication that we have been receiving many of the local community Mental Health Associations are confusing the number of the House Amendments that were important to them with the numbers of the Senate Amendments that they are now in opposition to. They were very much in favor of House Amendment #2, and they would like to see that restored, having been cut out, I believe, by Senate Amendment #1. And if I'm incorrect, I'd like to be corrected by someone. They also had some views in



regard to a House Amendment #4, and they keep repeating that. And House Amendment #4 was withdrawn and was never acted upon and was replaced by House Amendment #6. So they...they were contacted earlier and made aware of those House Amendments, and they do not understand the total legislative process and confuse those Amendment numbers, consequently, with the Amendments in the Senate. And I know Representative Dunn will be speaking on these Amendments; and I certainly would urge everyone to listen very carefully if you're interested in improving funding for local community mental health programs that have been very under-funded by the Department of Mental Health, who has been taking the money and using it in their administrative department, which really are not providing direct services to mental health and to developmentally disabled patients."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart has requested a division of the question. Representative Bowman. Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, one more question of the Sponsor, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Bowman: "Let me make sure I understand Amendment #1. You say that Amendment #1 restores monies to the central office, which have..."

Kempiners: "Not entirely the central office. There were some cuts in the central office. There were cuts in some institutions downstate; and there were some cuts in the Illinois Mental Health Institute in the City of Chicago. Basically, what the Amendment does is restores \$11,878,000 in operations reductions, and eliminates \$6,000... \$6,900,000 in grant increases. Both of these were approved by the House. The net effect was to add \$4,972,000 to the agency total returning it, as I indicated, to the position it was in when we got it. The...then additional Amendment reduces it. Both your staff and our staff here in the House indicated about a \$4,000,000 to \$,500,000 cut could be made and Senate Amendment 4 makes that cut. So what we did was return it in all these Amendments to basically the shape it was in when it was introduced and then cut it by \$4,000,000 with these Senate Amendments."

Bowman: "Okay, but the...the cuts that have made in the Sen...in Amendment #1, excuse me one moment, okay, the cuts that was made in the



positions which have been vacant for a period of time, but not necessarily 18 months."

Darrow: "...Well, would that explain why East Moline State Hospital will receive less money than originally proposed, while Anna State Hospital in my colleague's district will receive more money than originally proposed?"

Kempiners: "Yeah, that is my understanding that there are some...that these positions that have been vacant have been removed by this Amendment, and that's the reason."

Darrow: "So there is a possibility that at my hospital they will not be filling some vacant positions?"

Kempiners: "Excuse me, Representative Darrow, could you repeat the question? I may have given you an inaccurate answer, too, so may repeat the question, I'll..."

Darrow: "Well, what I'm concerned about is the people that work in the hospital in my district, and all I want to know is if there will be fewer positions at East Moline State Hospital?"

Kempiners: "There will be no jobs reduced. If we concur in the Senate Amendments, there will be no jobs reduced. There will be some new positions, if I'm not mistaken, there will be some new positions at East Moline State Hospital available."

Darrow: "But will there be slots abolished or slots where there is not an employee at the present time abolished?"

Kempiners: "There will be no change in the staff at East Moline with regard...and there will be no slots abolished."

Darrow: "Thank you."

Kempiners: "It's my understanding that I give you some inaccurate information, some of these cuts that are being made are being made in commodities in East Moline. So I did give you a little bit of inaccurate information in response to one of your earlier questions."

Darrow: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "I support concurrence with all the Amendments to this Bill. In response to Representative Darrow and to others who have facilities or programs of the Department in their districts, I'd like to make



the point that with the Amendments there will be no lay-offs, no cut-backs of state employees in the Department of Mental Health. That's what the Amendments mean. No lay-offs this year of any employees of the Department of Mental Health."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane."

Kane: "Would the Sponsor yield to a question? Could you very briefly tell us what the reasoning is or the standards that the Senate used in restoring this money?"

Kempiners: "It was their feeling in the Senate, from the information I have, is that they concurred with my feeling when we amended this Bill in the Senate that the cuts were in a meat-ax type approach. As I indicated in discussing this earlier, both your staff here in the House and my staff indicated that there was about \$4,000,000..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain, for what purpose do you arise? McClain."

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, I hate to interrupt during his answer; but, Mr. Speaker, the House floor is just full of all kinds of people that are not Pages, they have no tags. Some of them are...I don't know who they are; but they're all over the House floor. Would you mind...this is an important matter, and I don't think that a lot of people ought to be on the floor."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman's point is well taken. Will all unauthorized persons leave the floor? Representative Dunn. All unauthorized persons leave the floor. Representative Dunn."

Dunn, J.: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think..."

Unknown: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I think a previous speaker had... colleague had the floor."

Speaker Redmond: "Oh, pardon me, Representative Kane."

Kane: "Yes, what...I guess I'm not talking about the dollar figure. So what was the thinking of the Senate in terms of the standards that they were going to use to arrive at the dollar figure that's in this Amendment?"

Kempiners: "I'm sorry, Representative Kane, could you repeat the last



part of your question. The standards that they used in what?"

Kane: "To arrive at the dollar figures in this Amendment."

Kempiners: "You're talking about Amendment #1 now, right?"

Kane: "Right, Amendment #1, just restoring the dollars."

Kempiners: "Okay, it's my understanding that they looked at the Amendments that...Amendments in the House, and they were so ludicrous as we sent over...and I made this comment on the floor of the House...that the Amendments we sent over were so ludicrous that Amendment #1 just put the budget back in the shape it was when it was introduced. And then they went from there with Amendments #2, 3 and 4."

Kane: "Okay. Then in terms of the package of Amendments, what is their standard for staffing both the central office and the other state facilities?"

Kempiners: "Their approach basically was to look at three different types of staffing figures. The first was existing jobs, jobs that were filled. They removed none of those jobs. The...the second thing that they looked at were vacant positions, positions where there should be people employed, but haven't been for some period of time. I don't know what standard they used, but they eliminated some of those vacancies. The third thing they looked at was a request for new positions. And a lot of these are...for example, off the top of my head, Dixon, in order to qualify for some title 19 funding we have to get the ratio of staff to patient, it's approximately 1 to 1 now. We have to get it up to 1½ staff to 1 patient. So we requested some new positions. They looked at those and selectively approved...most of them."

Kane: "Then could you briefly state the standards that were reflected in the House Amendments when they went over to the Senate? I understand that that was pretty much somebody pulled a figure out of the air and..."

Kempiners: "That's exactly...that's exactly correct, Representative Kane. The community agencies wanted \$11,000,000, and because they couldn't get in the Committee, they picked a figure \$7,000,000 and just looked for wherever to cut. And this is why I concurred in the



Senate Amendment. The...a meat ax approach was used in what we did here in the House with no, you know, no reason to it or no rationale to it. And I think the Senate was accurate in going back to the figure that the Department came in with and then start from there.

I concur with that."

Kane: "And in the last number of years, say from 1970 to 1977, the grants to community agencies has gone up from somewhere in the neighborhood of \$7,000,000 to almost \$90,000,000, is that correct?"

Kempiners: "It's been... 600...that's correct, and it's been about a 644 percent increase. Yeah."

Kane: "And what are the standards that we're setting to give money to the community agencies? Are there any standards or are we just giving them money?"

Kempiners: "Okay, there are standards. I can't enumerate them for you; but one of the problems we had with the cuts, and this was brought in the Appropriation Committee hearing that the cuts in the central office would remove some of the people whose duties it was to monitor these community agencies to make sure they were spending the money accurately or the way they were supposed to. So that in addition to asking for the increases, they were also seeking decreases in central offices of the watch dogs who were to monitor these...the expenditures of these funds."

Kane: "Are these community agencies basically for profit agencies?"

Kempiners: "Generally not for profit."

Kane: "Generally not for profit."

Kempiners: "Generally not for profit, right."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that the Senate has taken a much more consistent approach to the funding for the Department of Mental Health than we did here in the House. I think that in the House we listened to some community agencies who came in here seeking for a lot of money for themselves. With no standards, they indiscriminately proposed a program for cutting the State Department of Mental Health in their central offices and also in the facilities around the state with no standards, indiscriminately. And what it would do is gut our state program



and put money into local agencies for which we don't have any standards either. And I think before we take this kind of approach we need to establish standards at both the state and the local levels so that we can make meaningful comparisons and come up with a reasonable budget. And I think that for this year the Senate's approach is much better than the approach that we had. And I would urge concurrence in the Senate Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Rigney. Please come to order. It's getting a little loud in here."

Rigney: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "Rigney."

Rigney: "Would the Sponsor yield? What I would like to establish, and I think you did mention it earlier in the debate, how many more dollars are these community facilities getting this year than what they got last year?"

Kempiners: "They are receiving approximately \$11,000,000 more this year than last year."

Rigney: "And that I think you said was an 18 percent increase?"

Kempiners: "Well, it depends on what figure you use. There were some impounded funds last year, and it's a...it's a 13.7 percent increase taking out those impounded funds, and an 18 percent increase considering those impounded funds."

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, just one comment. It seems to me that we have treated these community facilities very well. I think they should be appreciative of the money that they have received. And I would agree with Representative Kane that we should concur in all the Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dunn."

Dunn, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We've heard quite a bit of discussion this morning, and I think there is some confusion. Let me try to put all this together so the Members will understand. As the Mental Health Bill is before you at the present time, it is exactly in the form as it was introduced by the Governor, except that the bottom line of that budget has been reduced by \$4.4 million, \$4.4 million has been



cut by taking a little bit, a few dollars, from the central office and the regional offices and dollars from every mental health institution in the State of Illinois. Each institution in your district has been cut somewhat. The bottom line of the budget is below the Governor's request by \$4.4 million. In addition, the Senate undid everything that the House in Committee, in floor action did with regard to this budget. What that means is that the action approved by the House Appropriations II Committee and this Body on the floor transfer funds to your local mental health agencies for the mentally ill and developmentally disabled has been undone. We all know, we've heard the figures about the increases in the grants to the local agencies. We all know why this increase has taken place, that is because the people, the patients, who were formerly receiving care in our mental health institutions have come home. 80 percent of the people are now being treated at home. 80 percent of the dollars, the taxpayer dollars, in the mental health budget remains with the institution. The purpose of the so-called Consumer's Amendment, which represents a coalition of local agencies, their purpose is to get more grant dollars available to your agencies back home so the dollars can be used to treat the people who need care at home. There has been some concern about what standards are being applied to the grant agencies. Let me tell you in case you haven't heard from your local agencies that before they get any taxpayer dollars they must apply to the Regional Office of the Department of Mental Health with a grant application. Those applications are reviewed in the Regional Offices and the Central Office of the...of the Department of Mental Health before any money goes to the local agencies. There is adequate review, not only adequate, but if you talk to your local people you will know that uniformly across the state they feel that they have difficulty...have had difficulty in the past getting grant money brought home to them. There has been difficulty with the applications, there has been difficulty with impoundment. We hear the argument that, 'So what if we do appropriate more in the grant line? The money will be impounded.'



But I point out to you at this time that we have a budget, one of the very few budgets, that has come this far in the legislative process that is below, is below the Governor's request, below the Governor's request by \$4.4 million. We have a new Director in the...we have a new Director in the Department of Mental Health. We don't know what his position will be.. He seems open-minded. Perhaps if we can show a reduction, we can transfer the money that is reduced into the local agencies. There are some federal funds which...which do correspond to the reduction so that the Department of Mental Health will actually not come up short. What the Senate did was undo the Coalition Amendment, which is sponsored by the Illinois Association for Retarded Citizens, the Illinois Association for Mental Health, the Association of Community Mental Health Authorities of Illinois, the Illinois Association of Community Mental Health Agencies, the United Cerebral Palsy of Illinois Association, the Illinois Society for Artistic Children and the Illinois Epilepsy Association. All of these groups serve people in your local communities and do it on a not-for-profit basis. If we approve...if we approve the budget as it...as it is before us at the present time, we will be authorizing a cut in every institution in the State of Illinois, we will be turning over approximately \$4.4 million to the Governor to do with as he pleases and your local community mental health agencies will not have access to any of these funds. If we nonconcur, we have a chance to go to Conference Committee at which time we can...we can push for a change in the budget to transfer these cuts, this \$4.4 million cut, half to your local community agency for mentally ill and half to community agencies for developmentally disabled. I believe this is the thing to do. This has been the consensus of the House Appropriations Committee and the consensus of this Body. I believe we should nonconcur in this Amendment. That means that when the concurrence vote is called we should vote red, we should not vote green. We should get this Bill into a Conference Committee so that we can do what needs to be done with this budget. There's been a lot of time go into this. I'd be happy to answer any questions any



of you may have about what the cuts are in the institutions in your area. I remind you, again, that as the Bill stands now, it cuts everybody's institution and leaves the local mental health agencies in an unfavorable posture. I don't think any of you want to go home with a Bill in this shape. I recommend that you vote against concurrence."

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

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, little more can be said on this issue, and I move the previous question. Let's count the votes."

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

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, before I begin, have we divided the question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, we have."

Kempiners: "We have. All right, on Amendment #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is whether Amendment #1 will be adopted or not."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to close by saying that the Gentleman started his argument, the last speaker started his argument by saying he's going to clarify a situation and he really confused it. There has been a reduction of \$4.4 in General Revenue Fund; but because of a Senate Amendment #2, we added some federal funds. There is only a \$2,000,000...a \$2,000,000 reduction in this budget. So we don't have that much to play around with. But what I'd like to say is that when you look at the overall budget, there's been an increase of about 2.8 percent to the Department and an increase of 13.7 percent for the community agencies. Now, I'd like to ask you this question. Are the community agencies going to dictate how much money is going to be appropriated by the General Assembly overriding, overriding the Senate and possibly the House, both House staffs, the Republican and the Democrat staff, the Bureau of the Budget and the Governor? Are we going to let ...are we going to let political pressure take reason from us so



that when we make these appropriations we're going to reasonably look at the request or are we going to respond to the type of emergency phone calls you've received? It's my impression, my understanding that the agency letters went out yesterday notifying each community group how much it was to receive so that they will be aware that they're receiving a 13.7 percent increase, which is a pretty good increase in a year of austerity. I would ask you to vote 'yes' on my motion to concur in Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Byers, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The last two years, I've sponsored a mental health budget, and I've always ended up in a Conference Committee over this same agreement. Now, I think...I'm in sympathy with what's happening with the mental health community agencies, but it appears to me that there's very little likelihood that they will actually get any money if we do go to a Conference Committee. And I think the best agreement is one that we have right now. I'm in support of the community mental health agencies; I've always supported them. But I just don't believe that this is the proper time; and I think an 'aye' vote would be proper on this Bill."

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

Schuneman: "Enough has been said, Mr. Speaker, thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brady, to explain his vote. Okay. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 102 'ayes', 47 'nays', 11 recorded as 'present'; the Amendment's concurred with. Any further concurrence motions? 2? Amendments 2, 3 and 4?"

Kempiners: "Mr. Speaker, if I could ask the Gentleman on the other side of the aisle if we can take one motion on the remaining Senate Amendments?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to move to concur in



Senate Amendments 2, 3 and 4. Is there a division of the question? Division has been requested, we'll go to Amendment #2. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I just want to recognize a distinguished colleague of ours that is here today, Representative...former Representative Leland Rayson, who's over by Representative Steczo's desk."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Welcome back, Lee. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Lucco."

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to introduce two people up to my left, in the upper balcony here, 'Mrs. Pat Picharski', the wife of the Harvey Police Commissioner, and 'Mrs. Elizabeth Bigonoski'. They are from the 10th District representative...represented by Representatives Matejek, Getty and Miller. Glad to have you here."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Thank you. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners, on Senate Amendment #2."

Kempiners: "Okay, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment makes a total increase of \$1,682,700 as follows (and this is the federal money basically that I mentioned): \$1,027,700 in newly received federal funds for operation, \$285,000 in federal grant carry-overs from fiscal year '77, and \$370,000 in general revenue to fund the Peoria Oakwood Manor program, which previously...it's an alcoholism program, which previously was funded by the Department of Public Aid by putting it...by putting it in the Department of Mental Health it will be...it will qualify for Title 20 reimbursement. That's basically Senate Amendment #2; and I would move to concur in Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jim Houlihan. Jim Houlihan, discussion on the Amendment?"

Houlihan, J.: "Mr. Speaker, I think there was a long and somewhat detailed discussion of Amendment #1. Now, this Amendment does restore some funds, but I think Representative Kempiners has been...less than consistent and...candid on his presentation of this



issue. And, in effect, what we are going to do if we concur with all four of these Amendments is we will be deleting somewhere between \$2,000,000 from the total budget, we will be deleting \$4,000,000 from the state revenue...state funds that are used in this budget. And I think that that is in error. I think these funds are necessary for some of the programs. Because the House was not deliberative is maybe only a problem to us, but I think if we go into a Conference Committee we have a chance to restore more funds to I.S.P.E., more funds to the community service programs. And I think we ought to vote 'present' on these concurrences."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners, to close."

Kempiners: "I...I'm kind of taken aback at the Gentleman's thing. I've been less than candid on these things. I basically have said what I said with regard to how much money we're going to be coming out with less than we are. I would ask for a 'yes' vote on my motion to concur in Senate Amendment #2. I think the Senate did take a rational approach. The Gentleman who just spoke is one who participated in a Conference which meat axed \$7,000,000 out of the budget and I think he is responsible for our having to go through this procedure. So I think the rational thing to do is to vote 'yes' on my concurrence to Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2? 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's 110 'ayes', 15 'nays', 25 recorded as 'present'; the House concurs in Senate Amendment #2. The Gentleman from Whiteside, Representative Schuneman, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask leave of the House to change my vote on Amendment #4 to House Bill 1593. My switch was inadvertently voted 'no'; and I wanted to be recorded 'yes' on that Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman have leave to be recorded as 'aye'



on Amendment #4 to House Bill 1593? Any objections? Hearing none, you'll be so recorded."

Schuneman: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Amendment #3. The Gentleman from Will, Mr.

Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Mr. Speaker, I would renew my request to consider Senate Amendments #3 and 4 together if I might."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Objections have been raised. Amendment #3."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I was just personally trying to save the time of the House. Senate Amendment #3 adds \$6,278 for payment of a past capital project addition. This claim was denied by the Court of Claims because no funds from the appropriate line item...or the funds from the appropriate line item lapsed. But it is a legitimate claim. The claim is legitimate. That is not the reason it was denied by the Court of Claims, it was because the line item lapsed. And I would move that we concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 1599."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 1599. 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's 139...141 'ayes', 2 'nays', 16 recorded 'present'; and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 1599. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners, on Amendment #4...4."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Amendment #4 makes a total general revenue reduction of \$4,416,800 among various facilities and administrative offices in the Department of Public Aid. I would move to concur in Senate Amendment #4."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, don't let the votes on the last two Amendments convince you to immediately put up a green light on this Amendment. This is the Amendment that would result in \$4.4 million less going into mental health



services this year than the Governor has said could be there from state funds. This is the one where we have the potential if this Bill goes to a Conference Committee of getting some additional money into the community service programs that are all very hard pressed to take care of the additional quiet blows that they have because of the deinstitutionalization. This is the one that is crucial. This is the vote where we need to have red lights or have you stay off the green lights for concurrence because this is where we will be reducing mental health money by \$4.4 million. I think all of us in this House agree that there are needs for mental health services, and this is the way we can have a chance of using that money for mental health services in the State of Illinois."

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

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I couldn't agree with Helen Satterthwaite more. This is exactly true. This is the reduction of \$4 million plus to institutions throughout the state. For those of you that have institutions, you ought to be very concerned about those drastic cuts; for those of you that support labor you ought to be concerned about how many employees you will lose; and for those of you that are concerned about community based facilities this is your way in order to get more money for communities and have a Conference Committee. So for all of us, except for Bill Kempiners, I think this is the one that you can vote red on, get your Conference Committee Report and, hopefully, after everything is said and done everybody will be treated reasonably. And I, too, urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the last Amendment in the package, and this is the one that makes the cuts in the mental institutions. Just let me...let me tell you where these cuts are being made--Dixon, \$226,000; Singer, \$21,000; East Moline, \$64,000; Galesburg, \$130,000; Zeller, \$194,000; Chicago-Reed, \$431,000; Elgin, \$136,000; Howe, \$141,000;



Kankakee, \$282,000; 'Ludeman', \$199,000; Madden, \$13,000; Mantino, \$168,000, Tinley Park, \$62,000; Waukegan, \$121,000; Jacksonville, \$123,000; Lincoln, \$147,000; McFarland, \$94,000; Adler, \$7,000; Fox, \$100,000; Meyer, \$45,000; Alton, \$161,000; Chester, \$300,000; Murray, \$86,000, Anna, \$72,000; Bowen, \$88,000; and the Illinois Mental Health Institutes in Chicago which is the controversial I.S.P.E. and Institute for Juvenile Research, \$190,000. These cuts are being made, and as previous speakers have pointed out, this means that the appropriation is being reduced below the Governor's request for mental health services in this state with no corresponding transfer to your local community base programs. If we concur in this Amendment; this Bill will go to the Governor and the last opportunity to transfer additional funds to your local agencies will be lost. I respectfully urge that if you cannot vote red, you at least vote 'present' on this concurrence so we have the opportunity to discuss these vital issues in Conference Committee and come out with an improved Bill in the area of mental health. This is one of our most important human service areas in the State of Illinois, and in these times when we have not reduced other budgets, which were introduced according to the Governor, at the bare-bones level to begin with, we have kept those budgets at the bare-bones level; but can we go home and tell our people back home that we have reduced mental health services in the State of Illinois below the bare-bones level of the Governor's request? I respectfully request that you do not vote for concurrence on this Amendment, vote either red or yellow. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword, to..."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I, too, would like to urge the Members of this Assembly to vote red on this concurrence, on this Amendment. Representative Dunn has outlined what cuts there are in various local institutions. Those cuts will hurt nothing except the Director and the administration's ego. They will not be forced by virtue of any of those figures to cut out any of services that they now provide. It will be of no



disaster in any of those institutions in spite of the letters you may have received from some of them. And it will provide monies for the services that are provided directly to mental health patients, by the local community programs, most of which have been mandated and required by the Department of Mental Health, which have failed to provide adequate funds to fund these programs which they have insisted that these local programs must perform and which they have taken over from the Department of Mental Health in many, many instances. I would urge that the Members of this House do vote red upon the concurrence upon this Amendment and give us a chance to provide to local community mental health programs, the direct service programs to people throughout this state the kind of services that they need and that the Department has insisted that they should provide. And this is the only opportunity to do so. I urge everyone to vote red."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of this Amendment. I just want to say it's just as clear as Representative Kempiners, the Chief Sponsor of the legislation has already said it, that the...compared to the last fiscal year or up somewhere around 13 to 18 percent, as far as that money is concerned, and in the year of austerity, I don't know how much more they want. And we're a lot better off with this Amendment than throwing it into a Conference and worsening the whole situation. I would encourage everyone to vote 'yes' and let's get on with the legislation of the House."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Kane: "On these cuts, what's the rationale behind these cuts? The standard used?"

Kempiners: "The...as I indicated in my response to an earlier question you...vacant positions which have been vacant for a considerable amount of time. I want to reiterate, there are no lost jobs that



are currently being held with this Amendment being adopted. And, in effect, there are some extra jobs in areas...certain areas that will be created."

Kane: "And...and with this, what will be the average staffing level? Could you indicate to us in terms of staffing level and number of patients?"

Kempiners: "Overall, it's my understanding it would be about 1.5 to 1, 1.5 by staff person to 1 patient."

Kane: "So with...even with these cuts what there would be is a staffing level of about 1.5 full-time staff persons for each inmate, for each resident in the...in state facilities?"

Kempiners: "Right. And I might point out that that is the required federal level in order to qualify for Title 19 Reimbursement Fund."

Kane: "I see; and what has been the staffing ratio in the past?"

Kempiners: "Well, in some institutions we are down to a 1 to 1 staffing ratio. For example, in Dixon we have to raise there. And I would say that 1 to 1 has been where we have been in the past."

Kane: "So this...this in the opinion of the Department and the people who run the institution is a good staffing program to maintain all of the programs and improve the programs that we presently have in the Department of Mental Health."

Kempiners: "Yes it is. I'd like to emphasize that what's happened is that both your staff, again, your staff and our staff here in the House both recommended about this type of a cut; but we didn't sit down...the people who have been raising a lot of static on the floor of this House didn't bother sitting down with the Department, with the Bureau of the Budget and with your staff people to examine where these cuts could be made. The Senate people did this. And the Department concurs that they can live with these cuts if they were rationally made and were surgically made, and this last Amendment will do exactly what I said when I asked to take all four of them together. I think that in totality this makes it a better Bill. I think we're...we've got a real tight budget and we ought to concur in this Amendment."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would concur



with the Sponsor of this Bill. A lot of the rhetoric that we hear about the Department of Mental Health and the people that we are serving would...would justify funding and staffing at any particular level. I think that if we're going to be responsible and budget responsibly in this state we have to have some standards and we have to budget to meet those standards. And I think that the standards are reflected in this Amendment. Reflects the standard that is fair, is equitable and will provide the kind of services to the people who need mental health services at a good...at a good level. And I would recommend concurrence with this Amendment."

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

Barnes, E.: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in support of this Amendment. I want to be consistent as I have tried to be on that Committee. This Amendment...this Amendment embodied in this Amendment as the Sponsor of the Bill has indicated is basically the...about the same amount of reductions that both our staffs worked so hard on when this Bill appeared before our Committee. Not making any direct comment on many of the comments that have made here between the two factions in terms of the manner in which the Department of Mental Health should be going in. But one thing the Sponsor of the Bill has been truthful and has been consistent on; and I must commend the Department for one for agreeing that they do have vacant positions that they no longer need to carry. What this Amendment does is reduce those vacant positions that have been carried over a period of months. This will not, this will not, I emphasize, affect the patient-worker ratio in any way, in any manner. It will not have a detrimental...it will not have a detrimental character in reference to the servicing of the patients in these institutions. But what we are doing here is facing the realization that the Department of Mental Health has in the past...has in the past carried many vacant positions that they do not any longer need, they did not need them in the past. And what this Amendment addresses itself to is to reduce that amount of



money that had been budgeted to carry those..."

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

Barnes, E.: "...to carry those vacant positions. I concur with the Sponsor of this Amendment. I sympathize greatly with the opponents to this Amendment, I know they are sincere in what they are doing. I hope sincerely to work with them to insure that their program will be brought about; but I must...must very reluctantly rise to oppose them in this instance and ask the House to support the Sponsor of this Bill and vote 'yes' on this Amendment."

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

Houlihan, J.: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I was not going to rise on this. I think Representative Kempiners who is sponsoring the Bill has tried to slip this Amendment through and does not want this to go to any kind of a Conference Committee because he doesn't want any further discussion of it. But I rise on a point of personal privilege to address his remarks about our staff. I think they're totally uncalled for, I think they're irresponsible, and I think they misrepresent what was done by our staff. Our staff went through this analysis, did it very thoroughly and very diligently and, in fact, developed the criterion, developed the standard for cuts, and I think that the House staff did an excellent job, at least on this side of the aisle..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners, on a point of order."

Kempiners: "I do not wish to get into a shouting match, Mr. Speaker. I have indicated in my remarks that we ought to follow your staff's recommendations, that they were done very well. The comments I have made is that the Sponsors of these House Amendments were the ones who meat axed the reductions. I concur with your staff, I think your staff was very responsible. Now, if you want to, you know, attack me, attack me for my remarks for those who...who really ruined and put this budget in terrible shape for the Senate consideration; but don't attack me for the comments I made about your staff because, Mr. Houlihan, you have excellent staff, and I



will say that publicly, and we have excellent staff on our side.

And both our staffs agreed with this Amendment, Mr. Houlihan."

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

Houlihan, J.: "...Representative Kempiners, you can pound the table as long as you want, but both of our staffs don't agree with this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would you care to comment on the Amendment? Okay. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Byers."

Byers: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Amendment. I think after examining the proposed cuts that our staff has recommended in Committee and our Chairman, Representative Barnes, also agreed, I think what we should keep in mind here is that the appropriation for the public...mental health budget, this last year we spent about \$375,000,000; and even with these cuts we're going to have more money there than we had before. So I would recommend at this time that the proper thing to do would be to concur with this Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 1599."

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

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

I oppose this Amendment, and I think if we will take a good hard look at what we are talking about when we're saying we're going to eliminate vacancies. The vacancies were created because of the cuts to the mental health in previous years and was...they couldn't fill them because the money wasn't there. This is a slow way of being and coming to a point where there'll be no more institutions for mental health. It'll be the community comprehensive health center. And let me tell you, in case you don't know it, I asked the Director of Mental Health, I said, 'do you at any time intend to turn the community health centers over to the communities where they exist', he said, 'Yes, that is our intentions in the future'. So just remember when you go to ask for help and have to have bond referendums in order to get increased taxes to maintain these, and this is exactly what's going to happen. And I want to tell you one other thing, what happened to the five-year plan? That...nothing that's been said here today was even included in the



five-year plan. And I ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners, to close."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll be brief. I think the last Gentleman who spoke, from what he said, I think he should be voting 'yes' instead of 'no' because what this last Amendment will do will be to top off what this House has already said in its votes on the previous Amendments, that we are going to give the community agencies a...an increase of 13.7 percent. We are going to cut the Department in jobs that they cannot fill at the present time; where they can fill jobs to meet federal requirements, we're going to give them those jobs. I think that a 'yes' vote on this motion to concur is what we have been saying on the floor of the House on the four Amendments. And I'd just like to point out, I tried to take these Amendments as a package because I believe they are a package and I wanted to save the time of the House. And I would ...I would just stress that it, with this Amendment, we are still getting an increase of \$8,000...\$8,493,400 for operations and an increase in community grants of \$11,339,100 even with this Amendment. So I would urge concurrence in Senate Amendment #4."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #4? All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn, to explain his vote."

Dunn, J.: "Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to point out that there are a lot of switches being pushed, and I don't think the Members are here; and I want to point out that unless we get an honest Roll Call here I'll have to ask for a verification. So I'd urge everyone to push their own switch only."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 105 'ayes', 50 'nays', 8 recorded as 'present'; the House concurs in Senate Amendment #4. Mr. Dunn, do you want to...do you want to persist?"

Dunn, J.: "No, Mr. Speaker, I've decided not to request a verification. Thank you."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Then on that, the House does concur in Senate Amendment #4. The Bill is passed. House Bill 1608, Representative Telcser. I'm sorry, the Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain, on a point of information."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege if I may?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Proceed."

McClain: "Ladies, and Gentlemen of the House and Mr. Speaker, the Legislative Liaison for the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities is in intensive care at St. John's; and if you would keep John Ryan in your prayers and in your thoughts. I'm sure his family and those of us who are his friends or blessed to be his friends would appreciate it. Thank you."

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

Bowman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, House Bill 1508 was called on the Order of Concurrence earlier and Representative Houlihan asked to have it taken out of the record."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll get back to it after 1608."

Bowman: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Do you want to take this out of the record, Art? Okay. House Bill 1508, Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There were two Amendments adopted in the Senate and I think there are some problems that need to be worked out. And I move non-concurrence in the Senate Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved that the House nonconcur in 1508...House Bill 1508. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', all opposed...the House does not concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1508. And the Gentleman asks for a Conference Committee to be established. Yes, they do. House Bill 1958, Representative Brummer. 1958, Clerk."

Brummer: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. 1958 is the hold-harmless Bill with regard to school aid for the ...to respond to the problems that were created as a result of the



dramatic increases of multipliers in 1976. As you recall, there was a...1958 originally passed out of the House, I think, with 121 votes. It was a hold-harmless with regard to both equalizer and assessed valuation and operating tax rate. The Governor's Office requested that that be reduced into the 1880 format. That is what House...Amendment #1 does. I agreed to that Amendment; and it has the effect of reducing the impact of the Bill...House Amendment #2, I mean, not House Amendment...Amendment #2 requires that there be a specific line item appropriation with regard to this. Amendment #3 clarifies that...that prior year's entitlement shall mean the amount of the school districts actual state aid claim for the prior year as pro rated at the appropriation level. I move to concur with the Senate Amendments on this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 1958. On that question the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Mr....Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would just like to take this opportunity to commend the Sponsor of this Bill for his reasonableness and willingness to look reality in the...in the eye and to accept, as someone said, a sandwich instead of the whole loaf. And so I would encourage the adoption of all the Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to 1958. 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's 137 'ayes', 1 'nay', none recorded as 'present'; and the House concurs in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 1958. Pass. House Bill 1997. The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1997. Senate Amendment #1 is a Conflict of Interest Amendment, and I move that the House does concur."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1997. Is there any discussion? The



question is, shall Senate Amendment #1 be concurred with? All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 141 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'; the House concurs with Senate Amendment #1 to 1997. Passed. House Bill 2000. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter."

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Senate in their infinite wisdom has reduced the size of the Illinois Future Task Force from 33 to 17 members, 9 public and 8 legislative; and I would move that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2000."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2000. Is there any discussion? The question is, shall Senate Amendment #1 be adopted? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Final action. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. Oh, I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, do you seek recognition? Okay. Take the record. On this question there's 138 'ayes', 6 'nay', 1 recorded as 'present'; the House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2000. It's passed. House Bill 2032, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 and then move to concur in Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1. Well, first of all, what we should do is adopt Amendment #2, I believe, Gene. The Gentleman has moved that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #2. Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment...the Gentleman from Christian, Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "What does it do to the Bill?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would you kindly explain the Amendment?"

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Amendment #2 is the...is the Amendment which is...now down the jury summons procedure to single county



circuits. We had a Bill, 406, that Representative Stiehl had, which dealt with this issue of jury selection in multi-county circuits. And this deals with single county circuits. This Amendment was originally to be put on in the House, but it got caught up in the end of our...part of our Session on the House Bills and so we passed it over to the Senate to put this Amendment on. And Amendment #2 then provides or adds, permissive procedures for summoning the single...the jurors in single county circuits. This Amendment was worked out by the staff, both the Republican and Democratic side of the House."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does that answer your question?"

Tipword: "No."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would you kindly rephrase your question again, Mr. Tipword?"

Tipword: "I was just wanting to know what Amendment #2 did. He tells me that it applies to county circuits; but what does it do to them?"

Hoffman: "I don't think I...what this Senate Amendment #2 does it adds permissive procedures for summoning...for putting the summons out for juries in single county circuits. And it applies only to those counties which are single county circuits, like, well, DuPage is an example. And this came out of a Jury Commission Study that was done in the county. This Amendment was worked out in the House actually before it went over to the Senate between your staff and our staff. It's as clean as a whistle."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall Senate Amendment #2 be concurred with? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Dick, Dick Hart. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 150 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'; the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2032. Now, the Gentleman moves that the House do not concur in Senate Amendment #1. All in favor say 'aye', 'aye', all opposed...the House does not concur in Senate Amendment #1. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"



Barnes, E.: "Well, I merely want an inquiry to the Chair. I've noticed not just on this Bill but I've noticed on some other Bills that we've had where we've accepted some of the Amendments and nonconcurring on the other. If this Bill or any Bill like...that goes to Conference Committee, that really doesn't make any difference, is that correct?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Your point is extremely well taken. In order to save the time of the House, you're better off if you're not concurring on any one of the Amendments. Just to move that we do not concur with all the Amendments saves the time of the House and it goes back to a Conference Committee. And the entire Bill can be reworked at that time. So I would hope in the future that the Body would take that into consideration on the movement of nonconcurrency. The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, I would...would beg to respectfully disagree with the Speaker on that because it's possible that we would concur with one Amendment and not with the other, and it go back to the House of its origin and they would...would recede. It would then not require a Conference Committee of any kind. So I...I believe that at this stage it is proper to concur with some and not with others."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Your point is well taken as well; but you'd better have an assurance that the Senate is going to recede from that Amendment before you make that motion...as a practical point of view. Does that often take into your consideration or your point of view, Mr. Tipsword. Okay. House Bill 2052, the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. McBroom."

McBroom: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would move to concur with all 4 Senate Amendments to House Bill 2052. I'm satisfied with them and I...if you want me to explain them, Mr. Chairman, I'd be happy to do that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "If you would please."

McBroom: "The first Amendment makes it clear that the state's highway access rights are protected. The second transfer is land in DuPage County for a city road; and I understand that the members from DuPage County were interested in this and they used that particular



Bill as a vehicle to transfer this land in DuPage County. The third Amendment requires that the land be used for park purposes by the park districts. The final Amendment, the fourth one, removes the requirement that the Kankakee River Dam be taken over by the park districts. And I'd move for concurrence on all four, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, would Senator...McBroom, would you repeat that please, what that does?"

McBroom: "All four of them, Representative Mudd? I'd be happy to.

The first Amendment makes it clear that the state's highway access rights are protected."

Mudd: "Okay. I think it's Amendment #3."

McBroom: "The third Amendment requires that the land be used for park purposes only. And since it's been under lease they've been leasing 50 percent of it out to...by bid to local farmers, Representative Mudd, and this stipulates that the entirety must be used for recreational purposes."

Mudd: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman moves that the House concurs in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4 to House Bill 2052. 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's 147 'ayes', no 'nays', 3 recorded as 'present'; the House concurs in Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3 and 4 to House Bill 2052, and it's passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Antonovych, on House Bill 2069. House Bill 2069. The Gentleman in the chamber? Take it out of the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dan Houlihan, on House Bill 2126. Out of the record. House Bill 2130, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Taylor."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2130. Senate Amendment #1 allows members of the State Employment Retirement System having prior service as an elected police magistrate or a justice of the peace to purchase such credit provided that it



has not been putting in any other system. I move with the concurrence of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2130."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2130. 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's 141 'ayes', no 'nays', none recorded as 'present'; and the House concurs in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2130 and it's passed. House Bill 2161, Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2161. The Bill itself permits the county to establish a P.B.C. even though a municipality in the county already has established one. This Senate Amendment #1 limits the applicability of the law to counties between 350,000 and 1,000,000. It doesn't apply to your county, Mr. Waddell."

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

Waddell: "Mr. Speaker, for the record, I believe the Calendar says 2, not 1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Clerk will correct it. 2161 on the Calendar...on my Calendar says 2."

Daniels: "Is it Amendment #2 or Amendment #1? My analysis has #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's #2 according to the Clerk."

Daniels: "All right, and it would be on #2 I would make the motion. Thank you, Representative Waddell."

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

Barnes, E.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm not opposed; but, Representative, we over here couldn't hear what you said. So we'd appreciate it if you would sort of repeat it a little bit."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly repeat your explanation of Senate Amendment #2, please."

Daniels: "Senate Amendment #2 limits the applicability of the law to counties between 350,000 and 1,000,000."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Did you hear the explanation? The question is, shall Senate Amendment #2 be concurred with? 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's 144 'ayes', no 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present'; the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2161, it's passed. Yes. House Bill 2069, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Antonovych."

Antonovych: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there is a technical error in Senate Amendment #1. So I would move that the House nonconcur in this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved that the House do not concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2069. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', all opposed...the House does not concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2069. House Bill 2173. The Gentleman from Logan, Mr. Lauer."

Lauer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 2173 is the Bill which would set up the state-wide probation system. And I move to concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would you kindly put Mr. Lauer on, please?"

Lauer: "The effect of the Amendment is it takes the determination of standards out of the office of the...administrative office of the court system and gives it to the Council of Chief Judges of the various...well, the total Council of Chief Judges of the circuit. It makes the Bill permissive. And changes the monetary delineation to go to the Comptroller, instead of to Judge Gulley's Office. I move concurrence."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved that the House do concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2173. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Emil Jones. All right. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Schlickman: "Did you say that one of these Amendments made this new program permissive?"



Lauer: "Yes."

Schlickman: "What do you mean by that?"

Lauer: "The...in Amendment #3 on, let's see...just a moment, I've got to find the line..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dan Houlihan, to respond to the question."

Houlihan, D.: "Yes, because I am a Cosponsor with Representative Lauer of the Bill. What he is referring to is that this is a voluntary program, that the standards are not to be ignored, but it is a voluntary program if the counties wish to join in...into this state subsidy which is provided for in the Bill."

Schlickman: "In other words, under this Bill, if we were to accept this Amendment, I believe, Amendment #2, we will not have a uniform..."

Houlihan, D.: "Amendment #3."

Schlickman: "...Amendment #3...we will not necessarily have a uniform, state-wide probation system?"

Houlihan, D.: "I suggest it's just the opposite. It's...uniform state-wide system for the probation subsidies, but it is not mandatory. The counties in order to do...to become eligible for the subsidies have to follow the standards which will be promulgated by the Conference of Chief Circuit Court Judges."

Schlickman: "In other words, they can have their cake and eat it, too?"

Houlihan, D.: "Well, I suppose that's in the point of view, but they won't have the probation subsidies, Gene."

Schlickman: "Are you saying that...are you saying that they can get the subsidy without complying with the standards?"

Houlihan, D.: "No, I am not. I'm saying in order to be eligible for the subsidy, then they are subject to the standards."

Schlickman: "Then going back to my first question, which may be rhetorical in nature, by this permissive aspect we will not have a uniform, state-wide adult...or probation system?"

Houlihan, D.: "Well, I disagree with you because we are setting up the standards, but it is a voluntary program for the counties to join. But the attraction for the counties to join is that there is a subsidy feature here which is the main part of the Bill up to a



maximum of \$500 and...per month for adult probation officers, and, of course, increases the juvenile probation officers subsidy from the current \$300 a month to \$500 a month."

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

Bowman: "Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Bowman: "Okay. Who establishes the standards?"

Houlihan, D.: "The Conference of the Chief Circuit Court Judges of the state, which is the same standard we have now for the subsidy for juvenile probation officers."

Bowman: "So the Conference of the Chief..."

Houlihan, D.: "Circuit Court Judges."

Bowman: "...Judges, not...in other words, each different circuit does not establish their own standards?"

Houlihan, D.: "No, that is correct; and the Conference of Chief Circuit Court Judges."

Bowman: "Okay. However, whether or not the Circuit elects to adopt the standards is up to...to whom then?"

Houlihan, D.: "It's up to the individual county if they wish to participate in this program, and I've indicated, you know, it is permissive if they wish to participate. But in participating they must meet the standards that will be established by the Conference of Chief Circuit Court Judges."

Bowman: "Okay. Why was the change made? Why are these people any better qualified to establish standards?"

Houlihan, D.: "Presently, we have for the existing juvenile probation officer subsidy up to a maximum of \$300 a month. The Conference of Chief Circuit Judges sets the standard for eligibility for that program. What we are doing here is using the same state-wide system to...which is already in existence for juvenile probation officers to make it applicable also to adult probation officers."

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

Cunningham: "Will the Sponsor yield, one of them?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Cunningham: "What was the theory for switching the management from a



Court Administrator to the Conference of Circuit Judges...Chief Circuit Judges?"

Houlihan, D.: "The theory being that we presently have a standard set up with the Conference of Chief Circuit Court Judges for juvenile probation officers subsidy. And this will be simply, in effect, a continuation and expansion of that."

Cunningham: "I noted that the money was appropriated to the Comptroller instead of to the Court Administrator. What role does the Court Administrator now play in the Bill that's amended?"

Houlihan, D.: "None."

Cunningham: "Do the Sponsors agree with this complete change in the thrust of their original Bill?"

Houlihan, D.: "We do."

Cunningham: "Why? That was Skinner's question, not mine. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to 2173? 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's 125 'aye', 16 'nay', none recorded as 'present'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 on House Bill 2173, and it passed. House Bill 2229. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I move to concur to Senate Amendments #2 and 3 to House Bill 2229. Amendment #1 gives the downstate police the same prerogative as firemen to vest their pensions in 10 years at age 60. Amendment #2 gives those home rule districts who hire police officers 18 to participate in their pension program. I would move to concur with both Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved that the House do concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 2229. Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the House do concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3. 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's 132 'ayes', no 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present'; and the House does concur in Senate



Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 2229. and it's passed. House Bill 2243. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2243. This was the Bill which I introduced which took away the prohibition from insurance companies making political contributions. In the Senate, they have put an Amendment on on the grounds that the insurance companies are regulated closely by the Department of Insurance. And what the Amendment does it says, 'For the purposes of this Section', that we're talking about, 'Contributions from insurance companies, and contribution which is solicited by the Department of Insurance or any person in the executive would be prohibited'. And that's the only thing that it does; and in my opinion, we really don't need it; but I think there is an argument to be made that they are regulated by the Department. And, therefore, I would move for its concurrence."

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

Stearney: "Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Stearney: "Doesn't the Amendment provide that any employee of the executive branch of government is prohibited from soliciting a contribution?"

Sandquist: "No, as I tried to explain, Representative Stearney, it says for the purposes of this Section, and this Section deals with insurance companies and any employee of the executive department is prohibited from soliciting a contribution from an insurance company; but that is all."

Stearney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in addressing myself to the question, I have serious reservations about it. The reason being is that it seems to be overly broad; and I wish to remind the Members of the House that we do not have public financing of elections for the Members of the Legislature at this point in time. That being the case, we all must solicit contributions in order that we... a reelection campaign. It seems to me the way the Amendment is drawn is that any... if you have a person who's working in an



executive...as an employee in the Executive Branch of government he shall be prohibited from soliciting a contribution from anyone, regardless of whether it is an insurance company. And I believe that Amendment is overly broad and should...we should not move to concur in it. Because believe me I believe...I think everyone of you has an employee somewhere in state government, and that individual could not even solicit from his next door neighbor for a \$10 ticket to a cocktail party. I don't believe the Amendment is properly drawn; and if so, we should move not to concur and...and then redraft that particular Amendment in such a way that there could be no doubt in the court's mind as to exactly what it means. I urge you to vote 'no'."

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

Geo-Karis: "Will the Sponsor...will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Geo-Karis: "It's been very hard for me to hear with all the din in the background, what your Amendment reads...could you please just read that Senate Amendment?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me for one moment. Could we have a little order, please? Please proceed."

Sandquist: "All right, this is the Section, I will read it entirely, 'For the purposes of this Section a prohibited political contribution shall be any political contribution which...which was solicited by the Director of the Department of Insurance, any employee of the Department of Insurance, the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor, or any employee or member of the Executive Branch of this state or any other state'."

Geo-Karis: "That's it; is it?"

Sandquist: "That's it. But it starts off with the...'For the purposes of this Section'. And this Section has three additional sub-sections which talks about a contribution from an insurance company; and it is true, as Representative Stearney says, any employee of the state, Executive Department, cannot solicit from an insurance company."

Geo-Karis: "But that's all it does."



Sandquist: "That's all. He certainly can from any place else."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise and support the concurrence of this Bill because the Amendment is very clear in limiting the contribution solicitation to employees of the executive department. Now, you and I both know that insurance companies have been contributing sub rosa through their executives and some of the companies gave it back to their executives in the form of bonuses at Christmas. In this day of disclosure, I think it is important that we disclose all contributions and I don't think we should hide them in the closet just because it's insurance companies. And I certainly urge a favorable concurrence."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2243. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Who? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Epton, to explain his vote."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I suspect that all lawyers have areas of disagreement, and that's probably what makes for better fees or greater fees, I'm not sure if they're better. In this case, I would respectfully disagree with my colleague, Representative Stearney. I think that this prohibition would be strictly construed, as Representative Sandquist has indicated, it deals only with the Insurance Section of the Code. It would deal only with the prohibition relating to insurance companies, and an employee working for you, or for the state or for any political entity would not be prohibited from soliciting contributions from any other body. So I urge that you concur in this Amendment so that these insurance companies perhaps will give us back some of the money they so rightfully retain."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 95 'ayes', 33 'nays', 8 recorded as 'present'; and the House does concur in Amendment #2 to 2243, and the Bill is passed. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. McBroom, on House Bill 2272. McBroom. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter."



Porter: "Could you record me as 'no' on the last Roll Call, please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman wants to be recorded 'no' on 2272, you'll be so...I'm sorry, on 2243, so recorded. House Bill 2126. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House do concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2126. This is the Bill, which is the companion appropriation measure to House Bill 2173, which we have just passed now on Concurrence. What Senate Amendment #1 to this Bill does is to conform the Bill in the appropriation with the substantive measure. What it provides for is that the vouchering for the...the reimbursement for the probation officers subsidy shall be through the Comptroller's Office; and in this fashion, it conforms with the substantive measure as passed by the House. And I ask for an affirmative vote on our motion here to concur with Senate Amendment 1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2126? The question is, shall the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2126? All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130 'ayes', 8 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2126 and is, hereby, declared passed. The Gentleman from Kankakee back on the floor? Mr. McBroom? House Bill 2307: The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan. Out of the record. House Bill 2392. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Abramson."

Abramson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that the House do concur in Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 2392. What this Amendment did was cuts a...a supplemental line item transfer to the exact amount needed by the Industrial Commission to finish the fiscal year."

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

Walsh: "I'm sorry, that was an error."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's all right. Any discussion? The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill



2392? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Conti, to explain his vote. Do you want to turn his light off, please? Adeline? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 143 'ayes', no 'nays', none recorded as 'present'; the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2392 and is, hereby, declared passed. House Bill 2408, Representative Dan Houlihan. Out of the record. On the Order of Motions is House Resolution 384. The Gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to suspend Rule 41(a) for immediate consideration of House Resolution 384 and using the Attendance Roll Call of this legislative day."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "May we have a description of the Resolution?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Resolution has been distributed. Do you want to give him a description, please?"

Richmond: "Yes, in essence, it requests that the...that we urge...the General Assembly urge the Board of Higher Education to develop land for the operation of a School of Veterinary Medicine at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave..."

Schlickman: "No, please..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...All right, does that answer your question?"

Schlickman: "...Well, first of all, I'm going to object to use of the Attendance Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All right. The Gentleman moves..."

Schlickman: "And I'd like to ask a question regarding the Resolution."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...Please proceed."

Schlickman: "There is already a school...veterinary school in the State of Illinois, isn't there?"

Richmond: "Yes, there is."

Schlickman: "Well, what is the need for a second one?"



Richmond: "Because the University of Illinois, the approximate size..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, according to the Parliamentarian, on the merits of the Resolution. So we can discuss that once we move."

Schlickman: "Well, what's the emergency nature?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's...different question."

Schlickman: "Thank you, Dave, I thought you'd suggest I come up with that. What's the emergency nature and why did you wait so long?"

Richmond: "Well, it's getting to be an emergency because of the shortness of time, towards the end of the Session; but we just developed this Resolution and which I merely ask that it be considered."

Schlickman: "May I address myself to the non-emergency nature of the motion?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Proceed."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, hopefully, tomorrow we are going to adjourn. Here we have a Resolution calling on the Board...Board of Higher Education to recommend that there be a new school created at Southern Illinois University. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if there was a need for such a facility it's one that would have been anticipated prior to today, June 29, 1977, and that this Resolution would have been subject to the deliberative processes of this Body. Meaning that it would've gone to Committee, there would have been those interested in the subject who would have appeared before Committee and would have provided the basis for the adoption of this Resolution. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that it is untimely offered and one for which there appears no need for emergency treatment. And on that basis I urge a 'no' vote on this motion to suspend the rules for immediate consideration of House Resolution 384."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I join with Representative Schlickman on this because I see no reason for an emergency. And as far as the subject matter is concerned I know that the House does have a...of which the now Mr. Speaker on the rostrum is on the Committee as a Select Committee on the



Reorganization of Government, and in that you've got the Higher Education arena. And I think that something like this perhaps should go...of this magnitude should go to that particular Committee. And furthermore I would like to add that if we're going to have another professional school such as this it shouldn't be at Southern Illinois but I think it should be at Northern Illinois University where we've got the concentration of the population of this state. And for that reason I just would encourage a 'no' vote on this subject."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I oppose this motion as well as the Resolution for the following reasons. For nearly a decade the Illinois Board of Higher Education has been calling for the expansion of the University of Illinois College of Veterinary Medicine; but we in the state have not been funding...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, the Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain, on a point of order."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to interrupt the Gentleman; but he's speaking to the Resolution and not to the motion."

Wikoff: "...All right, I'll speak to the Resolution then, I oppose it, I don't think there's any need of it and let's run it through the Committee and let everybody have their say."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves to suspend 41(a) for immediate consideration. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Dawson. George. No, I want to make sure mine is hit. He's in favor of it. I'm afraid you're wrong. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Franklin, Representative Hart, to explain his vote."

Hart: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I understand the concerns of some of you about the time of this; but we only have today and tomorrow left. If there was time for this to go to a Committee, we would certainly be glad for that to do so; but no Committee is going to meet to hear it. And so I think the issue can be debated fully on the floor of this House. Let's get the necessary vote so



we can discuss the issue. I urge an 'aye' vote."

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

Walsh: "Only to say, Mr. Speaker, that I request a verification if this has a sufficient number of votes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. The Gentleman from Perry, Mr. Ralph Dunn, to explain his vote."

Dunn, R.: "Thank you...thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I certainly would urge that you give it 107 votes so that we can consider this and then if you think it's a bad Amendment, you don't like the Resolution, then you can voice your objection... We ordinarily give consideration to anyone who wants to submit and wants to hear a Resolution such as this. It's not a controversial Resolution, I don't think. It really just says that the Board of Higher Education should look into a veterinary school. And I'd urge that you put on a few 'aye' votes and let us consider this. Thank you."

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

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, the vice of the argument that the Gentleman from Benton makes is that it's too late now and...to go before a Committee; and, therefore, we ought to bypass the Committee. Well, why is it too late? If the Gentleman had filed a motion in time, the Education Committee could've posted it or the Executive Committee. People could have been heard. We will be back in September. If they want to have the matter heard, let it be heard before a Committee at that time. There are many issues involved. If they want to letter write in their individual capacity to the President of the Board of Higher Education, let them do so; but why commit this House to a course of action without an opportunity for all --- of the universities in the state to be heard, both public and private. And I would certainly, strongly oppose this eleventh hour..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Randolph, Mr. Birchler, to explain his vote."

Birchler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm surprised to see those red votes



up there. Those people some day are going to need something in their area. This motion is just to bring the thought to the House floor for us to debate. And I would like to see a few more green votes so we don't have to delay...to take time for verification.

Thank you."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to see a few more green votes on this issue. I think that we of the Body are capable of making decisions. I think that we can sit here on this floor, and I don't believe that any Committee or any one person, no matter who it is, has to have the right to sit up and pass on everything. I think there are times when we can pass our judgments to the entire Body and come to a conclusion. It's a reasonable thing, it's a needed thing. And I, too, would urge some 'aye' votes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 117 'ayes', 35 'nays', 7 recorded as 'present' to suspend Rule 41(a). On the Resolution. Do you want to go with the verification? Okay. Mr. Walsh on the verification. The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McGrew, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

McGrew: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think if the Gentleman from Cook would look around he would see that we have an excellent attendance. I think his motion is dilatory. We have over 10 necessary votes. And I think nearly everyone is here, Sir."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Clerk will poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Anderson, Chapman, Conti, Corneal Davis, John Dunn, Greiman..."

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

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I rise for the, I guess, the purpose of an announcement. It's just been called to my attention, and I hate to interrupt right now, but I think it's very important, it's been called to me attention that we're...the Senate has sent over notices of Conference Committees, and the notices of the Members of the Conference Committees and are just dropping them on your desks.. So



you'd better be looking on your desk. You might be assigned to a Conference Committee. I know I have one here for Representative Beatty that's going to meet at 1:30 in Room 400, and it's 1:45 now. So you'd better be taking a look on you desks to see if you've got ...I would suggest if the Pages are passing these out, they'd better make sure that they hand them to the Member and not just drop them on the desks of the Members. That might be a better way to handle it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Your point is well taken. Proceed with the absen-tees."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Greiman, Klosak, Kornowicz, Kucharski, Lauer, Madigan, McAvoy, Meyer, Molloy, Mugalian, Schoeberlein, Simms, and Willer."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, the distinguished elder statesman, Mr. Davis, wants to be recorded as 'aye'."

Davis, C.: "'Aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Davis as 'aye'. Simms as 'no'. Mr. Adams as 'aye'. Anyone else? Do you still persist in your verification, Mr. Walsh? Okay. Kindly proceed to verify."

Clerk O'Brien: "Adams, Antonovych, E. M. Barnes, Jane Barnes, Bartulis, Beatty, Birchler, Bowman, Bradley, Brady, Brandt, Breslin, Don Brummet, Byers, Caldwell, Campbell..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Vitek. Vitek. Do we have an electrician around here? The Gentleman has leave to be verified. You're verified."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Capparelli, Catania, Christensen, Cunningham..."

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

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I have to go to my first Conference Committee now, could I be verified?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leave? You're verified. Mr. Peters wants to be verified as well. He's recorded as 'aye'. Are you going to the same Conference Committee? Fine."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Darrow, Corneal Davis, Jack Davis, Dawson, Deavers, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, Ralph Dunn, Dyer, Epton, Ewell, Ewing, Farley, Flinn, Friedrich, Gaines, Garmisa, Geo-Karis, Giglio, Giorgi,



Hanahan, Harris, Hart, Holewinski, Dan Houlihan, Jim Houlihan, Huff, Jacobs, Jaffe, Dave Jones, Emil Jones, Kane, Kelly, Kempiners, Kent, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Laurino, Lechowicz, Leverenz, Levin, Lucco, Luft..."

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

Barnes, E.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I've been called away to Conference Committee. Can I be verified?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to be verified? You're verified."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Madison, Mahar, Mann, Marovitz, Peggy Smith Martin, Matejek, Matijevich, Mautino, McAuliffe, McBroom, McClain, McGrew, McLendon, McPike, Mudd, Mulcahey, Murphy, Nardulli, Neff, O'Brien, O'Daniel, Pechous, Peters, Pierce, Pouncey, Reilly, Richmond, Rigney, Robinson, Ryan, Sandquist, Schisler, Schneider, Sharp, Shumpert, Skinner, Stanley, Stearney, E. G. Steele, C. M. Stiehl, Stuffle, Sumner, Taylor, Telcser, Terzich, Tipsword, Van Duyn, Vitek, Von Boeckman, Wall, Williams, Winchester, Younge, Yourell; Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from LaSalle, Mrs. Hoxsey."

Hoxsey: "I'd like to change my vote from 'present' to 'aye', please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record the Lady from 'present' to 'aye'."

The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to change my vote to 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record the Lady as 'aye', Mrs. Macdonald."

The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Sevcik, 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huskey, to 'aye'. The Gentleman...that was Huskey as 'aye'. The Gentleman, Mr. Anderson, wants to be recorded as 'aye'. Anderson. Who? Mrs. Willer as 'aye', no, I'm sorry, the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Willer."

Willer: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to be recorded as 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record her as 'no'. Pardon me? What's our count now, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "124 'aye' and 35 'nay'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "124 'ayes'? We're starting off with 124 'ayes' and 35 'nays'. Mr. Walsh."



Walsh: "Sure, here they come. Representative Antonovych?"

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "I don't see him in his chair? Is the Gentleman in the chamber, Mr. Antonovych? Take him off the record. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, please change my 'no' vote to 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly change Mr. Getty from 'no' to 'aye'. Please proceed, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, did we grant Gene Barnes permission to be verified?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, we did."

Walsh: "Jane Barnes, in that case."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Jane Barnes? I don't see the Lady in the Chair.

Is the Lady in the chamber? Mrs. Jane Barnes? Take her off the Roll Call. The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer."

Walsh: "Beatty?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Wait a minute."

Brummer: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Brummer: "Please vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record the Gentleman as 'aye'. All right, now who were you asking about, Representative Walsh?"

Walsh: "Beatty?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Beatty? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Mr. Beatty? Take him off the Roll Call."

Walsh: "Brady?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Brady is here."

Walsh: "Brummet?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Brummet? Don Brummet is there."

Walsh: "Byers?"

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's not in his chair. The Gentleman in the chambers? Mr. Byers? Take him off the Roll Call."



Walsh: "Capparelli?"

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's not in his chair. Is the Gentleman in the chambers? Mr. Capparelli? Take him off the Roll Call. Anyone else?"

Walsh: "Yes, Mr. Cunningham?"

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's not in the chamber. Take him off the record.
The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Will Representative Walsh verify me so I can leave?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "You're verified. Anyone else?"

Walsh: "Dawson?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Dawson is in his chair."

Walsh: "Ewing?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ewing? He's here."

Walsh: "Farley?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Farley is right here."

Walsh: "Giglio?"

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

Walsh: "Hanahan?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hanahan is right over here."

Walsh: "Huff?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Huff? He's back there."

Walsh: "Jaffe?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Jaffe is in his chair."

Walsh: "Kempiners?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kempiners? He's in the back."

Walsh: "Laurino?"

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Don't see him.
Take him off the Roll Call."



Walsh: "Leverenz?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Younge: "To be verified."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady asks to be verified, Mrs. Younge...And Mr. Stanley, same request? And Mr. McBroom, same request? Any objection? That's Stanley, McBroom and Mrs. Younge are verified. All right, now..."

Walsh: "You know, Mr. Speaker, I think people ought to have a legitimate reason, such as going to a Conference Committee, to make that request and not to go lunch or wherever. Levin? Have you taken Leverenz off, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who?"

Walsh: "Leverenz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Leverenz? Is the Gentleman..."

Walsh: "He's definitely not here."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...He's right behind you."

Walsh: "Levin then."

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

Walsh: "Marovitz?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Marovitz is in his chair."

Walsh: "McAuliffe?"

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

Walsh: "Mati...he's there. Mr. Mudd, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mudd? The Gentleman's not in his chair. Is the Gentleman in the chamber, Representative Joseph Mudd? Joe Mudd? Take him off the record."

Walsh: "Murphy?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Murphy is back there."

Walsh: "Schneider?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Right here."

Walsh: "Sharp?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Sharp is in his chair."

Walsh: "Shumpert?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Shumpert? He's back there."



Walsh: "Taylor?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Taylor? He's back there."

Walsh: "Telcser?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Telcser? He's back there."

Walsh: "Wall?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, who...who were you asking about?"

Walsh: "Wall?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's back there."

Walsh: "Adams, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Adams was here, and he asked leave. He was recorded and gone."

Walsh: "Can't we revoke that?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, we can't."

Walsh: "Okay. We have no further questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. On this question there's 118 'ayes', 34 'nos', 3 'present'; and the Gentleman suspends Rule 41(a). Now, he moves that the House do adopt. The Gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Richmond. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, seek recognition?"

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I don't want to take any time of the House especially in the middle of a Resolution; but yesterday somebody brought up the matter of not getting notice for Conference Committees, and Representative Bradley assured us that we would. I received a call from my secretary that I'm supposed to be in Room 400 at 2 o'clock because the Director of the Department of Financial Institutions said I'm on a Conference Committee. And it's almost 2 o'clock, I haven't received a notice now. If I hadn't received that phone call, I wouldn't know. And I'm really not sure, it's only on what she said that there is a Conference Committee meeting at that time. So I would suggest that everybody get their act together because it's all screwed up right now, and make sure that we know a little bit ahead of time at least. I'd like five minutes notice at least."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Richmond, on House Resolution 384."



Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Resolution merely adds that the Board of Higher Education consider this...this request to address the acute problem that confronts the students of Illinois who would like the opportunity to attend a veterinary school of medicine. There simply isn't enough room for all of those who want to attend. Those of us who come from agricultural communities know that it's true. Having served on the Ag. Committee, I get a lot of inquiries and requests for help to get students into...in a veterinary school. It has been pointed out we do have a school in Illinois now, of course, at the University of Illinois. But do you know that only 80 people can be admitted to this particular school. And we had in 1977 800 to 900 applicants. We also know that many freshman through senior undergraduates declared interest in veterinary medicine are encourage to change their programs or their goals because they know that they have a very small chance of being accepted. The number of veterinarian schools in the entire country is only 22, with 3 in Canada, makes a total of 25. There's much supporting data for the need that...for this additional school in Illinois. It's impossible for most of our students to have access to this education. And that is the purpose of this Amendment. I would ask for your support...this Resolution, excuse me."

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

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I feel this has been fully debated; and I move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor sig...signify by saying 'aye', all opposed...the 'ayes' have it. Roll Call on the previous question. All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The question is, shall the main question be put? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 108 'ayes', 19 'nos', none 'present'; the previous question has been moved. The previous question. The question is, shall House Resolution 384 be adopted? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all opposed...in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it."



Roll Call has been requested. All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, no other state in this union has two veterinary schools. Iowa hasn't, Wisconsin hasn't. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have not been told what the cost of an additional school would be. We weren't told either, Mr. Speaker, that this Resolution doesn't ask the Board of Higher Education to consider. It says specifically, 'to develop plans for the operation of a school of veterinary medicine at Southern Illinois'. Now, there are two assumptions in this Resolution. One, that there should be a second school; and two, it should be at Southern Illinois University. Those are presumptuous. There've been no facts presented to us that we need a second one, that we shouldn't consider expanding the one we already have. And no consideration has been given, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to the other institutions of higher learning here in the State of Illinois. This is a terrible Resolution. It's presumptuous, it's nondeliberative, it's an imposition..."

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

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, there's a long way from this Resolution to a veterinary school; but this is a start. In the first place, Illinois has twice as many people as Iowa and Wisconsin. The second place, at Northern Illinois they go to vet. school and set up a little local clinic for dogs and cats. We'd like to have a few veterinarians who are interested in taking care of livestock in southern Illinois."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, very briefly in response. I should like to point out to the Gentleman from the other side of the aisle that Illinois is number one in agriculture, they're number one in income over 27 other states. If this alone would be a valid justification for it, and I cannot understand the constant harping and criticism when the



disagree with anything that's been said here relative to the need. I know there's a tremendous number of applicants out there for the positions available, and we are a state between 11 and 12,000,000. The only area that I disagree and the reason for my 'no' vote is that it's going to the wrong institution of higher learning. It belongs to Northern Illinois where we've got the concentration of the population and some of the best farmland in the heart as far as Illinois is concerned in the agricultural industry. And this is where it belongs. And as long as we're going to move in that direction, I for one will do everything I can to see that it goes to Northern as opposed to Southern."

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

Satterthwaite: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it is certainly true that there are far more applicants than have been accommodated by the current veterinary medicine school that we have in the State of Illinois; but the very reason that they are not being accommodated is because the state has not provided additional funding for the expansion of that program. I believe that currently the objection is to the number of people who then go into small animal practice. There is not a separate program for large animals and small animals. They take one course. It is because of our free enterprise system that many of the graduates from that course choose to go into small animal work. A far better direction for a resolution would be to provide separate training if we really want to put more people into large animal work. And I suggest..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 126 'ayes', 30 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'; and this Resolution is adopted. The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, for the purpose of one more announcement concerning Conference Committees. Now, we've got the people up here distributing the notices, and we have Members who are not here. Now, if those Members are in their



offices or some place within the sound of my voice, I suggest they stay pretty close to floor today so that they can be notified that they are on Conference Committees and can be in attendance at those...at those Committees to meet. I have a feeling that the same people that are not available on the floor are going to be the same people tomorrow night saying...and asking, 'Are we going to get out of here on time?'. Well; if they're here, and go to work on the Conference Committees, they certainly would expedite things and our chances of adjourning on time would be increased. So just try to be near by."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Messages from the Senate."

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

Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of Bills of the following titles to wit, House Bills 973, 1005, 2368, 315, 341, 375, 413, 417, 611, 689, 818, 699, 970, 1033, 1036, 1044, 1060, 1064, 1222, 1255, 1431, 17, 44, 107, 113, 1768, 1706, 1604, 1978, 2131, 2397, 2402, 1736, 2244, 2379, 186, 203... excuse me...206, 245, 428, 1039, 1012, 1212, 1081, 1636, 2322, 1384, 2412, 1, 14, 64, 363, 1071, 1769, 1833, 1975, 2347, 2361 and 2398, together with Amendments; passed by the Senate as amended June 28, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendments to Bills of the following titled to wit, House Bills #364, 168, 822, 979, 1001, 1038, 1102, 1182, 2030, 2089, 2179 and 2355; I'm further directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate requests a First Conference Committee. Action taken by the Senate June 28, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keats, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Keats: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to ask a question. Are you preparing to leave the Order of Motions?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I don't know about that, but I'm...I'm ready to make



an announcement that according to the information that I received, it's the intent that we should work right through; and, hopefully, break at a...little bit earlier than a hour this evening; but we will not break for lunch. Hopefully, we will be able to have dinner some time this evening..."



Speaker Lechowicz: "In the area of Nonconcurrency, Senate Bill 281. Representative Hart. I just told you, Hart."

Hart: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House recede from Amendment #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 281. This is a Bill that would require the Pollution Control Board to back up regulations so that they would be no more stringent than the Federal regulations. The Bill was worked out in the Senate with the approval of the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency and the Bill should not have been amended in the House. The House Amendment had a very damaging, at least House Amendment #2 had a very damaging effect on the Bill. Senate Bill 281 would insure that the continued use of Illinois produced coal in Illinois power plants and help to hold the line on the major operating expense fuel or generating electricity while protecting the public health. This Amendment would be damaging to that direction and I would move that we recede."

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

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to ask that this question be divided and that we take each of the Amendments at a time. I have no objection to accepting the nonconcurrency on Amendment #1, but I would certainly object to nonconcurrency on Amendment #2. And I wonder if the Sponsor would agree to that, that we would divide the question on this Bill."

Hart: "I have no objection, Mrs. Macdonald, to dividing the question. I think you have the right anyway, but they will go one at a time. So I would move that we recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 281 which the Lady agrees with."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved that the House do recede from Amendment #1. There will be a division of the question. On that question then, is there anyone seeking recognition? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman. Hoffman, your light's on. Okay. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keats, on the question? Your light's on. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "This on #1? I'm sorry, I wanted to speak on #2."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. The question is, shall the House recede



from Amendment #1? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 118 'ayes', no 'nays', none recorded as 'present' and the House does recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 281. Now, on Amendment #2, the Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart."

Hart: "I move that we recede from Senate, from House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 281. What this Amendment does, provides that the sulphur dioxide regulation shall be adopted by the Illinois Pollution Control Board for existing fuel combustion stationary emission sources such as coal-fired steam, electric generator operating plants. And it would really destroy the major impact of this Bill because it would just permit the Illinois Pollution Control Board to set a more stringent standard for SO2 in the form of an ambient air quality standard in Illinois. The Bill would have the Illinois standards no stronger than the national standards and I think that's an adequate standard for us to adopt. We've got to rely more on coal in the State of Illinois. I've been here for nine years now and one of the major thrusts of my legislative tenure has been to call attention to the State of Illinois that Illinois Coal has to be developed and used. It's the cheapest, most readily available, best kind of fuel to hold the line on electric rates, to stimulate the economy of Illinois through the use of the coal, to develop the economy, the addition of many jobs in Illinois. We need this Bill very much for Illinois and I would urge that we recede from Senate Amendment, House Amendment #2:"

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

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As I stated to this Assembly earlier last week, I seldom have any difference with the House Sponsor of this Bill. But when we did get into Committee and I heard the witnesses on this Bill and I read the Bill in detail, I felt compelled to put on Senate Amendment #2. This was an Amendment that had been suggested by the Chicago Lung Association and I am in complete concurrence with it. Illinois is not only an industrial state, but it is



also an agricultural state. And we are unique in our environmental atmospheric conditions also. And for us to make it impossible to meet the emergencies and the crisis environmentally for the health of our people and for our crops is absolutely irresponsible. In the last twenty years, in less than twenty years, acid rain has increased tenfold. I think that this in itself is a threat not only to our crops, but to the economy and to the health of our people. We are facing what we know to be a food shortage probably within ten or twelve years. And for Illinois not to be able to meet the threat of acid rain, is absolutely unthinkable in my opinion. Yesterday and today, out in the lobby a number of you have been given this yellow brochure. I find it interesting that there is no identification on the brochures and while I am not quarrelling in any way with the information, I cannot verify whether or not it is true. I think that the chart on the front of the brochures is interesting because it relates to different scales on a graph. There certainly has been a lot of discussion about this second Amendment that I have put on and I want it noted in the record that any piece of material that has come has been identified. Jacob Demille, the Chairman of the Pollution Control Board, the Chicago Lung Association, who are very concerned about this Bill, certainly have always signed and thoroughly explained and taken responsibility for the information that has been passed out. I think again that I want to emphasize to all of those who will be voting on this issue that we will be shirking our responsibility if we let these standards of this state be restricted only to those standards that are established and promulgated for other states and for the minimum standards of the United States. We are a unique state and why should we be restricted to standards that are set for Ohio, New Mexico, Utah, Nevada. It is just unthinkable when we know that Illinois does have and will have unique situations where we must be able to be flexible enough to move for the protection of the health and the welfare of our people. I urge you to vote with me and vote 'no' on this... (microphone turned off)."



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

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I certainly support Representative Hart in moving to not concur in this Amendment. Illinois is blessed with one of the greatest deposits of coal in the whole world. Illinois has the opportunity of helping solve the energy crisis. But because the Illinois Pollution Control Board has decided to impose stricter standards than the other states, a lot of the industry is going to other states. We have a brand new mine in my district. You know where the coal is going? It isn't being burned in Illinois. It's being shipped to Indiana. They're going to make electricity out of it, pay no sales tax, sell the electricity back to us and have all the jobs. Now if you want to drive industry out of Illinois and make Illinois lose industry and not get new industry as it should, let's burn Illinois coal in Illinois, not in Indiana and Missouri and Kentucky and other places. We have a great opportunity but we can't do it if the Illinois Pollution Control Board keeps on imposing higher standards than our neighboring states. I urge you to vote to nonconcur in this Amendment."

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

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Lady who is the proponent of this Amendment would answer a question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Ewing: "Representative Macdonald, what does the... your Amendment actually provide? What are the restrictions in your Amendment?"

Macdonald: "The Amendment merely says... strikes out the language that says that the Illinois Pollution Control Board cannot promulgate standards any more strict than Federal standards. This has nothing to do with the thrust, the main thrust of this Bill which is to mandate the Pollution Control Board to come up with standards by October, I believe it is, of 1978."

Ewing: "Would this effectively eliminate the use of our coal resources in Illinois?"

Macdonald: "Certainly not. I would like to read to you what Jacob Demille says. He said, 'How would more Illinois coal be burned under this Bill? All new power plants to be built must meet



Federal new source performance standards which require scrubbers on the use of low-sulphur coal.' This deals with existing plants, not new plants in rural areas. The Board's regulation here is 6.0 pounds of sulphur dioxide per million B.T.U.'s modified downward for short smokestacks. Now, this has nothing to do with the burning of the coal. This is... the thrust of this Bill, it does have in it and we left that in, the first Amendment was clarifying to talk about systems that will be used in intermittent control systems and so forth. We've left that in. The thrust of this Bill was to mandate the Pollution Control Board to promulgate their standards so that we could go forward with the use of Illinois coal. I might also add that the Pollution Control Board has a system, a protective system of variances. And if it is felt that we in our wisdom and the Pollution Control Board and the other Environmental Protection Agencies feel and I'm certainly sure that the new feeling is that the new compromises and that the newest alliances that have been drawn, that agencies are very sympathetic as we are in this General Assembly and that variances in other means of being able to burn our Illinois coal will be possible."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak to the Amendment. I believe that we should leave this Amendment on. If it allows us to use our Illinois coal and protect our environment, I would hope that we would adopt... would refuse to recede from the Amendment and put it in a Conference Committee as necessary."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson."

Anderson: "Ms. Macdonald yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates she will."

Anderson: "What about home consumption of coal? Will this affect that in any way, Illinois coal?"

Macdonald: "Well, I can only say that on an analysis from the Department of Mines and Minerals of the State of Illinois, that they have said that in May of 1977, production of coal was up in Illinois. Now, that is verified from Brad Ezilsizer, the Director, so I don't see that this has any problem at all with..."



Anderson: "What I mean, Representative, if the gas supply is suddenly cut and people have to go back to the use of coal, will they be able to use Illinois coal in their furnaces?"

Macdonald: "Certainly they can if the proper pollution devices are put on..."

Anderson: "No, no, not a scrubber. Just a smokestack, just like they have on their homes. Can they use Illinois coal in their home? The day is coming that this is going to come about. Can they use the coal?"

Macdonald: "Well, I don't think that that is addressed in this Bill, Representative Anderson. The thrust of this Bill, the main thrust of this Bill is to urge and to set dates for the Pollution Control Board to set standards so that the coal miners and the coal companies will know what those standards are and they can begin operating under those standards."

Anderson: "But under your Bill, they would be more stringent or could be more stringent than the Federal standards?"

Macdonald: "The Pollution Control Board would, of course, does have now and should have that authority."

Anderson: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman's moved the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed? The previous question's been moved. The Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Hart, to close."

Hart: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a much-needed Bill. The discussions about acid rain I think are scare tactics. The Illinois Agricultural Association, I've discussed this matter with them and they have no position on this Bill. They're not against it. I believe that with the exception of Mr. Demille, who's against everything, that most of the Pollution Control Board members are in agreement with this. The Illinois Environmental Protection Agency has agreed to it. It was worked out in the Senate so that the Bill had their approval. I believe that we should recede from this"



Amendment and send this Bill to the Governor's desk in the form in which it came from the Senate. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 281. All those in favor will vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'nay'. Amendment 2, I'm sorry. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Marovitz, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to vote 'no' on this. I think the number one priority of all of us in Illinois ought to be the health and welfare of every citizen in the State of Illinois. And if you don't vote 'no' on this, you're saying, forget about the health and welfare of the people of the State of Illinois. Let's just worry about some people that produce coal and forget about health and welfare. This isn't going to affect business and anybody that tries to make you believe it's going to affect the coal industry in Illinois, isn't telling you the truth. But it is going to affect the health and welfare of the people of the State of Illinois. The language in House Amendment #2 that has been talked about would not allow for the burning of additional coal in Illinois. All plants covered by this Bill already burn high sulphur coal in Illinois. The language in House Amendment 2 would needlessly eliminate the necessity for keeping down pollution from this coal that's already burned. So let's think about all the citizens of the State of Illinois and vote 'no' on this motion."

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

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Each one of us in this representative Assembly have a responsibility to improve and enhance our environment. This Amendment does that. This is a small step. It's little help, but we should not backslide at this particular juncture. It's all of the people in the State of Illinois that we must represent. And in the long run, all of us, all of us regardless of whether we dig or don't dig coal are going to, are going to profit. I urge you



to vote 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Christian, Representative
Tipsword, to explain his vote."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I don't know why
Illinois should require greater standards than the rest of the
country. It certainly appears to me that the Federal standards
would be just as protective and sufficiently protective as those
standards we should set in Illinois. We've had a whole series
of years that we've seen since the... this environmental pro-
tection situation came into being in Illinois, but we've had a
Board that has tried, I think, to have one-upmanship on the
Federal government all the time. In every area, they've tried
to be just a little more strict and a little more difficult to
deal with than under the Federal standards. The Federal stan-
dards are for all the people, for the people of the State of
Illinois and people throughout this entire country. And I can
see no reason why we should have to go to something more strict
just so that Mr. Demille and his people can feel like their better
than the Federal standards are. We have the largest coal deposit
in the...(microphone turned off)."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Griesheimer,
to explain his vote." The timer is on."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House. I believe the original Sponsor of this Bill hit the nail
on the head. This is not a matter of anti-coal. There's very
few Legislators in this legislative Assembly that oppose the
development our coal resources from southern Illinois and I've
supported Representative Hart in all of his ways in doing so.
But I think to give away our authority to the Federal govern-
ment entirely places us at the mercy of the Federal government.
And this is ridiculous at this day and age. If you want to vote
for the Federal government taking over control of our state,
then vote with Representative Hart. If you feel that this Amend-
ment should leave the authority in the State of Illinois, then
you should definitely be voting 'no'. It's our only salvation.
I urge a 'no' vote."



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

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to explain my 'no' vote. If you want to keep our environment as best as we can possibly have it in Illinois, you should be voting 'no' on this motion. This is possibly the most important environmental thing that has come before us this year. I certainly hope that those of you who have a great deal of respect for the original Sponsor of this Bill won't be voting 'aye' just to support him. I respect him, too. And I think that he is indeed trying to support his area as he sees fit. But we all have an obligation to support our environment and to make our environment as best as we can for all of the people of Illinois. And that's why on this we should be voting... (microphone turned off)."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Jack Davis, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

J. Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Illinois is the Saudi Arabia of the coal industry in the United States. Illinois will fund the energy needs of the nation for the next thirty or forty years if we allow it to be done. Ladies and Gentlemen, for those of you that read Ann Rand, Atlas is going to shrug within our lifetime with fossil fuel unless we develop Illinois coal which could be the biggest bonanza that this state has ever seen. Please vote 'yes' on this Amendment, the Federal standards are adequate. Please vote 'yes'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Mudd, to explain his vote."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this is a very serious matter. We've adopted by state and Federal laws, means of protecting our environment so we've got... we went too many steps too far. Right now we're being asked to restrict the environment in Illinois even greater than the Federal government. It causes a hardship on industry, it causes a hardship on utilities and the same people that are getting up here and speaking against Representative Hart's proposal to recede are the same ones that are hollering about the high cost of utilities in the state. We



need the votes to pass this... or to support Representative Hart and adopt a sensible procedure that helps not only environment in the state, but industry and the utilities as well so that we can help the taxpayers in the end."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Wolf, to explain his vote. Timer is on."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, normally I am in support of Representative Hart on most of his issues and I think he's usually right, but I think it's also important for state government to retain the right and responsibilities to determine what is not sufficient or is sufficient to protect the public health and welfare of the people of our own state. At a time when incidence of lung disease is increasing, we should not just rely on Federal regulations which is the same and is for a minimum standard for Arizona, Kansas, Illinois. These are not always the same. I think that the State of Illinois should be able to determine different standards if necessary to protect the health of the people of the State of Illinois and I certainly support Representative Macdonald."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Flinn, to explain his vote."

Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Representative Hart's motion to recede from Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 281. I opposed this in the Committee. I felt like the Representative... Hart is the House Sponsor of this Senate Bill, should leave the Bill in it's original form and let it pass as it was... came from the Senate. If anybody else has got any ideas what they ought to do, they ought to introduce their own Bill. There are number of states around Illinois that have more stringent standards on SO2 emissions than Illinois does. The problem is they don't enforce their standards. And as a result, the Federal standards are applied. Now, some previous speaker talked about the health and welfare. Well, let me tell you this. If we don't do something about burning Illinois coal, there's going to be plenty of people on welfare."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from DuPage, Mrs. Dyer, to explain her



vote." Mrs. Dyer please."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, now here's a Bill where both the environmentalists and the really deep, deep, dedicated true conservatives can join hands. If there is one refrain that we have heard on our side of the aisle from the Members who consider themselves really conservatives is that we should protect state's rights and that we should be able to set our own standards, whether it's in land planning or funding or even equal rights for people. We do want to do it at the state level. I'm shocked at some of the green lights that are up there that are going to give power to the Federal government to set the same standards for Illinois that they do for Arizona and other less populated states. I urge a red light."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle, to explain his vote."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, it seems odd to me to see all the red lights up there from the people who talk about the business climate in this state and talk about the great burdens on business, the great burdens on government, that they're voting red when this particular Amendment if it goes on is going to hurt those same entities. A vote to recede is to help those people you've been talking about all Session. We all ought to be on green up there if we really want to do that. There's no question here that if this Amendment goes on, it's going to hurt those people. That's why we ought to be receding. That's why I can't understand why people take that position all Session about business and the problems it has in this Session and this state and they're on red still. They ought to be on green."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner, to explain his vote. Skinner please."

Skinner: "The State of Illinois had the first Environmental Protection Agency of the entire world. We're number one. The U.S. E.P.A. was number two or three. Now, if this passes, those people in Chicago who are voting for it, every time you go to a wake, somebody that's died of cancer, please remember you're part of the cause, not part of the solution. Waukegan, an area in Lake



County, now the dirtiest part of the whole state as far as air pollution goes, what'll happen if we put coal back in Waukegan? I live about seventy-five miles northwest of Gary and I can't breathe clean air when the wind comes from the southeast now. Before the E.P.A. was passed, I couldn't. Now, why in the devil are we going to go backwards? Can't Illinois be better than other states? Why do we have to go to the lowest common denominator?

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Pierce, to explain his vote."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Illinois coal will be used over the years. It's not going away. It'll be in the ground. We should support Representative Macdonald in her House Amendment by voting 'no', by voting 'no' to recede here. That Illinois coal will be burned. It'll be burned in the future in a way that will not cause increases in emphysema which we've seen throughout our state over the past fifty years in this century. It'll burn in a way that'll not increase lung cancer in our state which we've seen a tremendous increase since the turn of the century. That Illinois coal is as good as gold. It's in the ground. It's going to be burned. It doesn't all have to be burned this year or next year. We are the Saudi Arabia, but that doesn't mean we have to burn our coal in such a way as to increase emphysema, increase lung cancer. We should support the Amendments put on by this House in the Environment Committee and accepted on the floor of the House by Representative Macdonald."

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

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Much has been said here about the supporting business and industry in Illinois and I want to say that my record in this General Assembly can stand on its own on that basis. But when priorities have to be established, I will never put the health and the welfare of the people of this state over any business or any industry. I urge you with the growth and the development in the increase of respiratory diseases to think what you are doing here today. This is a very serious environmental issue and if



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

we start the precedent of taking away our power to meet our emergencies, I can tell you we are in serious trouble in Illinois. I urge you to let this go to a Conference Committee and see if we can't iron out and have some kind of a compromise on this very, very serious issue. Please vote 'no'."

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

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I've been surprised in all this talk about Illinois business that we have neglected one of the most important businesses we have and that's agriculture. I would think we've really passed over this issue of acid rain entirely too lightly. There's... it's quite clear that the sulphur dioxide content of the atmosphere does in fact have a bearing on acid rain. It's also true that the acid levels in the rainfall have increased substantially over the last ten years. And if they're going at the same rate they're going now, we can expect in the next ten to fifteen years, a PH level or an acidity level that would be low enough that would... or would be acid enough that we could reduce the nitrogen content in our soybean production by very, very significant amounts. You've gotten a memo from the Illinois Pollution Control Board that indicates that parts of the state have already experienced...(microphone turned off)."

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

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let's be big enough to confess here and recede to the mistake that we've made. I would urge you, beseech you to vote with Representative Hart in this Amendment. There are hundreds of miners in Jefferson, Hamilton, Wabash and White counties that join in that plea. This becomes curiouser and curiouser. These prophets of doom that talk about lung cancer and all the maladies that can inflict mankind have no confidence in their Federal government. I ask you to believe that there are people of intelligence and ability and dedication in Washington that will look after the interests of the public health of all Americans, whether



they live in Illinois or elsewhere. All we seek here is to use the Federal standards. What could be more reasonable than that? The idea that we should penalize one section of Illinois for the benefit of another violates every concept of fair play. Vote green with pride."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I hear those bleeding hearts who talk about the purification of air. But nevertheless, when they send the men down in the mines, they haven't got the same bleeding hearts. They're the ones who are really breathing the fumes of sulphur, the toxics and what you might have. But there was no cry of compassion for them as to what they had to breathe, it was only what we can do. I suggest to you that I ask you to vote for the people who want to bring Illinois coal into use. I point out to you if you've read any of the later periodicals that even German war production continued to climb throughout the war because they shifted to coal from oil. That's how they got their synthetic oil. I tell you that coal will be the saviour of this country if you allow it to be so. But if you're going to scrap it and harness it, it cannot help pull us through the crisis that we have."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from LaSalle, Mr. Anderson, to explain his vote."

Anderson: "You know, the rain clouds belong to the whole United States. They don't belong to Illinois alone. And the rain that falls here perhaps comes from another state and not from the State of Illinois. That's why I think the Federal regulations are good enough for us and they should be good enough for the rest of the United States. I urge a green vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Fulton, Mr. Schisler, to explain his vote."

Schisler: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support the Gentleman, Mr. Hart, Representative Hart. I happen to be on the Illinois Energy Resource Commission and I think I know a little bit about what's going on in the State of Illinois."



And I'll give you a prime example. I live in Fulton County and ten or fifteen miles away is the City of Peoria and we cannot sell our Fulton County coal to the City of Peoria. Now, it's nice to talk about having clean air, but how would you like to be on a fixed income and have to pay for Wyoming and Kentucky coal? I move to vote green. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson, to explain his vote."

Johnson: "We haven't had too many issues this Session that have had the environmental impact or importance that this Bill does cause what we're saying if we recede and vote green on this is that even though Illinois is unique and even though we're one of the best agricultural states in the country where agriculture is particularly important as it's affected by the factors that are involved here, we're still going to recede and we're still going to abide by Federal standards. I would say to those people who represent agricultural districts with what the discussion has been in that regard that you ought to vote red because we have a right and obligation in a unique agricultural state to set stiff, stiffer and more strict standards than the Federal government. For that reason, I would ask you to vote red."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Macdonald, to explain her vote."

Macdonald: "I've explained my vote, but at the appropriate time, I would like to ask for a verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You need 89 votes, ma'am. The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich. I believe you've explained your vote, haven't you?"

Friedrich: "I have. So has... Mrs. Macdonald has twice and I thought maybe I could twice."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Perry, Mr. Ralph Dunn, to explain his vote."

R. Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, southern Illinois industrial growth depends upon the use of coal, upon the mining of coal, upon the use of it in our power plants. I think that Federal standards are good enough. We who talk about



being for, say, equal rights, we want to have the Federal standards uniform on that. I hate to mention it, but I did happen to think about it. But here now we're saying Federal standards for coal are not good enough, we need stronger standards. We're crippling the most important industry in Illinois if we don't adopt and use the Federal standards. If we try to restrict the use of coal, we're going to hurt all of Illinois, not just southern Illinois. The price of coal that you pay, the price of utilities that you pay depends upon the amount of... the price of coal. And western coal, some of it, has as much as a dollar and forty or a dollar and fifty cents a ton excise or severance tax on it. Illinois coal is plentiful and it's right here in Illinois."

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

Hart: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we're not giving up control of the regulations. There's misleading. All we're doing is to... adopting regulations no stronger than the Federal regulations. The... in a Senate Committee, they admitted that there was overkill in the regulations. That was the first time that I'd ever heard any admission like that, although we've all been thinking it throughout the year. The Conference Committee actually on trying to work something out here was taken care of in the Senate when they finally agreed on the final Bill as it came out of the Senate. This does not shift any regulations control, but would just back it down to the Federal regulations. This takes 89 votes and I would urge the Members to give the 89 votes necessary to recede."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. Poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Christensen, Kornowicz, Madison, McAvoy, Schoeberlein, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Change my 'no' vote to 'aye'. One for southern Illinois. On this question there's 89 'ayes'. 80 'nos', 2 recorded as 'present'. The Lady asks for a verification. Mr. Brady, would you kindly come to the podium. Representative Brady. Before we start verification, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Dan Houlihan."



D. Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. On behalf of Representative Michael Getty and myself, I would like to introduce to the Body a man who has had one of the most distinguished careers in law enforcement and as an attorney that I am familiar with, he is the Governor's new appointee as the Justice on the Court of Claims. He's a former associate of Representative Getty and myself in the office of the State's Attorney of Cook County where this gentleman has served in excess of thirty years. He's in the gallery to the rear, the Honorable Leo Pock, who was confirmed today by the Senate."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Congratulations, Mr. Pock. Now, Representative Madigan asks leave to be verified. Representative Brady asks leave. Representative Cunningham asks leave to be verified. Representative Dan Houlihan."

D. Houlihan: "May I be verified now, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave. Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "May I be verified please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "And may I be verified? I've got a Conference to go to. Yeah. Representative Dave Jones asks leave to be verified."

Speaker Bradley: "Would the Clerk please read the names of those who have been verified?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Those verified are Brady, Rich Brummer, Cunningham, Dave Jones, Lechowicz and Madigan. And Dan Houlihan."

Speaker Bradley: "Gene Barnes. Can Barnes be verified now?"

Mrs. Macdonald, Gene Barnes is in a Conference Committee.

O'Daniel, for what purpose do you rise?"

O'Daniel: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be verified. I've a three o'clock meeting."

Speaker Bradley: "Mrs. Macdonald, all right? Okay. Kozubowski, do you have a conference? All right, Mrs. Macdonald, Kozubowski. All right, verify the affirmative."

Clerk O'Brien: "Adams, Anderson, E.M. Barnes, Bartulis, Birchler, Bluthardt, Bradley, Brady, Breslin, Rich Brummer, Don Brummet, Caldwell, Campbell, Capparelli, Conti, Cunningham, Corneal Davis, Jack Davis, Dawson, Deavers, DiPrima, Domico, Doyle, Ralph Dunn,



Ebbesen, Ewell, Farley, Flinn, Friedrich, Garmisa, Giglio, Harris, Hart, Dan Houlihan, Hudson, Huff, Huskey, Jacobs, Dave Jones, Emil Jones, Kent, Klosak, Kosinski, Kozubowski, Lauer, Laurino, Lechowicz, Lucco, Luft, Madigan, Mautino, McAuliffe."

Speaker Bradley: "Would those Members in the aisle please be seated.

Mrs. Macdonald is having some problems seeing the Members.

Mr. Lucco and Mr. Schisler, Mr. Hanahan, Mr. Hart, Mrs. Macdonald can't see the... Mr. Hanahan, for what purpose do you rise?

Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Change my vote from 'no' to 'aye' please."

Speaker Bradley: "Change Mr. Hanahan's vote from 'no' to 'aye'. And you wish to be verified as 'aye'?"

Hanahan: "I have to go to conference."

Speaker Bradley: "Mrs. Macdonald, verify him as an 'aye' vote? What purpose does the Gentleman... Mr. Rigney, arise?"

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a notice of a Conference Committee on Senate Bill 153 to meet at three o'clock and I would like to be verified and also to announce the other Members of that Committee that we're going to be meeting."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Rigney: "Senate Bill 153."

Speaker Bradley: "Who are the other House Members, Mr. Rigney?"

Rigney: "Matijevich, Kozubowski, Leverenz, Cunningham, Rigney."

Speaker Bradley: "I think they're on their way up there."

Rigney: "Oh, okay."

Speaker Bradley: "Can he be verified then, Mrs. Macdonald? She very graciously agrees. Continue."

Clerk O'Brien: "McClain, McCourt, McGrew, McLendon, McMaster, McPike, Mudd, Murphy, Nardulli, Neff, O'Daniel, Pouncey, Pullen, Richmond, Rigney, Schisler, Schuneman, Sevcik, Sharp, Shumpert, Simms, E.G. Steele, C.M. Stiehl, Stuffle, Sumner, Taylor, Terzich, Tipword, Totten, Tuerk, Van Dyne, Vitek, Von Boeckman, Wall, Wikoff,"

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Ewing, would you come down here a minute?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Winchester and Younge."



Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose the Gentleman from Kankakee,
Mr. McBroom, arise?"

McBroom: "Mr. Speaker, would you please change me from 'no' to 'aye'?"

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. Questions
of the affirmative roll. 91... could you turn her... Mr. Bowman's
mike, fine."

Macdonald: "Pouncey."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Pouncey. He's back there."

Macdonald: "Shumpert."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon?"

Macdonald: "Shumpert."

Speaker Bradley: "Shumpert is in the rear of the chamber in his seat."

Macdonald: "Byers."

Speaker Bradley: "Byers. Byers is... how's he record? He's recorded
as voting 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Voting 'no'."

Macdonald: "I'm sorry. Garmisa."

Speaker Bradley: "Garmisa. Not in his seat. Is he in the chamber?
How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll."

Macdonald: "Laurino."

Speaker Bradley: "Laurino. Garmisa is in the chamber. Put him back
on the roll. Laurino. He's not in his seat. Is he in the
chambers? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Macdonald: "McAuliffe."

Speaker Bradley: "McAuliffe is in a seat."

Macdonald: "Emil Jones."

Speaker Bradley: "Emil Jones is in his seat."

Macdonald: "Breslin."

Speaker Bradley: "She's in her seat."

Macdonald: "Deavers."

Speaker Bradley: "Deavers is in his seat."

Macdonald: "Domico."



Speaker Bradley: "Domico is in his seat."

Macdonald: "Farley."

Speaker Bradley: "Farley is in his seat."

Macdonald: "Huff."

Speaker Bradley: "Huff. Is Huff in his seat? He's in his seat."

Macdonald: "Wikoff."

Speaker Bradley: "Wikoff. Is the Gentleman in his seat? In the chamber?
How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll."

Macdonald: "Mautino."

Speaker Bradley: "He's in his seat."

Macdonald: "Sevcik."

Speaker Bradley: "Sevcik is not in his seat. Is he in the chamber?"

How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Macdonald: "McGrew."

Speaker Bradley: "McGrew is standing by his chair."

Macdonald: "Nardulli."

Speaker Bradley: "Nardulli is in his seat."

Macdonald: "O'Daniel."

Clerk O'Brien: "He's been verified."

Speaker Bradley: "He was verified. I think he gave us..."

Macdonald: "Yeah, I'm sorry. Taylor."

Speaker Bradley: "Taylor. Representative Taylor is in the aisle."

Macdonald: "Von Boeckman."

Speaker Bradley: "Von Boeckman is not in his seat. Is he in the chamber?"

How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off."

Macdonald: "Wall."

Speaker Bradley: "Wall is... Wall is not in his seat. Is he in the
chamber? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll."



Macdonald: "Totten."

Speaker Bradley: "Totten is in another chair. He is in the chamber, though. He's sitting back there next to Mr. Schuneman. Mr. Totten, stand up there would you please?"

Macdonald: "Lucco."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Lucco. Representative Lucco is in the chamber. And Mr. Von Boeckman, Mrs. Macdonald, has returned. Right here. Put him back on the roll."

Macdonald: "Ewell."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Ewell is not in his seat. Is he in the chamber? I don't think that he was one of those that was verified earlier. Mr. Clerk, was that one of the names? Ray Ewell?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No, he has not been verified."

Speaker Bradley: "Is the Gentleman in the chamber?"

Macdonald: "Carmisa. Oh, he's back."

Speaker Bradley: "What about getting... let's get Mr. Ewell taken care of. He's not in the chamber. How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll."

Macdonald: "Brady. No, Brady was..."

Speaker Bradley: "I think Brady was..."

Macdonald: "He was verified. I'm sorry. Schisler."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Tipword."

Macdonald: "Schisler."

Speaker Bradley: "Oh, Schisler is standing right next to Mr. Hart."

Macdonald: "Doyle."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon?"

Macdonald: "We saw Doyle."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. Mr. Laurino has returned to the chamber, Mrs. Macdonald. We'll put him back on the roll."

Macdonald: "Stuffle."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Stuffle is in his seat."

Macdonald: "I have no other questions, Mr. Speaker."

Unknown: "Mr. Speaker, what's the count?"

Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose..."



Macdonald: "May we have the count?"

Speaker Bradley: "Yes. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Mulcahey, for what purpose do you rise?"

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, would you change my vote from 'no' to 'aye' please?"

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn. What purpose do you rise? His light's on flashing. Mr. Mulcahey. Mr. Dunn, is he in the chamber? He was requesting to be recognized. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Simms."

Simms: "Change me to 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as 'no'. Just a minute, we'll get these... Mr. Ewell has returned to the chamber. Put him back on the Roll Call. And the Speaker wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. On this question there are 89 'ayes'... On this question there are 89 'ayes', 78 'nays'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Mr. Hart, moves to reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 281 was passed and Mr. Schisler moves to lie... that that motion lie on the table. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman's motion to reconsider is tabled. On the Order of Con... Nonconcurrency, On the Order of Nonconcurrency appears Senate Bill 281. Mr. Hart."

Hart: "Did you call on me? Did you call on me, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, arise?"

Schlickman: "Point of order, Mr. Speaker. You had announced previously that the Bill had passed. It was the motion to recede from an Amendment that had been adopted."

Speaker Bradley: "You're correct. The House does recede from Amendment..."

Hart: "Number 2."

Speaker Bradley: "...#2 to Senate Bill 281. Mr. Bowman, for what purpose do you rise?"

Bowman: "Yes, I also... I think there was a request for a Roll Call on the motion to table."



Speaker Bradley: "No, there was... I didn't hear that. It was, I think the... we did have a verified Roll Call on the motion to recede. Now, evidently we have... 281 has been taken care of, Mr. Hart, on Nonconcurrency. How about Senate Bill 937, Mr. Kane, on Nonconcurrency? For what purpose the Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Robinson, arise?"

Robinson: "Mr. Speaker, you I believe mistakenly announced that the Bill had passed and it was on that mistaken announcement that a motion to... Well, there has not been any motion to reconsider or lay on the table your corrected conclusion."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, we'll go back and clarify that. Mr. Hart moves to reconsider the motion to recede from Senate Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 281 and on that, Mr. Schisler moves to table that motion to reconsider and all those in favor of that motion say 'aye', opposed 'no' and the 'ayes' have it. And the motion is tabled. Now... If Mr. Brady is in the sound of my voice, he has a Conference Committee on Senate Bill 1209 at 3 p.m. in Room 400. He was the only Member we couldn't find. The rest of them have received their notices. That meeting was... fifteen minutes ago, so you'd better hurry. This notice has been out for some time. It's just that Mr. Brady was off the floor. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment to Bills of the following titles: Senate Bill 29, Senate Bill 596 and Senate Bill 868. Action taken by the Senate, June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Bradley: "On page 2 appears Senate Bills, Third Reading. Senate Bill 36, Mr. Winchester. The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 36. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the Department of Conservation. Third Reading of the Bill."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 36 is such a great Bill, I've been holding it for three weeks so we could get to the exciting point of the



legislative year so we'd have something joyous for everybody to listen to and vote affirmatively for. It appropriates \$100,000 from the Capital Development Fund to the Department of Conservation for a grant to the Saline Valley Conservancy District for land acquisitioning for the Lewis-Saline River-Lake Project. I'd appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, the question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor will 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 123 'ayes', 25 'nays', 2 voting 'present'; this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. Senate Bill 496."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 496, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations of the Capital Development Board for permanent improvements, grants and related purposes. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Let's...Representative Telcser here on Senate Bill 496? We'll take it out of the record. Mr. Simms, for what purpose do you arise?"

Simms: "15...1594."

Speaker Bradley: "15..."

Simms: "It's on the Order of Concurrence."

Speaker Bradley: "...on what, the Supplemental?"

Simms: "The main Calendar."

Speaker Bradley: "You move to nonconcur..."

Simms: "Nonconcur in all of the Amendments...ask for a Conference..."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in all the Senate Amendments to House Bill 1594 and requests a Conference. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed 'nay'; the 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendments 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 to House Bill 1594. Now, for the edification of the Members or an announcement, if you have been assigned and received an assignment to a Conference Committee, those Members on the...House Bill 168 will meet at 3:30 p.m. at table 1. House Bill



364, Table 4, 3:30. House Bill 822, Table 1 at 1 o'clock. House Bill 979, Table 4 at 4 o'clock. House Bill 1001, Table 1 at 4:30. House Bill 1038, Table 4 at 4:30. House Bill 1102, Table 1 at 5. House Bill 1182, Table 4 at 5 o'clock. House Bill 2030, Table 1 at 5:30. House Bill 2089, Table 4 at 5:30 p.m. House Bill 2179, Table 1 at 6 p.m. And House Bill 2355, Table 4 at 6 p.m. Those are all in Room 400. You will be receiving separate notices on all those; but that takes care of some of the questions we've been receiving from the Members. Senate Bills, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 501. Ralph Dunn. 496, Mr. Telcser. Repre...he's read it a third time. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 496 is the Capital Development Bond Bill. We've accepted all of the Amendments which the House Members who want to have it adopted both in the Committee and on the floor. And I'd be...appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor shall vote 'aye' and opposed shall vote 'no': Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 127 'ayes', 11 'nays'; this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. Senate Bill 501."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 501, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Corrections. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Perry, Mr. Ralph Dunn. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword, arise?"

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, I hit the wrong button on that last, 496. I'd like to be recorded 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Hearing no objections, the Gentleman will be recorded as voting 'aye' on Senate Bill 496. Mr. Dunn."

Dunn, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 501 is the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Corrections; and I would urge an 'aye' vote on passage to Third Reading."



Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Robinson wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye' on Senate Bill 496, right, Mr. Robinson? Right, hearing no objections ...the question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor will 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's 143 'ayes', no 'nays'; this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. 718. Senate Bill 718, read it a third time."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 718, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation of the Capital Development Board. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 718 provides for \$10,000,000 for the purchase and construction of a containerization facility on Lake Calumet Harbor. This facility is needed very badly to be able to keep the State of Illinois in competition with our neighboring ports in Indiana and Wisconsin. Without this facility, Lake Calumet is unable to keep up with these other ports. I'd like to take...and ask for a favorable Roll Call on this, please."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? The Gentleman from...Mr. Schlickman, do you wish to be recognized, Sir?"

Schlickman: "Please. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Schlickman: "This is an appropriation?..."

Dawson: "Yes, it is."

Schlickman: "...to the Chicago Regional Port District?"

Dawson: "Yes, it is."

Schlickman: "And from what funds...which fund does that...does that appropriation come?"

Dawson: "From the Capital Development Fund."

Schlickman: "And what is the amount?"

Dawson: "\$10,000,000."

Schlickman: "\$10,000,000?"

Dawson: "That's about it. You want to go first class, right?"

Schlickman: "And is this a grant or a loan, as you had indicated previously?"



Dawson: "This is a loan, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Where does it say that in the Bill and what are the terms of the loan?"

Dawson: "This is supposed to be an interest...correction, this is a grant then."

Schlickman: "Oh, it's a grant and not a loan?"

Dawson: "No, it is not."

Schlickman: "So once it's given, nothing comes back?"

Dawson: "That is correct."

Schlickman: "Now...under the companion Bill, for the first time this port district would be given the authority to receive funds, is that correct?"

Dawson: "That is correct."

Schlickman: "From the State of Illinois."

Dawson: "Yes."

Schlickman: "And this is the beginning of the state subsidizing that district, is that correct?"

Dawson: "No, it's not the beginning."

Schlickman: "It's \$10,000,000 in 1977. Do you have any idea how much it'll be in 1978?"

Dawson: "It'll be nothing at all on this. The main part of this money will be going for the purchase of the land."

Schlickman: "Is there the authority underlying this appropriation. In other words, the authority for the distribution...issuance of bonds?"

Dawson: "That is...yes, that is in the General Bond Bill for the capital development."

Schlickman: "Where is the authority for the issuance of bonds for the \$10,000,000?"

Dawson: "That is in the Capital Development Board Bond Bill, Representative."

Schlickman: "That's a Bill that has been acted upon the Legislature this Session?"

Dawson: "It is in the process of being acted on now."

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

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."



Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I hope you will note that we are talking about the sum of \$10,000,000 of state funds from bonds to be issued by the state, bonds that will ultimately cost per one dollar, the sum of one dollar and 70 cents over the life of the bonds. And these are bonds that will be issued to the tune of \$10,000,000 principal for a port district that many think can't be salvaged. That it shouldn't...can't survive. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that this is just the beginning of the state subsidizing this port district and furthermore it'll serve as a precedent for the state likewise subsidizing other port districts within the State of Illinois. I think it's a bad practice. I think it's a poor precedent to commence in this year of what should be fiscal restraint. And I urge a 'no' vote."

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

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In response to the previous speaker, I just point out to you that presently the State of Illinois has in the C.D.B. budget provided \$6,000,000 worth of money in bonds for the other port districts in this state. So this is not a new precedent. \$6,000,000 for the other port districts in this state. Senate Bill 718 has been discussed on this floor for a good number of years. In fact, I believe Dan Dougherty in the Senate a number of years ago. Representative Maragos and Representative Collins have consistently worked for this important piece of legislation in this chamber. In 1974, if my memory serves me correct, we appropriated \$3,500,000, the same type of funding for this process. And, in turn, just to show you what the cost of increase since 1974, what we could have done for \$3,500,000 now is going to cost us \$10,000,000. The item before us, Ladies and Gentlemen, is a very important item, not only for the port districts, it's important for the agricultural community of this state. It was pointed out in testimony in the Appropriations Committee that I sat in last year the importance of this...having this facility located in Illinois, located in the primary Great Lake route of the port district of Chicago, because Indiana, Ladies and Gentleman,



have gone into a very serious competition in developing a port authority to siphon off the agricultural products that are going through this...our port presently. We have consistently supported the various other port districts throughout this state and providing the money and the necessary resources to improve those facilities. I don't see anything wrong with Senate Bill 718. It's a grant from the Capital Development Board bond for \$10,000,000. We have increased the authorization in another Bill. And, in turn, we already have provided \$6,000,000 to other port facilities. It's a good Bill, it should deserve your 'aye' support. Thank you."

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

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Earlier this week I noted in the newspaper the foreign arrivals coming into the various ports in the midwest area. The Chicago Port was receiving but four ships, while nine ships were going into 'Burns' Harbor in Indiana, and other ships were going into Milwaukee Harbor in Wisconsin. Shipping that should come in through the transportation hub of the country, which is Chicago. And the only thing that prevents our progressing is the lack of containerized facilities at the Chicago Regional Port District. Representative Schlickman pointed out that people say this port can't be salvaged. He's right if we don't do something. And under current conditions it won't be salvaged. But for this investment relatively minor when in the greater scope of things \$10,000,000 will bring many times that in revenues into the State of Illinois. With the port district of Chicago prospering shipping will come here, it's the natural place. We...if we have containerized facilities, we'll have it all. We've got...we've got the elevators in Lake Calumet; we'll have the containerized facility at the mouth of the river, and we will be, again, the shipping hub of the midwest. This is needed, this is so sorely needed for the economy of the State of Illinois that I shudder to think that anyone would hesitate to make this minor investment in the economy of the state. This will bring foreign trade in, it will bring shipping trade along the Great Lake's route. It will create jobs, and will pump income into



the coffers of the state. This is not a district Bill, this is a state-wide Bill. This port we have is one of our most valuable assets in this state. This is truly a gem. And for us to let it...get crumbled and deteriorate would be next to criminal. For \$10,000,000, and I'm sorry it's that much, because the first time the Bill went through, as Representative Lechowicz pointed out, we could've done this for \$3,500,000. So be it, that's one over the dam. Now, we have to spend \$10...and it's \$10,000,000 of the best spent dollars we will ever invest. And that's what I want to stress. This is an investment in the future of the economy of this state. And I implore you to give us an 'aye' vote on Senate Bill 718."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword."

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen, I'd like to address this Bill as Chairman of the Commission for Economic Development in the State of Illinois. We have been placed in your hands, I know, the report of that Commission during this past year. And during this past year, the Commission devoted itself to the business climate and business improvement in the State of Illinois. And this is one of the aspects of necessary business improvement that was...was recommended in the report that was given to you from the Business and Economic Development. This port has declined from the premiere port on the Great Lakes until all of the other ports are surpassing it simply because we do not have the facilities to handle the cargo that must...needs to pass through that port. We set this port up, but never ever have we provided to this port the funds that are necessary to make a port operate. While all of the other ports on the Great Lakes have been having subsidies of...of magnanimous proportions so that those ports could be properly equipped and so that they could handle the vessels coming through. Today, general cargo does not move except in containerized kinds of cargoes, which require the installation of cranes that cost in the area now, and they've increased as has been told you many, many times during the time that this proposal has been before us, it now costs about \$8,000,000 to install one of these cranes. The wharfrage



time that a ship must pay for one day makes it very, very essential to to them that they go only to those places where container cargoes can be handled when they're handling general cargo such as we would propose to handle by container cranes and by this expenditure. Because the wharfage fees for the turn-around time that would be... they would be slowed down, take up all of the profits that they would otherwise earn. And so they just will not come to the port of Chicago. In addition, this would be located out near the mouth of the Chicago River, instead of having to be taken down through the Chicago River which adds another great expense to them. Also down the river we have no room for this kind of a port. There are other facilities that are handling both cargoes of various kinds. It is absolutely essential that we do this in order to regain for the Port of Chicago our only port on the Great Lakes, that the premiere place that belongs to it and a place where our manufacturers from throughout this state and throughout the middle west can move their cargoes by containerized cargo carriers. It...only in that way that we can ever get back into the general cargo business through that port. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Meyers."

Meyers: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to point out that Chicago Regional Port District was the port...first port district established in the State of Illinois by this General Assembly, and there are...subsequent to that there were eight other port districts established by this General Assembly. The succeeding eight all had received state subsidies, the first one, the Chicago Regional Port District, established itself, sold revenue bonds, paid these...is in the process of paying these bonds off, it is, in fact, three years ahead of time in the retirement of these bonds. This would...this additional money would, as so many other speakers have mentioned, would provide a container facility. Ladies and Gentlemen, this would unload a container facility ship. Once unloaded, it is conceivable that this ship would want to take Illinois grain back to Europe or the Mideast, wherever it's coming from. We...and this would be a good Bill for downstate."



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

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker...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 Cook, Mr. Dawson, to close."

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, all I'd like to say is that this Bill would generate revenue not just for the district, but the whole state, which is badly needed. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is, shall this Bill pass? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Epton."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have a conflict of interest in this matter; and as always I will vote my conscience."

Speaker Bradley: "You have a ship?"

Epton: "Sir, was that plural?"

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? Mr. Mulcahey, for what purpose do you arise, Sir?"

Mulcahey: "Well, just to explain my vote a little bit, Mr. Speaker. There was a very important question I think that should've been asked, it was not asked. I couldn't get any recognition to do it. And that is, how much this land costs per acre? And it's my understanding that the land itself is not that valuable. As far as the \$10,000,000 is concerned is used for the purchase of the land, of course, we know it's going to go for that purchase for site improvement...the purchases. And it is indeed my understanding that the property is not...what we're paying for. And the total completed project is completely unknown at this particular time. But it's going to be a heck of a lot greater than \$10,000,000 they're asking for. And so because the estimated cost of the land alone ranges from \$10,000,000 to \$11,000,000. So the land itself is actually going to cost more than the \$10,000,000 itself. And I'm not quite sure if this property is worth that much."



Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 133 'ayes', 25 'nays'; this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is, hereby, declared passed. Senate Bill 752."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 752, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the various ports and Commissions of state government. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the Omnibus Senate Appropriation Bill. And with leave, there were two Amendments that were discussed yesterday, one for the Intergovernmental Cooperation Commission and the other one for Motor Vehicle Laws Commission, they want to be included in this Bill. And I would ask leave to have this Bill brought back for those two Amendments, and they have been distributed."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. O'Daniel."

O'Daniel: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make...to be made known to the Body that the Calendar is in error. It shows that Amendment #7 isn't on there; but I've checked in the...with the Clerk's Office and it's...that's a mistake of the Calendar."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to return this back to Second Reading, is that correct, Mr. Lechowicz?"

Lechowicz: "That is correct, Sir, for the purpose of two Amendments that I've stated."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Walsh on the Gentleman's motion."

Walsh: "Yes, I object, Mr. Speaker, to the Gentleman's motion. And I'd like to be heard at the appropriate time."

Speaker Bradley: "I think this would be an appropriate time, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "All right, Mr. Speaker. This is the, as the Gentleman said, the Omnibus Bill. It is more than an Omnibus Commission Bill. It is a Bill that has been laden with all kinds of things, most of which are bad. Now, on this Bill is the sell-out by people in this Body to the City of Chicago, which costs the state \$2,500,000 this year in fiscal 1978, and approximately \$4,000,000 for the next five years. I submit that's a terrible, terrible concept. And,



Mr. Speaker, what this Bill..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Mudd has risen on a point of order, Mr. Walsh.

What's your point, Sir?"

Mudd: "Well, Mr. Speaker, he...he's talking about the Bill; and I think all we're asking for is leave to bring it back. Maybe some of the things that Representative Walsh objects to are going to be taken care of by Amendments. He doesn't know what the Amendments that we're bringing it back to Second are going to include."

Speaker Bradley: "I think your point is well taken. Mr. Walsh..."

Walsh: "...I can guarantee you they will not include removing that, Representative Mudd. And if I were assured that they would, I would approve of taking it back to Second Reading. What the Gentleman is going to do for one thing is include the appropriation for the Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation. A Commission which I think is very worthy and is deserving of great consideration by this House. However, I do not like to see that..."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from...the Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain, on a point of order. State your point, Sir."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Parliamentarian, Bill Walsh, knows full well that he has to speak to the motion and not to any specific Amendment. And I wish the Gentleman would favor the motion."

Speaker Bradley: "I think he...I think the man was..."

Walsh: "...Mr. Speaker, I'm...saying is mostly to the motion..."

Speaker Bradley: "...the Gentleman was implying somewhat to Mr. Mudd..."

Walsh: "...as I possibly can. I am trying to argue against taking this Bill from Third Reading to Second. The problem with an Omnibus Bill is that there is something in there that everyone can vote for, and in voting 'no' on an Omnibus Bill, then everyone feels badly or feels that they should not have voted 'no' because of one specific item. To include all Commissions and then after including all Commissions many, many other things such as the example I gave you and such as, Mr. Speaker, for the first time ever an appropriation of \$100,000 to the Speaker for the purpose of determining whether election expenses or for the purpose of paying..."



Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Walsh, I think you are talking to the Bill now..."

Walsh: "...I, Sir, am talking to the motion. The motion and the Bill are one and the same..."

Speaker Bradley: "...I thought you meant...I thought you meant an item that was in the Bill...I thought you mentioned an item that was in the Bill, I'm sorry..."

Walsh: "...I'm using that as an example, Mr. Speaker; but it's impossible to separate the motions from the Bill. And I'm trying to argue why this should not be taken from Third to Second. To put a couple of more appropriations on this Bill is wrong. To put in particular the appropriation for the Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation and Appropriation which I would support on this Bill is absolutely wrong because there are so many parts of the Bill that I cannot support that it puts me in an untenable position. Not so untenable, Mr. Speaker, that on Third Reading and with this appropriation adopted I cannot vote 'no'; but I find it difficult to vote 'no'. And I see no reason why I or anyone else should be put in this position. So I would urge that this Bill stay on Third Reading, preferably forever; but not be moved back to Second Reading because it's the wrong procedure. And I hope in the future we never again have an Omnibus Appropriation Bill. I urge you to vote 'no'; and I insist on a Roll Call, Mr. Speaker, on the Gentleman's motion to take this from Third to Second Reading."

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

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, at the request of the Chairman of both of the Commissions that I mentioned, the Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation and the Motor Vehicle Laws Commission, I told them that I would move it back to Second Reading. And I don't believe that the Vice-Chairman of Intergovernmental should object, because, as you know, your Bill is in the Senate and, in turn, it's going to be adopted to this Omnibus Commission Bill as all the others are. Now, Representative Walter Kozubowski is the man who asked me about bringing this Bill back to Second Reading, I told him that I would try. I'm doing so. And, Mr. Speaker, I move now that Senate Bill 752 be returned back



to Second Reading; and, in turn, I'll take a Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "On that motion, all those in favor of the Gentleman's motion to return Senate Bill 752 to Second Reading vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. 90...On this question, 95 'ayes', 19 'nays'; and the motion...the Gentleman's motion prevails. We'll return the...Senate Bill 752 to the position of Second Reading. Before we get to the Second Reading on that, we have some announcements on some Members that we're unable to find. Mr. Griesheimer is assigned to Conference Committee on House Bill 168 that's meeting at 3:30. If he in the sound of my voice, would he please go to Room 400. Mr. Deuster on on 168 at 3:30; and Mr. Jaffe is on 168 at 3:30. It's going to be impossible to move these Conference Committees along unless the House Members are there. Mr. Deuster. Those are the same...same ones. They...those notices will now be placed on the Members' desks. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe we're on Amendment #45, which is Representative Kozubowski's Amendment."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #45, Kozubowski, amends Senate Bill 752 as amended by inserting the following Sections and so forth."

Kozubowski: "Mr. Speaker...thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. House Amendment #45 to Senate Bill 752 places the annual appropriation for the Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation into this Omnibus Bill. The amount that would be appropriated is \$356,700. And I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #45 to Senate Bill 752. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it. Further Amendments? Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment 46, Giglio, amends Senate Bill 752 as amended..."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Giglio."

Giglio: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the Amendment for the Motor Vehicle Law Commission appropriation. It's the same as the Bill 2362 that was passed out of here some time back."



What we did, we forgot to include that the money comes out of the Road Fund; and, therefore, I wanted to ask to put this on the... on this Bill. And I would ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #46 to Senate Bill 752. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion

say 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "Third Reading. Mr. Schlickman, for what purpose do arise?"

Schlickman: "Well, before...before you announced to Third Reading, I sought your attention and I'm wondering if you could keep this Bill at the Order of Third...Second Reading for about five minutes, please?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Sponsor indicates that he'd rather leave it on Third Reading where we find the Bill right now. On the Order of Concurrence on page 3 of the Calendar appears House Bill 1468, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Senate attached Amendment #1 to House Bill 1468; and in discussions with the City of Chicago and others, we have not been able to reach an agreement. And I don't want to nonconcur in the Amendment, nor do I want to concur. So pursuant to the Rule of 25(b) I would like at this time for the House to place House Bill 1468 on Interim Study."

Speaker Bradley: "It takes 89 votes, yes, Sir."

Yourell: "...Insurance Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to return House Bill 1468 to Interim Study. All those in favor of the Gentleman's motion...we have to have 89 votes...all in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. While we're waiting, we might hurry things along a tidbit if we...on Supplemental Calendar #1...if there are any Members that are going to nonconcur, if you'd let us know, we can call those nonconcurrences. If you'll come up to the desks, we'll take care of it that way...up to the Clerk's well. The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."



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

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, Sir."

Tuerk: "Why does it take a vote on this motion to send this Bill to Interim Study?"

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell, I think can answer it."

Yourell: "Yeah, it's in our rules."

Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Bradley: "Yes, Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "I just got the answer from the Sponsor of this Bill that it's in the rules, that it needs a Roll Call vote to send the Bill to Interim Study. Now, this is contrary to a practice that was followed a few nights ago, when another certain Bill, Senate Bill 600, was sent to Interim Study without the acknowledgement of the Body. Now, could you clarify that for me, please? I direct... I direct my inquiry to you..."

Speaker Bradley: "I think... I think it's under House Resolution 232 that was adopted the other night pursuant to House Resolution 232 calling for short debate. That was on the Short Debate Calendar; and because of that... adoption of that Resolution, we find it necessary to get 89 votes to return this to Interim Study. Mr. Tuerk."

Tuerk: "I'm still not clear in my mind how that differs from the Senate Bill 600; and that was certainly... wasn't on short debate."

Speaker Bradley: "No, 600 was not on short debate. And this Bill was on short debate."

Tuerk: "Well, wouldn't the form that you happen to use at the appropriate time, which was convenient, wouldn't that same rule apply?"

Speaker Bradley: "Well, 600 applied under... House Resolution 232, part G, 'The Sponsor of any Bill on any Calendar shall have the right prior to the commencement of the debate on Third Reading to recommit his Bill to the Interim Study Calendar of the Standing Committee in which it was heard. That was how 600 got in the position it did. And this Bill did not get to... this Bill had gotten beyond that point and we need 89 votes. And the Clerk will take the record."



And we have 145 'ayes', 3 'nays'; and the Gentleman's motion prevails. On Concurrences...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I thought this might be an appropriate time, and since today is the second to last day, this might be an appropriate time for a motion...a motion that I had been considering. My motion is that we go to the Order of Motions and consider the motion that Representative Tuerk has filed to take from the Labor and Commerce Committee on Interim Study, Senate Bill 600, and return it to the order of business that it was on on the Calendar. And I so move, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, I don't think this is the proper time. You wouldn't want me to go out of...out of order for the business we're on. We're on the Order of Concurrence now. On the Order of Concurrence and Supplemental Calendar #1 appears House Bill 17. Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "...motion."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Walsh..."

Walsh: "I have followed that motion with another motion. We were on the Order of Motions."

Speaker Bradley: "We had an inquiry after the motion. We had to address ourselves...address ourselves to that..."

Walsh: "Yeah, but you had a motion, I made a motion."

Speaker Bradley: "...and now we're going to Concurrence..."

Walsh: "Before you went back to the Order of Concurrences, I made that motion."

Speaker Bradley: "...The Gentleman from...on Order of...we'll get back to motions...on the Supplemental Calendar #1, yes, the Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Mr. Speaker, at the appropriate time I'd like to have leave...ask leave of the House to be voted 'aye' on Senate Bill 496. I was in a Committee at the time."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman have leave to be recorded as voting 'aye' on 496? Mr. Winchester, the Gentleman from Hardin."

Winchester: "Mr. Speaker, could I have leave to be recorded as voting 'aye' on 501..."



Speaker Bradley: "Well, let's get the one taken care of first. They..."

Winchester: "...Oh, okay."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Johnson, 'aye' on which one? 496? They will so be recorded. Now, Mr. Winchester wished to be recorded as voting 'aye' on Senate Bill 501. Hearing no objections, he will so be recorded. On Concurrence House Bill 17. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly."

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 17. What this Amendment does it replaces, as you know, this is the obscenity proposal which I introduced; and what it does there, it places the word, 'work' in place of the word 'thing'. I don't see anything wrong with this. I know the Supreme Court used the word 'thing' in describing obscenity. But the word 'work' certainly fits in there; and I wouldn't object to this. And I would like to concur and ask for your support."

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

Leinenweber: "Yeah, would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Leinenweber: "Dick, would you read the sentence that they changed the word in so we can see what the context was, please?"

Kelly: "Yes, I will. Okay, on page 2 by deleting line 5 and inserting in lieu therefore the following: 'The work depicts or describes in a patently offensive way'."

Leinenweber: "All right, previously, the things...it was the same sentence; only the word 'thing', is that right?"

Kelly: "That's all that it does, is change the word 'work' instead of 'thing'."

Leinenweber: "That sounds like a typical Senate Amendment."

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

Darrow: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Darrow: "Representative Kelly, would you consider this a more restrictive piece of legislation than the obscenity Bill that recently was passed by the Senate?"



Kelly: "Yes, this is one of the strongest obscenity statutes that you could have. It's a very strong, it...it complements the obscenity statute which was upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court recently, the Illinois statute. And it also goes somewhat further by describing violence and saying that interest in violence would also be considered obscene. And the U.S. Supreme Court in their decision, I might point out, they reviewed these magazines and booklets and ...that were, in fact, violent materials and not what you would consider pornographic. And I think that even gives more approval to this type of legislation. Yes, it is a very strong conservative type of...of obscenity law."

Darrow: "In other words, by voting for this we're helping the Senate get off the hook that they find themselves on for not reading their legislation before voting?"

Kelly: "That's right. There's quite a bit of difference between these different proposals. And, yes, we will get them off the hook."

Darrow: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 17. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "Thank...thank you, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Bradley: "To explain his vote."

Greiman: "...well, to explain my vote, I am...I like to think that I'm an adult, and I'm glad to see that there are so many that care what I read and care what I think, and care enough to pass an oppressive law which is contrary to the First Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 141 'ayes', 15 'nays', 5 voting 'present'; the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 17. Mr. Greiman is on 'aye'. You want to be recorded as voting 'no'? Mr. Greiman wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Williams."

Williams: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would just to tell Representative Greiman he's welcome."



Speaker Bradley: "There have been...there have been objections to your changing your vote, Sir. We didn't hear him...the Gentleman will be recorded as voting 'no'. And the...on the Calendar appears... on Concurrence House Bill 44. Mr. Skinner, the Gentleman from McHenry, is he with us today? House Bill 107, Mr. Barnes. 113, Mr. Pierce, on Concurrence."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 113 is the Bill introduced to prohibit school boards in our state from imposing residency requirements on teachers. In the House, an Amendment was placed on the Bill by Mr. Walsh on the floor that would've protected those teachers already working for the school district, but not those hired afterwards when the residency may have been a condition of employment. The Senate really didn't change that. They rewrote the provision of the Bill a little bit; but it's exactly the same in its meaning as when it passed here. The Bill does protect from residency requirements all teachers working for any school district in the state that imposes such a residency requirement at the time that the residency requirement is imposed. All teachers then working will be protected. Teachers hired in the future will be subject to the residency requirement as the condition of employment. I believe the Amendment doesn't change the Bill in any substantial way. And, therefore, I move that the House concur in the Senate Amendment to House Bill 113."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 113. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. While we're taking that Roll Call, there's a Conference Committee on House Bill 979 at 4 o'clock in Room 400. We can't find any of the Members on the floor. If they're within hearing distance, I would suggest they get up there. Mr. Totten, Mr. Hudson, Mr. Neff, and Mr. Giglio and Mr. Von Boeckman. 400. House Bill 186. The Gent...Oh, I'm sorry. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 136 'ayes', 1 'nay'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 113. House Bill 186, the Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. Luft."



Luft: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 186. The Amendment changes the effective date of the Bill from July 1, 1977 to July 1, 1978. The Amendment also enables state agencies to defer federal funds to persons in their care and custody if such funds are personal benefits. It also permits agencies to make expenditures without an appropriation if they have the statutory authority to do so. And the Amendment also allows disbursement of federal funds to local governments for a school district if the funds have been designated solely for such distribution. The Bill has not subsequently been changed. I would, therefore, move that we do concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 186."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 186. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', those 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 152 'ayes', no 'nays'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 186. At the suggestion of Representative Edgar we have a motion by Mr. Winchester on House Bill 1033 to nonconcur. The Gentleman...Mr. Winchester, the Gentleman from Hardin."

Winchester: "Mr. Speaker, that is 1033. 1033."

Speaker Bradley: "1033, you move to nonconcur in Senate Amendments 2, 3, 4 and 5."

Winchester: "...3, 4 and 5."

Speaker Bradley: "And on that motion, all in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed by saying 'no'; in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur in Amendments to ...Senate Amendments to House Bill 1033. On the House Bill 206, the Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster. 206, Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, I think there's a little mix-up on this, I believe the Calendar lists Amendment 2 as having been adopted. And we have Amendment 1. Right now, we're trying to find Amendment 2."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. McMaster, according to the Amendment received by



or the message received from the Senate, it doesn't refer to #1, it refers that Senate Amendment #2 was adopted."

McMaster: "And all we have is Amendment 1, and we're trying to find Amendment 2."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, let's take it out of the record until you get that straightened out. I understand Amendment #2 right now is being collated by the Republican Pages, so you ought to have it in a few minutes. House Bill 245, Mr. Jack Davis, the Gentleman from Will."

Davis, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move we nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 245."

Speaker Bradley: "Nonconcur, Sir?"

Davis, J.: "That's right."

Speaker Bradley: "All right. The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 245. All in favor of the Gentleman's notion say 'aye', opposed say 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment to House Bill 245. House Bill 315. The Gentleman from Lawrence, Mr. Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to coin a phrase, the Senate Amendment has made a good Bill even better. This is the horseshoeing Bill. And the Senate struck the provision that would make the owner of a horse, who hired a non-licensed farrier to do the work, liable criminally. That provision has been deleted now. Otherwise, the Bill is the same form as it left the House. The thing for you to remember is that the grandfather clause is reopened. You can get your horseshoers in your district licenses without an examination up until January 1, 1978. If they've got five farmers, we'll certify them if they know how to license horses. I would urge you to vote 'aye' on a very good Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 315. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say...or vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 104 'ayes', 23 'nays'; and the



House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 315. If Lee Schwartz is within the sound of my voice would he please come to the podium. House Bill 341, Mr. Taylor, the Gentleman from Cook."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move that the House nonconcur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 341."

Speaker Bradley: "Okay, the Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 341. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion say 'aye', opposed say 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, and the Gentleman's does nonconcur...in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 341. 375. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stearney: 'Or Amendment 2, I'm sorry. 341 on Amendments #1 and 2, we move to nonconcur. Mr. Taylor, on both of the Amendments, you moving to nonconcur?'"

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I'm moving to nonconcur and request a Conference Committee so that I can work out some of the differences we have there."

Speaker Bradley: "Okay, he moves to nonconcur, and we already non-concurred. Back to Mr. McMaster on House Bill 206."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, we have found Senate Amendment #2. All it does is put the Aggregate Mining Problems Study Commission into House Bill 206, which is a Bill in regard to surface mining. The Amendment puts the Aggregate Problems Commission in there and puts the reporting date of May 2, 1979, for the Commission. I would move that we concur in Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to...the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 206. 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 130 'ayes', 1 'nay'; and this ...the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 206. House Bill 44, Mr. Skinner. Out of the record. The...House Bill 375, Mr. Stearney."

Stearney: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 375. It merely



clarifies the original intent of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, the Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 375. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', the Senate...Senate Amendment #3? 2? Senate Amendment #3 is shown on my...3 is a message from the Senate...so we'll concur in Amendment #3 to Senate Bill...House Bill 375. All in favor...Mr. Leinenweber, the Gentleman from Will."

Leinenweber: "Yeah, I had a question for the Sponsor. I...in looking through my pile of Amendments, and I can't find it. In what way does it clarify the original intent of the Bill?"

Speaker Bradley: "I think what we'd better do...Mr. Stearney, would you come up and make sure that Senate Amendment #3...that we have the message from the Senate is the correct one. So in the meantime, we'll take that out of the record; and we'll go to House Bill 413. Mr. Holewinski, the Gentleman from Cook, on House Bill 413."

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 413. What the Senate Amendment did was to remove the Section in this Bill that would have created the crime of aggravated arson since we addressed that through another fine piece of legislation earlier this Session. What the Bill does now is not duplicate that effort, but rather complement it by plugging a loophole in the arson statute that allows a person to...or does not cover the situation where a person might set fire to their own property, not for the purposes of defrauding an insurance company, but merely to get out of an investment. And I would move for concurrence in Amendment #1."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 413. All in favor of the... the Gentleman from Kane...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 134 'ayes', 1 'nay'; and the



House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 413."

Speaker Redmond: "417, Representative McGrew. McGrew, 417? Out of the record. Representative Stearney, 375."

Stearney: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur in Amendment #3 to...Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 375."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion?"

Stearney: "House...to an Amendment...to Amendment #3 on House Bill 375."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman explain the Amendment? That's been the usual policy."

Stearney: "The Amendment clarifies the original intent of the Bill, which was meant to provide that a Judge in sentencing an individual convicted for certain classifications of murder may either sentence him to the term of 14 years, which is the present statute, or in certain situations sentence him to serve 20 years before becoming eligible for parole. The Amendment says that may have the discretion of the sentencing Judge be required to serve up to 40 years, unless time credit for good behavior before being eligible for parole. The Amendment clarifies the original intent of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion to concur in Senate Amendment 3 to House Bill 375. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 136 'aye' and no 'nay'; and the House concurs in Senate Amendment 3 to House Bill 375. 428, Representative Bluthardt on that one? Bluthardt, 428. Our plan is to work tonight until we clear off these Calendars, 1, 2 and 3, so that we'll have tomorrow available for some other business. Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1, which is clarifying language on the effective date of laws. It adds a provision of the effective date of any Bill that might be signed into law by the Governor after January 1st. It's a very remote possibility; but we felt that it



ought to be covered. And so I move for concurrence with Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 429. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote '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's 138 'aye' and no 'nay'; and the House...Robinson 'aye'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 428. 611. Representative McBroom. All right. Wait a minute, wait a minute, wait a minute. Yeah, there's a second Amendment. Representative Bluthardt, did you move...I guess we only took Amendment 1, and there appears to be two Amendments on that."

Bluthardt: "Yes. I move for the concurrence on both Amendments, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "I only put the question for Amendment 1. So the question is on the Gentleman's motion to concur in Amendment #2 to House Bill 428. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 135 'aye' and no 'nay'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 428. 611, Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 611 was amended in the Senate. What we did is we amended it to be in conformity somewhat with the Collins-Nimrod Bill; and Amendment #1 encompasses their changes. Amendments #2 and 3, in addition to that, provides that at the time of a hearing the defendant would be examined by a psychiatrist who is not connected with the Department of Mental Health. To go back a little bit, House Bill 611 deals with defendants who are found not guilty by reason of insanity and requires a hearing prior to their release back into the community after they have been found in need of mental treatment."

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



Daniels: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Daniels: "Referring to Amendment...Senate Amendment #1, on that particular Amendment that would put it in line with Senate Bill 1143, is that correct?"

Darrow: "That is my understanding from Representative Collins."

Daniels: "From Representative who? I'm sorry."

Darrow: "Collins. Oh, Senator Collins, I'm sorry."

Daniels: "All right. Now, regarding to Senate Amendment #2, what does that do?"

Darrow: "Amendment #2 provides that the defendant be examined by a psychiatrist or psychologist not in the employment of the Department of Mental Health. This would be at the hearing to determine whether he's no longer need of mental treatment."

Daniels: "So Senate Amendment 2 says that there'll be an independent examination by a psychologist or a psychiatrist, correct?"

Darrow: "That's my understanding."

Daniels: "Now, what does Senate Amendment #3 do?"

Darrow: "Senate Amendment #3 goes on to say that a physician licensed to practice medicine in all of its branches who specializes in psychiatry and who's not employed by the Department of Mental Health. My understanding that this...if you read your...the Amendment #1 in conjunction with this...would apply to the defendant at the hearing."

Daniels: "Now, don't both Senate Amendments #2 and #3 amend the same Section by line number?"

Darrow: "That's my understanding."

Daniels: "Aren't they inconsistent on their face?"

Darrow: "No, I don't think they are."

Daniels: "One says that it will be a physician licenced in all branches specializing in psychiatry, that's #3, the other one says it'll be a psychiatrist or a psychologist amending the same line."

Darrow: "Yes, but it's my understanding #3 amends #2. So we are going with #3."

Daniels: "I have my staff man here. Could you take it out of the record



so we could look at it just for a minute? And then we could get right back to it. Would that be all right?"

Darrow: "Yeah, as long as we get it out."

Daniels: "Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 689, Brady. Out of the record. 818, Brummet."

Brummet: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that the House do concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 818. House Bill 818 is the sediment control Bill; and Amendment #1 to this Bill, Senate Amendment #1...to concur...take it out of the record just a minute."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. We're being visited this afternoon by the son of a former Chief Clerk of this House, Kenny Boyle of Carlinville. He's son of a former Chief Clerk. Representative Winchester. 966. He also served here, I think. Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 966 is a Bill for the ordinary and necessary expenses of the Environmental Protection Agency. The Senate put on three Amendments; and I move that we concur in these three Amendments. The first one adds an additional \$10,000,000...\$10,115,000 to the Anti-Pollution Bond Program to reflect the E.P.A.'s most recent projection of unexpected balances. The second one just deletes language concerning the Department of Public Health; and the third one deletes the 6 percent transferability clause of the Anti-Pollution Grant."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keats."

Keats: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask the courtesy of the Sponsor if we could separate these three votes because I have no objections to two of the Amendments, but I am rather strongly opposed to the third; and would just not have to vote against the entire Bill."

Sandquist: "I have no objection to that. I will move that we concur in Senate Amendment #1, which is the one that increases the Anti-Pollution Bond Program by \$10,115,040."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion...Representative Lechowicz."



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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Lechowicz: "What's the purpose of this \$10,000,000 increase?"

Sandquist: "The purpose is to reflect their most recent projections of the unexpected balances. And it's something that the Department, in going over, wanted."

Lechowicz: "What's the outstanding debt that they have now as far as bond authorization?"

Sandquist: "I...I don't have that right with me. If you want to... if you want to..."

Lechowicz: "...I would like to ask you and the Department, before when we passed the bonding authorization for the E.P.A., they had a listing of projects, the priority of call that was submitted to the Appropriations Committee. I'd like to know if that priority of call has been exhausted; and if these are new projects or to cover the cost of increase in construction on old projects."

Sandquist: "...All right, Mr. Speaker, let's take this out of the record; and I'll get that information."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 970, Representative Bennett."

Bennett: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 970, which is the appropriation to the local fire protection personnel fund to the Illinois Fire Protection Personnel Standards and Education Commission. All that Senate Amendment #1 does is reduce the operations by \$3,400."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 970. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. 970, it should be; John, 970. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 136 'aye' and no 'nay'; and the House concurs in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 970.

973, Representative Gaines. Gaines on 973. 1005, Representative Peters. Peters? Yeah, 1005. Peters on 1005."

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



House Bill 1005 is the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Public Aid...Health, I'm sorry, Public Health. The Senate amended or added a total of six Amendments to the Bill. With the leave of the Chair, I would explain each of the Amendment additions and then unless there is objection, I would move the House to concur with the Senate action in all six Amendments. Amendment #1 shifts back the \$1,100,000 in planning grants to the Illinois Family Planning Council. After conversations with Representative Barnes and Representative Houlihan, who had a great interest as you might remember in this money being restored, we felt that it was probably best to accept the Senate action and accept this restoration. And then have the Department and the Family Planning Council continue whatever negotiations they have now started to resolve this. Senate Amendment #2 adds \$44,105 for the State-wide Health Coordinating Council. Senate Amendment 3 adds a total of \$10,000,000 in federal hospital construction funds which were deleted by the House. Now, the House has deleted this amount of money because there is really no way that the state can handle these funds. What used to happen is the Federal Government would send the money to the state and the state would pass it out to the local districts. What ends up happening now is it goes directly to the local district, but the state...the state must sign off a pro forma kind of thing. I think the Senate must...might have understood and added these federal funds which we will not end up getting so there is no real change in the Bill. Senate Amendment #6 makes a reduction of \$18,300 in general revenue from the Office of Health Services. Senate Amendment #7 cuts out additional positions for a total of \$19,100. And Senate Amendment 8 adds a total of \$67,100 in general revenue for the administration of the Generic Drug Act. As put in this Bill totalled \$77,267,755 of which \$40,100,000, roughly...\$40,800,000 was federal funds. The total Bill now is \$77,507,000 of which, again, about \$40,800,000 is federal funds. And if there are questions, Mr. Speaker, I'll be happy to answer any questions. If not, I would move concurrence of Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 6, 7 and 8, and final action on



House Bill 1005."

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

"Will you break up the conference between the Chair and Representative Barnes? Representative Wikoff, Catania, Giorgi, Simms, please sit down."

Barnes, E.: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'll be very brief. This Bill was before us, there was some contention about one Amendment that related to the family practice. It was worked out in the Senate. I agree with Representative Peters. The Bill is in the shape now, that is, all sides are agreeable to. And I would move for this adoption, which is the final...final action on House Bill 1005."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 6, 7 and 8 to House Bill 1005. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 143 'aye' and no 'nay'; and the House concurs in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 6, 7 and 8 to House Bill 1005. Representative Bradley."

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to...for the purpose of an introduction of a former Page of the House of Representatives. Presently, he's a lieutenant in the U.S. Navy, a fighter pilot. The son of the Speaker of the House, Bill Redmond. He's come with his wife and his two grand...or his two children, the two grandchildren of the Speaker; and I wish they would stand and be recognized, all four of them, please."

Speaker Redmond: "1012. Representative Marovitz. Marovitz? Out of the record. 12...1026, Abramson. Abramson. Representative Abramson."

Abramson: "Would you take this out of the record for a second? Mr. Speaker, would you take..."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 1033. Representative Mulcahey, for what purpose do you rise?"

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, could I have leave to be recorded 'aye' on 1005,



please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted. 973, Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that we nonconcur with the Senate Amendment which takes out the money that the House added in order to reduce the back log plus some other deductions."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "I would ask that we nonconcur the Senate Amendment that deletes the line items that the House added plus two other deductions to reduce the amount significantly. And the Commission will not be able to properly perform their jobs with these kinds of cuts. Therefore, I feel that we should nonconcur and have a Conference Committee to see what we can do about compromising it."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 4 to House Bill 973. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Oh, pardon me, pardon me. On all of them? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 4 to House Bill 973. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the House...the motion carries and the House nonconcur in the Senate Amendments. 1039, Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Thank you, Mr...."

Speaker Redmond: "Geo-Karis, 1039."

Geo-Karis: "...the Senate made the Amendments on the Department of Aging Budget; and I would like to move to concur. It added, and it was the Senate's idea, it added an amount to the...a federal amount of another million some dollars to this budget. And I'd like to move to concur."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? Representative Wolf...I didn't hear a word of what you said, and I don't think Representative Wolf did. Will you please repeat?"

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Senate added an Amendment 1 in which it added a total of another



\$1,855,000 in Federal funds to the Illinois's share of higher than initially anticipated federal funds, and \$238,750 of this increase is for administration and \$1,616,250 is for grants. I would like to move to concur with the Senate Amendment 1 to the Department of Aging appropriations, House Bill 1039."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Lady's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1039. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 129 'aye' and no 'nay'; and the House...motion carries and the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1039. 1044, Representative Kent.. Representative Hudson, for what purpose do you arise? Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I have leave to be recorded as voting 'aye' on this last...the one just ahead of this?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Representative Sumner. Please come to order, I can't...can't hear. The decibel level is 198."

Sumner: "May I have leave to vote 'aye' on 1039, also?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Lady asks leave to be recorded in the previous Roll Call. Any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted. Sumner. 1044, Representative Kent."

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 10...House Bill 1044 is the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Registration and Education. There were Amendments added in the Senate which deletes \$94,566. I move to concur with the Senate Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Representative Kent, what if anything did the Senate do with respect to the appropriations for the three surveys?"

Kent: "Could you repeat that, Tim, I didn't hear you?"

Johnson: "I said what, if anything, did the Senate do with respect to our original appropriations for the three surveys, the water survey; the natural history and geological survey. Do they do anything at all in their Amendments to what we'd originally appropriated?"

Kent: "I don't believe they did anything in those at all, no. It's mostly



the E.D.P., the addition in the museum and then some corrective Amendments is what it is."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any further...Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "My...the explanation that is before me on...at least Amendment #5 says that there's been reduction to the State Geological Survey, Natural History Survey and the State Water Survey by a total of \$557,200."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Representative Kent, I mean no disrespect by this, but I asked a question because I wanted to get a sure answer. Now, I get one answer from one and one from the other. I want to know what happened to the three surveys."

Kent: "I can understand why there is some confusion because what it does is...does it puts the retirement of the surveys into another Bill so that they are all together. It's just the retirement part; but it is in another Bill."

Johnson: "Okay."

Kent: "It's in House Bill 546."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Anything further? Are you ready for the question? The question's on the Lady's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 1044. Those in favor...is that 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8 or just 2? Senate Amendments 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8 to House Bill 1044. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 143 'aye' and no 'nay'; and the House concurs with Senate Amendments 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, and 8 to House Bill 1044. 1060; Representative Meyer. Representative Ted Meyer on the floor? Temporarily, we'll go back to 611. Representative Darrow."

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

I move the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 611."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 611. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it,



the motion carries, and the House nonconcur. 2402, Representative Walsh. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur with the Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 2402. Senate Amendment #4 makes some very drastic reductions in the appropriations to the State Board of Elections. And, frankly, we would like to see if we couldn't restore some very necessary items. And so, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 2402."

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

Robinson: "Well, what exactly does...is taken out with the Amendment?"

Walsh: "There are several...several items, some rather small, the larger of them...it's about a 10 percent reduction. The reduction is of \$230,392. The largest of these is \$59,000, of the larger two, \$59,700 for contractual services under general counsel; and another for personal services under planning and program development of \$90,300."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment 4 to House Bill 2402. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the motion carries and the House nonconcur. 1060, Meyer. Still not here. 1064, Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you...thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move that the House do not concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1064 and a Conference Committee be appointed."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion...that was concurrence, was it, Representative Mahar?...noncon...the question is on the Gentleman's motion to nonconcur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1064. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the motions carries and the House nonconcur. 1081, Representative Adams."

Adams: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I recommend that we concur with Senate Amendment #1. What this is it's an upgrade of the residency of the Precinct Committeemen. What the Amendment will do, it will allow the County Chairman to appoint, to fill the vacancy, the appointee, all his qualifications



are that he lives in...within the county. Now, he cannot be appointed until after they have had their elections. So that the County Chairman cannot load up the precincts to win an election or anything like that. This would take care of a...the vacancies that occur and the next election he can be replaced very easily for anyone that wanted to run is all the person would need would be one vote. So I think this is a very good upgrading of participation in elections. So I would like to concur with this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, the Amendment's defective. On line 5, 'county' should be underlined and it is not. It should be withdrawn and corrected."

Adams: "What was the question?"

Beatty: "The word 'county' as part of the Amendment it should be underlined on line 5. It is not, so it should be withdrawn and corrected."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Beatty: "Nonconcur."

Speaker Redmond: "Johnson."

Johnson: "Well, I want to...wait and see what the Sponsor is going to do first. According to the information I have 'county and precinct' are both underlined according to the information I have on my sheet. Is that the problem? Okay, let's...let me ask you, then, 'Mr. Sponsor...do what you want with that, but...am I to understand then if your Bill passes as amended and signed into law that once a vacancy occurred before the next election that that could be filled by the appointment of the County Chairman...'"

Adams: "Right."

Johnson: "...for anybody who lives in the counties for that precinct?"

Adams: "Right, right."

Johnson: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would have to rise in strong opposition to this Bill as amended. I think part of the basis of the strength of our political system is at the precinct level. And if we're allowed...there's many responsibilities that a Precinct Committeemen has, including filling vacancies for County Coroner..."



Speaker Redmond: Representative Beatty, for what purpose do you arise?"

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, for a point of order. The Amendment is defective on its face, we shouldn't be entered into a debate here. It should be nonconcurrent with."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Adams, have you considered Representative Beatty's suggestion?"

Adams: "I...I..."

Beatty: "On line 5."

Adams: "...I missed that, would you repeat that again?"

Beatty: "On line 5, the word 'county' should be underlined, it is not. It's part of the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the Gentleman that he take the Bill out of the record and confer to see if this matter can be resolved. We've had enough legislation leave the Legislature in defective form without some more coming out this Session."

Speaker Redmond: "The Parliamentarian advises me that the objection is correct. Things were better last Friday, Saturday and Sunday. Late Friday, 4 o'clock. What's your pleasure, Representative Adams?"

Adams: "...if that is the only...is the only problem that the two words should be underlined, is there any problem with amending it on its face to clear that up or would that not satisfy?"

Speaker Redmond: "It's a Senate Amendment the Parliamentarian advises me."

Adams: "Oh, we'll just take it out of the record momentarily and see if ..."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record."

Adams: "...see if we can clear it up."

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 1212, Matijevich. Will the son of the former Chief Clerk please sit down. Representative Matijevich here? Out of the record. 1222, Representative Dan Houlihan. Out of the record. 1255, Von Boeckman. We may never come this way again. 1384, Representative Chapman. Representative Chapman, 1384? Out of the record. 1431, Representative O'Brien."

O'Brien: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move to concur



with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1431."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions on Representative O'Brien's motion.
Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Would the Sponsor explain what the Amendment does, please?"

O'Brien: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Senate
Amendment reduces the rate increase 4 cents; and in addition to
that it graduates it over a two-year period instead of a three-
year period."

Mulcahey: "Increases the rate 4 cents. What is this for, Representative
..."

O'Brien: "Reduces..."

Mulcahey: "...reduces the rate, what is this for?"

O'Brien: "...sanitary...this is the Metropolitan Sanitary District
Bill...it reduces the original Bill that was passed out of the
House, it reduces the amount of the rate increase from 13 cents
to 9 cents. It graduates it over a two-year period instead of
a three-year period."

Mulcahey: "Okay, if my...I'm safe to assume then that this reduces
the...reduces the increases for 1978 and 1979 and then eliminates
the proposed increase for 1980, is that true?"

O'Brien: "That's correct."

Mulcahey: "Okay. Then as amended by the Senate, the Bill would increase
the rate to .40 percent for 1979 and .46 for 1979 and each year
thereafter, correct?"

O'Brien: "No, I believe it would...it would be from 37 cents to 40
cents in 1978, which is a 3 cent increase; and it would be from
40 to 46 cents in 1979, which is a 6 cent increase."

Mulcahey: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would rise
to support the motion made by Representative O'Brien in regard to
House Bill 1431. The Amendments put on by the Senate are in keeping
with the discussions we had here in the House. And then the
kind of Amendments that we had talked about here and hoped that
the Senate would put on. I think it is in a reasonable kind of



shape now, and we...and I certainly give my support to 1431 and would ask the Membership of the House to do the same."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any questions? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Amendment #1 to House Bill 1431. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 117 'aye' and 14 'no'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1431. 1212, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on House Bill 1212 this was an Act revising from March 1 to June 1 the date on which first installment of real estate taxes become delinquent in counties of less than 3,000,000 which adopt the accelerated tax collection system. The Senate Amendment would allow such counties to opt for either the statutory date of March 1 or such other date not later than June 1 by Resolution of the County Board. It's a good Amendment. So, therefore, I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1212."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1212. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 129 'aye' and no 'nay'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1212. 1255, Von Boeckman. Von Boeckman. Representative Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "...on...oh, okay, now, I'm on."

Speaker Redmond: "Sure you are."

Von Boeckman: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1. What Senate Amendment #1 does to my House Bill is it brings it in compliance with H.U.D. regulations on moving trailers all over the United States; and I move concurrence."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1255. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted



who wished? Have all voted who wished? Representative Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, there's an Amendment #2. That was the effective date, Amendment #1. Amendment #2 stated what I do... and I respectfully ask concurrence with those Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "You requested your motion was concurrence in both Amendments 1 and 2, is that correct?"

Von Boeckman: "Correct."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The question...this question...the Clerk will take the record...on this question there's 126 'aye' and 1 'no'; and the House does concur in Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1255. 1736, Representative Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I move to nonconcur to the Senate Amendments in Senate Bill 1736...House Bill 1736."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Keats would like an explanation of the Amendments to which you're requesting a non-concurrence."

Polk: "If he would come over to my desk, I would be more than glad to explain all six of them to him."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you ready for the question? The question's on Representative Polk's motion to nonconcur in Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 to House Bill 1736. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'; the motion carries and the House nonconcur. 1604, Representative Levin."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1604. This Amendment makes no substantive change. It was requested by the Department of Insurance; and it...it simply makes a reference to another Section of the Insurance Code so that there is no need for the Department to promulgate new regulations"

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1604. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 110 'aye' and no 'nay'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1064. 1384, Representative Chapman. Representative Chapman."



Chapman: "No, no, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Do you want that out of the record?"

Chapman: "Please."

Speaker Redmond: "417, Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur in the Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 417. As you may recall, House Bill 417 was the Bill that I introduced for \$62,000 was the money necessary to hire six additional. I'm sorry. 112 additional secretaries for both the Democrats and the Republicans to have the ratio of secretary per Representative to 2 to 1 instead of the existing 3 to 1, excluding Committee Chairmen, Minority Spokesmen and Leadership. Obviously, the Senate had the Bill far too long to have any results during the remainder of this Session. So what we have done is amended the Bill downward \$46,674 leaving the original Bill now to \$15,326. That is a total appropriation be necessary to buy the equipment, the secretaries' desks, typewriters, stands, wastebaskets, et cetera, for 13 additional secretaries. I believe at this time we would need 10 on the Democratic side and 3 on the Republican side. And I would move for its concurrence."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, I hope everybody paid attention to the explanation of what the Bill does and what the Amendment does. If you look at your Digest, you'll find that this Bill squeaked through with 89 votes. And I believe after a verification. Anybody that knows anything about the operation of this House knows that most of us do not need a full-time secretary, that two of us don't need a full-time secretary, and three might even be just about right for most of us. Some of us do have a full-time one now. It's certain to me the cost of maintaining the General Assembly in the ever surprise...we just cannot and should not go ahead and reduce or increase our staff at this particular time. The year is 99 percent over, it is absolutely inexcusable to increase our staff in this way. And I would certainly urge that we get less 'aye' votes on this concurrence because it's the last chance to beat this Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 417. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In my closing I would like to say that I think the Representative from the other side of the aisle, someone sold him a ticket after the train has already left the station. He's totally incorrect; I do not know what his workload is, I can tell you what it's been on this side of the aisle this Session. This...this vote was not verified. In fact, if we do not concur in this, the Senate could recede and we would have \$62,000, instead of a mere \$15,000. So I would suggest an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 104 'aye' and 34 'no'; the Gentleman's motion fails. 107 votes. It takes 107. 1636. Oh, pardon me, you're right. On this question there's 104 'aye' and 34 'no'; and the Gentleman's motion prevails and the House does concur in Amendment #1 to House Bill 1636. Okay. Representative Keats."

Keats: "I rise on a point parliamentary inquiry. Did you say 417 had failed?"

Speaker Redmond: "No, it passed."

Keats: "Okay, excuse me, I thought you were ruling at 107 votes, and I was going to question your judgment. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "No, no, no. Don't ever do that. 3...1636, DiPrima. DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move that we concur with Senate Amendment #1. What it does it just changes the appointment of Members of Commission so Majority Leaders appoint two Legislators and Minority Leaders appoint one. And that's okay with me."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion on Representative DiPrima's...the question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1636? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? I know it. Have all voted who wished?"



The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 126 'aye' and 6 'no'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1636. Representative Houlihan. Houlihan. 1706, Representative Edgar. Out of the record. 1768, Jaffe. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "I'd like to go to the Order of Sports and inform you in the House that according a study that was made of collegiate basketball teams for the past season, the University of Marquette had a schedule that was exceeded toughness-wise by 27 other colleges."

Speaker Redmond: "How did they make out in the National Tournament?"

Schlickman: "I don't know."

Speaker Redmond: "I thought you knew everything."

Schlickman: "Well, I know something pleasant, Mr. Speaker. According to Jimmy the Greek, with the Cubs continuing to win and their pursuers knocking each other off, he makes them one to two favorites in the National League East with Philadelphia 4 to 1 and St. Louis at 10 to 1."

Speaker Redmond: "1768, Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Senate put on something new on 1768. What they put on went to special education. It's attached to a special education building program. As you know, they can tax now for a period of 8 years. That period is over at the present time, and they want it to go to 12 years. So they want to extend it for 4 more years. That's something new for 1768. I don't have any objections to it, and I would move to concur in Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Again, I hope the Membership is listening. Would you answer a couple of questions, Representative Jaffe? As I understand, the tax had a life of 8 years, and this Bill now seeks to extend the life from 8 to 4...or 12 years?"

Jaffe: "Yeah. This is a local tax. And this is what the special education people want; and they want it, and they say they need it to finish their building that they're unable to do within the next...within 8 years. They need that 12-year period so they want



to extend it for 4 more years. I have no strong feelings about it; but I'm moving to concur on it."

Leinenweber: "Is this...is this permissive throughout the state?"

Representative Jaffe, is this permissive throughout the state, every district of the state?"

Jaffe: "I believe it is. I believe it is."

Leinenweber: "And is there any referendum provision in there?"

Jaffe: "No, I don't believe that there is."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to briefly address the Amendment that's concurrence. If you'll look at your Digest, this Amendment, as the Sponsor rightly pointed out, is completely different from the Bill as it left the House. And it seeks to extend the tax which was imposed by the General Assembly or allowed to be imposed by the General Assembly for a limited purpose for a limited period of time, for a 50 percent longer time. And, again, as I understand it, there's no referendum provisions. So, in effect, a... taxpayers who are led to believe that the tax would no longer have to be paid at the end of 8 years will now find out that through the actions of the General Assembly that they'll have to pay that tax for 4 more years. So I...this is really the issue, whether or not you want to extend this tax for 4 years without giving the people back home a right to vote on it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the adoption of this Amendment from the Senate; and in addition to the reasons that Representative Leinenweber has accurately outlined, this really appropriately belongs not in the Section of School Code but really in the Section relating to capital building. And I think what we have done in the last few years is try to offset the cost of education in this building program by using general revenue funds. Now, we've done away with the general revenue funds. No, I think also we're at the point where we can do away with this legislation. To extend it 4 more years is really silly. I think it ought to be ended, and then the further request can be taken by the Capital Development Board, where it properly belongs. And I believe that



would be the way to go. And by doing that, we would continue school construction in a more effective and efficient manner and this necessary...and this legislation really is unnecessary. So I would oppose the proposal as it presently is before us."

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

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, as I indicated to you, this is a new twist on 1768. It was a concept that was in the House beforehand, which I had...which I think Representative Deuster had. I have no great feelings about it; but my feeling...I voted for the concept before hand. And I do think that the special education people need this money and I would leave it to the will of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1768. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Deuster to explain his vote."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would encourage some 'yes' votes. This was similar to legislation that we considered and almost passed; however, it was scaled back drastically. The Bill to which Representative Jaffe made reference broaden the purposes; and it was not the will of the House to do this. However, this just continues for a few more years the existing tax authority that has always...that has been there. I have in my hands the figures...out in Lake County we have imposed this tax. We have made this local effort. We do still have disa... children who have hearing impairments particularly, and they have plans to build that kind of a facility to help them. I know the special education people would like to continue this until we get in a position where we have a fuller and more adequate secure and stable state financing for this. And I urge your support for this important Amendment, which as I say does not broaden the use at all; but just continues the existing authority for just 4 more years. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 41 'aye', 48 'no'; and the



Gentleman's motion fails. Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Mr. Speaker, I would then move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1; also, Mr. Speaker, I might say that on...on the next Calendar we have the next Bill which is 1769, I'd like to move to nonconcur on that Bill, too, if we possibly could. So I would move to nonconcur on 1768."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion that we ...the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1768. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the motion carries and the House nonconcur. On the Supplemental 2 is 1769, Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "I would move to nonconcur in House...in Senate Amendment #... Senate Amendments 1 and 3 on House Bill 1769. These add a new tax and I don't think that anybody would want to vote for that concept; and I would just move to nonconcur."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment 1. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the motion carries. The House nonconcur. 1071, Representative Macdonald. Representative Macdonald on 1071."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to nonconcur on House Bill 1071. They cut out \$150,000...\$159,900 from the budget of the Institute of Environmental Quality; and I would like to negotiate to see what we could do."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any questions? The question's on the...the question's on the Lady's motion that the House nonconcur in House Bill 1071. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the motion carries and the House nonconcur. 966, Representative Sandquist. Sandquist on 966."

Sandquist: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the Bill for the ordinary and necessary contingent expenses of the Environmental Protection Agency. We had some problem before. I worked it out with Mr. Lechowicz. And at this time I'd like to move...there's 3 Amendments...and because some people have a different view on some of the Amendments, I will move that we concur in Senate Amendment



#1, which is not a new appropriation. It just reappropriates money that had previously been in the Anti-Pollution Bond Program. And I would move for its concurrence."

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

Unknown: "How much?"

Sandquist: "\$10,115,040."

Stuffle: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?" Representative Sandquist, do any of the Amendments deal with the sewer projects that were added in the House?"

Sandquist: "No, they're still all on. There was an Amendment, but that was defeated. So they're still on."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House..."

Sandquist: "No, just 1, just 1."

Speaker Redmond: "...Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 966. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 115 'aye' and 2 'no'; the House concurs in Senate Amendment 1...Senate Amendment 1 on House Bill 966. Representative Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe there's any objection to the other 2. So I'd like to have 2 and 3 heard together. They make minor changes. One of the them takes out the language referring to the Department of Public Health in making the determinations on the Anti-Pollution grant. That's 2. And #3 just removes the 6 percent transferability clause on the Anti-Pollution grant. So there can't be that change. And I move their concurrence."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur. Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Sandquist: "Yes."

McClain: "Mr. Sandquist, do you mean in moving that...in removing that 6 percent transferability, now they have unlimited transferability?"



Sandquist: "No, it means they don't have it at all."

McClain: "Oh. Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion the House concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 966. Those in favor vote 'aye'...Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, would you...would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Van Duyne: "Mr. Sandquist, you mentioned the public health...Department of Public Health, could you explain that a little bit? I got the impression that they are going to be eliminated from making any type of priority list or...am I correct or not?"

Sandquist: "They just make recommendations and they would still take the recommendations; but they...the Environmental Protection Agency has the priority list."

Van Duyne: "Okay."

Speaker Redmond: "Question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 966. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 138 'aye' and no 'nay'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 966. Have we called 44, Representative Skinner? Have we called that one? 44, Skinner? Out of the record. 10...107, E. M. Barnes. Has that one been called? Representative Hart."

Hart: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 107, the Senate Amendment reduced the appropriation by 50 percent. 107 is a companion Bill to House Bill 106, which Representative Barnes and I also sponsored. I'm advised that the Act that we created could not be implemented in time to use all of the money that was in 107. So I move to concur with the Senate Amendment to House Bill 107."

Speaker Redmond: "Was that concur..."

Hart: "Move to concur."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's



motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 107. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 141 'aye' and no 'nay'; and the House concurs in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 107. 44, are you ready, Representative Skinner. 44."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur on the Amendment to House Bill 44 and ask that a Conference Committee be appointed."

Speaker Redmond: "Skinner. The Gentleman has moved to nonconcur in Senate Amendment 1 to...all three of them, Representative Skinner? ...explain the Amendments, please."

Skinner: "I'm not sure I can, Mr. Speaker, from a technical point of view; but I can tell you that we are taking \$20,000,000 away from senior citizens this year in the budget. And I am willing to settle for approximately \$10,000,000 to be given back at this... the estimate at the present time or the Senate Amendments only give back approximately \$3 to \$4,000,000."

Speaker Redmond: "Your question...your motion on nonconcur, does that apply to all three Amendments?"

Skinner: "It really doesn't make too much difference I don't think."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 44. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the House nonconcurs. 689, Brady, are you on the floor? Brady? Out of the record. Don Brummet, are you ready on 818? Don Brummet? Yourell, 1978? Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, here's Representative Yourell, he'll handle it himself."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1978 makes certain technical changes, notably a change of words that were inadvertently put in the wrong Section; and we corrected that. And then we changed the consolidated election date from...to the first Tuesday in April, and the consolidated primary to the last Tuesday in February, and changed the word 'consolidated' to 'nonpartisan'. These are



all technical changes. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1978."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti. Conti. Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the last time, the last opportunity we'll have to kill this bad Bill. And in case we can't do it on the floor of the House, I hope the Governor's microphone is on, I hope he takes a good long look at this Bill and vetoes it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope the Governor does take a good, long look at this Bill because this is probably the most meaningful piece of election reform legislation to come out of this House in many years. It's certainly one of the best Bills I've ever had the privilege of attaching my name to. We've debated this Bill thoroughly. I'm not going to get into the merits unless we have to on explanation of votes. But I would just urge you to vote for these technical changes on a Bill that you in this House have voted for favorably twice now, two occasions, and all you're asked to do is concur with some technical Amendments. And I, once again, solicit your support for an excellent piece of legislation."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, on the Gentleman's motion to concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1978. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, contrary to what the Sponsor said...just said, this is your...really your last chance to vote against a Bill which is going to cause more confusion in your district than you ever heard of. If you think people get mad at you for little things, just wait until they try getting all these elections mixed up, where the districts are not co-extensive, where they don't follow precinct lines, where you've got five elections at once, and the Judges don't know which block they belong in. Just go home and vote for this and then try to explain it at the next election. I'd like to see you try."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Sponsor of this Bill and this motion said it's the best Bill he ever handled, and I can believe that because he's handled some pretty bad ones. Take, for instance, the original Campaign Disclosure Ethics Bill. That was so fouled up we're still amending it and trying to clarify it. If this Bill were so good, it wouldn't have been necessary to bring in this Amendment clarifying so many things. This Bill is going to create as Dwight Friedrich said, 'Utter confusion'. It doesn't take into consideration other statutes that are applicable that we find in the Election Code and the Municipal Code. There is going to be a conflict and it is going to create such confusion that it's going to take us years and years of amending to try and clarify it. I would urge you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 94 'aye' and 57 'no'. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I think this thing is probably one of the more important things we've done all Session dealing with, and I'm reluctantly, unless they want to undo those that have voted who aren't here, I'd have to ask for a verification. I do that with great reluctance. If you want to dump it and keep everybody on their own key, I won't do it."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 94 'aye' and 57 'no'..."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "...Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Unless you make the people change their votes for the people who aren't here, I'm going to ask for a verification. I don't want to slow down the time of the House, but this is a real serious matter in which I know that the Legislators are going to be criticized for; and I just want to be sure that the people that are voting 'aye' are here."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan."

Houlihan, J.: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like my 'yes' vote be recorded and also



be verified. I have to go to a Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "May the Gentleman be verified? Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I'm here in all my splendor; but I have a 5:30 Conference Committee on Table 4 in Room 420 if you want to find me. And I'd like to be verified now."

Speaker Redmond: "May he be verified? Representative Mann."

Mann: "I'm going to the same Conference Committee in Room 400; and I'd like to be verified."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tim Johnson. Johnson."

Johnson: "Mr. Speaker, would you change my 'no' vote to 'yes'?"

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from 'no' to 'yes'. Representative Bennett. Representative Bennett...desires to be recorded as 'aye'. Bennett. What's the count; Mr. Clerk? 76...96 'ayes' and 55 'nos'. Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, change my vote from 'no' to 'aye', please."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from 'no' to 'aye'. That's 97. On this question there's 97 'aye' and 55 'no'. Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "'No' to 'aye', please."

Speaker Redmond: "Change the Gentleman from 'no' to 'aye'. That's 98. Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "Change mine from 'no' to 'aye', please."

Speaker Redmond: "Change Von Boeckman from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative McGrew 'aye'. That's 101. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I'll withdraw my...verification. I still don't under... I think they would be glad to change their vote later on; but if they want to leave it that way now, it's all right with me."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there's 101 'aye' and 55 'no'; and the motion carries; and the House does concur in Amend...Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1978. 2131, Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I ask the House to please concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2131. In the sale of property for school districts, all this Bill says is that the money first taken in must pay off any existing mortgages. This is the existing law; and I would move to concur with the Amendment."



Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "That...concur, is that correct? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2131. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 132 'aye' and 4 'no'; and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2131. 1026; Representative Abramson."

Abramson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 1026 was the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Illinois Commerce Commission. Senate Amendment #3 makes no dollar change, but simply line items the Gas Pipeline Safety Act portion of the appropriation. I move that the House concur with the Senate Amendment #3."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 3 to House Bill 1026. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 120 'aye' and 6 'no'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendment 3 to House Bill 1026. 2244, Schoeberlein. Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Representative Schoeberlein is in Florida. What's his Bill...?"

Speaker Redmond: "Recreate the Illinois Commission on Labor Law."

Johnson: "I know he's going to be gone the rest of the term."

Speaker Redmond: "Who was on that Labor Laws Commission? Representative Jacobs, are you familiar with 2244? An Act to create the Illinois Commission on Labor Laws? Representative Schoeberlein is the Sponsor. He's not here."

Jacobs: "Yes. I'm in favor of concurrence on Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion to concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2244. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "I think we should note what the Amendment does, which is to add



the creation of the Commission of Urban Education, which does not seem to me too much like the Commission on Labor Laws. And possibly we should allow this to go to Conference Committee, rather than allow the Senate to tag on something to this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Well, I would just suggest to Representative Pullen that if that's her objection, that was a raisable and germaneness in the Senate, and I think it's probably related enough; when it's relative and noncontroversial. And I think in Representative Schoeberlein's absence and with the support of Representative Jacobs, that we ought to support this."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion to concur in Senate Amendment 1. Those...Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 94 'aye' and 36 'no'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2244. 2322. Representative Hart, for what purpose do you arise?"

Hart: "To handle this Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Hart: "Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2322 removed two House Amendments; one Sponsored by Representative Von Boeckman, and another Sponsored by Representative Terzich. The Amendment of Representative Terzich was subsequently incorporated in House Bill 1830, which passed on Concurrence today. The Amendment of Representative Von Boeckman, which was removed, was done with his approval. So I would move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 and 2 at the same time. The second one has to do with something that we should all be interested in. It provides that...allow our districts...all of its employees the opportunity to purchase the service credit which they were denied due to the...due to the delay in establishing the mechanics of transferring them to the payroll. Since these employees are required to pay both the employee and employer costs for the service, there would be no cost to the state. I move to concur with Senate Amendments...of both Senate Amendments to this Bill."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the noise level...I just...I just couldn't hear what Representative Hart was saying relative to this...this Bill. Would he repeat this again, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "I'll be glad to... Senate Amendment #1 removes House Amendment #2, which had been Sponsored by Representative Von Boeckman. This was done with the approval of the Gentleman from Tazewell. The other part of Senate Amendment #1 removes House Amendment #4, which had been Sponsored by Representative Terzich. This Amendment was also removed with his permission and was incorporated in House Bill 1830 with which this House concurred earlier today. Second...the second Senate Amendment provided a way for our district office secretaries to pick up three months that they were ineligible for because of the delay in establishing the mechanics of transferring them to the state payroll. And they are going to have to pay both the employer and the employee costs for this service; and the state will not be out any money. It was through no fault of theirs: that they were not able to qualify as state employees between the time of December 31, 1975, and April 1, 1976; and they can go back and pick this up."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, now, again, you took out...this Senate Amendment took out an Amendment that Representative Terzich had on which we passed on 1830, is that correct, earlier today? And the other Amendment...so I'm in full agreement. I think it ought to be passed out. Thank you."

Hart: "Okay. Thank you. Move to concur."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to 2322. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Hart, did you move to concur in both Amendments?"

Hart: "Yes, I did."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendments



1726.

1 and 2. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 135 'aye' and 2 'no'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2322 and 1 and 3 to House Bill 2322. 2379, McBroom: The hyphenated Sponsor Representative Harris, 'aye' on 2322. Representative McBroom

McBroom: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd like to move concurrence on this Bill; please."

Speaker Redmond: "On all the Amendments?"

McBroom: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28 to House Bill 2379. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "That's a long one there. I wonder if you could ~~res~~ the Amendments, but...would you repeat which ones we concurred with? Wait a minute, wait a minute."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 117 'aye' and 33 'no'; and the House concurs Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28 to House Bill 2379. 2397. Representative Kane or Houlihan, Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2397 is the implementing legislation for the Governor's Executive Order #2 with the Department of Law Enforcement. What Senate Amendment #1 does is makes some technical changes in the Amendment that was drawn by the Governor's Office that was incorrect. And I would urge concurrence on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2397."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters, for what purpose do you arise?"

Peters: "Will the Sponsor yield for one question?"

Kane: "I'd be very happy to."

Peters: "Representative Kane, does this include the language referring to the former office of Special Investigations? Was that stuck in here or not?"



Kane: "No, there are no substantive changes in this Amendment. Just a technical cleanup."

Peters: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you ready for the question? The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2397? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 137 'aye' and 1 'no'; and the House concurs in Senate Amendment to House LBill 2397. 2412, Representative Klosak."

Klosak: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, 2412 was a very good Bill when it left this chambers. What it did, it transferred \$32,000 for a feasibility study of finding an alternate supply of water for the City of Danville. The Senate in their wisdom has tacked on a \$1,000,000 transfer in the Department of Transportation to reimburse the Half-Fare for School Children Bill. Now, this is for fiscal '77. If we hurry up and pass this and the Governor signs it today, they've got to spend this \$1,000,000 tomorrow. They have a 24 hours to spend it. I feel it's an absolutely ridiculous Amendment, nevertheless, relying upon the intelligence of our Governor; I ask you to concur in House...in the Senate Amendment to House Bill 2412."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on...the question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2412. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 105 'aye', 30 'no'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2412. Any Member have a Bill on Supplemental Calendar 2 or 3 in which they desire to nonconcur? I think maybe since they have to go back to the Senate that maybe we should take those. Representative Giglio, nonconcurrency?"

Giglio: "No, recede, nonrecede...I want to not...what is it...not...refuse to recede?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah."

Giglio: "I want a Conference Committee."



Speaker Redmond: "Which one have you got?"

Giglio: "29, Senate Bill 29. On Supplemental Sheet 3."

Speaker Redmond: "Oh, yeah. You want to refuse to recede, is that correct?"

Giglio: "Right, I want a Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Supplemental Calendar 3. Senate Bill 29, Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "I would ask that we refuse to recede from Senate Amendment #5 that we put on. It was the Amendment that we thought would be... put this Bill in shape for the consolidation of days to register between the county and the city. It's a technical Amendment; and we'd have to have a Conference Committee to fix it up."

Speaker Redmond: "Questions? The question's on the Gentleman's motion... Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield? Was the Amendment 28 days or 35 days?"

Giglio: "Well, it was 28 for the city and 35...but what it was, Don, it's a technical...technicality to be fixed up. It's not going to do anything with the dates. They agree with them, the only way we can do it is to bring it back and put it in a Conference Committee."

Totten: "Well..."

Giglio: "It's not going to change the dates...but the way we passed it out it's going to be fine. There's just some technical work that has to be done. We'll fix it up and bring the Bill back."

Totten: "...All right."

Speaker Redmond: "Questions? Any further questions? The question is on the Gentleman's motion...Representative Giglio, did you refuse to recede, was that it?..."

Giglio: "Right and ask for a Conference..."

Speaker Redmond: "...refuse to recede from Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 29 and request a Conference Committee. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the motion carries. Representative Jack Davis."

Davis, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Senate Bill 880 on the Supplemental Calendar on the Order of Nonconurrence I would move to not recede



from Amendment #1 and request a Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? That's 880, Mr. Clerk. The question is on Representative Davis' motion that the House refuse to recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 880. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the motion carries and the House refuses to recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 880. Representative McMaster's, for what purpose do you arise?"

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, we have House Bill 1098 on the Calendar. It was amended in the Senate. I would like to move to nonconcur in the Senate Amendment and ask for a Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, what Calendar is that in?"

McMaster: "It's on the original Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "On the original Calendar, 10..."

McMaster: "1098."

Speaker Redmond: "1098. 1098. That was to nonconcur?"

McMaster: "Yes."

Speaker Redmond: "Any questions? The question's on Representative McMaster's motion that the House...1098...the question is on the Gentleman's motion to concur in Senate Amendment..."

McMaster: "Nonconcur."

Speaker Redmond: "...nonconcur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1098. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the motion carries and the House nonconcur. Dan Houlihan on 596, Supplemental 3."

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Senate Bill 596, I move that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 596 and request the appointment of a Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan has moved to refuse to recede from Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 596. Those...and request a Conference Committee...those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the motion carries and the House refuses to recede. Anyone else? Supplemental Calendar #2 appears House Bill 1. Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, this is House Bill 1, the Habitual Criminal Act or Three Time Loser Bill. I know it's a controversial issue."



Four years ago...Mr. Speaker, can we take this out of the record for awhile? Mr. Speaker, can we take this out of the record for awhile?"



Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. 14, Yourell."

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

We have three Amendments, Senate Amendments on House Bill 14.

Senate Amendment #1 is a technical Amendment that combines House Bills 14, 15 and 16 into one Bill. This Amendment was developed

with the assistance of the Auditor General and does not change the substance of any of those Bills. Senate Amendment #2 was

recommended by the Senate Executive Subcommittee to eliminate a possible conflict 14 might have had with a series of Bills Rep-

resentative Greiman had introduced on the Administrative Procedures Act. This Amendment would exempt the Illinois Office of

Education, the Department of Financial Institution for certain requirements for the Administrative Procedures Act. Senate Amend-

ment #3 was requested by the Index Division of the Secretary of State's office. This Amendment would delay the repeal of the

old Act concerning administrative rules adopted in 1951 until

January 1, 1978. That same day the Illinois Administrative Pro-

cedures Act is made applicable to all Executive Branch agencies

by House Bill 14. This old Act will not be needed after this

is accomplished. I move for the concurrence of Senate Amend-

ments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 14 and yield to Representative

Edgar, the hyphenated Cosponsor of House Bill 14."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Edgar."

Edgar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to shortly say I'd like

to urge the Members of this House to vote in favor of this. With

passage of this Bill, this will give the Legislature in Illinois

the tools to, I think, do something about the bureaucratic red

tape that we spend a lot of time talking about. We would join

thirty-one other states that have similar type Committees which

will watch the bureaucratic rules and regulations for our state.

I'd request a favorable Roll Call on this."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further discussion? The question's on the Gentle-

man's motion to concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House

Bill 14. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all

voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take

the record. On this question there's 120... 135 'aye' and no



'nay' and the House concurs in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 14.. Representative Kane."

Kane: "On the last two Bills that have been called and at least on the next several that are on the Supplemental Calendar #2, the Senate Amendments have not been distributed. And I would think that we ought to hold up until at least the Amendments have been distributed."

Speaker Redmond: "Your point is well taken. Joe, can you tell me what the story is on Amendments? Evidently we have some problem with Amendments, so let's go to Supplemental Calendar #3. 868, Representative E.G. Steele. Out of the record? 881, Representative Catania. Well, these are nonconcurrences. House Amendments."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The House Amendment was very carefully worked out to put a limit on the amount of money that could be earned by children in the schools for the blind and to provide that they would not be competing with private interests. I do not want to recede, so I'd move to nonconcur and ask for the appointment of a Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "I was distracted, Representative Catania. What was your motion again?"

Catania: "I ask that we do not recede from the House Amendment and that an appointment, that a Conference Committee be appointed."

Speaker Redmond: "The Lady has moved that the House do not recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 881. Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Are we on House Bill 881?"

Speaker Redmond: "Senate Bill 881."

Wolf: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Those in favor of the Lady's motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and we refuse to recede from Senate Amendment, House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 881. 926, Edgar. Representative Edgar. Out of the record. 964. Representative Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you rise?"

Geo-Karis: "When House Bill 2322 was called, I thought it was Senate Bill 2322 cause I didn't see the classification and I inadvertently voted 'no'. I would like to have leave of the House to vote 'yes' on 23... House Bill 2322."



Speaker Redmond: "Does the Lady have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. 1023, Capparelli. We'll take 964 out temporarily, Representative Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I ask that the House refuse to recede from Senate Amendment #3 and I would request a Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House refuse to recede from Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1023 and requests a Conference Committee. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the motion carries and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1023. 1025, Brady? Out of the record. 1029, Garmisa? Out of the record. 1046, Hart? Do you want to refuse to recede...do you want to take that one? Out of the record. 1142, Lucco? 964, Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that we recede from...from the Amendment from...Senate Amendment to 964 and ask for a Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative...Representative Laurino moves that we refuse to recede from Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House...to Senate Bill 964 and requests a Conference Committee. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it, the motion carries and we refuse to recede. Representative Adams."

Adams: "Yes, I have been checking on that Amendment to 1081, and the Amendment is in order. The analysis has two words underlined to make sure that they know what the Amendment says; and actually what I'd like to do is to call that Bill and have it voted on to concur with the Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "1081. Representative Adams. Representative Beard 1081 back from the record. House Bill 1081. Representative Adams has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendment I to House Bill 1081. Those in favor vote 'aye'. Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we didn't have a chance the last time to talk about the merits of this Bill. I think every Member of this House should realize what this Bill is."



does. This Bill provides that if an individual after the election is no longer a resident of the precinct that he can remain a Precinct Committeeman or, as a matter of fact, the County Chairman can appoint somebody to that precinct when a vacancy occurs, even though he doesn't live in the precinct. And I think the ramifications of that are pretty substantial and fairly obvious. The powers of the County Central Committee, in addition to filling vacancies in county offices, are many, including the state conventions, delegates of the national convention and so forth. And have people appointed at the whim of the County Chairman outside the precinct, I think, is an inordinate amount of power to the County Chairman and is also alien to the concept we have of the precinct organizations here in...here in Illinois. And I also think, and I'm surprised that the Sponsor would ask for concurrence on this particular Bill because it's absolutely the total polar opposite of what the Bill originally provided. The original...Bill originally provided that when one was no longer a resident of a precinct that he lost his powers and so forth as Precinct Committeeman. And now this Bill does absolutely the opposite. And so I would urge all the Members of the House to look at this Bill; and if you want to have people anywhere in the county be Precinct Committeeman, even if they're not in that precinct, you want to give those kind of powers to the newly or the County Central Committee and up to the County Chairman, then go ahead and vote for it. But if you don't, and you agree with Representative Adams' original concept as the Bill sailed out of here nearly unanimously, then you ought to vote 'no' on this motion to concur."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hart."

Hart: "I agree with the Gentleman that spoke last. I think a Precinct Committeeman ought to live in the precinct. And here we got a Bill that started out as a Bill to prohibit anyone who didn't live in the precinct from being a Precinct Committeeman and now we're going to come back in here ask...concur on an Amendment to allow anyone in the county to be a Precinct Committeeman in the precinct, even if he doesn't live there. So I believe that the Gentleman's motion



to concur should be defeated; and we should send this back for a Conference Committee to see if we can't work out the specific problems which the Bill was supposed to address itself to without this complete overkill of the problem. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Adams."

Adams: "The...they have...still persist that the Amendment is not in order and so instead of debating it, I would then move to nonconcur and will go to Conference Committee and then we will straighten it out."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman moves...the Gentleman has moved to nonconcur in the Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1081. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it and the motion carries. The House nonconcur. Representative Giorgi." Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now recess for dinner until 7:30. I move that the House now recess until 7:30."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion that we stand in recess for an hour and a half. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it. The problem is we have some Amendments that are not yet printed, so we're at an impasse stage... The hour of 7:30 having arrived, the House will come to order. Representative Geo-Karis is here. Representative Sharp and Kempiners. Who? Abramson is here. McPike. The Pages are all here. I think we'd better stand...Edgar is here. Ed, electrician, is here. The Pages are here. The Doorkeeper is here. The galleries are full. I think the House will be in recess until the call of the Chair. The House will come to order. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of Bills of the following titles to wit, House Bill 1524, 878, 941, 1055, 1185, 1203, 1228, 1237, 1638, 2087, 2374, 2409, 1521, 1545, 1603, 1697, 1749, 2119, 2137, 2185, 2259, 2261, 2325, 2342, 2358, 2384, 2393, 2411, 2416, 2417, 106, 165, 166, 213, 259, 397, 408, 409, 490, 585 and 651; passed by the Senate June 28, 1977. "



Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in adoption of their Amendments, 1, 5 and 10, to a Bill of the following title, Senate Bill 830; I'm further directed to inform the House that the Senate has refused to concur with Amendment #6. Action taken by the Senate June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary.

A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 364. I'm further directed to inform the House they refused to adopt Amendment #2. Action taken by the Senate June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate

by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurred with the House in the adoption of Amendments 2, 3, 4 and 5 to Senate Bill 495. I'm further directed to inform the House they refused to concur with Amendment 1. Action taken by the Senate June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr.

Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate concurred with the House in adoption of Amendment to Senate Bill 693. I'm further directed to inform the House that the Senate refused to concur with Amendment #2. Action taken by the Senate June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives

that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment to the following Bills to wit, Senate Bill 926, 1023, 964, 881, 1142, 1046, 880, 1039, 1025, 1203, 1208 and 1281. Action taken by the Senate June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm rising for a matter of information. The last couple of days there's been quite a few Resolutions passed on this House floor granting things to various people; and I just



had a Cub fan ask me what the procedure would be to get a Resolution passed to see if we couldn't get the Cubs six runs tonight."

Speaker Redmond: "I think you'll find that the Cub players will have all the Resolution that's required. Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Can we go with my..."

Speaker Redmond: "What'd you say?"

DiPrima: "...Can we go with my House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment..."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we may be able get there. Wait until I get finished signing this stuff."

DiPrima: "...All right."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we were supposed to recess until 7:30 p.m. It is now 9:01 p.m.; can I possibly be informed, because I'm rather dense in understanding, what is the delay?"

Speaker Redmond: "The printer is still printing Amendments."

Geo-Karis: "I see. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Johnson. Representative Ewell, is he on the floor? The House will be in order. Supplemental Calendar #3, 1142, Representative Lucco.: Representative Lucco on 1142."

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr....thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. On the nonconcurrence on Senate Bill 1142, I would like to refuse to recede to the Senate's wishes and send Senate 1142 to a Conference meeting."

Speaker Redmond: "You've heard the Gentleman's motion. Is there any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1046. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed...and to request a Conference Committee...the question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House refuse to recede from Senate Amendment...from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1046 and request a Conference Committee. Those in favor vote 'aye'...Representative Satterthwaite, for what purpose do you arise?"

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker..."



Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Lady order."

Satterthwaite: "Could we renew our request that regardless of whether it's concurrence or nonconcurrence that we have some explanation of the contents?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Lady has requested an explanation of the Amendments, and I think she's in order."

Lucco: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Representative Satterthwaite. I'm sorry, and I overlooked that. Senate Bill 1142 actually is a...an Energy Bill. It's the one that creates the Mine and Energy Department. It's the combination of energy program into the Mines and Minerals Department. We passed it out of the House here with an overwhelming...overwhelming vote. We sent it over to the Senate; and we do have a little bit of misunderstanding on it, but I think we have it ironed out. And by going to a Conference meeting we think we can resolve it."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you ready for the question? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1142, and requests a Conference Committee. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it... it's Amendments 1, 5 and 7...the motion carries and the House refuses to recede from Amendments 1, 5 and 7 and requests a Conference Committee. 1039, Garmisa. Representative Garmisa. Representative Garmisa on 1039."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would refuse to recede from the Conference Committee Report...or the concurrence and ask for a Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question...Representative Bowman. Representative Bowman desires an explanation of the Amendment, Mr. Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker, the Amendment is the Amendment we put on here that dealt with the 'tricycle' problem."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you ready for the question? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1039, and requests a Conference Committee. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it,



the House refuses to recede from House Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1039. Representative Edgar on 926. Out of the record. 868, Representative Steel. Do you want to go with that? Out of the record. 1025, Representative Brady? Out of the record. --54, Representative Yourell? Out of the record. 363, Simms. Out of the record. 975, Representative Breslin. Out of the record. 2347, Representative Kane. Out of the record. 2361, Representative Hanahan. Out of the record. 2398, state government. Representative Kane or James Houlihan? Out of the record. Representative Marovitz. Maro..."

Marovitz: "Mr. Speaker, if you're looking for..."

Speaker Redmond: "1012."

Marovitz: "...Sure...thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House..."

Speaker Redmond: "1012, Mr. Clerk. Representative Marovitz." Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege and possibly and assist to Representative Marovitz. There seem to be dozens of people on the floor that don't belong on the floor. I can hardly hear. The din is just frightful. I can't see the Speaker half the time. I wish you would clear..."

Speaker Redmond: "Please come to order. Representative...Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "...Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move that the House do concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1012. Senate Amendment #1 provides that notice of a public hearing on a supplemental appropriation ordinance is to be given by publishing the notice at least 10 days prior to such hearings. And I would move that the House do concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1012."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question's on the Gentlemen's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1012. Those in favor...Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "I'm sorry, could you explain that Amendment again, please?"

Marovitz: "Certainly. Senate Amendment #1 provides that...that notice



of a public hearing on a supplemental appropriation ordinance is to be given by publishing the notice at least 10 days prior to that hearing, Gene."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Any further questions? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1012. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 129 'aye' and 1 'no'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1012. Meyer on the floor? 2131. Mr. Clerk, I understand that we have some problems with 2131. Would you explain what happened?"

Clerk O'Brien: "We concurred in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2131; but the Roll Call printer failed to print a Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "What was the count?"

Clerk O'Brien: "We had a Roll Call of 132 'ayes' and 4 'nays'."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you ready for the question to get a Roll Call on this one? The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2131? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130 'aye' and 2 'no'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2131. Constitutional Amendment, Third Reading. Representative DiPrima. Constitutional Amendment, Third Reading. House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 29."

DiPrima: "All right, men to your battle stations. All right. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, before I start off, I want to commence by thanking each and every one of you from the bottom of my heart for the loyal support you've given me on all the veterans legislation this Session. And right here to my right is my right hand arm...my right arm in the Senate, Senator Bob Mitchler, who passed them all out of the Senate; and is looking forward to getting this Resolution. And while I'm at it, I'd like to extend an invitation to each and every one of you, the Governor's going to be at the American Legion Convention on Friday, July the 8th; and Bob Mitchler and I would like to have the honor of escorting any one



of you that show up around 10, 10:30 over to the distinguished guests' room, Room 2020W at the Palmer House in Chicago. And Senator Bob Mitchler and I will personally escort you up to the podium and have you introduced and given the recognition you rightfully deserve. Now, at times I'll admit I got a little perturbed when some of you fellows, you know, were a little reluctant to support me on some veterans legislation; but what if I did get mad, what if I'd had, you know I'm Sicilian, what if I'd have had you taken for a ride with my goon squad. My goon squad is comprised of Cal, 'the Terror' Skinner, and Jim 'Boom-Boom' Houlihan over here. And if I'd had you... these guys take you out for a ride, you know, and Pouncey is my prime mugger, Commander Pouncey. But so what the heck. And all in all everything worked out pretty good; and like I say I extend this invitation, Senator Bob Mitchler and I extend this invitation to each and every one of you to attend the American Legion State Convention at the Palmer House on Friday, June the 8th, about 10:30 or 11 o'clock in Room 2020W at the Palmer House. Now, to go on to my last Bill here. This is a Constitutional House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 29. Now, don't get terrified. If you pass it out of here, it has to pass out of the Senate, then it has to go on the ballot. So what this would do it would grant real estate exemptions to the veteran organizations. And what I propose to do if and when it does pass to give this break to just posts that are on the verge of bankruptcy; posts that probably don't take in more than \$10 or \$15,000 a year in the money-raising programs. And such money should be used toward the upkeep of their post properties and participation and patriotic and civic programs throughout the year. And they have to give an accounting of that money. So this in reality is a real good House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment. And I would be very endeared to each and every one of you if you would give me your support and passing this out of the House and laying on the lap of Senator Bob Mitchler and let him get the head 'extent'. Thank you."

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



Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I...I...would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Totten: "Do you have, Representative DiPrima, do you have any idea or indication of what the reduction...or what the cost would be to local districts if this additional property were exempt?"

DiPrima: "Well, number one, I voted for your Laetrille Bill; now to get down to the cost, this would be very minimal because, as I said, this is going to help just the little posts to keep them from submerging all together, just to keep their heads above water. So those folks that are making money, I don't intend to give them a break. When they're making money, they've got to pay their taxes. I just want to try and save the little posts. Mr. Ewing, I'm ready for you."

Totten: "Well, the only...the only similarity between this and laetrille, is this would be quite a bitter pill to swallow for many local districts."

DiPrima: "I don't know, the doctors are beefing about laetrille, but I'm with you...Ewing."

Totten: "Wait a minute, I'm...oh..."

DiPrima: "Do you want to..."

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

DiPrima: "...Mr. Totten wants to..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, I know it's probably futile, but I'd like to ask the Representative a question:"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Proceed."

Ewing: "You say that you only want to exempt that property which isn't income producing, does that...is that set forth in your proposal."

DiPrima: "...What?"

Ewing: "You said you only intended to exempt property which was not income producing, is that set forth in your proposal?"

DiPrima: "Well, every post has a little income, you know, they have..."



Ewing: "Well, then we would...then we would exempt...we wouldn't exempt any of them, would we?"

DiPrima: "...Oh, no; I would in a Bill if and when this passed, that only posts that are making enough money to take care of their property and participate in various patriotic and civic programs throughout the year, they would have to give an accounting of that money. Those posts that go over and beyond it, would have to pay their taxes."

Ewing: "Now, one further questions. Does this exempt all Legion-owned property?"

DiPrima: "This would be only the federally recognized veteran organizations such as the Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Am Vets, and the Disabled American Veterans."

Ewing: "Does this exempt any property they own?"

DiPrima: "Oh, no, just their post property. If they've got that much property, then they've got money, they've got to pay."

Ewing: "Well, I..."

DiPrima: "I ain't about to give a break to anybody that's worth a lot of money. Now, when DiPrima pays everybody pays."

Ewing: "...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would hope that we would have some attention to this very important Amendment. This proposal for a Constitutional Amendment..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "May I have your attention, please? Could we have your attention, please?"

Ewing: "...to give a tax break to the Legion organ...the Veterans organizations. Now, it's like being against motherhood to be against such a thing. But, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, the precedent which you would set with the adoption of this Resolution is extremely far reaching. And I do not believe there's anything in this Resolution which would say that if you have income-producing legion or veterans both you pay taxes. This would exempt them all and maybe all of their property. And, Ladies and Gentlemen, I think we should put this to rest once and for all, with all due respect to the Sponsor, who seems to be able to get anything he wants for the veterans organizations through this Body."



DiPrima: "Now, you see Ewing..."

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

DiPrima: "...going way out on left field. Now, you're making an accusation there that isn't true. Now, I'm saying exactly as I said before that the only posts that are going to get this break is just the posts that are just barely surviving. Any posts that's making money is going to pay their tax. You know the hospitals don't pay no taxes, you know what they do to you. All right, Ladies and Gentlemen, I guess we've had enough discussion on this. I would...really appreciate a very affirmative vote so my...I can give the Bill right here to Senator Bob Mitchler to take with him to the Senate. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House adopt House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #29? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Epton, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House; if I may have your attention, please. I found it extremely difficult..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Bernie. Could we have your attention, please? The Gentleman is explaining his vote, he's entitled to your attention, please."

Epton: "...Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that, and that's...perhaps it has to do with my comments. I found it extremely difficult to hear what Representative DiPrima, Representative DiPrima, I found it extremely difficult to hear the arguments that you advanced in favor of your Bill. And because of that, I want you to know that I'm happy to vote 'aye'."

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

Byers: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker.. I think everybody in here is for the veterans and veterans organizations. And we go to their parades and to their clubs and posts and all that. But what's happening in our state is we're giving exemptions to so many people that we're shifting the burden of the taxes to groups that can't pay them."



And that's the reason taxes are so high in the state, that just so many people have exemptions. And I think that we should stop these exemptions, and I think a good place to start would be here by not approving this Constitutional Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "May I point out to you that this vote takes 107 votes. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Laurino, to explain his vote."

Laurino: "Is there a possibility of asking the Chair a parliamentary inquiry?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, there is."

Laurino: "How many votes does this legislation need, Representative Lechowicz?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I just made that comment, Representative Laurino. This measure takes 107 votes to pass."

Laurino: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen, to explain his vote."

Ebbesen: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House; I tried to listen carefully to what Representative DiPrima has said. And if this was to pass out of the House, it must pass out of the Senate. And then the people of the State of Illinois have to make that determination, that's all he's asking for. And as I understood him, he said it would be accompanied in the future by then appropriate legislation, not for those people in veterans organizations, whatever the posts might be, that were liquid in making money, but those that were in difficulty. That's what the future legislation would address itself to. And I think it deserves an 'aye' vote here to at least get it over to the Senate and let them make a determination over there."

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

Sandquist: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to say that we are not granting an exemption to anyone here. As the previous Speaker just said, all we're doing is allowing the people to vote on it. If they don't want to have the veterans organizations be



exempt, they can vote 'no'. They're the final judge of it. We're giving them the opportunity to vote; and, therefore, I'm going to vote 'aye!.."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Huskey, to explain her vote ...Mr. Huskey, I'm sorry." The Gentleman from Cook."

Huskey: "That's better, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, several...several years ago in our town we had a really bad tornado and some 30...and some people were killed. Who were the first to come to the aid of these people of the dead and injured but the V.F.W. and the American Legion halls which were the largest buildings in our community. That also applies to...we used the V.F.W. hall far more. And all their members were assisting and helping clear up the wreckage of the tornado. And many, many other occasions, who were the first people to finish the facilities of their halls to their community projects? It was either the V.F.W., the American Legion or other veteran organizations. So at least let the communities themselves decide whether they want these particular buildings excluded from the tax rolls. Why...why would you stop them from that privilege? So I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis, to explain her vote. The timer is on."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I understand that this Resolution in order to pass has to have 107 votes. This Resolution is one that's going to be decided by the people if we will only let the people have the right to vote on it. We're not going to exempt any property for any patriotic organization without the vote and the referendum by the people. I think the people are entitled to vote on it. I think the purposes are very laudable. And there's nothing wrong with patriotism. And I think it's high time we had more of it. And I urge 107 votes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Stephenson, Representative Rigney, to explain his vote."

Rigney: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, despite the assurances that were given by the Sponsor, the Constitutional Amendment simply exempts all post property. It doesn't relate in



any way to the earning capacity of that post or to their other assets. So I think we should not be taken in by this. It exempts all of their post property."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Jacobs, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Jacobs: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Just recently if you remember we saw Boy's State up in the gallery. This was a part of the charity part and...that the Legion and the veterans organizations play. And I think that we're 95 votes, we only need 12 more. We're only going to let the people decide. And I think that the good that they do, they have the scholarship programs and so on. If you want to stop all that, and then force them to pay their taxes, that's all well and good. But let's keep up the good work that the veterans organizations are doing, and if you're a good veteran, you're name is going to be on that as voting 'aye'. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich, to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am a veteran and a member of the American Legion; and I certainly am aware of all the good things that have been said about the veterans organizations. But I want to call your attention to something you may not be thinking about. There were 40 proposed Constitutional Amendments introduced in the Senate, 36 in the House. There will be no election until next year. We don't know yet which of these Amendments are going to be up for final consideration. Only three Articles of the Constitution are being amended in any one year. This may or may not be the one that's most important. There may be some key ones. Personally, I would appreciate it if Larry had kept this in the House until we had a chance to look at all those that came out of Committee and considered them at once. As important as this is, there may be others that are more important and I think the House should retain this Bill until we find out what action we're going to take on the others, at least in Committee."



Most of us have not even had a chance to hear our Amendments considered in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Polk: "Well, Mr. Speaker...Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen, many of us obviously have a conflict of interest here because we happen to belong to a post that has a very small membership. I happen to be one of those. However, let's remember that this organization of the American Legion is one that we hope we do not get any new members in. We sincerely hope that never again will there be another young man or young lady have an opportunity or have the ability to become a member of the American Legion. What we hope for is that our country will never again be in war and if it's never in war again, it's going to happen to us and we're going to die off and it's going to be the end. So those people who have contributed, we're simply asking for them to have an opportunity and a place to go. I would sincerely hope and see that we have 110. I hope that number can stay up there."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 116 'ayes', 22 'nays', 12 recorded as 'present'; House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #29 is, hereby, declared passed. House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #22, Representative Totten. Out of the record. On the Calendar on page 3, Concurrences, House Bill 992, Representative Stanley. House Bill 992, Jack."

Stanley: "...Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a concurrence motion on the Governor's Liquor Control Appropriation Bill. This year the total is \$392,400; and it's down from last fiscal year, where it was \$403,500. And I ask for a favorable Roll Call on this concurrence motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 992. On that, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield? I want to know what the Amendment is we're concurring with."



Stanley: "Yes, I will. I'm sorry, I didn't hear the question. The
Lott Amendment cuts \$8,970 out of the personal services, retirement and
social security, the Senate Amendment."

Totten: "It's a good Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman moves that
the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 992.
All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed
by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted
who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question
there's 127 'ayes', 4 'nays', none recorded as 'present'; and the
House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 992 and
is, hereby, declared passed. House Bill 1422, Representative O'Brien.
O'Brien. Take it out of the record. House Bill 1593, Representative
Deavers. Is the Gentleman on the floor? It passed? Okay. House
Bill 1594, Representative Simms. Well, this Calendar isn't current
then. House Bill 1608, Representative Telcser. Out of the
record. House Bill 2272, Representative McBroom. 2272, Jack.
For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Keats,
seek recognition?"

Keats: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask unanimous leave...I was off the floor
at the time and someone was generous enough to vote me 'no' on
House Joint Resolution 29; and being a veteran myself with a
blatant conflict of interest, I would, of course, been voting 'yes'
and to avoid the embarrassment of having been voted 'no' when
I was indisposed, I'd like to be changed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Does the Gentleman have leave to be recorded as 'aye'
on House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #29? Hearing,
no objection, you'll be so recorded. House Bill 2272, the Gentle-
man from Kankakee, Representative McBroom."

McBroom: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I've discussed this
with Representative Terzich, he's much more familiar with the
subject matter than I and he's going to act as Sponsor of the
Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich, to
explain the Bill."



Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2272, the Amendment provides that a Member may rescind his election not to participate under the retirement system provided that he is still a Member and files with the Board prior to December 1, 1977. The previous date was December 1, 1975. This change in past years had consistently been approved by the General Assembly for all funds. It has the approval from the Pension Laws Commission. I would urge concurrence with Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 2272."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2272. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'...voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record. On this question there's 122 'aye', no 'nay', 15 recorded as 'present'; the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2272 and is, hereby, declared passed. House Bill 2307, Representative Ryan. House Bill 2307, Representative Ryan. Do you want that Bill called? Out of the record. House Bill 2408, Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House do concur in Senate Amendments 1, 3 and 4 to House Bill 2408, which is the appropriation to the Supreme Court for the judiciary system of this state. Senate Amendment 1 adds nothing to the appropriation. It simply makes explicit what has been the funding formula for this appropriation since 1965 to the effect that 25 percent of the expenditures shall be from the Road Fund and 75 percent from General Revenue Fund. Senate Amendment #3 deletes \$3,500 from the General Revenue Fund, which is unnecessary because of the adoption by this House of House Bill 2173, the probation subsidy to be vouchered through the Comptroller's Office. And Senate Amendment #24 results in the reduction of \$128,000 from this appropriation. That reduction is a reduction in the cost of lending increase provided for...for judicial system employees. That's what the three Senate Amendments do. They're reasonable and I ask that the House do concur in Senate Amendments 1, 3 and 4 to House Bill 2408."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "Is this the Bill that provides raises for some higher level employees of the judicial system?"

Houlihan, D.: "No, it does not. The only employees who have a cost-of-living increase in this are some 200 employees of the judicial system. They're basically clerical positions and also janitorial positions."

Robinson: "Thank you."

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

Kane: "Would the Sponsor yield to Amendments...I mean...to a question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Kane: "Is this the same formula that's been used in previous years for allocating court costs?"

Houlihan, D.: "That is correct. It's been the formula that's been in existence since 1965."

Kane: "And how much will be coming out of the Road Fund this year?"

Houlihan, D.: "1...25 percent of the expenditures shall be from the Road Fund, 75 percent from the General Revenue Fund."

Kane: "In dollar amounts what would that be? How much money are we talking about?"

Houlihan, D.: "The total appropriation is approximately \$45,000,000, figure 25 percent of the \$45,000,000."

Kane: "About \$25,000,000?"

Houlihan, D.: "Yes."

Kane: "Thank you."

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

Cunningham: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, he...yes, he will."

Cunningham: "Amendment #4, is that the same Amendment that we fought in Appropriations I, when it was pointed out by the Sponsor at that time that the raise was higher than the average, and we tried to roll it back from 8 to 5 percent?"

Houlihan, D.: "I don't know if it's the exact same Amendment, certainly, of course, with the intent of what the Amendment that was thought



to be introduced in Appropriations I."

Cunningham: "The point I wanted to make is that if it's reasonable now it should've been reasonable then. We mustn't let the Senate be the watchdog of the Treasury. Appropriations I attempted to correct this error with the Amendments made. It's a more acceptable Bill than it was. But Appropriations I gets a black eye that they do not deserve. We'll be voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendments 1, 3 and 4 on House Bill 2408. On that question all those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 121 'ayes', 11 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1, 3 and 4 to House Bill 2408 and is, hereby, declared passed. On Nonconcurrency is Senate Bill 937. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Kane. No...take it out of the record? House Bill 689, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brady. Take it out of the record. House Bill 818, Representative Brummet. House Bill...take it out of the record. House Bill 1060, Representative Meyer. Take it out of the record. House Bill 1081, Mr. Adams. It's nonconcurrent on that one. House Bill 1222, Representative Dan Houlihan. Out of the record. House Bill 1384, Mrs. Chapman. Is the Lady there? Mrs. Chapman? Out of the record... Bill 868, E. G. Steele. Yes, I did. What? Okay, I'll get to it. E. G. Steele out of the record. House Bill 1706, Representative Edgar. 1706."

Edgar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1706 as it left the Senate required hearings on objections to nominations of candidates for public office to be public hearing. Senate Amendment #1 added to House Bill 1706 the provisions of House Bill 1566. We passed House Bill 1566 out of here by a vote of 118 to 32 on May 20th. The purpose of House Bill 1566 was to extend the polling hour in all elections in this state by one hour to a closing time of 7 p.m. My intention as Sponsor of House Bill 1706 as amended is to extend voting hours state-wide to 7 p.m. This



action will allow greater participation in the electoral process, especially in the case of commuter and suburban voters. It's very difficult for voters living in Wheeling and Barrington Township or in DuPage County to return from his job in the City of Chicago in time to cast ballot by 6 p.m. This Bill is specifically intended to deal with the problems of these voters. By extending the voting hour state-wide to 7 p.m. we will help solve this problem. I move the House concur with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I believe it's Senate Amendment #2. Which one is it? Mr. Edgar?"

Edgar: "Senate Amendment #2...sure, yeah, Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House do concur in Senate Amendment #2. Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan, D.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Sponsor if he'll yield."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Houlihan, D.: "Representative Edgar, what you stated was that this would apply a 7 o'clock closing hour for polls throughout the state; and yet the Amendment, Senate Amendment #2, refers only to any municipality operating under Article 6 of this Act, and that Article, of course, is the Board of Election Commissioners. Isn't it accurate that the Amendment if adopted, your Senate Amendment #2, would extend the 7 o'clock closing hour only to a municipality which is operating under a Board of Election Commission?"

Edgar: "Well, the intention of the legislation..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Could we have a little order, please?"

Thank you. Please proceed."

Edgar: "...my understanding is the intention of this legislation is to apply this state-wide."

Houlihan, D.: "Well, I'm not asking you, of course, what your intention is. And I think if you're going to do it, you're going to have to do it on a uniform basis. But the problem is the way this Amendment is drafted will result in this type of a situation. And I would ask the Membership, please, to heed what we're talking



about here. Any Member, for example, in the City of Chicago who has a legislative district that encompasses both the City of Chicago and suburban areas, and I am such a Member in the 28th Legislative District, as is Representative Meyer and Representative Jones, if we adopt and concur in this Amendment to this Bill, the net effect will be that those precincts in my district, which are within the City of Chicago, will have a closing time of 7 p.m.; but those precincts which are in the suburban part of my district will have a closing time of 6 p.m. Now, you are causing here, I suggest to you, Representative Edgar, a very serious and fundamental problem. And I suggest that we should nonconcur in this rather than concur because it's going to pose a completely unworkable situation. And I suggest it well may be unconstitutional."

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

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

The full intention of this Bill, the debates that have taken place in the Senate and the House, are to ex...to give the franchise for all the voters of Illinois up to 7 o'clock. And I think 1566 House Bill came out of here by a vote of about 118 to 32. And it offered that privilege and that right. I think Representative Houlihan, and I think if there are some technical problems, I think they can be worked out. And I think the intention and the legislative debates that have taken place on the floor of the House and the floor of the Senate explain that this is for all the people of Illinois and not just the people in any given municipality under a Board of Elections or a Commission."

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

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we don't really go into the matter of intent as to the debate unless there's an issue as to the language of the statutes. When the language of the statute makes it...unclear, we've got a problem. And the only way we can resolve that problem is by going through a Conference Committee and clearing up that language. I have another problem. I really think that we should not extend the hour; 12 hours is plenty of time for someone who wants to vote.



in an election to do so. We don't go to the matter of paying more money for Judges of election. We don't go into the matter that the later that you have these polls open, the later that you're going to get the results. And the easier it is to have cases of fraud. The later you go into the hours of night, returning election results, Judges are tired, and you take that chance that you may not have an honest election. I remember my good friend and former Senator in Lake County, he had a theory about elections. He said, 'You know, we make so much to-do about the people that don't vote. And we try to make it easier for people to vote.' And he said, 'You know, the people that go out and vote, those are the people that are...are concerned about government, concerned about their taxes. And you'll probably get better government... and by making sure that people who really are concerned about their government do go out and vote. 12 hours is plenty of time; but nonetheless, even if you believe that you need that extra hour this statute is still not clear in the way it's going to be written so you would have to have a Conference Committee. And, therefore, I would urge nonconcurrency."

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

"The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', all opposed...the previous question has been moved. The Gentleman, Mr. Stanley, to close...oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Edgar."

Edgar: "Thank you. Let me just reiterate. I feel this legislation would open up the voting process to more people and I think that's ...there's been a lot of talk and it's a move in that direction. I think if there are any technical problems in this Bill it can be worked out. I'd ask for a favorable vote on the concurrence of Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 on House Bill 1706? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Giorgi, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Giorgi: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if the question by Representative Houlihan



is correct, the 10 cities in Illinois that have the Board of Election Commissioners are now being mandated to keep the polls open until 7 o'clock; but does he provide the necessary funds to pay the extra hour that the Judges and the Clerks and everybody else that's going to be involved in the electoral process, is he going to...is he providing the money in this Bill? Is there an accompanying Bill to provide the funds necessary? And why aren't those 10 cities that have a Board of Election Commissioner penalized?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Christian, Representative Tipsword, to explain his vote."

Tipsword: "Well, I would just like to say that I don't necessarily disagree with what they intend to do in this Bill; but I don't think it does what they intend. It does solely and only apply to those municipalities under Article VI of the Act. It doesn't apply to the entire State of Illinois, if that's what you really intend to do. And I think you're going to create a real hiatus in a lot of districts throughout this state; and I...I really think you would be very wise if you really wanted to do what Representative Edgar said that...take this out and try to work it out before you move it on Concurrence."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Lawrence, Representative Cunningham, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have been slow to recognize the merit of this exceptional Bill. The thought that ran through my mind was that the voters in the 54th District, Democrat and Republican alike, are astute enough to get to the polls early, by 5 o'clock. But when I recognized the terror that it strikes into the heart of the Chicago machine, I know in my own heart this is the right vote to make so that we can have maximum voter participation in Illinois. If you aren't voting green, you're missing an excellent opportunity to improve the number of people that go out to vote and you should do so even though it might inconvenience your constituents because up north they need it. We need a few more votes so this good Bill will pass."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Getty,



to explain his vote." Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I support the concept of extending the hours. I come from a suburban district where people have to travel all the way to almost the Will County border within my district. I think that's a good idea. Unfortunately, as this Bill is drafted this would not help to extend the hours in my district, it would extend the hours in the City of Chicago; but I don't run in the City of Chicago. I think we should have the benefit of this. I think the Sponsor is wrong, I think he should nonconcur; and I think that he should let us through a Conference Committee put it in so it's going to be right and we can all...through all of the State of Illinois have voting until 7. And I vote 'present!.'

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Ebbesen, to explain his vote."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the previous speaker just took the words right out of my mouth. I think that this should apply to every place in the State of Illinois; and I see no reason if we went into a Conference we could...this couldn't be worked out to add in where it applies to every voting area, every voting district. And as far as Republicans and Democrats, if you take statistics, according to all those people who are willing to admit their Democrats, there's by 10, 12, 14 percentage points more of those than there are Republicans, and I would think we could put 177 green lights up there, other than those who are absent for legitimate reasons after going into a Conference Committee. I think we all ought to be voting red, go into a Conference and do this thing right. Let's not have it apply to the places where it will do more harm than good."

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

Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I...I came into the chamber this evening fully intending to vote for concurrence of 1706. My district falls one-third in the suburbs of Chica...in the suburban



area, I'am from the suburbs, and two-thirds in the City of Chicago. And I, frankly, run pretty damn good in the suburbs; and I can't imagine why I would give Chicago voters a bigger opportunity to come and vote than I would suburban voters. I think this is a good Bill. I think everybody should have that extra hour; but I don't think we should have double standards. And so I'm going to have to vote 'present' along with Mike Getty and everybody's thinking, I think, on this thing."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Marion, Represent...Mr. Friedrich, to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, over 100 Members of this House today voted for the consolidation of Elections' Bill; and I can tell you it'll take at least an extra hour for the people to find out where they're going to go and the Judges... which ones they're going to vote in that consolidation election. You're going to need probably a couple hours instead of one hour. If you voted for that, you certainly should...should vote for this."

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

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, would like to see state-wide hours of 7 p.m. for voting. But people have not been able to...who support that view have not been able to tell me what's really wrong with this particular Bill. In fact, if I'm not mistaken, some of the people who now object to having this apply only to the City of Chicago were the very same people who not too long ago, when 1566 was up before us, objected to...to having the suburban areas included. So I think that we should go ahead and pass this out as it now stands and probably in the future we will have...be able to extend the hours beyond the city limits of Chicago. I certainly think that would be a good idea."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins, to explain his vote. He passes. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kozubowski, to explain his vote."

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



of the House."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me for a minute. There are no pictures allowed at this time. Thank you. Please proceed, Representative Kozubowski."

Kozubowski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to this motion to concur to Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 1706. I would suggest that the Gentleman who is sponsoring this motion that the Constitution of the State of Illinois requires uniformity in election laws. And certainly this provision is contained in Amendment 2. It would not go to 'whole' uniformity in the election laws of the State of Illinois. Therefore, I would urge my colleagues to vote 'no' on this measure."

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

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I live in an area where the first train, and the only train, in the morning leaves a few minutes after 6 o'clock. It doesn't get back into my area to 6 o'clock. So it...it exempts all these riders of this train from being able to vote. Being able to...extending this one hour will afford the privilege of all these train riders that ride the R.T.A., by the way, a chance to vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Robinson, to explain his vote. Robinson, please. Thank you."

Robinson: "Mr. Speaker, first of all, for those who have some problems with what they see as technical language in the Bill, I'm convinced that after this gets through the Governor, through interpretation, that it will apply state-wide. For those who say that there are problems with Judges getting tired late at night, most of the state is now on some form of machines. The Judge's job has been cut short. Part of that savings to the Judges should be turned back to the voters. One hour of the time that they save in counting ballots should go to the voters. And finally, let me say that I believe that the Chicago Democrats who are supporting this are once again the victims of their own mythology. The myth of those rich,



white-collar workers out in the suburbs who don't..."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to this Bill because of the clear inequity that it would create in areas such as Cook County. As has been explained previously, what we are creating here today is a situation where in one part of a legislative district, the polls will close at 6 o'clock; but in the other part of the legislative district they will close at 7 o'clock. And, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I wish it clearly understood and clearly recorded that I understand this Bill to apply only to Article VI of the Election Code and those municipalities under Article VI. That is my clear understanding of this Bill; and I suggest for the record that any amendatory veto by the Governor which would extend this Bill beyond Article VI of the Election Code would clearly be violative of the 1970 Constitution, which provided that the amendatory veto should apply to matters of form and not of substance. We have had court decisions previously which have clearly stated that a Governor cannot completely rewrite a Bill. And amendatory veto which would apply this Bill beyond Article VI, in my opinion, would be clearly a rewrite of the Bill; and, therefore, unconstitutional."

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

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would suggest that those people who are interested in extending the deadline for polling by one hour should pull this Bill back because this Bill is clearly inoperative for most of the state. It applies very clearly to only those municipalities that operate under Article VI. In Springfield, what that would mean is that 135 precincts in the City of Springfield would vote until 7 o'clock; and all of those people that are outside in Sangamon County and Montgomery County would have to close the polls at 6. And I think that it's very clear that that's what this Bill applies to and anybody who says



that it doesn't just doesn't know what they're talking about. And I would suggest a 'no' vote and any of those people who are truly interested in allowing people to vote one hour earlier, to pull this Bill back and make the Bill do what they say it does. There's no point in playing politics and trying for an image when it's clear that the Bill does not do that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow, to explain his vote."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as I sit here night after night I begin to wonder what's going on with the Republicans. About two nights ago they helped Chicago pass a cross-town Bill and tonight they're helping Chicago get another hour in order to vote the good Democrats up there and strengthen the organization in Chicago. I didn't know that was part of the negotiations they had up in Chicago; but evidently it is. The problem with this and the reason that I'm voting 'present' is that I think we do have a constitutional problem here. Article III of the Constitution says election laws have to be uniform in general. And I think this is a violation of that. I would like to see 7 p.m. closing time for the polls in my districts, some of the election Judges may be opposed to that and would favor 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. But I think it's important that we have people vote; but until this is changed to conform with our Constitution I'm going to be voting 'present'. Thank you."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the election laws referred to in the Constitution, the interpretation suggested by the prior Speaker, I submit it's not quite so because you have school district elections that are on different days and different hours. So you cannot really apply it that way. I think this is a very necessary Amendment. I think that people should not be disenfranchised just because they cannot get their buses or trains to go as fast as they're supposed to. And you know and I know there are a lot of people who would like to get to vote. I think it's only right to let the people have a chance



to vote until 7 p.m. That's the American thing to do, that's the Democratic thing to do; and I'm surprised there aren't more Democrat votes on the board."

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

Houlihan, D.: "At the appropriate time and if necessary, I'd ask for a verification of this Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, in order to save the time of the House, if a person is nothere, do us all a favor and if he's voting, vote him 'present' because all we're going to do is pass the time of every Member who is here on this verification. Kindly vote your own switch 'yes' or 'no'; and if the Gentleman has left, kindly record him as 'present'. Otherwise, we're going to be here all night. Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 93 'ayes', 56 'nays', 14 recorded as 'present'. The Gentleman has asked for a verification. A verification is in order. All unauthorized personnel kindly remove themselves off the floor. Would the Ladies and Gentlemen kindly be in your own seat? Doorkeepers, kindly enforce the rules of this House. Now, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Edgar."

Edgar: "Could we please poll the absentees before we go to..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, we may. The Clerk will please poll the absentees. But before we do that, would all the unauthorized personnel remove themselves from the chamber, please? Please proceed to poll the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "E. M. Barnes, Breslin, Hanahan, Huff, Johnson, Klosak, Kornowicz, Madison, Peggy Smith Martin, McAvoy, Reed, Satterthwaite, Schoeberlein; Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Proceed with the verification. Would kindly everyone be in your own seat and respond...please proceed with the verification."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson, Adams, Anderson..."

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

Houlihan, D.: "Mr. Speaker, could we request that the Members be in their seats and raise their hand when their name is called?"



Speaker Lechowicz: "Record the Lady as 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is he recorded?"

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

Mann: "Change me to 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Change him to 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin. I guess he's not there. Please proceed to..."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Hudson, Huskey, Jaffe, Dave Jones, Keats, Kempiners, Kent..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Klosak, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Klosak: "Mr. Speaker, I am not voted. May I be recorded as voting 'aye', please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "(Replies in foreign language)...kindly record him as 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Kucharski, Lauer, Leinenweber..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. You know there's an awful lot of movement going on in the floor. This is a verification, would you kindly be in your own seats and kindly respond by raising your hand when your name is called. And all unauthorized personnel remove yourselves from the chamber now. And we will wait until that is done. Proceed with the verification."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Leverenz, Levin, Luft, Macdonald, Mahar, Lynn Martin, Mautino, McAuliffe, McBroom, McCourt, Meyer, Molloy, Miller, Mugalian...Pechous, Peters, Pierce..."

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

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, it's finally dawned on my thick head that this doesn't apply to Lake County, where my constituents live; and, therefore, is not uniform and isn't in accordance with the Constitution of our state. And I would like to change from 'aye' to 'no' because it discriminates against the people of Lake County."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record him as 'no'. Mr. Luft, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Luft: "Change me to 'no', please."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly change Representative Luft to 'no'.

Representative Jaffé. Please proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Polk, Porter, Pullen, Reed, Reilly, Rigney, Robinson, Ryan, Sandquist, Schlickman, Schneider, Schuneman, Sevcik, Simms, Skinner, Stanley, Stearney, E. G. Steele, C. M. Stiehl, Stuffle, Sumner, Telcser..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Steczo, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Steczo. I can't hear you. Put on Murphy's ~~State~~ mike."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Steczko: "Vote me 'aye', please. And can I be verified I have a Conference Committee..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You want to vote 'aye'?"

Steczko: "Yes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You can't be verified. Do you want...yeah...any objections? Hearing none, you're verified."

Clerk O'Brien: "...Tipsword, Totten, Waddell, Wall, Walsh, Wikoff, Willer, Winchester and Wolf."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dan Houlihan. Any questions of the affirmative vote?"

Houlihan, D.: "What's the count, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the count, Jack? Kindly change Ted Leverenz from 'aye' to 'no'. You're starting off with 93 'ayes'."

Houlihan, D.: "Representative Holewinski?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's here."

Houlihan, D.: "Representative James Houlihan?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Jim Houlihan. I don't see him in the chair, is the Gentleman in the chamber? Take him off the record. Where? Where? Take him off the record. There he is. Put him back on. He's hiding behind Brummer."

Houlihan, D.: "Representative Christensen?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Christensen? Christensen in the chamber? Is Mr. Christensen in the chamber? Yeah, he's here."



Houlihan, D.: "Representative Conti?"

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

Houlihan, D.: "Representative Daniels?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Daniels? I don't see the Gentleman in his chair? Take him off the record. Oh, Elmer, what are you doing up there? Put Elmer back on, Elmer Conti back on. The Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Friedland, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

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

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

Friedland: "Vote that 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Record him as 'aye', please. The Gentleman from Logan, Mr. Lauer. You're recorded as 'aye'."

Lauer: "May I be verified now to go back to Conference Committee?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to be verified? Mr. Lauer, leave is granted. The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Lady recorded?"

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

Satterthwaite: "Please vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record her as 'aye'."

Houlihan, D.: "Mr. Speaker, did you remove Representative Daniels?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, I did."

Houlihan, D.: "Representative Mautino?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Representative Mautino? He's here."

Houlihan, D.: "Representative McGrew?"

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leave him on the record."

Houlihan, D.: "Representative Levin?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's here."

Houlihan, D.: "Did you remove Representative Mautino?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, he was right here, Dan. He's right here."

Houlihan, D.: "Oh, all right. Representative Stearney?"



Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Stearney, I don't see the Gentleman in the chair. Take him...is the Gentleman on the floor, Representative Stearney? Take him off the record. Flush him down, will you. Take him off the record. Stearney."

Houlihan, D.: "Representative Skinner?"

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

Houlihan, D.: "Representative Telcser here?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Telcser? Yeah, he's back there."

Houlihan, D.: "Representative Leverenz? Or was he changed before?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman changed from 'aye' to 'no'."

Houlihan, D.: "All right. Representative Hoffman?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Hoffman is in his chair.."

Houlihan, D.: "Representative Virginia Macdonald?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Macdonald is in her chair."

Houlihan, D.: "Representative Meyer here?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ted Meyer? He's back there."

Houlihan, D.: "Is Representative Bartulis here?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Bartulis? The Gentleman is in his chair."

Houlihan, D.: "Representative Polk?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Polk? The Gentleman is not in his chair. Is the Gentleman in the chamber, Mr. Polk? Take him off the record. The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Johnson: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is he recorded?"

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

Johnson: "Please vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record him as 'aye'."

Houlihan, D.: "Representative McAuliffe here?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded? He's here. He's here."

Houlihan, D.: "Representative Kucharski here?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kucharski? He's here."



Houlihan, D.: "Representative Sevcik here?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, the Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk, has returned to the chamber. Please put him back on the Roll Call."

Houlihan, D.: "Mr. Speaker, what is the count at this point?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "95."

Houlihan, D.: "Is Representative Wall here?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Wall? He's back in the chamber, yes; he's back in his seat."

Houlihan, D.: "Is Representative Lynn Martin here?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Martin? Yes, she's in the aisle."

Houlihan, D.: "Representative Catania in the chamber?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady is not in her chair? Mrs. Catania? There she is to your left."

Houlihan, D.: "Representative Breslin here?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I can't believe she's recorded."

Houlihan, D.: "Is Representative Boucek here?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, he is."

Houlihan, D.: "That completes the questions that I have of the affirmative vote, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Grundy, Mr. Christensen."

Christensen: "Mr. Speaker, will you change me from 'aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly change the Gentleman from Grundy, Mr. Christensen, from 'aye' to 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Pechous."

Pechous: "Mr. Speaker, please change my 'aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly change Mr. Pechous from 'aye' to 'no'."

The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I believe...how is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman was removed from the Roll Call."

Daniels: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record the Gentleman as 'aye'. Anyone else want to be recorded? Or unrecorded? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes. Representative Barnes. Kindly record him as 'no'."



Gene Barnes as 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Lou Caldwell. Kindly record him as 'no'. Representative Keats, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Keats: "Mr. Speaker, could you have the Clerk see how I'm recorded?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Keats: "Leave me there. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jaffe...the count, let's Jaffe go...The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce a former Member of the Senate and the great Democratic leader from Chicago, Senator Marshall Korshak."

Speaker Lechowicz: "May I also point out that he was also a Member of this House, and a very distinguished Member of the House and the Senate and the Sanitary District, a fine Committeeman of the 5th Ward, a true friend of all. Welcome to Springfield, Marshall Korshak, once again. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner. Skinner."

Skinner: "I'd advise everyone to stay away from me right now because I'm probably contagious with the flu, but I think I want to vote 'yes' here."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record the Gentleman as 'aye' and keep away from Skinner. The distinguished senior Member, Deacon Davis."

Davis, C.: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want you to meet and see the outstanding businessman...one of the outstanding businessmen of our nation, the editor and publisher of Ebony and Jet, the honorable John H. Johnson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Accompanied by my good friend, Joe 'Calmen'. Does anyone else wish to change their vote? Clerk, what's the count? Representative Griesheimer."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Griesheimer: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record him as 'aye'. What's the count?"

On this question there are 94 'ayes', 63 'nays', 10 recorded as



'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1706, and is, hereby, declared passed. Senate Bill 926. Representative Edgar. Senate Bill 926, Gentlemen. The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Edgar."

Edgar: "Do you want to take that out of the record, please?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "You want to take that out of the record?"

Edgar: "926, out of the record, yeah."

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

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote by which 1706 was... Amendment to 1706 was adopted or concurred with."

Speaker Lechowicz: "1706..."

Schlickman: "Amendment #2."

Speaker Lechowicz: "...The Gentleman has moved to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #2 was adopted, 1706. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keats, on the question."

Keats: "I move that that be... lay on the table."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that that lay on the table. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', all opposed... the 'nos' have it... the 'ayes' have it. The motion to reconsider is tabled. Senate Bill 1025, Mr. Brady. Senate Bill 1025, Mike. 10... there you go... 1025. At Dan Houlihan's desk."

Brady: Yes, Mr. Speaker, fellow Members, Senate Bill 1025, the Senate has moved to nonconcur, I move not to recede from those Amendments and ask for a Conference Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved that we do not recede from Amendments, 1 and 3 and asks for a Conference Committee. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', all those opposed... a Conference Committee will be requested. Senate Bill 1046. Senate Bill 1046, Representative Hart." Take it out of the record. What? Senate

Bill 868, E. G. Steele."

Steele: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move on Senate Bill 868, I move that we refuse to recede from the House Amendments 2 and 4 and move that a Conference Committee be appointed."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has...the Gentleman has moved that the House refuse to recede to the Amendments and ask for a Conference Committee to be appointed to Senate Bill 868. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', all those opposed...a Con...a Conference Committee will be requested. Jack, Jack...House Bill 1060."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move that the House accede to Senate Bill...Amendment #1 to House Bill 1060, which was centered in Knuppel's Amendment including the words in...which would say the words 'including the' to make sure that these in...prescribed institutions were the ones...the only ones limited."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What was your motion, Representative Meyer?"

Meyer: "To concur with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1060. On the question, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield to a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Totten: "I wonder if you could explain exactly what the Bill was as you introduced it and what the effects the Amendment has that we're concurring with?"

Meyer: "The Bill as introduced authorized certain institutions in the metropolitan area of Chicago, the Chicago Art Institute, the Adler Planetarium, the Field Museum of Natural History, the Museum of Science and Industry, Chicago Historical Society, the Oriental Institute at the University of Chicago, Lincoln Park, the Museum of Contemporary Art, the Chicago Academy of Science, John F. Shaddock Aquarium, and the Chicago Zoological Society, to be authorized to be in the Capital Development Authority. The Senate Amendment #1 added two words 'including the', which was Senator Knuppel's Amendment in the Executive Committee to make sure that this was specific that these were the only institutions to be included."

Totten: "Okay, then the effect of the Amendment is to allow the Capital Development Board, which does not have the permission now



to make improvements using bonds of the state at these institutions which they were not allowed to do before, is that correct?"

Meyer: "Yes, Sir."

Totten: "And only...and only these institutions."

Meyer: "Yes, Sir."

Totten: "Then this would expand the authority of the Capital Development Board or the scope in an area where they would be allowed to make improvements, is that correct?"

Meyer: "To these regional and cultural institutions, which have a total combined attendance of more than 11,000,000, which produced tourist income of more than \$2,000,000,000 to the State of Illinois. And in 1975 generate more than \$258,000,000 in local and tax state revenues to the State of Illinois."

Totten: "Well, I...just speak on the concurrence."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Totten: "You know, I...we seem to be, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, rather inclined to expand our Capital Development Board authority and we only saw last night the extend by which we're issuing bonds in this state. And although the specific institutions that are outlined in this Bill may be well worth it, I just don't think the state at this time can afford to expand that authority because these institutions will be in here rather quickly asking us to increase our authorization and issue bonds for various improvements, et cetera, that they would want to make at these institutions. I think it's unwise to do that at this time; and I don't think we should concur with this Amendment at all."

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

Meyer: "I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House do concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1060. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 107 'ayes', 15 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1060 and is, hereby, declared passed. The Lady from...



the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman, on House Bill 1384. Okay.

C House Bill 689, Mr. Brady; House Bill 818, Mr. Brummet; House Bill 1975, Mrs. Breslin. 1975."

Breslin: "Yes...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would ask that we concur in Senate Amendment #1. It corrects three spelling errors."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady moves that the House do concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1975. It's a technical correction Amendment. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, shall 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's 139 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2347...is, hereby, declared passed. House Bill 2361, Representative Hanahan. Take it out of the record. 2398, Jim Houlihan. Take it out of the record. 926, Mr. Edgar. Edgar? 926? Out of the record. House Bill 1429, Mr. Madigan. Out of the record. Where? Do you want to go on your nonconcurrency? Doug? 937? House Bill 1, Representative Kosinski. Anyone have any one of their Bills they want to be called? House Bill 1, Representative Kosinski. House Bill 1? Does anyone have a Bill on the Calendar that they want to have called? No, he does not. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan, on House Bill 2307."

Ryan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with the Senate Amendment #1, which provides that the ceiling on municipal revenue bonds shall be 9 percent. It presently is at 8. And I would move to concur in Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2307. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 127 'aye' and 7 'no'; and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill



2307. Clerk, are there any Bills that are concurrences or non-concurrences that we didn't call? Messages from the Senate."

Clerk Hall: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following Preamble and Joint Resolution in the adoption of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit, Senate Joint Resolution 38. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has adopted the following Preamble and Joint Resolution in the adoption of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit, Senate Joint Resolution 51. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendment #1 to a Bill of the following title to wit, House Bill 526; and I'm further directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate requests a first Conference Committee. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendment #1 to a Bill for the following title to wit; House Bill 840, and I'm further directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has requested a first Conference Committee. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendment #1 to a Bill for the following title to wit, House Bill 841; and I'm further directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate requests a first Conference Committee. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendment 1 to a Bill of the following title to wit, House Bill 845; and I'm further directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate requests a first Conference Committee. A message from the Senate by Mr.



Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendment #2 of a Bill of the following title to wit, House Bill 908; and I'm further directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate requests a first Conference Committee. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendment #1 to a Bill of the following title to wit... and House Bill 1109; and I'm further directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate requests a first Conference Committee. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendment to a Bill of the following title, House Bills 1216, 12...1829; and I'm further directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate requests a first Conference Committee. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur in the House in the adoption of their Amendment of a Bill of the following title, to wit, Senate Bill 322; action taken by the Senate June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment to a Bill of the following title to wit, Senate Bill 116; action taken by the Senate June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the adoption of the following Preamble and Joint Resolution to wit, House Joint Resolution 17, concurred in the by the Senate June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Speaker ...by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendments #1 and 2 to a Bill of the following title to



wit, House Bill 341; and I'm further directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate requests a first Conference Committee: Action taken by the Senate June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendments #1, 2, and 4 to a Bill of the following title to wit, House Bill 973; and I'm further directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate requests a first Conference Committee. Action taken by the Senate June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendments #2, 3, 4 and 5 to a Bill of the following title to wit, House Bill 1033; and I'm further directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate requests a first Conference Committee. Action taken by the Senate June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendment #1 to a Bill of the following title to wit, House Bill 659; and I'm further directed to inform the House that the Senate has...the Senate requests a first Conference Committee. Action taken by the Senate June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendment #1 to a Bill of the following title to wit, House Bill 1062; and I'm further directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate requests a first Conference..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan, for what purpose do you arise?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, please remove all unauthorized persons off of the floor?"

Speaker Redmond: "All unauthorized persons leave the floor."

Clerk Hall: "...action taken by the Senate June 29, 1977..."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann, for what purpose do you arise?"

Mann: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, for all the Members of Judiciary. I we will have a brief meeting at 8:30 in Room 31."

Clerk Hall: "...action taken by the Senate June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendment #1 to a Bill of the following title to wit, House Bill 1399; and I'm further directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate requests a first Conference Committee. Action taken by the Senate June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendments #1 and 3 to a Bill of the following title to wit, House Bill 1412; and I'm further directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate requests a first Conference Committee. Action taken by the Senate June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendment #1 to a Bill of the following title to wit, House Bill 1428; and I'm further directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate requests a first Conference Committee. Action taken by the Senate June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendment #1 to a Bill of the following title, House Bill 1762; and I'm further directed by the Senate to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate requests a first Conference Committee. Action taken by the Senate June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendment to a Bill of the following title to wit, House Bill 1806; and I'm further directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate requests a first Conference Committee. Action taken by the Senate



June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendment #1 to a Bill of the following title to wit, House Bill 2069, a Bill for...and I'm also directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate requests a first Conference Committee. Action taken by the Senate June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendment #1 to a Bill of the following title to wit, House Bill 2306; and I'm further directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate requests a first Conference Committee. Action taken by the Senate June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendment #2 of a Bill of the following title to wit, House Bill 741; and I'm further directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate requests a first Conference Committee. Action taken by the Senate June 29, 1977. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to recede from their Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 to a Bill of the following title to wit, House Bill 1736; and I'm further directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate requests a first Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan. Representative Mann, was that next Saturday?"

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, it's tomorrow morning at 8:30 in Bl."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, does the Clerk require any time? I move that we adjourn until 9:30 tomorrow morning."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion that we adjourn until 9:30 tomorrow morning. Those in favor say 'aye', ...wait a minute, wait a minute, wait a minute...Representative



Stanley."

Stanley: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, just something that has to be done tonight; but I filed a motion to reconsider the vote by which the House concurred on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 992, which is the Liquor Control Commission. And in doing that the problem we have is severe cuts in travel, makes it impossible to maintain the same level of inspection. And I'm asking for that motion to make it a nonconcurrent motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I'm aware of the problem, and I intend to support the Gentleman's motion; but we are adjourned."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk advises me that..."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, did you...did you put the Adjournment Resolution the Adjournment Motion?"

Speaker Redmond: "...Yes, I did."

Madigan: "You did."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, anyway the Clerk advises me that that Bill has gone to the Senate. Representative Madigan says that he is aware of the problem; that he will work with you on it. The question's on the motion to adjourn until 9:30 tomorrow morning. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'; the 'ayes' have it...Representative Jones...we have now adjourned...Representative Jones."

Jones, D.: "Be recorded 'aye' on 1975."

Speaker Redmond: "You'd better do that in the morning. We're adjourned now."

Jones, D.: "All right."

Speaker Redmond: "All..."



<u>1.</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	1		Doorkeeper	
	1		Speaker Redmond	House to order
	1		Clerk O'Brien	Prayer
	1		Speaker Redmond	
	1		Leinenweber	Order of baseball scores
	1		Speaker Redmond	
	1		Byers	
	2		Speaker Redmond	
	2		Schlickman	
	2		Speaker Redmond	
	2	11:32	Friedrich	
	2		Speaker Redmond	
	2		Hanahan	
	3		Chapman	
	3		Speaker Redmond	
	3	11:33	Giorgi	
	3		Speaker Redmond	
	3		Cunningham	
	3		Speaker Redmond	
	3		Stanley	
	3		Speaker Redmond	
	3		Hudson	
	3		Speaker Redmond	
	3		Madigan	Excused absence
	4		Speaker Redmond	
	4		Deaver	"
	4		Speaker Redmond	



2.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	4		Matijeovich	
	4		Speaker Redmond	
	4		McLendon	HB 1040-SA #1 & 2
	4		Speaker Redmond	
	5		Hanahan	HB 1406-SA #1
	5		Speaker Redmond	
	5		Deavers)	
	6		Hanahan)	
	6		Speaker Redmond	
	6		Bowman	HB-1508-SA #1
	6		Houlihan, D	Out of record
	6	11:42	Speaker Redmond	
	6		Deavers	HB 1593-SA 1-5
	7		Speaker Redmond	
	7		Houlihan, D.)	
	7		Deavers)	
	7		Speaker Redmond	
	8		Schlickman)	
	8		Deavers)	Yield to Mautino
	8		Speaker Redmond	
	8		Adams	Explains
	8		Speaker Redmond	
	8		Deavers	
	8		Speaker Redmond	
	9		Tipsword	
	9		Speaker Redmond	
	9		Byers	



3.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	9		Speaker Redmond	
	9		Adams	
	9		Speaker Redmond	
	9		Darrow	
	10		Speaker Redmond	
	10		Deavers	
	10		Speaker Redmond	
	10		Schlickman	
	10		Speaker Redmond	
	10		Leinenweber	
	11		Deavers	
	11		Speaker Redmond	
	11		Byers)	
	11)	
	11		Deavers)	
	11		Speaker Redmond	
	11		Barnes, E.	
	11		Speaker Redmond	
	11		Ebbesen	
	11		Speaker Redmond	
	12		Mautino	
	12		Speaker Redmond	HB 1593-SA #3 & House concurs
	12		Jones, J. D.	HB 1595
	12		Speaker Redmond	
	12		Schlickman)	
	12)	
	12	10:59	Jones)	
	13		Speaker Redmond	House concurs
	13		Kempiners	HB 1599-SA #1,2,3,4



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

4.			
<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
13		Speaker Redmond	
14		Hart)	
14)	
14		Kempiners)	
14		Speaker Redmond	
15		Tipsword	
15		Speaker Redmond	
16		Bowman)	
16)	
16		Kempiners)	
17		Darrow	
17	12:07	Kempiners	
17		Speaker Redmond	
18		Robinson	
18		Speaker Redmond	
18		Kane)	
19,20,21)	
19,20,21		Kempiners)	
21		Speaker Redmond	
21		McClain)	
21)	
21		Kempiners)	
21		Speaker Redmond	
21		Rigney	
21		Speaker Redmond	
22,23,24		Dunn, J.	
24		Lechowicz in the Chair	
24		Hoffman	Moves previous question
24		Speaker Lechowicz	
25		Kempiners	To close Amendment #1
25		Speaker Lechowicz	



5.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	25		Byers	Explains vote
	25		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs Amendment #1
	26		Kempiners	Leave to take Am 2,3,4
	26		Speaker Redmond	
	26		Kelly	Introduces Rayson
	26		Speaker Lechowicz	
	26		Lucco	
	26		Speaker Lechowicz	
	26	12:30	Kempiners	SA #2
	26		Speaker Lechowicz	
	27		Houlihan, J.	
	27		Speaker Lechowicz	
	27		Kempiners	To close
	27		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs
	27		Schuneman	'aye' on Am #4 to 1593
	28		Speaker Lechowicz	
	28		Kempiners	Renews request
	28		Speaker Lechowicz	
	28		Kempiners	Explains SA #3
	28		Speaker Lechowicz	AM #3 House concurs
	28		Kempiners	Explains SA #4
	28		Speaker Lechowicz	
	29		Satterthwaite	Opposes Amendment #4
	29		Speaker Lechowicz	
	29		McClain	Opposes Amendment #4
	29		Speaker Lechowicz	
	30		Dunn	Opposes Amendment #4



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

6.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
30	12:37	Speaker Lechowicz	
31		Tipsword	Opposes SA #4
31	12:38	Speaker Lechowicz	
31		Ebbesen	Supports SA #4
31		Speaker Lechowicz	
31		Kane)	
32,33) Kempiners)	
33		Speaker Lechowicz	
34		Barnes	Supports
34		Speaker Lechowicz	
34		Houlihan, J.	Point of personal privilege
34		Speaker Lechowicz	
34		Kempiners	Point of order
34		Speaker Lechowicz	
35		Houlihan, J.	Responds
35		Speaker Lechowicz	
35		Byers	
35		Speaker Lechowicz	
36		Jacobs	Oppose Amendment #4
36		Speaker Lechowicz	
36		Kempiners	To close
36		Speaker Lechowicz	
36		Dunn, J.	Possible verification
36		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs
36		Dunn, J.	Withdraw request
37		Speaker Lechowicz	
37		McClain	Point of personal privilege



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
7.			
37		Speaker Lechowicz	
37	12:56	Bowman	
37		Speaker Lechowicz	
37		Bowman	HB 1508-SA #4
37		Speaker Lechowicz	House nonconcur
38		Brummer	HB 1958-Amendment #4
38		Speaker Lechowicz	
38		Hoffman	
38		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs
38		Younge	House 1997-Am #1
39		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs
39		Porter	HB 2000-SA #1
39		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs
39		Hoffman	HB 2032-SA 1 & 2
39		Speaker Lechowicz	
39		Tipsword)	
39)	
39		Hoffman)	
40		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs #2
40		"	House does not concur #1
41		Barnes, E. M.	Inquiry of chair
41		Speaker Lechowicz	
41		Tipsword	
41		Speaker Lechowicz	
42		McBloom	HB 1052-SA 1,2,3,4
42	1:10	Speaker Lechowicz	
42		Mudd)	
42)	
42		McBroom)	



8.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	42		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs
	43		Taylor	HB 2130-SA #1
	43		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs
	43		Daniels	HB 2161-SA #2
	43		Speaker Lechowicz	
	43		Waddell	
	43		Speaker Lechowicz	
	43		Daniels	
	43		Speaker Lechowicz	
	43		Barnes)	
)	
	43		Daniels)	
	44		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs
	44		Antonovych	HB 2069-SA #1
	44		Speaker Lechowicz	House nonconcurs
	44		Lauer	HB 2173-Am #1,2,3
	44		Speaker Lechowicz	
	44		Levin	
	45		Schlickman)	
)	
	45		Speaker Lechowicz)	
	46	1:17	Houlihan, D.)	
)	
	46		Schlickman)	
	46		Speaker Lechowicz	
	46		Bowman)	
)	
	46		Houlihan, D.)	
	46		Speaker Lechowicz	
	47		Cunningham)	
)	
	47		Houlihan, D.)	



9.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	47		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 2173-SA 1,2,3, House concurs
	47		Capparelli	HB 2229-Am #2
	48		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs
	48		Sandquist	HB 2243-SA #2
	48		Speaker Lechowicz	
	48		Stearney)	
	49		Sandquist.)	
	49		Speaker Lechowicz	
	49		Geo-Karis	
	50		Speaker Lechowicz	
	50		SAndquist	Proceeds
	50		Speaker Lechowicz	
	50		Epron	Supports
	50		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs #2-2243
	51		Porter	Record 'no' on 2243
	51		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 2126
	51		Houlihan, D.	Moves to concur SA 1-2126
	51		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs SA 1-2126
	51		Abramson	Moves House concur #2-2392
	52		Speaker Lechowicz	Hcuse concurs SA 2-2392. HR 384
	52		Richmond	Suspend Rule 41-a
	52		Speaker Lechowicz	
	52		Schlickman	Question
	52		Speaker Lechowicz	
	52		Richmond	
	52		Speaker Lechowicz	



10.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	52		Schlickman)	Objections & Questions
	53		Richmond)	
	53		Speaker Lechowicz)	
	53		Schlickman)	
	53		Richmond)	
	53		Speaker Lechowicz	
	54		Ebbesen	
	54		Speaker Lechowicz	
	54		Wikoff	Opposes
	54		Speaker Lechowicz	
	54		McClain	
	54		Wikoff	
	54		Speaker Lechowicz	
	55		Hart	
	55		Speaker Lechowicz	
	55		Walsh	Requests verification
	55		Speaker Lechowicz	
	55		Dunn, R.	
	55		Speaker Lechowicz	
	55		Katz	Opposes
	55		Speaker Lechowicz	
	56		Birchler	Supports
	56		Speaker Lechowicz	
	56		Ewell	Supports
	56		Speaker Lechowicz	Rule suspended
	56		McGrew	Walsh's motion dilatory
	56		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
11.			
56		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
56		Speaker Lechowicz	
57		Bradley	Announcement
57		Speaker Lechowicz	
57		Clerk O'Brien	Continues poll of absentees
57		Speaker Lechowicz	
57		Davis, C.	'aye'
57		Speaker Lechowicz	
57		Clerk O'Brien	Continues poll
57		Speaker Lechowicz	
57		Clerk O'Brien	Absentees
57		Speaker Lechowicz	
57		Giorgi	Regular to be verified
57		Speaker Lechowicz	Okay
58		Clerk O'Brien	Continue absentees
58		Speaker Lechowicz	
58		Barnes, E.	Regular to be verified
58		Speaker Lechowicz	Okay
58	1:50	Clerk O'Brien	Verifies Roll Call
58		Speaker Lechowicz	
58		Hoxsey	Change to 'aye'
58		Speaker Lechowicz	
58		Macdonald	'aye'
58		Speaker Lechowicz	
58		Willer	'no'
58		Speaker Lechowicz)	
)	
59		Walsh)	Question Affirmative Roll



<u>12.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
62		Speaker Lechowicz	Motion to suspend carries
62		Matijeovich	
62		Speaker Lechowicz	
63		Richmond	
63		Speaker Lechowicz	
63		Darrow	
63		Speaker Lechowicz	
64		Schlickman	
64		Speaker Lechowicz	
64		Friedrich	
64		Speaker Lechowicz	
65		Ewell	
65		Speaker Lechowicz	
65		Wikoff	
65		Speaker Lechowicz	
65		Geo-Karis	
65		Speaker Lechowicz	
66		Ebbesen	
66		Speaker Lechowicz	
66		Satterthwaite	
66		Speaker Lechowicz	Resolution 384 adopted
67		Bradley	Announcement
67		Speaker Lechowicz	
67		Clerk O'Brien	Messages from Senate
67		Speaker Lechowicz	
67		Keats	Inquiry
68		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 281



13. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
69		Speaker Lechowicz	
69		Hart	
69		Speaker Lechowicz	
69		Macdonald	Asks division of Am 1 & 2
69		Hart	Recede from Amendment #1
69		Speaker Lechowicz	
70		Bowman	
70		Speaker Lechowicz	
70		Hart	Amendment #2
70		Speaker Lechowicz	
71		Macdonald	
72		Speaker Lechowicz	
72		Friedrich	
72		Speaker Lechowicz	
72		Ewing)	
72)	
73		Macdonald)	
73		Speaker Lechowicz	
73		Anderson)	
74)	
74		Macdonald)	
74		Speaker Lechowicz	
74		Ebbesen	Moves previous question
74		Speaker Lechowicz	
75	2:30	Hart	To close
75		Speaker Lechowicz	
75		Marovitz	
75		Speaker Lechowicz	
76		Hoffman	



14.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
76		Speaker Lechowicz	
76		Tipsword	
76		Speaker Lechowicz	
76		Griesheimer	Explains vote
77		Speaker Lechowicz	
77		Getty	
77		Speaker Lechowicz	
77		Davis, J.	
77		Speaker Lechowicz	
78		Mudd	
78		Speaker Lechowicz	
78		Wolf	Explains vote
78		Speaker Lechowicz	
78		Flinn	"
79		Speaker Lechowicz	
79		Dyer	"
79		Stuffle	
79		Speaker Lechowicz	
80		Skinner	
80		Speaker Lechowicz	
80	2:42	Pierce	
80		Speaker Lechowicz	
81		Macdonald	
81		Speaker Lechowicz	
81		Bowman	
81		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
15.			
82		Cunningham	
82		Speaker Lechowicz	
82		Ewell	
82		Speaker Lechowicz	
82		Anderson	
82		Speaker Lechowicz	
83		Schisler	
83		Speaker Lechowicz	
83		Johnson	
83		Speaker Lechowicz	
83		Macdonald	Possible verification
83		Speaker Lechowicz	
83		Friedrich	
83		Speaker Lechowicz	
84		Dunn, R.	
84		Speaker Lechowicz	
84		Hart	
84		Speaker Lechowicz	Poll absentees
84		Clerk O'Brien	
85		Speaker Lechowicz	Change to 'aye'. Verification.
85		Houlihan, D.	Introduction
85		Speaker Lechowicz	
85		Houlihan, D.	Leave to be verified
85		Speaker Lechowicz	
85		Brummer	"
85		Speaker Lechowicz	
85		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
16.			
85		Macdonald	
85		Hanahan	Change to 'aye'
86		Speaker Bradley	
86		Rigney	Leave to be verified
87		Speaker Bradley)	
)	
87		Clerk O'Brien)	
87		McBroom	Change to 'aye'
88		Speaker Bradley)	
)	
89,90		Macdonald)	Questions of Affirmative Roll
90		Speaker Bradley	
90		Mulcahey	'aye'
90		Speaker Bradley	
90		Simms	Change to 'no'
90		Speaker Bradley	89 'ayes'. Motion to reconsider lies on table.
90		Schlickman	
90		Speaker Bradley	House recedes from Am #2-SB 281
90	3:15	Bowman	
91		Speaker Bradley	
91		Robinson	
91		Speaker Bradley	Hart moves to reconsider. Schisler lie on table.
91		Clerk O'Brien	Message from Senate
91		Speaker Bradley	
91		Clerk O'Brien	SB 36-3rd Reading
92		Winchester	
92		Speaker Bradley	Passed
92		Clerk O'Brien	SB-496-3rd-Reading



17.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
92		Speaker Bradley	
92		Simms	HB 1594-Am 1-8
93		Speaker Bradley	House nonconcur
93		Brady	
93	3:23	Telcser	SB 496-3rd Reading
93		Speaker Bradley	Passed
93		Clerk O'Brien	SB 501-3rd Reading
93		Speaker Bradley	
93		Tipsword	Recorded 'aye' on 496
93		Speaker Bradley	
93		Dunn, R.	SB 501
94		Speaker Bradley	Passed
94		Clerk O'Brien	SB 718-3rd Reading
94		Speaker Bradley	
94		Dawson	
94		Speaker Bradley	
94		Schlickman)	
)	
96,96		Dawson)	
96		Speaker Bradley	
97	3:27	Lechowicz	Supports SB 718
97		Speaker Bradley	
98		Collins	Supports SB 718
98		Speaker Bradley	
99		Tipsword	Supports SB 718
99		Speaker Bradley	
99		Meyer	Supports SB 718
100		Speaker Bradley	



<u>18.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
100		Van Duyne	Moves previous question
100		Speaker Bradley	
100		Dawson	To close
100	3:34	Speaker Bradley	
100		Epton	Explains vote
100		Speaker Bradley	
100		Mulcahey	Explains vote
101		Speaker Bradley	SB 718 passed
101		Clerk O'Brien	SB 752
101		Speaker Bradley	
101		Lechowicz	Back to 2nd
101		Speaker Bradley	
101		O'Daniel	Calendar in error
101		Speaker Bradley	
101		Lechowicz	
101		Speaker Bradley	
102		Walsh	Objects to Lechowicz's motion
102	3:38	Speaker Bradley	
102		Mudd)	Point of order
)	
102		Walsh)	
102		Speaker Bradley	
102		McClain	Point of order
102		Speaker Bradley	
103		Walsh)	Continues
)	
103		Speaker Bradley)	
104		Lechowicz	Renews motion
104		Speaker Bradley	Motion prevails. 2nd



19.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
104		Lechowicz	
104		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Am 45 to SB 752
104		Kozubowski	
104		Speaker Bradley	Am #45 adopted
104		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #46
104		Speaker Bradley	
105		Giglio	Expl. Amendment #46
105		Speaker Bradley	Am #46 adopted. 3rd Reading
105	3:45	Schlickman	
105		Speaker Bradley	
105		Yourell	HB 1468-Interim Study
105		Speaker Bradley	
106		Tuerk	Parliamentary Inquiry
106		Speaker Bradley	
106		Yourell	
106		Tuerk)	
106		Speaker Bradley)	
107		Speaker Bradley	Motion carries
107	3:55	Walsh	Motion
107		Speaker Bradley	
107		Wikoff	Vote on SB 496
107		Speaker Bradley	
108		Winchester	'aye' on 501
108		Speaker Bradley	
108		Kelly	HB 17-SA #1
108		Speaker Bradley	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
20.			
108		Leinenweber.)	
108		Kelly)	
108		Darrow)	
109		Kelly)	
109		Speaker Bradley	
109		Greiman	Explains vote
109		Speaker Bradley	House concurs
109		Williams	
110		Speaker Bradley	
110		Pierce	HB 113-Am #3
110		Speaker Bradley	House concurs
111		Luft	HB 186-SA #1
111		Speaker Bradley	
111	4:07	Speaker Bradley	House concurs
111		Winchester	HB 1033-SA 2,3,4,5
111		Speaker Bradley3	House nonconcur
112		McMaster	HB-206
112		Speaker Bradley	Out of record
112		Davis, J.	HB 245-SA #1
112		Speaker Bradley	House nonconcur
112		Cunningham	HB 215-SA #2
113		Speaker Bradley	House concurs
113		Taylor	HB 341-SA #1, 2
113		Speaker Bradley	House nonconcur
113		McMaster	HB 206-SA #2
113		Speaker Bradley	House concurs
114		Stearney	HB 44-SA #3



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
21.			
114		Speaker Bradley	Out of record
114		Holewinski	HB 413-SA #1
115		Speaker Bradley	House concurs
115		Speaker in the Chair	
115		Stearney	HB 375-SA #3
115		Speaker Redmond	
115		McClain)	
)	
115		Stearney)	
116		Speaker Redmond	House concurs
116		Bluthardt)	HB 428-SA #1
)	
116	4:22	Speaker Redmond)	House concurs SA #2-HB 428
116		Darrow	HB 611-SA #2
116		Speaker Redmond	
117		Daniels)	
)	
118		Darrow)	
118		Speaker Redmond	Out of record
118		Brummet	HB-818-SA-#1
118		Speaker Redmond	
118		Sandquist	HB-966-SA-#1
118		Speaker Redmond	
118		Keats	Separate
118		Speaker Redmond	
119		Lechowicz)	
)	
119		Sandquist,)	
119		Speaker Redmond	Out of record
119		Bennett	HB 970-SA #1
119		Speaker Redmond	



TRANSCRIPTION INDEX

DATE: 6-29-77

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
22.			
120,-	121	Peters	HB 1005-SA #1,2,3,4,6,7,8
121		Speaker Redmond	
121		Barnes, E.	
121		Speaker Redmond	House concurs
121		Bradley	Introduces Speaker's family
121		Speaker Redmond	
121		Abramson	
121		Mulcahey	Leave, etc.
121	4:48	Speaker Redmond	
122		Gaines	HB 973-SA #1
122		Speaker Redmond	House nonconcurs
123		Geo-Karis	HB 1039-SA #1
123		Speaker Redmond	House concurs
123		Hudson	
123		Speaker Redmond	
123		Sumner	
123		Speaker Redmond	
123		Kent	HB 1044-SA #2
123		Speaker Redmond	
124		Johnson)	
124)	
124		Kent)	
124)	
124		Speaker Redmond	
124		Tipword	
124		Speaker Redmond	
124		Johnson)	
124)	
124		Kent)	
124)	
124		Speaker Redmond	House concurs SA 2,3,4,5,6,7-1044



23.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	124		Darrow	HB 611-SA 2,3
	125		Speaker Redmond	House nonconcur SA 2,3-611
	125		Walsh	Nonconcur SA 4 -HB-2402
	125		Speaker Redmond	
	125		Robinson	Question
	125		Walsh	Response
	125		Speaker Redmond	House nonconcur
	125		Mahar	House concur SA #1-HB 1064
	125		Speaker Redmond	Nonconcur. 1081
	125		Adams	Concur SA #1 to 1081
	126		Speaker Redmond	
	126		Beatty)	
)	
	126		Adams)	
	126		Speaker Redmond	
	126		Johnson)	
)	
	127		Adams)	
	127		Speaker Redmond	
	127		Beatty)	
)	
	127		Adams)	
	127		Speaker Redmond	
	127		Madigan	
	127		Speaker Redmond)	1081 out of record
)	
	127		Adams)	
	127		Speaker Redmond	1431
	128		O'Brien	1431 concur SA #1 to 1431
	128		Speaker Redmond	



24.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	128		Mulcahey)	
	128		O'Brien)	
	129		Peters	Supports
	129		Speaker Redmond	House concurs SA #1 to 1431. 1212
	129		Matijevich	Concur SA #1 to 1212
	129		Speaker Redmond	House concurs SA #1 to 1212
	129		Von Boeckman	Concur SA #1,2 to 1255
	130		Speaker Redmond	House concurs 1,2 to 1255.
	130		Polk	Nonconcur SA's to 1736
	130		Speaker Redmond	
	130		Polk	
	130		Speaker Redmond	Nonconcur SA 1,2,3,4,5,6-1736
	130		Levin	Concur SA #1 to 1604
	131		Speaker Redmond	House concurs SA 1 to 1604.
	131		Chapman	No 1384
	131		Speaker Redmond	Out of record. 417
	131		McGrew	Concur SA #1 to 417.
	131		Speaker Redmond	
	131		Leinenweber	Opposes
	132		Speaker Redmond	
	132		McGrew	To close
	132		Speaker Redmond	House concurs SA 1 to 1636
	132		Keats)	Parliamentary Inquiry
	132		Speaker Redmond)	1636
	132		DiPrima	Concur SA #1 to 1636
	133		Speaker Redmond	



25. Page	Time	Speaker	Information
133		Speaker Redmond	
133		Schlickman)	Order of sports
133		Speaker Redmond)	1768
133		Jaffe	Concur SA #1 to 1768
133		Speaker Redmond	
133		Leinenweber)	
134		Jaffe)	
134		Speaker Redmond	
135		Schneider	Opposes
135		Speaker Redmond	
135		Jaffe	
135		Speaker Redmond	
135		Deuster	Supports
136		Speaker Redmond	Motion fails
136		Jaffe	
136		Speaker Redmond	House concurs
136		Jaffe	HB 1769
136		Speaker Redmond	House nonconcur
136		Macdonald	HB 1071-SA #1
136	5:20	Speaker Redmond	House nonconcur
137		Sandquist	HB 966-SA #1
137		Speaker Redmond	
137		Stuffle	
137		Sandquist	
137		Speaker Redmond	House concurs
137		Sandquist	SA #2 and 3
137		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
26.			
138		McClain)	
)	
138		Sandquist)	
)	
138		Speaker Redmond)	
138		Van Duyne)	
)	
138		Sandquist)	
138		Speaker Redmond	House concurs SA 2 and 3
138		Hart	
139		Speaker Redmond.	House concurs
139		Skinner)	HB 44-SA #1,2,3
)	
139		Speaker Redmond)	House nonconcurs
139		Speaker Redmond	
139	5:28	Collins	
140		Yourell	HB 1978-SA #1
140		Speaker Redmond	
140		Conti	
140		Speaker Redmond	
140		Collins	
140		Speaker Redmond	
140		Friedrichs	Explains vote
141		Speaker Redmond	
141		Bluthardt	
141		Speaker Redmond	
141		Friedrich)	Possible verification
)	
141		Speaker Redmond)	
142		Houlihan, J.	'yes' vote
142		Speaker Redmond	
142		Pierce	Verified



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
27.			
142		Speaker Redmond	
142		Mann	Same request
142		Speaker Redmond	
142		Johnson	
142		Speaker Redmond	
142		Bennett	
142		Mulcahey	'no' to 'aye'
142		Speaker Redmond	
142		Waddell	'no' to 'aye'
142		Speaker Redmond	
142	6:38	Friedrich	Withdraws
142		Speaker Redmond	House concurs
143		Capparelli	HB 131-SA #1
143		Speaker Redmond	House concurs
143		Abramson	HB 1026-SA #3
143		Speaker Redmond	House concurs
143		Johnson)	
143		Speaker Redmond)	
143		Jacobs	HB 2244-SA #1
143		Speaker Redmond	
144		Pullen	
144		Speaker Redmond	
144		Johnson	
144		Speaker Redmond	House concurs
144		Hart	HB 2322-SA #1 & 2
145		Speaker Redmond	



<u>28.</u> <u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
145		Ebbesen)	Repeat
145)	
145		Hart)	
145		Speaker Redmond	
145		Ebbesen	
145		Hart	
146		Speaker Redmond	House concurs
146		McBroom	HB 2379-SA
146		Speaker Redmond	
146		Geo-Karis	
146		Speaker Redmond	House concurs 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,9,10
147		Kane)	HB 2397-SA #1
147)	
147		Peters)	
147		Speaker Redmond	House concurs
147		Klosak	HB 2412-SA
147		Speaker Redmond	House concurs
147		Giglio	SB 29-HA #5
148		Speaker Redmond	
148		Totten)	
148)	
148	5:52	Giglio)	
148		Speaker Redmond	House refuses to recede
149		Davis, J.	SB 880-HA #1
149		Speaker Redmond	House refuses to recede
149		McMaster	HB 1098-SA #1
149		Speaker Redmond	House nonconcur
149		Houlihan	SB 596-HA #1
149		Speaker Redmond	House refuses to recede
150		Kosinski	HB 1-SA #2-out-of-record



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

29.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
151		Speaker Redmond	
151		Yourell	HB 14-SA 1,2,3
151		Speaker Redmond	
151		Edgar	
152		Speaker Redmond	House concurs
152		Kane	
152		Speaker Redmond	
152		Catania	SB 881-HA #1
152		Speaker Redmond	
152		Wolf	
152		Speaker Redmond	House refuses to recede
152		Geo-Karis	
153		Speaker Redmond	
153		Capparelli	SB 1023-HA #3
153		Speaker Redmond	House refuses to recede
153		Laurino	SB 964-HA #1,2,3
153		Speaker Redmond	House refuses to recede
153		Adams)	
153		Speaker Redmond)	HB 1081-SA #1
154		Johnson	
154		Speaker Redmond	
155		Hart	
155		Speaker Redmond	
155		Adams	Move to nonconcur
155		Speaker Redmond	House nonconcur
155	6:13	Giorgi	House recess
155		Speaker Redmond	



30.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
156		Clerk O'Brien	Messages from Senate
156		Speaker Redmond	
157		Lucco	Matter of information
157		Speaker Redmond	
157		DiPrima	
157		Speaker Redmond	
157		Geo-Karis)	
157		Speaker Redmond)	
157		Lucco	Refuse recede SB 1142
157		Speaker Redmond	
158		Satterthwaite	Question
158		Speaker Redmond	
158		Lucco	Explains Amendment
158		Speaker Redmond	House refuses to recede Am 1,5, 7 to SB 1142. 1039
158		Garmisa)	
158		Speaker Redmond)	
159		Speaker Redmond)	
159		Marovitz)	
159		Speaker Redmond	
159		Mugalian	Personal privilege
159		Speaker Redmond	
159		Marovitz	Moves House concur SA #1-1012
159		Speaker Redmond	
159		Schlickman)	
160		Marovitz)	
160		Speaker Redmond	House concurs SA 1 to 1012.



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
31.			
160		Clerk O'Brien)	2131
)	
160		Speaker Redmond)	
161		DiPrima	Explains HJRCA 29
162		Speaker Lechowicz	
162		Totten)	
)	
162		DiPrima)	
162		Speaker Lechowicz	
163		Ewing)	
)	
163		DiPrima)	
163		Speaker Lechowicz	
164		Ewing	
164		Speaker Lechowicz	
164		DiPrima	To close
164		Speaker Lechowicz	
164		Epton	Explains 'aye' vote
164		Speaker Lechowicz	
165		Byers	Explains 'no' vote
165		Speaker Lechowicz)	
)	
165		Laurino)	
165		Speaker Lechowicz	
165		Ebbesen	
165		Speaker Lechowicz	
166		Sandquist	Explains 'aye' vote
166		Speaker Lechowicz	
166		Huskey	Explains 'aye' vote
166		Speaker Lechowicz	
166		Geo-Karis	



32.	<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	166		Speaker Lechowicz	
	167		Rigney	
	167		Speaker Lechowicz	
	167		Jacobs	
	167		Speaker Lechowicz	
	168		Friedrich	
	168		Speaker Lechowicz	
	168		Polk	
	168		Speaker Lechowicz	
	168		Stanley	HB 992-'aye' vote on concurrence
	168		Speaker Lechowicz	
	168		Totten)	
)	
	169		Stanley)	
	169		Speaker Lechowicz	
	169		Keats	
	169		Speaker Lechowicz	
	169		McBroom	
	169		Speaker Lechowicz	
	170		Terzich	
	170		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 2408
	171		Houlihan, D.	
	171		Speaker Lechowicz	
	171		Robinson)	
)	
	171		Houlihan, D.)	
	171		Speaker Lechowicz	
	171		Kane)	
)	
	171		Houlihan, D.)	



33.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
171		Speaker Lechowicz	
172		Cunningham)	
172		Houlihan, D.)	
172		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 1706
173		Edgar	Explains HB 1706
173		Speaker Lechowicz	
173		Houlihan, D.)	
174		Edgar)	
174		Speaker Lechowicz	
174		Stanley	
174		Speaker Lechowicz	
175		Matijevich	
175		Speaker Lechowicz	
175		Edgar	To close
175		Speaker Lechowicz	
176		Giorgi	
176		Speaker Lechowicz	
176		Tipsword	
176		Speaker Lechowicz	
177		Cunningham	
177		Speaker Lechowicz	
177		Getty	'Present'
177		Speaker Lechowicz	
177		Ebbesen	
177		Speaker Lechowicz	
178		Greiman	'Present'
178		Speaker Lechowicz	



34.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
178		Friedrich	
178		Speaker Lechowicz	
178		Bowman	
178		Speaker Lechowicz	
179		Kozubowski)	Explains 'no' vote
179		Speaker Lechowicz)	
179		Huskey	
179		Speaker Lechowicz	
180		Robinson	
180		Speaker Lechowicz	
180		Madigan	
180		Speaker Lechowicz	
181		Kane	
181		Speaker Lechowicz	
181		Darrow	'Present'
181		Speaker Lechowicz	
182		Geo-Karis	
182		Speaker Lechowicz	
182		Houlihan, D.	Verification
182		Speaker Lechowicz	
181		Edgar	Poll absentees
181		Speaker Lechowicz	
181		Clerk O'Brien)	Polls absentees
181		Speaker Lechowicz)	
182		Houlihan, D.	
183		Speaker Lechowicz	
183		Clerk O'Brien	Verification



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

35.

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
183		Speaker Lechowicz	
183		Katz	'No' vote
183		Speaker Lechowicz)	
183		Peters)	
183		Speaker Lechowicz	
183		Gaines	
183		Speaker Lechowicz	
183		Ebbesen	'no' to 'aye'
183		Speaker Lechowicz	
183		Reed	
184		Speaker Lechowicz	
184		Mann	
184		Speaker Lechowicz	
184		Klosak	Votes 'aye'
184		Speaker Lechowicz)	
184		Clerk O'Brien)	Continues verification
184		Speaker Lechowicz	
184		Pierce	
184		Speaker Lechowicz	
184		Luft	
185		Speaker Lechowicz	
185		Clerk O'Brien	Continues verification
185		Speaker Lechowicz	
185		Steczo	
185		Speaker Lechowicz	
186		Houlihan, D.)	Questions Affirmative Vote
186		Speaker Lechowicz)	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
36.			
186		Friedland	
186		Speaker Lechowicz	
186		Satterthwaite	
186		Speaker Lechowicz)	Continues verification
187		Houlihan, D.)	
187		Johnson	
187		Speaker Lechowicz)	Continues verification
188		Houlihan, D.)	
188		Christensen	
188		Speaker Lechowicz	
188		Pechous	
188		Speaker Lechowicz	
188		Daniels	
189		Speaker Lechowicz	
189		Keats	
189		Speaker Lechowicz	
189		Madigan	Introduction
189		Speaker Lechowicz	
189	10:38	Skinner	'aye'
189		Speaker Lechowicz	
189		Davis, C.	Introduction-John H. Dunn
189		Speaker Lechowicz	
189		Griesheimer	'aye'
190		Speaker Lechowicz	HB SA #2 House concurs
190		Edgar	
190		Speaker Lechowicz	
190		Schlickman	1706-move to reconsider



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
37.			
190		Speaker Lechowicz	
190		Keats	Move lie on table
190		Speaker Lechowicz	
190		Brady	SB 1025-HA.1 & 3
190		Speaker Lechowicz	House refuses to recede
190		Steele, E. G.	SB 868-HA #2 & 4
191		Speaker Lechowicz	House refuses to recede
191		Meyer	HB 1060-SA #1
191		Speaker Lechowicz	
192		Totten)	
)	
192		Meyer)	
192		Speaker Lechowicz	
192		Meyer	To close
193		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs
193		Breslin	HB 1975-SA #1
193		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs
193		Ryan	HB 2307-Am #1
194		Speaker Lechowicz	House concurs
194,195,196,197,198		Clerk Hall	Messages from Senate
197		Speaker Redmond	
197		Madigan	
197		Speaker Redmond	
197		Mann	Announcement
198		Speaker Redmond	
198		Mann	Announcement
198		Speaker Redmond	
198		Madigan	Move adjourn 9:30



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
38.			
199		Speaker Redmond	
199		Stanley	
199		Speaker Redmond	Adjourned

