

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order and the Members please be in their seats. We will be led in prayer by the Reverend Al Morehead, Pastor of Mt. Pulaski Christian Church."

Reverend Morehead: "Our Father, God, we ask Your guidance on this last day of the meeting of the Legislature. There is much that we lack in wisdom. We need physical strength to do what must be done but more than that we need the wisdom to run the affairs of this great state and to be involved not only in here but in the affairs of our country. We thank You, God, for the opportunity and the privilege to share in representing the authority that You have given to us. So, I pray for Your very special guidance for these men and for the heavy responsibility that they carry. We give You the praise and the glory. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Is Representative Geo-Karis in the chamber? Representative Geo-Karis is not here, nor is Representative Walsh but Mike Getty's here and Bradley. Everybody buy this morning's Springfield paper, there's a very nice picture on the front page. Anybody feels a speech coming on today I'll recognize them and we might as well get it now. Representative Polk feels a speech coming on."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, I think this dialogue has gone on long enough and I'd like to move the previous question?"

Speaker Redmond: "What was the question? Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. July 5 is rapidly approaching and our colleague Bill Kempiners will bite the dust. I want to report to you, the pressure is mounting on him because a morning or two ago he sprayed his Right Guard on his hair by mistake."

Speaker Redmond: "Nervous as a July groom. Representative Jacobs."

Jacobs: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, it's nice to see that in the morning paper that we have someone down there in the well who is in deep thought and I want to commend him for it because I've heard a lot of comment on it today."

Speaker Redmond: "You better hurry up and get the paper because I understand... The star of the front page has got more than one copy. Roll Call for attendance. Representative Barnes, do you feel



a seizure coming on? Everybody's invited to the Irish - American Parade, Tuesday. That's on the 2nd of July out in John Matejek's district. Isn't that the Irish - American Parade on the 2nd? Representative Matejek."

Matejek: "It will be a pleasure to have the distinguished Speaker of the House and the next Governor of the State of Illinois at the 10th Legislative District, Sunday, at the Polish - American Democratic Club Picnic, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Oh, I thought that was the Irish - American."

Matejek: "...Day in the 10th District."

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

Kempiners: "Mr. Speaker, I would seek leave to use the Attendance Roll Call to put House Bill 3288 on the Fall Calendar."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections leave is granted and the Attendance Roll Call will be used. 3288 was that? Where is it now?"

Kempiners: "It's on House Bills, Third Reading."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Redmond: "Somebody said that you wanted leave to put something on the Fall Calendar. Is that correct?"

Richmond: "Right. Table 3384, I believe it is."

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, 3384, on Third Reading. Did you want leave to put that on the Fall Calendar or just table it? The Gentleman asks leave to table 3384. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection it is tabled. Representative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I have leave to put House Bill 1089 and 3071 on the Fall Calendar?"

Speaker Redmond: "1081?"

Younge: "1089."

Speaker Redmond: "And what was the other one?"

Younge: "3071."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any objections? Hearing none the Attendance Roll Call will be used in support of her motion that House Bill 1089



and 3071 be put on the Fall Calendar. Representative...Dr. Ebbesen. Is that Dr. Ebbesen coming... I just wonder if you'd walk up and down each aisle so that all the Members will have an opportunity to view your residence. Gorgeous. Representative Boucek."

Boucek: "Question, Mr. Speaker. While we're waiting and we have so much time. We have now waited about twenty minutes, I wonder if we could hear from Representative Totten, at this time on his proposal. I think this would be an excellent time to start."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten was all over the papers this morning and I think he's just very contented. I don't know whether the Governor is but... Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'm never contented. But I happened to be reading one of those press comments of yours regarding my efforts and indicating that you thought I belonged in the Springfield Municipal Opera. Well, I thought about that for a long time and told you I'd respond to it. I'm sure you remember the quote that Dick 'Vada' had during the playoffs...the N.B.A. playoffs when he said that 'The Opera is never over till the fat lady sings.' Well, Mr. Speaker, will you please start singing?"

Speaker Redmond: "Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1008. Harris et al. 1065. Pechous. 1066. Shumpert. 1067. Van Dwyne. 1068. Keats. 1069. Geo-Karis. 1070. Marovitz. 1073. Skinner."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1008, Harris, asks that we ask that the Capital Development Board study the feasibility of having a state regional office building in Marion. House Resolution 1065, Pechous, congratulates the Italian - American Civic Organization on their 10th Anniversary. 1066, Shumpert, congratulates Bishop Eleazar Lenox on his 53rd Anniversary as Pastor. House Resolution 1067, Van Dwyne, congratulates Providence High School for winning the Illinois Class A Baseball Championship. 1068, Keats, we declare our support for Policeman Bruce Warrer for not revealing the name of an informant of his. 1069, Geo-Karis, congratulates Plumbers Local Union 93 on its 75th Anniversary.



1070, Marovitz, we thank Alan Crane for everything he does around here on News 78. Skinner, 73, we officially name Roscoe Cunningham as the official cornpopper of the House. I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, no discussion. I wonder, John, I have a Death Resolution that's being prepared downstairs, will there be another opportunity to put it in with the Agreed..."

Matijevich: "That comes separately, Bob. I move for the adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those... Representative Adams. Representative Adams. Adams."

Adams: "John, I think we should get Giorgi back because I could understand all of those that you talked about this morning."

Matijevich: "I'm sorry about that."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries, the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Further Resolutions? Death Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1071. Léverenz et al. Respect to the memory of Mrs. Monica Hyde, mother of Congressman Henry Hyde. House Resolution 1072. Leverenz et al. In respect to the memory of Mr. James Durante."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich moves the adoption of the Death Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries. Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it was with a great deal of pride and satisfaction that I heard a moment ago when Matijevich the Magnificent announced that I had been awarded the cornpopper award. And this honor comes to me undeserved, unsolicited, and perhaps inappropriate but it is appreciated nevertheless, John. The person that is really entitled to the award is the Honorable Calvin Skinner and his beautiful wife, Robin. It was they who brought the merchandise upon



the floor. My friends and I merely acted as workers in the vineyard or perhaps workers in the popcorn business. And after all, Cal has more of a pop off record than I, even Matijevich the magnificent would...warrant an award. We feel that being awarded the popcorn...we're grateful, as I said, but being awarded the popcorn popper award... It might be misunderstood, that isn't really the greatness of which ... records were made. But its notwithstanding these misgivings, from the bottom of my heart, with appreciation unlimited, I say thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Clerk could read the Resolution, it's only about five paragraphs."

Speaker Redmond: "The record indicates that Representative Geo-Karis is here. Will you read 1073."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1073. Whereas Roscoe D. Cunningham had his origin in Rural Richland County and was reared in suburban Sumner, Large County Illinois. And whereas, Mr. Cunningham obtained his formal education, such as it is, in public schools and the University of Nancy and whereas, Roscoe has fed at one public trough or another for more than a decade and a half. And whereas, it has come to the attention of this House that it has never had an official popcorner. And whereas, it is high time that this Body acquire a popcorn popper. Now, therefore be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eightieth General Assembly, the State of Illinois, that Roscoe Cunningham, the sly fork, be in...he is hereby designated the official cornpopper of this House. And that as such he has full authority to pop corn at such time and in such manner as he deems expedient to divert attention from weighty or legislative matters."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to associate with as a friend and a colleague, Roscoe Cunningham. I think as an orator he has few peers. He reminds me of the man that he served with in the Roman Council, Cicero. And, Mr. Speaker, it is true that he has fed at the trough but the trough has been good



to him, Mr. Speaker and it's been good to the people that have sent him here. Now, I have a suggestion for him. He knows of my long admiration for him. There is a vacancy to be filled in the Office of Alderman in the Fifth Ward and from a distance Roscoe has always admired Leon Despres. And I want Roscoe to drive up with that 1934 Pontiac that he uses, run for Alderman in the Fifth Ward and I guarantee you that Epton and Mann will put you over. That's an invitation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Epton protests."

Epton: "No, no not at all. I agree with Representative Mann entirely on almost every issue. What he forgot to add, he left a few words off his last statement, we will certainly push him over, what he forgot to add was the cliff."

Speaker Redmond: "Is that just the border on the lake? Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "I wonder if we could have the rane Resolution read?"

Speaker Redmond: "What's the number of that one? Representative Mann. I'm not too sure the Sponsor's here."

Mann: "Am I on? Well, Mr. Speaker, I forgot to put in the...the plug to payola...here. Roscoe has let it be known that he has a tux and he will travel. He'll do barmitzvahs. He'll do anything that the master of ceremonies...he'll do anything that the occasion requires and I can't think of a better man to do it than Roscoe."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, when I asked you to adopt that Resolution for Roscoe I should have said it something like the words of Roscoe because Roscoe would have said something like, 'Let it tickle your conscience. Don't fear. Vote green, relax you'll enjoy it.' Right, Roscoe?"

Speaker Redmond: "We're honored by the visit of a former Member, now the Mayor of Aurora. Former Representative Jack Hill. Sitting right there... Here he is. Here's the Mayor."

Matijevich: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I've had more requests to do Deacon than I have Jack Hill but I'll try Jack Hill. And I really..."



You know, Adams just walked over a little while ago and he said 'John, when are we going to get to the order of impersonations?' And I said, 'You know, you really have to feel it or you can't get to it.' But now that you...I'll try to... You know, I use to sit and watch Jack Hill so often. And now that I've been screaming...I'm the loudest screamer now that we've got. And I said... You know, I sat here and watched Jack Hill for so many years and then when Deacon came over here, there's nothing more to learn. I've learned it all. So... But here's the way Jack Hill and some of you didn't know Jack Hill. Jack Hill would start out and it really would happen, ordinarily when the ...either there was something that Chicago was doing and Jack didn't like it or if Jack was sitting here and Jack would be getting a little red in the face because we're sitting too long and he felt we ought to get out of here. And Jack... I don't know how old his boy is now but at the time I remember when he got up and gave this talk I think his kid was about 8 years old, but he'd get up and he'd say... First he'd scream for attention, 'Mr. Speaker... Mr. Speaker... Mr. Speaker, are you going to give me attention or aren't you? Mr. Speaker, I've been sitting here in this seat all day. And all I want is a bite to eat and I want to go home. Mr. Speaker, don't you know I've got this 8 year old kid at home? He doesn't even know who I am, Mr. Speaker. We've been sitting here working, working, working. You're in that back room, you're having a bite to eat. You're back there and we're out here working, working, working. Mr. Speaker, please my little boy needs me at home. My wife needs me at home. My family needs me at home. Give me a rest. I don't know if I'm going to make it, Mr. Speaker. Please, I need to go home, will you please let me go home to my kid?'"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevec."

Matijevec: "I guess I only try people who I really... You know, Jack Hill was so close to me and I knew he'd never get hurt by anything I'd say and... Somebody said, 'Could you try to do Deacon.' I really don't know if I can but I'll do it, Deacon, because I know



Deacon might appreciate this. I'll do it. Deacon knows that when he...when he made that original announcement that he was going to retire I sent him a personal note because I felt so bad about that because we need Deacon around here. Deacon, first usually when he's going to get up to talk, first Deacon kinda gets up like this, see... 'Mr. Speaker, I want to say first... and I'm glad you called me because I was going to talk loud and draw a crowd. First, I want to say that I'm kinda humble. Because I've got so many awards around here, I'm humble about it. And I love all of you, know matter how you vote, I love you and I know you got your reasons. And some of you, some you here don't know what I've been through. And when I came to Springfield...when I came to Springfield...when I came to Springfield I had to sleep in the train station. I had nowhere to sleep, I had nowhere to eat. You don't know that. And you wonder. You wonder why, why, why I vote for poor people. You wonder why? If you were poor, you'd know why. You'd know why. And I don't care what the color of your skin is when you're poor, you're poor. And I got it right here in my hands...right here in my hands, that's where I've got it. I've got that Roll Call right here, and I'm going to carry it with me, walk down every district and tell the people how you voted against poor people. And I want that to be on your conscience forever. And I'm proud, proud to vote for poor people all the time. No matter their color. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "The reason I did this, Woody Bowman said he could do me and I said, 'God bless you, Woodie.' Go ahead, I want to see it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, first a little time out here, I've got to look the part. Spk... I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think that the Gentleman from the other side of the aisle has not been taking proper cognizance of the extent of the pot hole problem in the state. This isn't a partisan issue, Mr. Speaker, this isn't a partisan issue. We all fall in pot holes, Republicans and



Democrats alike fall in potholes. Now, Mr. Speaker, we've got do something about this, about this this very day. Now just because Mike Bakalis is supporting this plan doesn't mean that you're given license to vote against this. What are you going to say to your constituents with their broken legs? Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order that the Republican Party is trying to slow down the progress of this House today and to prevent a vote on this most important Bill. And I don't know, I couldn't in good conscience vote against a Bill like this because I don't know to answer them. And if one of my Republican colleagues came hobbling over here with a broken leg saying he'd fell into a pothole, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leinenweber. Pardon me..."

Leinenweber: "Well, I was going to suggest... I don't see him on the floor, that while we're at ease, rather than wasting time later, Representative Collins could give his speech on the Art Council since he was caught short. I don't see him on the floor. Perhaps if he comes in we could go to that order, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "I don't see him here... I don't like to do something when they're not here, but...Ellis Levin. All right... Some of you don't know what utility companies are all about, evidently, because...you'd be supporting me on this very important issue because after all, the poor people are...they're..they're ripped off by the utility companies...all the time...you know that. Where'd that question come from, Mr. Speaker? Oh, there he is. Sure... I agree with that but that's not important, the important thing is to stick it to the utility companies."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kane's microphone...."

Bowman: "How many votes will this require, Mr. Speaker? Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mulcahey. Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, has anybody this morning explained to our friends in the gallery what's going on and why?"

Speaker Redmond: "They've all been given Calendars and they can follow it.



Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Is Stearney here today? Now, Mr. Speaker... Now, Mr. Speaker, I've got this budget for the Department of Education and Registration and I took it in good faith, I only want to 'get the harlot of the director and all of her help.' Because after all, I want to save the taxpayers money. You know why? 'Cause they won't hire some of my people. And you know, Mr. Speaker, we got to do something about it, Mr. Speaker. Now, I demand a pension, Mr. Speaker, because this budget is very important to me, I've got to prove a point, I've to show that young woman what I can do as a Legislator and go back home and tell them I did it. Do you overrule me, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, you're taking your life in your own hands if you overrule me, after all, I'm a good lawyer. And if McMaster thinks he's going to put a license on my work you've got another thought coming. No, Tom, we don't need a license, we're licensed already. Do they license the farmers. Now, you heard me Tom. Mr. Speaker, I demand equal time with Mr. McMaster."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Garmisa's phone."

Maske: "I'm suppose to sell 177 pounds of petroleum oil. Who'll give me 100 dollar bill, 100 dollar bill, let's get her rolling now, 100 dollar...100 dollar bill, will you give her 2? Will you give her 2 now, now 2, now 3, now will you give her 4 hundred dollar bills? 4 hundred dollar bill, will you give her 5? Now 5, will you give her 6 hundred dollar bills? Now 6, now 7 will you give 8? Now 8, will you go to 9, 900 dollar bill, now 9, now 9, will you go to...9, now 10 hundred dollar bill. 10 hundred dollar bill, will you give 11? Now 11, now 11, 11 hundred dollar bill, will you give 11 now? 11 now, 11 now hundred dollar bill. Now bid 10, 12 hundred, now you go to 12, will you go to 13? 13, 13, 13, 13, will go to...now 14, will you go to 14. 13, will you go to 14 hundred dollar bill? Now 14, will you go to 15? 15, 15, 15, 15, 15 hundred dollar bills. Will you go to 15, 15, will you go to 15? 15 hundred dollar bills. Going once. 15, now 16. 16 hundred dollar bill. Not often, here we go, come on. 15 hundred. Sold it to Stearney."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think it's only fair that since I did a couple parodies of my other colleagues I'd do one of myself. And I'll be brief, Mr. Speaker. (Mumbles)... When I talk, I hope... I can never hear myself when I talk and probably everybody else is just as well off if they can't either, so that's why I mumble, see."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Before the rabble here gets a little revved up I have two imitations I'd like to do. I've worked on them for a long time. I'd like to do sort of a combination of Mike Nardulli and John Vitek first... And I think we ought to give John and Mike an award because I've never seen them out of their chairs, never seen them cause trouble, never seen them disrupt the Body and they've really been fine Members. Mr. Speaker, I have to get dressed first, I have to do our Majority Leader, but you know I have to get real straightened up for that. You know, many of you haven't seen Mike put his tie on. This is before he gets to the floor, he doesn't just do this...Lee... Lee, will you take care of this? Lee... Danny, if Lee needs any help, will you... Teddy...Teddy, Teddy, coffee tomorrow. Mr. Speaker, the Minority Leader over there has said, but I say to you, I say to you, this is a Democratic program, for people, for concerned people, for good people. I say to you over there, the Minority Leader has said to us, but I say to you over there that this is a good program. And I say to you, I may not know what's in that Bill but my boys do. And if you're not on the train now you may never get on the train. Now, I'd like to do my performance of the Chair but there was some nervousness about that. So I'll just retire now. Lest you think that we Irish can only mimic ourselves, there is also a Gentleman who really taught me most about the legislative process when I first came down here and we had the C.T.A. vote. I wanted to find out some of the information and so I asked Representative Lechowicz if he'd prepare a memo for me. He didn't think his role as staff for Houlihan was appropriate



and he threw the 50 or 80 pages...in there. But he did teach me quite a bit and one of the things I learned most was..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, I've been privileged to sit next to the Gentleman here for 14 years and I'd just like to give you very quickly Harold Katz on a verification... Mr. Speaker, I'm here.... Mr. Speaker, I'm really here, Mr. Speaker, I'm here. See you later, Bill"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. We enjoy our last day here but there are a few serious things and I don't want to change the mood but I think that there are some people who normally is not recognized. We're all out here and we are recognized and everyone can see us and they see us attending to the business that we are attempting to do here. But there are some people that we see walking around, they may be nameless but they are there. They're working extremely hard and I want to take this opportunity...I want to take this opportunity for both the Minority Staff and the Majority Staff. Jerry Reddick, who is the Staff Director of the Minority Staff. Philip Gornay, the Deputy Director. Tim Claborn, Martha, Mark, Julia, Dan, Sue, Brandon and Terry, of the Minority Staff. And on the Majority Staff, Bob Carter, who we all badger around here. Bill Holland, Jim Morphew, Veronica, Bruce, Martha, John, Ron, Linda, Tom, Gary, Mudd, Tammy, Bob Kren and Barbara Brunk. And all of the other staff members on both sides of the aisle, I want to extend to them and I think we all here in the Legislature who all year long go to all of these people with all of our problems, with all of our many requests. I want to extend to them my thanks and my appreciation for all of the hard work that they do. And I would...I think that we here in the Legislature, if I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like to request just a standing ovation from all of us for all of those people for all of the work that they do."

Speaker Redmond: "I received a communication from Charlie Wheeler, the head of the Springfield Press Corps, in which they... he says that



the Press Corp by unanimous vote has requested the House of Representatives put on a gridiron dinner next year. Representative Matijevidich."

Matijevidich: "Mr. Speaker, Tim Simms wanted me to do Adeline and I...

and I can't do her because I told Tim I would but only on one condition and he didn't follow through with it. I don't know if Tim's here, he didn't follow through with that condition.

I said, 'Tim, if you can get one of those rubber turkeys or rubber chickens, I'll do it.' Because usually she's got something on her desk she's eating. But she's not...she's not, you know, Tim didn't come through and he doesn't have that because usually she's eating something. She gets up, you know, and starts going like that. But Mark O'Brien wanted me to do something, I don't know if I can even do it. but yesterday, I think it was yesterday, the Speaker and Adeline really got into something and the Speaker started talking about...I mean Adeline started talking about somebody taking their clothes on and off and on and off and the Speaker's done it a few times where he'll turn on the side and go...(laughs like Speaker Redmond)... Adeline...Adeline...Adeline."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't know if we've commended one particular group already but I wouldn't be a Member of the Clerk's Office for all the money in the world because they sure have to put up with a lot of trials and tribulations. And I think the Gentlemen and the Ladies of the Clerk's Office are to be commended and the Clerk, Mr. O'Brien, and his associates, Chalkie, John, George Schoening and John Hall and all the rest of the staff, I think we owe them a bit of gratitude. Because it's not easy when have... we flock down to see them and put ourselves on the Attendance Roll Call and...want copies of Roll Calls. I think you've done a very fine job and it's much appreciated by, I know by me and I'm sure all of us. I think they deserve a good hand because they've really done a great job. And one more group that we often neglect is our Pages. I don't know how they put up with some of us sometimes but we want you to know we love you. And they deserve a



good hand because it's not easy working in a place with 177 bosses, plus the leaders and everybody else and keeping your sanity. And so our pages deserve a good hand too, both sides."

Speaker Redmond: "Page 3. Conference Committee Reports. 562.

Representative Chapman. Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is the Conference Committee Report for House Bill 562, which is legislation which speaks to a problem that citizens in our Third Legislative District have, who are double taxed, who are in two library districts and are paying for library services twice. And the...we had a problem with the Senate Amendment. It didn't do what we had all thought it did so we put the Bill into Conference Committee and this...this technical problem has been corrected and I'd ask for your concurrence."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the Lady's motion that the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 562. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 134 'aye', no 'nay' and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report to 562. Representative Geo-Karis desires to be recorded as 'aye'. Does she have leave? 841. Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. 1468. Representative Yourell. Out of the record. 1803. Representative Robinson. Stuffle. Either of them here? Robinson or Stuffle? Out of the record. 2843, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is the appropriation for the Legislative Reference Bureau. This is a result of the 1st Conference Committee Report and there's some adjustments made to make it conform with the 5.5 increase and I move for the adoption of the 1st Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House do adopt the 1st Conference Committee Report to House Bill 2843. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On



this question there are 122 'aye' and no 'nay' and the House does adopt the 1st Conference Committee Report to House Bill 2843. 322...35. Representative Macdonald."

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

I move that we do accept the 1st Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3225. If you remember, this is the Bill that amends the Environmental Protection Act and eliminates the need for dual permit systems. There were several Amendments put on in the Senate that we did recede on the 1st one, which was a new Commission. The compromise was that there should be a temporary Joint Hazardous Waste Study Committee. This is now in accordance with the wishes of Mr. Schuneman, Representative Schuneman and Representative Sharp, who had Bills that were put in an Interim Study Committee in the Senate. So I would ask that we now concur and accept the 1st Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question's on the Lady's motion that the House do adopt the 1st Conference Committee Report to House Bill 3225. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 126 'aye' and no 'nay' and the House does adopt the 1st Conference Committee Report to House Bill 3225. 3351. Representative Stiehl."

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

I move that the House do adopt Conference Committee Report #1 on House Bill 3351. There was a technical error in the Senate Amendment and the Bill was put into Conference Committee to correct this error. Amendment #1 simply was a conveyance of land from the Department of Conservation to the Oregon Park District in Ogle County and I would move for adoption of the Committee Report."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the Lady's motion that the House adopt the 1st Conference Committee Report to House Bill 3351. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?"



Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 130 'aye' and 1 'no'. And the House does adopt the 1st Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3351.

393. G.L. Hoffman. 1562, Representative Lynn Martin. 1562."

Martin: "Yes, I move we concur with the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the Lady's motion that we do adopt the Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1562. Those in favor vote 'aye'... Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Well, if I could just request for myself on these things... we know what the Bill does and how the Conference Committee has changed the substance of the Bill and so forth, just so we have a rough idea on what we're voting on."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Martin, will you explain the content of the report?"

Martin: "Yes, it was a Conference Committee, in reality, to put on another Amendment. And therefore, the Senate just as a matter of getting it to a Conference Committee, receded from a House Amendment. However, there was agreement that the Amendment that was desired to be added would be nongermane. So the... we just sort of went back to stage 1. The Bill and Amendments are as the House passed them out."

Speaker Redmond: "Is that sufficient, Representative Johnson?"

Johnson: "No, it really isn't. It has some Amendments on it, I just want to know what the Bill does."

Martin: "The Bill gives injunctive power to local health authorities. The Bill also extends the deadline to 1980 for restaurant personnel to have accomplished a course offered by the Department of Public Health."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "I just wondered, Mr. Speaker, has this Conference Committee Report been distributed?"

Martin: "Yes, it has."

Speaker Redmond: "Yes it has. Mrs. Hox... Representative Hoxsey."



Hoxsey: "Yes, Representative Martin, is House Amendment #1, which mandates that restaurants have trained sanitarians employed is that Amendment still on the Bill?"

Martin: "Representative Hoxsey, I think perhaps you are misinterpreting that Amendment. The way the law reads now they must do it by July 1, tomorrow, 1978. The Amendment says it will be...extend it to 1980."

Hoxsey: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Just a Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker. The way the Conference Committee Report is written it is... the recommendation is that the Senate concur in House Amendment #1 to this Senate Bill. I ask the Parliamentarian, in consequence is it necessary for the House to take any action in respect to this Conference Committee Report?"

Speaker Redmond: "If it has been put in a Conference Committee then it is necessary, the Parliamentarian advises me. Anything further? The question is, shall the House adopt the 1st Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1562? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 135 'aye', and 7 'no' and the House does adopt the 1st Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1562. 1790. Representative Brady? Out of the record. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2632. Representative Hanahan is recognized. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 2632 is the appropriation for the State Office of Education and the grant-in-aid Bill. After having many Amendments adopted in the House the Senate, seeing fit to adopt a few other Amendments, and I'd like to go through the Amendments and then to a general description of the Bill as present before the House of Representatives. Senate Amendment #1 reduces 159 thousand 860 dollars in



General Revenue Funds in operations and 18 thousand 787 dollars in Driver's Ed. Fund operations for the Office of Education. It allocated the General Revenue appropriations by department rather than by division. Senate Amendment #2 provided that no more of 50 percent of the appropriation for personnel services, equipment, travel, printing, tele-communications, commodities and EDP shall be expended, obligated or contracted for until January 1, 1979. Senate Amendment #3 appropriated 10 million for the School Construction Bond Fund to reimburse school districts for costs of constructing special education facilities. Senate Amendment #4 eliminated 100 thousand in General Revenue Funds Grant for Career Education Program, as a companion Bill, H.B. 2636, failed on Third Reading in the Senate. Senate Amendment #5 eliminated 1 million 109 thousand 580 dollars to General Revenue Funds requested for EDP. Senate Amendment #7...6 was tabled. 7 amended language appropriating 35 million in Federal P.L. 94.142 Fund to specify that the money is for grants through eligible districts and for current payments of room and board costs for children in private special ed. facilities. Senate Amendment #8 established separate divisions for federally funded EDP and appropriated 1 million 109 thousand 580 GRF funded EDP, deleted by Senate Amendment #5. Senate Amendment #9 and 10 failed. Senate Amendment #11 added 29 thousand 240 dollars in General Revenue Fund operations for storage space rental and 100 thousand General Revenue Fund for Chicago Office Personnel Services, to restore vacant bilingual positions deleted in Senate Amendment #1. Senate Amendment #12 reduced various ERF grant programs by a total of 7 million 803 thousand 500 dollars. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the bottom line on House Bill 2632 as we have it before us today is 751 million 518 thousand 500 dollars. Now, that includes



all the federal funds and all the General Revenue and grant funds. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there are things in there that I don't necessarily agree with. There are some things that I would have liked to have seen done, especially in these special ed. fields and gifted and the rest of those fields but this is the bottom line. This is the dollar amount that we could live with. This is the dollar amount that the Governor can sign into law and I move to concur with the Senate action on House Bill 2632."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, I regret as the chief Cosponsor of this Bill that I would have to differ with my chief Sponsor on the concurrence motion at this time. I do not think that this Bill gives something to everybody. I think we've left out an important item in it and I think that we can rectify that if we can take this Bill to Conference Committee and achieve the results while we're giving equity to all. There is one other item that's been discussed much by many and I would hope that the Sponsor of this Bill would consider that he could nonconcur in this at this time so that we could change this in a way that would give us meaningful equity for all areas that are involved in a categorical grant program. Obviously, if you had a list and a printout you would see that although the Bill started from the State Board of Education with monetary items in all categories, there are some that are notably missing and have zeros in them now. I don't think that's fair. I think we should do something about this. I think we should vote a nonconcurrency vote at this time and move this Bill into a Conference Committee and see if we can address this."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "I move to divide the question."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I too would hope that we would not concur. I just noticed in this Bill that they have restored most of the money that we reduced in the bilingual education program, that was sponsored by Mr. Kosinski on the other side of the aisle. As usual, the Senate puts all the money back in for their pet projects. I think we should not concur. I think we should put this back in a Conference Committee and work on it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. I think Downstaters should pay particular attention to Amendment #12, which reduced by over 6 million dollars the line item for transportation in Downstate school districts. I think we should resist Amendment #12 and nonconcur and go to a Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is an issue that we've been working on obviously for quite some time. One thing that I campaigned up and down the state...when I say campaign I campaigned on behalf of the Illinois General Assembly to those people that have been interested and concerned to attend the School Problem Commission and the...and the hearings that Representative Schneider held throughout the state in regard to what people really needed this year and...in education. One thing we told everybody that we were going to attempt to do was to bring the level up to 1300 and we weren't successful, we brought it up to 1293. But that's somewhat pie in the sky many people thought. The next thing that we had promised them or hoped that we would be able to do was to bring our regular transportation up to full funding. That was one of the campaign rhetoric



and promises that we made. When you consider the fact that last year in regular transportation we were paying 78 percent and with the budget that we have today we're going to be going to 90 percent. That is certainly a big section of the pie if it's not all the way. In special ed. transportation, we again had indicated and hoped that we'd be able to go at 100 percent level. And you consider now that we're going from 88 percent to 94 percent, that's significantly closer than we've ever been. We've tried for many years to bring this up to full funding and we had great anticipations and hopes that we might be able to do it this year. You consider that some of the areas that have been cut were the two areas that we considered to be the mandated programs and we've been telling the people over and over again that what we want to do is to bring the mandates up to full funding and then we will be concerned about those programs that are not mandated in every district. We did not fulfill our responsibility or obligation this year but I think that we can go back to the districts and indicate to them that this year what we have done is shared with you early exactly how much money you're going to get. We have tried to be as open as possible in relation to the formula, so that when you go back to your districts six months later you won't have some superintendent coming up to you and say, 'What in the world did you do to me again this year?' We think the printouts now have been pretty clear. We think we know how much money we have in this total package. If we get the 33 million that President Carter has promised us we are going to be in the best financial shape that Downstate education has been in since I've been in the General Assembly and I would urge that we concur with House Bill 2632."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."



Skinner: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly, I am aghast to hear that the Transportation Fund is not being fully funded. It is just unbelievable that we keep fully funding the Regional Transportation Authority which provides student transportation in Chicago and we can't fully fund the formula for Downstate schools. That is just incredible. And for that reason I definitely shall vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman. There seems to be some misunderstanding about this Bill, we better take it out of the record. Out of the record. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, I'm the Sponsor of the Bill and I'm getting sick and tired of people calling shots for me. Now, either I have a right to have my Bill heard, I'm in the middle of a debate on that nature. I'm looking up some figures for other people, now if somebody else wants to handle this Bill and thinks they could do a better job why don't they come forward with it? I mean now either I'm going to have my rights not abridged by somebody else or not. Now, I'd like to know what's going on. Nobody's invited me to any secret meetings to find out what's going on here. I'd like to know why this Bill is being taken out of the record. I have not requested it and I'm the Sponsor of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege. I would like to say that first of all I'm pretty sick and tired of sitting around here and having people talk about my Bill for 1 billion some odd dollars. That's nonsense. Everybody else here knows it's nonsense. You're talking about everybody's money. We're all bound up by this particular thing. Not just the Sponsor. I can go down to the Legislative Reference Bureau



and ask to duplicate every single solitary Bill that comes through the place, simply so I can say that it's my Bill but that's a lie. These Bills belong to the entire Body. It's my Bill until it gets signed and then it belongs to everybody. And it's nonsense. I think everybody's got an interest in these particular Bills. It's the biggest single Bill that's appropriated in this General Assembly and no one Member, no one person has the right to say it's mine and my particular prerogative. Nowhere in the rules does it indicate that the particular Bill belongs to any one person. It is a product of the House and the House, with 89 Members, can do almost anything. I think there's some error, some confusion and I think we ought to take our time and determine what ought to be done in this Body. We're at the last day. We're close...we are close to trying to finish our business but we can't do it if we're going to allow ego and other things to interfere with the orderly process of the House. Now I notice that this Bill was called when the Majority Leader was off, the Minority Leader was off the floor and this is the type of subject that needs a little bit of direction. And Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, our Chairman...our Chairman for the caucus, that is the Democratic caucus, is not here. Perhaps at this time we ought to move a recess and have a Democratic caucus for about ten minutes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I believe that especially since we are into this period of time on the last day of this Session, I believe that the request of the Gentleman from Cook is a valid request. I don't know what's going on around here now but something is going on that is not in the best interest of all, and I underline, all of the people of the State of



Illinois. Now, I would urge you, Mr. Speaker, since our caucus Chairman is not in attendance, so we can get some things straight so we'll know where we're going, I would urge a Democratic conference this morning as soon as possible."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jones."

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like a ruling from the Chair on this piece of legislation. I see Representative Hanahan and Representative Brady is Cosponsors of this legislation. I'd like a ruling to tell me because there is a difference in opinion between the two. Representative Brady indicated that he would like to have this Bill held. Now, does he have equal priority to this legislation as Representative Hanahan."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, they're hyphenated Cosponsors, which would indicate they have equal rights...rights of the, both the mother and the father to a child. It's pretty hard to divide it up. But I think, I've looked at the rules and I've consulted with the Parliamentarian, there is no prohibition about taking a Bill out of the record except after the question is put and the Roll Call has been started. Now, had I hadn't put the question and the Roll Call had not been started and due to the problem that we have with the two Sponsors on it, I'm going to take it out of the record. Maybe Representative Brady and Representative Hanahan...sit down. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, I think that's an arbitrary ruling. That is your ruling and I won't appeal it but I suggest that whenever there has to be a meeting, for whatever purposes, I'd like to, as chief Sponsor of this legislation, to be invited to these private meetings. And I'd like to say this to you, Mr. Speaker, I'm sick and tired of people, for their own petty gains trying to use the



children of Illinois in special ed., transportation and all the rest of it be the pawn for their own petty gains for whatever reason they have. I'm sick and tired about being maligned about a Bill that has nothing to do with the many other interests of some of the Members of this House. And I'd like this Bill to be called, I'd like this Bill to be voted on and I'd like the conscience of this Membership to be called upon on voting either up or down in the Concurrence as soon as possible."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Mr. Speaker, I think you have made a ruling and I think that ruling is in the best interest of this legislative Body. Now, this is the last day of the Session. All of us in here, as Representative Hanahan has just indicated that this is a Bill that has been arrived at hopefully by concession, where in my opinion every segment, the citizens of every segment of this state have an interest. And I can guarantee, Representative Hanahan and anyone else, that a conference would be the best thing so that we can...if we don't have any general agreement about these Amendments that we'd better go back to the drawing board and take another look at them because we're not going to have a rerun of what has been occurring in the two previous Sessions on the supposedly, last day. I would suggest very firmly, Mr. Speaker, that you run this House and that there are rules and regulations and I don't think that we ought to violate any of them at this critical point in the closing day of this Session."

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

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise for a ruling on this particular issue. It's my understanding that the first Sponsor of the Bill has control of that Bill and the



hyphenated Sponsor may entertain a substitute motion at any time on that particular Bill and he...the hyphenated Sponsor only can entertain a substitute motion. The Bill is in complete control of the first Sponsor. And I suggest that we go with the Bill and if there's a disagreement between the Sponsor and the hyphenated Sponsor that we can have a ruling on a substitute motion at that time."

Speaker Redmond: "Well our rules are silent on the...on the roll of the hyphenated Gosponsor. Probably the best thing to do is to have only the principal Sponsors after this and we won't get into that problem. Now, as far as... I don't know whether there really is any answer to who has control of a Bill but let me tell you that in my experience here none other than Senator Russell Arrington, a sales tax Bill was attached to his Bill and he had absolutely no control of it. I think Representative Ewell is right, the minute this thing is dropped in before the Body it belongs to the Body. We try to honor it as best we can but the Member does not have complete control. Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Would you at least give us a time certain that this will be called?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, sometime this afternoon. I'll do the best we can and see if we can't get everybody to sit down and make some kind of a decision. This is a pretty complicated position that I'm in. I don't know what in the world to do, but I just know that in my judgement... in my judgement I'd have it come out of the record now. How about 3202? Representative Dan Houlihan, are you ready on that one?"

Clerk O'Brien: "We have a young man that's a Page here that was getting Amendment #1 to House Bill 2891. Who is requesting this? On the Republican side, Amendment 1 to 2891?"



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Byers."

Byers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if I might address myself to House Bill 2632 and I think we have the question...has been divided so I guess we'll go to Senate Amendment #1 first and I would rise in support of that in concurring with that Amendment. It does cut 159 thousand dollars out of the General Revenue Fund operation of the Office of Education and also 18 thousand 778 dollars from the Driver's Education Fund and I would rise in support of that also and ask that we have an 'aye' vote on concurring with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Would the Member indicate what House Bill 3202, in its final form, will do?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan. He took it out of the record. How about on the Speaker's Table? House Resolution 150. Representative Kucharski? Out of the record. 154. Representative Taylor. Out of the record. 400. Out of the record. 403. Out of the record. 404. Out of the record. 457. Representative Steczo. Out of the record. 722. Representative Friedrich. Representative Friedrich. Representative Friedrich, do you want to proceed with 722, House Resolution?"

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple Resolution. It was passed with no dissenting votes in the Executive Committee, there was one person who voted 'present'. This merely memorializes Congress not to extend the present Equal Rights Amendment seven years. This is not in opposition to E.R.A., but this is the first... it would...an extension would create precedence. In the past no Amendment has been put to the Legislators longer than 4 years. And I feel that if it's to... it can be resubmitted and give the states an opportunity to make their decision again. So I urge your unanimous support."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise to oppose this Resolution. What Representative Friedrich is trying to do here, in case anyone didn't hear him, is to have us tell Congress that they should not extend the deadline for ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. I think we have demonstrated very clearly right here in this room in the last month the need for an extension of the deadline. Until we are all through doing whatever it is we want to do using that issue to express our own views, I think we need to have time so that the women of this country are not done in. There are...as to the time that it has taken for Constitutional Amendments to be ratified, there are still Constitutional Amendments that were submitted to the states late in the 19th Century and early in the 20th Century going around the states. And they could still be ratified because they did not get submitted to the states with deadlines. There is nothing in the Constitution that says there has to be a deadline, but the United States Congress, in its wisdom, early in the 20th Century decided to put deadlines on so that they would have some idea of which Amendments were likely to come back to the Congress and not simply go around the states indefinitely. It was a responsible step to take. They arbitrarily selected seven years. Seven years was the deadline with which they submitted the Equal Rights Amendment to the states for ratification. However, it is now clearly within the powers of the Congress to extend the deadline if they so choose. And as I say, I think we here right in this room in the heart of the State of Illinois, have demonstrated the need for the deadline. So I hope you will all join us in defeating this Resolution. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."



Griesheimer: "Will the Sponsor yield, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will. Representative Friedrich...

Representative Friedrich is the Sponsor."

Griesheimer: "Representative Friedrich, would you just tell us again exactly what this Resoluituion does?"

Friedrich: "This Resolution memorializes Congress not to extend the present Equal Rights Amendment another seven years. This does not preclude their introducing another Amendment which would go through the routine. No other Constitutional Amendment has been considered longer than four years and I think this is a precedence, whether of not you're for E.R.A. And I will say this, in the Committee pro E.R.A. people voted for this Amendment, for this Resolution in the Executive Committee. So I do not consider it an anti or pro E.R.A...."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Representative Friedrich, I just wanted to make that clear so the entire House could hear this. Whether you're for or against this issue, I have to feel that everyone in this House that's been a Member for anything over one term and those of you that have been here for three and four terms know quite well there has been no issue that has been considered more thoroughly, talked over more, discussed more, argued more, debated more; been subject to more lobbying, more cajoling, more threats, more promises, than the E.R.A. And I would say that at this point in our history, this state, with all the money and expense this has cost the taxpayers of this state that we have an absolute obligation to support this Resolution, correctly introduced by Representative Friedrích. We must tell our Congressmen that we are through with this issue, We don't need to discuss it any more, it's been discussed enough. And to those of you that have lost this issue, take your loss gracefully and let this Resolution go through."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."



Madison: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we just recently took a vote on the Equal Rights Amendment and although we did not have a three-fifths majority, we had 105 Members to vote in the affirmative on the question of the Equal Rights Amendment. It would be my hope that those same 105 persons would vote against this Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kent."

Kent: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The Lady has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put. Those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple Resolution. I don't think anybody can misunderstand it. I put it in because I feel that the thing was drug on for seven years. Some of the states have indicated that they do not...that they wanted to withdraw their original ratification. There's a question about that. I think after seven years if the people who are for this want to they can put in another Amendment, just as was done here on the floor of this House, in support of it. But I think the time has come and I think it would be a bad precedence. That's my...and I hope you would support this Amendment. I would tell you again that it came out of the Executive Committee with no dissenting votes."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the House adopt House Resolution 722? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, a ball game is a ball game, that's the American way. And if you can't win the ball game, the baseball game in nine innings you lose. But that doesn't mean that you can't play the



game over the following day. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, with respect to E.R.A., the length of the game is seven years, as provided in the Amendment that was presented to us by the Congress. Now, if it fails by March, 1979, the Congress can go back to the workshop, it can redo the proposed 27th Amendment and with some changes, I can assure you, I could vote for it. And I respectfully suggest that we do adopt this Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, in explaining my 'no' vote, the proposition of equality of rights under the law for all American citizens may be fun and games to Representative Schlickman, but it is not fun and games to 250 million men, women and children in the United States. I think it's very inappropriate for a Resolution of this kind to come from the only state that changed its rules to require a three-fifths majority vote on this. Which means that the 'no' voters on this issue have one and a half times the power of the 'yes' voters. This was done, as we know, even in the face of an opinion by our Attorney General, and even in the face of a decision by the Federal District Court, that the Illinois Constitution was invalid in requiring this and we are free to adopt a rule of only 89 if we ever see the light and so do it. Finally, I might add two more points. One, I've been here for ten years. I've certainly been here every since E.R.A. came rolling out of Congress with ^{its} overwhelming majority. Not once, not once has this issue been voted up or down in either House on the basis of its merit. In every Session it has been some extraneous political consideration by either one party or the other or one faction within a party or sometimes even one disgruntled individual within a party in one House that has ...this issue. We have gotten 105 affirmative votes, as you know. I hope we'll get 105 'yes' votes up there...I mean



'no' votes up there. I would like to point out finally that most Amendments have never had any kind of a deadline. It is unusual for Congress to even impose a deadline. Right now there is still a proposed Amendment to change the Child Labor Laws, that was introduced back in the 1930's. It is still floating around in the state for Resolution. So there is no...there's nothing sacred about seven years. Some of the states that potentially may still ratify this are not having legislative Sessions before March 22, 1979. It took 100's of years for women just to get the votes. We're not going to stop until we get equal rights."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that it's a surprising, erroneous knee-jerk reaction for the proponents of E.R.A. to automatically resist this Resolution on account of the firm record of the one who offers the Resolution. If there's any group that ought to be enthusiastic for this Resolution, casting a proud green 'aye' vote, it is the pro E.R.A. forces. The nature of the human animal is such that unless their feet are held to the fire we all procrastinate, and that principle is applicable in states to Legislators. And if you let this thing drag on for another seven, fourteen or twenty-one years, a very good idea might be lost. But if you'll keep the pressure on these Legislators and make them vote every week, why you can expect happy results. Eighteen weeks from now there's going to be an election that will answer all your questions. The message will be sent clear and simple from the people of the State of Illinois as to their opposition to E.R.A... going to extend it seven years or as long as you like. In the meanwhile you need to examine one more point and that is that if you don't extend the period, those Senators



across the rotunda will return to their former practice of coming over here and laboring the Legislators before the courageous stand of Representative Jones sent them back to mind their own business and put their votes behind their mouths. So if you want the Senate to finally go on record on this matter, vote for this Resolution because they'll recognize, as you and I do, there's time for everyone to stand up and be counted and quit alibiing. Vote green."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the...even the proponent of the anti E.R.A. people say that if the adjustments are made, and there's very minor adjustments to be made and if you give Congress the change to make these minor adjustments and at a later date come back with it, I can find myself again voting for E.R.A. if the adjustments are made to satisfy our constituents. But as the way the E.R.A. is now there is no give or take, it's either take all or take nothing. So, let's give it back to Congress. Let them...get things in order so our constituents can be sold on E.R.A. so we can come back here another day and vote 'aye'. So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I vote 'yes'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think this....I just can't understand why we don't have more green votes. I would think any of us would reconsider and vote green on an issue such as this. We've had seven years on this issue and what's unfair about it, we've had I believe four states that would like to rescind from their actions. And...now this would be very unfair for those four states to go ahead and extend it...seven time and not give them an opportunity to rescind from their former action. And I don't care whether we're for the E.R.A. or against it,



I just don't see how we can oppose a Resolution like this. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain, do you seek recognition? Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Well, I guess there's been enough discussion generally about the Equal Rights Amendment this Session but I believed and sponsored it for most of the year out of a deep conviction and feeling and sense that it was right. It dealt with human rights. And I think that human rights have no timetable, they have no deadlines. I fought a battle for it, I will continue to fight that battle and I will vote 'no' because human rights have no deadline."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 85 'aye' and 66 'no'. It only requires a simple majority, so the Resolution is adopted. Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, when this Resolution is sent off to Congress is there any provisions whereby the Roll Call could be sent along with it so Congress understands that this Resolution did not have unanimity?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't really know what the procedure is on it. 833, Representative Katz on the floor? 970..."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, Bob Mann is the real Harold Katz.

I think he did it better than I was able to do it this morning. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 833, the distinguished Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Darrow, wanted to extend it statewide and he filed an Amendment so I would request that House Bill...House Resolution 833 be sent back to Second Reading and that you recognize Mr. Darrow to move his Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis, do you seek recognition? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Amendment, is that correct? Who's Amendment is it? Representative Darrow."



Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In the discussion of this Resolution yesterday it became obvious that the problem experienced in the Chicago school system has been a problem experienced by all the schools in the State of Illinois. And rather than have a Resolution that would somewhat prevent...we decided that the group should study the entire State of Illinois and their policy towards substitute teaching. Therefore, I ask that the Resolution be amended. I now move that that Amendment be adopted."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "I support the Amendment and I would urge its adoption."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of Amendment #1. Those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries and the Amendment is adopted. Will you turn Representative Walsh on? Will you repeat that please?"

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, what I said was that you're usually wrong, this time you're mistaken."

Speaker Redmond: "That isn't what you said, I'd like to have you repeat what you said loud and clear. Representative... We'll furnish you with a transcript and a copy of that, Representative Walsh. Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Resolution 833 is a simple Resolution. It simply directs the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education to look into the question of the full utilization of substitute teachers in the State of Illinois. The practices that existed in substitute teaching grew up in a period of time when there use to not be enough teachers. And in many situations it would appear that substitute teachers are not selected with the view to being certified in the field, so that you may have a history class in which



the teacher who responds is an English teacher and of course the teacher is only custodial and can not utilize the occasion for really teaching. Now, all the Amendment... the amended Resolution does is to simply permit the House Committee to look into this. It is cosponsored by the distinguished Chairman of the House Education Committee, Mr. Schneider. There are several Members who believe that it would be useful in terms of their communities and I would urge the adoption of House Resolution 833."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm glad that we had an Amendment to this Resolution. Because to...to make it statewide because all we did was to take a silly Resolution and make it ludicrous. This is probably the most idiotic thing we've done in this entire Session. We do have a School Problems Session(sic), who sensibly is looking into these type of problems. But even if they weren't, this Committee that is being asked to look into this problem and form a Subcommittee could very simply do so on the order of the Chairman of that Committee. And to compound this offense, the hyphenated Cosponsor of the Resolution is the Chariman of the very Committee that's being asked to form this Subcommittee. We've got a Chairman of a Committee sponsoring a Resolution asking his own Committee to form a Subcommittee to look into a problem. I think of all the silly things we've done this Session, the Sponsor of this Resolution ought to get the prize for the most ridiculous action that this House has been asked to take in the entire Session."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I too rise to make some comment about the



(b/c)

necessity of this type of a Resolution. It's obvious that this is coming from some specific source but let me tell you, as one person who is in the business on a day to day basis, that substitute teachers are not that all easy to find. Substitute teachers who can come in and take over a classroom on very short notice...it has more to do on a day to day basis, on a one-day basis, has more to do with the teacher as a human being as opposed to a teacher in terms of credential. And those of us who are out there on a day to day basis know that there aren't very many good, competent substitute teachers, people who are available to work at the rates they will pay for substitute teaching, to take the job. Whatever comes out of this is not going to amount, in my judgement, to a hill of beans. It's a ...it will be a, in my judgement, a waste of the time of the people who would be asked to serve on the Subcommittee. I'm very hopeful, as a Member of the Elementary and Secondary Education Committee, that if this Resolution is adopted that they don't come and ask me to serve on this Subcommittee because there are many, many, many more important things to do that one ought to utilize their time on. It's for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question..."

Representative Roman Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, sometimes method is questioned but the ultimate goal and the ultimate result is my concern. And it was obvious by the fact that Members of this House asked that this 7...833 be brought into a statewide consideration, evident is the need. Obviously, the need with a great expenditure of money in education to properly train our children, is important to many of us. That need can be expressed in properly...outfitting those classrooms with



the teachers capable of teaching a particular subject. The way the position stands right now teachers who are not accredited in certain areas, as substitutes, are training our people. This investigation, and I repeat, no matter what the method used, this interpretation of the problem through a Subcommittee I think is essential to everybody, not only from Cook County but from every region in the State of Illinois. I would concur with what Mr. Katz and the rest of you are trying to do. I think it's extremely important, with the expenditure of taxpayers' money, that the proper teachers hit the proper classrooms to properly educate our children."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of House Resolution 833. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. 89 votes required. Representative Katz, to explain his vote."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, just an opportunity to close. With regard to these Gentlemen's suggestions that this is the kind of thing that can be done without a Resolution, there is some question as to the power of a Committee to conduct independent investigations. If you will look at the 833 Resolutions that are listed...House Resolutions that are listed, there are a great many of them that do direct investigations by Committees. I'm really unable to understand why anyone would be concerned about looking into the problem. The Chairman of the Committee felt it was a good idea. We spend literally billions of dollars in the field of education. We go into things like minimal competency testing in order to make sure that children can read and write. We are perfectly willing to hold schools to accountability. I don't see anything to be lost by looking into a problem without any preconceived notion to the Committee and I would urge and appreciate the assistance of this Committee and of



this...Members of this House to enable us to look into a little problem in an orderly, legislative way, which is what this Resolution does."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 53 'aye' and 60 'no'. The Gentleman's motion fails. Representative Marovitz, for what purpose do you rise?"

Marovitz: "For the purpose of reading House Resolution 1070."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk, do you have House Resolution 1070? Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Resolution 1070, I'd like to read it. Whereas, Alan Crane, after 8 years in Springfield as legislative correspondent for Chicago Radio Station WBBM, has decided there are better ways to spend his days and nights than watching, listening to and reporting on the Illinois General Assembly. And, whereas in the midst of an attack of good judgement he accepted another position with WBBM that will require his presence in Chicago, thus preventing him from coming to the General Assembly. And, whereas Alan Crane has earned the respect of his fellow members of the legislative reporting media and a reputation among everyone for honesty and integrity. And, whereas the listeners of WBBM have been well served by the reporting of Alan Crane for the past 8 years, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eightieth General Assembly of the State of Illinois that on behalf of the people of Illinois we thank Alan Crane for his 8 years of providing his listeners with accurate, quick and clear reports on the activities of the Illinois General Assembly. And that we acknowledge his years of dedicated service and that we wish him good luck, happiness and success in his new position. And be it further resolved that a suitable copy of this Preamble and



Resolution be presented to Alan Crane of News Radio, '78."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lee Daniels."

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've heard a lot of talk about people in the press and the news and the radio media and the television media but Representative Marovitz, I'm sure all of us appreciate what you're trying to do in recognizing someone you claim has been of public service, but there are many of us here, particularly on the Republican side, who are not familiar with this person, Alan Crane. Frankly, we know John Madigan and we know that they're very close. I've never heard of this guy, Crane. Phil Crane and there's a Crane in Southern Illinois but is there a Crane in Chicago? And if there is we'd kind of like to meet him and see if this is the kind of person we should vote for in passing this Resolution. You know, we've been passing a lot of Resolutions in this House without really going into content of what we're talking about. Now, Mr. Marovitz, are you going to produce this mystery man that you claim has been around Springfield? How many of you people here really know this guy, Alan Crane? Has he ever talked to you? How many Republicans are aware? Is he a Democrat that sits on the other side of the aisle? Which side of the Press Room does he sit on? The right side or the left side? We want to know these things before we support a Resolution honoring a mystery man, is he here? Mr. Marovitz, answer us."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "I believe he's paging right now. He's down getting some coffee. But if we could wait, as soon as he gets his tip he's promised to stand up and say a few words to the Body about the quality of the legislative process and how it's deteriorated over the



eight years."

Daniels: "Mr. Marovitz, I would encourage then that we would hold our votes until you produce this mystery man from News Radio '78."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dunn. John Dunn."

Dunn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to the Resolution and I wonder if the Sponsor would pull this out of the record for a minute because several of us have Amendments we'd like to propose to this Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jack Davis."

Davis: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Resolution. And for the benefit of Representative Daniels, this particular Crane is almost like the whooping crane, an extinct species. And so I think we should pass this Resolution and encourage reproduction of this particular type of crane."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Gentleman from DuPage need not worry that from now we're going to have good bipartisan reporting from WBBM. John Madigan is going to come down and do the job."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, I think the Members of the House might like to be enlightened as to exactly what the new responsibilities are this Al Crane is accepting and ask the principal Sponsor for...if he had any objection and the other Members of the House to be added as Cosponsors."

Marovitz: "They're going to be expanding their weather reporting service and Alan Crane will be doing the weather at ten minutes after the hour, from 6:00 in the morning till 6:00 at night."

Bowman: "Will he be in one of those big weather balloons..."

Marovitz: "He'll be in a weather - copter. And in addition to the traffic report, he'll be giving 30 seconds of weather following the traffic report at ten minutes after the hour."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham."

Cunningham: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, no one has had as much experience with the crane species as Representative Schlickman and I. We've each had painful encounters with cranes, none with this particular variety. But the thought occurs to me that we adopted a Resolution for this same Alan Crane four years ago when he left and he didn't stay gone and then for us to come back now and adopt another may seem duplicative, to use someone's term. Maybe we could say, 'good riddance' or 'at last' and wish him well."

Marovitz: "Something like extending E.R.A., Roscoe."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I...in finding out that Alan Crane is going to leave again, I'm sure that Billy Marovitz and a lot of these guys will be glad he's gone. Springfield will never be the same if he makes his disappearance this time publicly... permanently, but I do want to say that I think that Alan Crane, who keeps a lot of us up at night when we've spouted off on the tube here wanting to hear ourselves does a good job. The mystery to me is how he does it and actually when he does it, because although the night life has dried up here in Springfield since Alan has been here, it will never be the same with him gone."

Marovitz: "Well, for the information of my friend, Representative Caldwell, Alan Crane came up to me and said that if I would introduce a Resolution on his behalf he'd be happy to will me his black book, so that's why the Resolution is..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, everyone here has been extolling or removing some of the virtues of Alan Crane but he has someone with him



that I think is tremendous and that's his son, Mark. Mark was my companion last night and...and I'll tell you one thing, I couldn't have had a nicer young gentleman than Mark. And I think his father can take lessons from him because he certainly knows how to win his way to a woman's heart and I'm just going to wait for Mark till he grows up and I can tell you by that time I think he'll be real eligible for me."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madison."

Madison: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the remarks of Representative Davis about the possible extinction but I just want Representative Davis to know that I don't believe that this House could put up with the cloning of a crane."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I was back in the office when Representative Marovitz gave his explanation. I think he said that Alan Crane was going to take another job with WBBM in Chicago. After listening to his many interviews, I wonder if he's going to be on the mystery theater? Is that it Alan?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tom Miller."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that we interrupt the Resolution with three commercials."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move the previous crane."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the same line that Representative Daniels is inquiring of the Sponsor of this Resolution, I wonder if you could clarify something. I always mix up the two most prominent radio voices in Chicago, Alan Crane and Len O'Connor. Now which one's got the white hair? We'd like to know that. Secondly, we'd like to have clarified is that the



real fact that you're introducing this Resolution is, you've made a deal and now Penny is going to leave with Crane to Chicago so that Representative Pullen will no longer be... Well, I was told it was Representative Geo-Karis. But anyway, if you could clarify those two things you've got our vote over here."

Marovitz: "I'll whisper in your ear, Ron."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Nardulli."

Nardulli: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Alan Crane is neighbor of mine. He's a resident of the 19th District. And I want to tell you that he is very capable and outstanding in the neighborhood with the community groups and I'm hoping that his new job doesn't take him away from us. So, Alan, lots of luck to you. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, after Representative Marovitz disclosed that Alan Crane offered to share his black book with him upon departing, I wonder if the Representative would be kind enough to add me as a hyphenated Cosponsor and perhaps Representative Keats and O'Brien...did I overlook anybody?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "I'd be happy to add the entire Membership of the House of Representatives as Cosponsors of this very important Resolution. Everybody except Representative Daniels that is."

Speaker Redmond: "Anybody that wants to be added, raise your hand. The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Resolution. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Take the record. 974. Representative Murphy. Representative Madison, for what purpose do you rise?"

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to have leave of the House to reverse the Roll Call."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels objects."

Daniels: "We don't know who he is. This whole debate has been over a mystery man. Now, Marovitz, if you want to pass this Resolution we want to meet this fella. Now, who is he and which side of the aisle is he really on."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Will the real Alan Crane...the real Alan Crane, please stand up."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk advises me that the electronic machine didn't work correctly that time, so all in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question 159 'aye' and 1 'no'. The Resolution is adopted. 974. Murphy."



Speaker Redmond: "974, Murphy."

Murphy: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, 974 is a Resolution about the midwest rail merger plan. What this is all about is to have this in Illinois' State Legislative Investigating Commission investigate the merger because we are subsidizing some of these railroads with tax dollars. We happen to know what happened down East, that big central railroad, Penn Central, now lives off of the government. The smaller rails are against the merger and as long as there's tax dollars involved, I think it's important of the legislation...of the Legislature to be involved in any merger. Skinner should be on his toes because there's RTA money in here. And I move for the adoption, Sir."

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

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, if the Sponsor will yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Madison: "Representative Murphy, I wonder if you could tell me for the benefit of the taxpayers in Representative Keats' district whether or not Penn Central is on welfare or subsidy?"

Murphy: "I can't answer, Sir."

Madison: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there anything further? The question's on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of House Resolution 974. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 110 'aye' and 18 'no'. The motion carries and the Resolution's adopted."



Speaker Redmond: "1053. Representative Madigan. Representative Madigan, 1053."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 1053 would direct the Illinois Legislative Investigating Commission to investigate the current financial condition of the County Hospital in Chicago, which is under the jurisdiction of the Cook County Health and Governing Commission. There have been numerous newspaper articles detailing the development of testimony in a court case in Chicago which clearly indicates that there has been over expenditure of appropriations with the hospital. This is designed to interject the...the state into the monitoring of expenditures at that location and I would request a favorable Roll Call and I move for the adoption of the Resolution."

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

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "Unfortunately a description of this is not contained in the current Digest. I'm looking at the Calendar, page 5, with the synopsis of this Resolution no reference is made to the Cook County Hospital. Rather it says, 'into the current administration.' You're not talking about state administration, is that correct?"

Madigan: "No. I have the Resolution in my hand and it's directed solely at the Cook County Health and Hospital Governing Commission."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Inquiry of the Sponsor. Has this Resolution gone to Committee?"

Madigan: "Yes, it was reported out of the Executive Committee Wednesday morning."



Levin: "Okay. If I may speaker to the Resolution,
Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Levin: "A couple days ago we had a Bill which looked like it was rather noncontroversial and nobody spoke against it, there was no problem, there just weren't any votes for the Bill. And that was really kind of the first indication, unfortunately, of the controversy that has developed between Cook County Hospital and the County Board. There currently is a lawsuit pending between the two and it seems to me that the appropriate place to resolve the problem is either, (a) between the parties, or (b) in the courts. And there's no need for the Legislature to get involved in what is really a local issue. You know, as a result I would urge non-adoption of this Resolution. We have a very serious problem in Cook County. We do have financial problems at Cook County Hospital. I'm sure that once a little time has passed, the various sides will kind of calm down and there will be the opportunity for reestablishing a dialogue and resolving the problem. But, you know, I...I don't think it would be appropriate for the Legislature at this point to interject itself into what is a very local problem, in which...something that doesn't affect the balance of the state at all."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Keats."

Keats: "Mr. Speaker, I've got a question or two for the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan, Representative Keats desires to inquire."

Keats: "Cook County Hospital, is that a state hospital or a county hospital?"

Madigan: "It's a county hospital."

Keats: "Who appoints the Governing Board of Cook County



Hospital?"

Madigan: "It's a very complicated appointment process that was developed by this Legislature at the direction of Governor Ogilvie during the Ogilvie administration. And it was an Ogilvie reform measure that provides for a blue ribbon screen committee...names to be submitted to another group that makes the eventual appointments. I don't know who does make the actual appointment. Maybe some other Member of the Body knows, I...to answer your question, I don't think it's the County Board."

Keats: "Okay but it's not the state. What we've got another one of these goo...blue ribbon panels."

Madigan: "Ogilvie wanted the state out of this."

Keats: "Okay, then the third question then is the funding then is the funding of the hospital. Outside of Medicaid and Medicare, does the state fund county hospital?"

Madigan: "Not to my knowledge."

Keats: "That's what I'm wondering. It seems to me it's a county hospital and I say this in all seriousness, I don't mean this cynically, George Dunn is quite competent in many cases and I just don't think the state ought to be overriding what is really not a state issue. And I think given a little time George Dunn will take care of it. He has a tendency to do that."

Madigan: "Mr. Keats, the statute does not give anybody the ability to monitor expenditures at the hospital and the interest of the state is through the Department of Public Aid and, as you said, in the Medicare and Medicaid programs which probably provides over 75 percent of the costs of the hospital."

Keats: "Yes, thank you very much, Representative, you did clear up my question."

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

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to look at this Resolution



very carefully. I'm sure that the Majority Leader does have concern about Cook County Hospital. There have been areas of disagreement with the County Board but the Resolution, if you read it, presumes that what has happened there in terms of personnel and service cutbacks is the fault of the Cook County Governing Board. And I think if we're going to have an investigation we ought to investigate the Cook County Commission and the Commissioners of the County Board as well as the Governing Commission. I think it's bad precedence to jump into a highly volatile situation where there's a lawsuit pending, where the future of the only hospital that administers solely to the needs of the poor in Cook County and is very vulnerable for that reason, it would seem to me that it ought to be left to the County Board and the Governing Commission to work out their own problems. And if they can't, if we have an investigation, let's include investigating the County Board as well as the Governing Commission. And for these reasons I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Waddell."

Waddell: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan, will you yield?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Waddell: "Would you be willing to amend this on its face to include the CTA and the RTA?"

Madigan: "No."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield? What's the total appropriation of this?"

Madigan: "This is the direction..."

Conti: "What's the total appropriation for the county hospital to operate the county hospital? The annual budget?"

Madigan: "I think a couple hundred million dollars."

Conti: "Yes, this is the reason I want to speak in behalf of



this Resolution. I think it's very much needed and that there should be...this Resolution should be adopted today because there has been quite a bit of controversy in Cook County on this and I'm, as a taxpayer in Cook County, would like to know just what is taking place at the county hospital."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Caldwell."

Caldwell: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that the Illinois Legislative Investigating Committee is the agency to find out what's wrong with Cook County Hospital's operation. Now, for the last several years, as you know it was under the jurisdiction of the Cook County Board at one time. They tossed it into...there was a ... cry by a lot of the citizens and they set up the Commission. The Commission has been wrestling with it. The problem is that the Cook County Board has to vote for the budget and the Commission has found that with all of the people who become ill, all the emergency business, everything, they dump it into the county hospital and they give them service and that costs money. And... naturally the Cook County Governing Commission comes up every year asking for a supplementary money... I'm not sure that the Legislative Investigating Commission is the agency to do this job. I think it's the responsibility of the Cook County Board itself. It's an awesome job and of course there's no question in my mind that since Dr. Horton took over he's had a lot of pot shots and he's looking over his shoulder all the time while trying to govern and run the hospital efficiently. They searched all over the world and they brought him...took him away from New York City and he came here. He's a guy that's not too much of a diplomat but apparently knows what the hell he's doing and I'm not sure that we're going to make any progress by having our Legislative Investigating Committee do some investigations. I'm going



to oppose this Amendment."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan, to close."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, quite clearly, the State of Illinois has a crucial interest in the operations of this hospital. If the evidence, which has already been educed before the Circuit Court of Cook County is accurate and there's no reason to suspect that it's not, there will be a substantial over expenditure of appropriations at the hospital. And if that does occur you can presume that the administrator of the hospital will look in a variety of places for relief and one of those places will be right here. So that it is in our best interest to interject ourselves immediately and to monitor the expenditure of funds."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of House Resolution 1053. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there's been so much controversy in that hospital... and let's not kid ourselves, a lot of our tax money is going to it and I think we should support this Resolution and let's have something done on it..."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 126 'aye' and 8 'no' and the House does adopt House Resolution 1053. House Joint Resolution 11. Representative Yourell. Representative Yourell on the floor? Out of the record. House Joint Resolution 26. Representative Stearney. 26. Out of the record. House Joint Resolution 42. Representative Porter. Out of the record. House Joint Resolution 95. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, House Joint Resolution 95 would create a special joint Committee of both the House and the Senate to study and examine the admistration of the unemployment



insurance in the State of Illinois. This Resolution was amended yesterday to provide the usual appointment scheme between both the House and the Senate and between the Speaker, the Minority Leader, the President of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the Senate. The Resolution is designed to examine the current operation of the Bureau of Employment Security, Division of Unemployment Compensation. All of us have heard from our constituents. They've heard our constituents complain that claimants before the bureau too easily receive benefits, that there is no proper check by the bureau upon these claims and that it is the poor administration of the Bureau of Employment Security, which is responsible for the large deficit in the unemployment trust fund. I would request a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Members of the House of Representatives, I urge the defeat of this Resolution. It would be a Commission controlled by the Majority Party, 6 to 4. We all know why we have problems with Unemployment Insurance and Workmen's Compensation in the State of Illinois. We ought not participate in perpetrating those problems anew through this Commission, we ought to defeat this Commission, I urge its defeat."

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

Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I agree with the Representative that just spoke. Because, we have had ways to correct the problem. They have been suggested. They have been spoken about, they have been entered into legislation but the very people that are wanting to study, study, study are putting this one in for another Committee. How many Committees do we need. This should not be a



nonpartisan...if it is passed it should be a nonpartisan Commission rather than a partisan Commission. This is all our problems. This is all of our constituents' problems so we should all be a part of it. But studies we've done, studies, more studies, we don't need. I urge the defeat of this Resolution."

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

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, there are four reasons why we should vote 'no' on the adoption of this House Joint Resolution. Number one, we have already had two such joint Committees which studied administrative problem in the bureau in 1976 and in 1977. This Resolution ignores their findings, some of which have already been implemented. Number two, there is strong evidence that the Bureau of Employment Security has vastly improved the quality of hearing officers under the present Thompson administration. Evidence of this is in the increase of the number of disqualifications in 1977, 30 percent as opposed to a figure of only 13 percent in 1976. Three, these types of investigations will only detract from the present need to revise some of the statutory provisions of the Unemployment Compensation Act, including those dealing with benefits for those who voluntarily leave work or refuse to work to honor a picket line. Number four, this joint Committee would have no limit on the monies it may spend on staff, recordings of hearings, per diem, etc. And I join with the others who have spoken against this Resolution and urge a 'no' vote on its adoption."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, we've had a lot of attention given to this area and I think that we proposed several times different things to try to help. We've even proposed a Special Session to deal with some of these problems and we...we had legislation before this House just recently



and we got a ruling back from the Federal Government that we couldn't even do those things because they were response...the responsibility of the Federal Government. We draft and passed legislation that we...it dealt in an area that we weren't even responsible for. I think if anybody's really serious about this program they'll vote for this Resolution. And any study that we can give this area would prove beneficial. I urge an 'aye' vote."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "Fine. The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Madigan, to close the debate."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, this Resolution proposes a study which is very much needed. I would highly recommend it to the Membership and recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Huff, to explain his vote."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Contrary to what a previous speaker said, he thought of four reasons why we shouldn't go into this investigation. Well, I submit to you, Ladies and Gentlemen, I can think of one billion reasons why we should. Because that is exactly the amount that the 'Use Fees Fund' is on the verge of being bankrupt again. And I remind you that around this time last year when Senate Bill 6 was debated on this floor I...I wanted to state then that I thought we would plant ourselves in that posture then. And we have and I think that because of that it does indeed warrant some sort of an investigation."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take



the record. On this question there are 106 'aye', 30 'nay', 3 voting 'present'. The Gentleman's motion carries and the House adopts House Joint Resolution 95. House Joint Resolution 96. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, this Resolution would propose a study of the experience rating system used by the Bureau of Employment Security to determine the tax rate for employers who are participants in the unemployment compensation system. This area certainly cries out for reform and study. All of us have talked to employers who have incurred significant increases in their rates without good explanation. I suggest to you that this is an area where there should be no dispute and we ought to adopt this Resolution."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The question is on the adoption of the Amendment, or the Resolution. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 96 'aye' and 32 'nay' and the Gentleman's motion prevails and the Resolution is adopted. Capparelli 'aye'. House Joint Resolution #97. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I request leave of the Body to amend this Resolution at this time. The Amendment has just been filed and I believe it would be Amendment #1 and would the Clerk read the Amendment? Read the Amendment."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1. Amends House Joint Resolution 97 by inserting after the first Resolved clause the, 'Resolved that the Special Joint Committee shall consist of ten members appointed as follows, three by the Speaker, two by the House Minority Leader, three by the President and two by the Senate Minority Leader, and be it further'."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Madigan, on the Amendment."

Madigan: "I move for the adoption of the Amendment."



Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of the Amendment. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion... Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, we haven't got the Amendment, it hasn't been distributed."

Madigan: "I stated that, that it was just filed with the Clerk and the Clerk read it and I'll explain that... It provides for the normal appointment scheme of a Commission so that there would be three appointed by the Speaker, two appointed by the House Minority Leader, three appointed by the President of the Senate and two by the Senate Minority Leader. This Amendment is identical to those two Amendments that you verified yesterday."

Totten: "Well, I'd like to verify this one but I haven't got the copy to verify it. I've just...I'm just amazed at the way that you can get things through here when other Members rights, who even have things on the Calendar, are abridged to try and get things through this General Assembly and I just think the practice of going to Mr. Madigan's business when he files the Amendments and we don't have a chance to analyze them is...is...it's just a terrible abuse of the power of that microphone and that...we should wait till the Amendment is distributed before we go to it."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, could we hold this until Mr. Totten has the Amendment? Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Take it out of the record. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duyne, arise?"

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, just in response to Representative Totten. I'm surprised too and I'm on his side."

Speaker Bradley: "House Joint Resolution #99. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Antonovych."



Antonovych: "Mr. Speaker, I would urge the adoption of Amendment #1. It's merely a technical Amendment. It changing the effective year. So at this time if you could take this to Second Reading and adopt the Amendment."

Speaker Bradley: "All in favor of the Gentleman's motion will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 106 'aye', no 'nay' and the Amendment is adopted. Bowman and Pechous 'aye' on that. That was just on the Amendment, we'll vote on the Resolution now. Are there further Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Antonovych, on the Resolution."

Antonovych: "The Resolution would create an Ethnic Heritage Festival Committee. Its purpose would be to designate a ten-day period next summer, 1979, to try to coordinate the many very local festivals going on throughout the metropolitan area of Chicago and to coordinate these festivals so that we can give more of a national prominence to the ethnic makeup of our area, looking at a map at the Smithsonian Museum I could see that other than for the Eastern seaboard Chicago has the largest density of ethnic population and I would urge the adoption of this Resolution."

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

Darrow: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Darrow: "Why have you limited this to the Chicago area? We have ethnic cultures throughout the State of Illinois and this is...this is something that we should consider for the whole state."

Antonovych: "Sure, we're not trying to restrict this. It would be a matter of transportation and convenience because what we'll try to do is put Chicago, as the center



on the map to encourage the national interest. However, in the Resolution we have the term 'elsewhere', so it does not restrict it to Chicago. I'm aware of Bishop Hill with the Swedish population and very many other areas of settlement of ethnic groups."

Darrow: "Is there an appropriation for this?"

Antonovych: "Not in this Resolution. We're trying to get an appropriation of 25 thousand dollars if needed to get one staff person to go to the various groups residing in the state to coordinate this. It's a very difficult process because every neighborhood, if you can imagine, every local church, every parish has its own festival and to try to coordinate this information and see what the interests is to have this, for example, in a ten-day period in the month of August would require some staff personnel. But it's not in this Resolution."

Darrow: "Well, Representative Polk and I represent a huge amount of Belgians and we don't want you to forget us."

Antonovych: "I won't."

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

Polk: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Polk: "Representative Antonovych, could you tell me what the Roll Call vote was in the Illinois Foreign Relations Committee was on this Amendment?"

Antonovych: "I think it was unanimous."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion to adopt the Resolution. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 104 'aye', 6 'nay' and the Resolution is adopted. Senate Joint Resolution 62. Is Mr. Barnes on the floor? On the Calendar on page 4 under Conference Committee Reports appears House Bill



1803, Mr. Stuffle. The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle."
Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I would move to...
that the House accept the Conference Committee Report...
first report on 1803. This is a Bill that deals with the
various state funded pension systems and an increased
in the post retirement adjustment for pension purposes
of two to three percent."

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

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield for a
question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

McCourt: "Is this the...similar to...this is House Bill 1803,
can you tell me when that Bill first went out of the
House how many systems it was applicable to?"

Stuffle: "I didn't hear the question, Sir."

McCourt: "Well, House Bill 1803, as I remember it, that
Bill was applicable only to two pension systems. I
believe it was the state employees system and the university
employees system. Is that correct?"

Stuffle: "When it went out of the House it had two systems.
When it came back from the Senate it had three and there
was a fourth possibility there. The Amendment was
withdrawn in the Senate, when we got to Conference Committee
we decided to work with all four of the basic state
employees systems."

McCourt: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House, what we're doing here today will be setting a
very bad precedent. The Senate Amendment requires that
active members of both the state and university pension
systems pay one half of one percent additional contributions
as to the...for the additional benefits, increasing the
annual income for the retirees from two to three percent.
Now that...that Amendment was rejected and in turn this
Conference Committee Report says that we will increase the
annual increment from two to three percent for the state



employees, the state university employees and the Downstate teacher system. Now the impact statement that we received originally shows that this will cost the state employee system 35 to 40 million dollars annually and the State Employees Pension System at least 20 million dollars. We have received no impact statement for the Downstate teachers system. There are 17 pensions systems whose benefits are controlled by this General Assembly. Concurring in this report will affect the policy of all the other 14 systems. Once the benefit accrues it cannot be reduced under our Constitution. Defeat of this concurrence report is a vote for the preservation of the financial stability of our pension system. Pensions should not be increased without increasing the employee's contribution. If ever a motion deserved a 'no' vote this concurrence report does and I solicit your 'no' vote."

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

Robinson: "Mr. Speaker, I think that everyone, even the Gentleman who just spoke, would agree that the retirees from the schools, from state government, are having a hard time because of the raise in cost of living. The average pension for state employees for instance, is under 300 dollars. And I think everyone could agree that that just isn't enough to live on and that there is certainly a need for an increase. Right now state employees, retired teachers get an annual increase of 2 percent a year. And that's just not enough. Now I know that pensions are complicated. Representative Stuffle, perhaps more than anyone on this floor, has worked with pension issues day in and day out as a staff member and as a Legislator. Let me just go over a little history in this pension system. A few years ago when the Legislature and the retirees got together and said, 'We need a cost of living increase.', there was



an agreement that the state employees and the teachers would pay a half of percent contribution. And in return for that contribution they would get a two percent increase. And that that half of percent contribution was to pay for that two percent increment each year for the retirees. What's happened? That contribution was not only more than enough, it brings in two to three times, every year, the cost of the two percent that the retirees get. In other words, for instance with the state employees system last year it cost a million 300 thousand dollars. And yet employees paid in almost five million dollars. And this has been happening year in and year out so that, for instance for the state employees there is now a reserve account of 85 million dollars that the employees paid in that was an addition to what was needed to pay out. For the universities, 25.6 million sitting there. Downstate teachers, 95.6 million sitting there and Chicago teachers 81 million. And that reserve account is going to grow even if we pass a 1 percent increment for the retirees. Something that will give them a little extra money to live on. These people have worked all of their lives in state service. This is more than fair. This is more than fair. These people have paid in for their regular benefits everything they were asked. Why is there a problem with the Pension System? Because the state didn't pay its share. But with this benefit, which it accounted separately, with this benefit it didn't take any state payment to make up for it. The payments by the workers themselves is two to three times more than is needed for the existing benefits and two times more than is needed even if we raise it. This is only fair. It's only just. The agreement was made before. Let's pass this and let's pass it now."



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

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm going to have to concur in what Representative McCourt has said. And I'd like to go into this in just a little depth. I don't deny that those who are retired and the automatic..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Ebbesen, one minute please. Mr. Conti, for what purpose do you rise?"

Conti: "Mr. Ebbesen, I'm sorry to interrupt but there's a young Page boy here that has two hot clam chowders that are going to be very cold unless he can find where they belong."

Speaker Bradley: "Just found them. Mr. Ebbesen, continue Sir."

Ebbesen: "Yes. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to just review just a little in terms of this whole pension picture. I don't think anyone in this House or anyone in the General Assembly, as a matter of fact, would...would not agree that the amount that some people are attempting to survive on in the retirement category is...even with the two percent increase...automatic increment every year, is not enough. I would call your attention also to the fact that on the Conference Committee Report two people that failed to sign that report recommending this proposal was the...one was the Chairman or is the Chairman of the Pension Laws Commission, Senator Robert Egan. And another one is a member and I think Vice-Chairman, Senator Berning, did not sign this. The reason for it, I think is twofold. I think the Senate agreed that if we're going to do this at least we could ask for one half in all these systems. One half of one percent to be paid by that employee. Now, I'm here to tell you that I'm aware also that as far as the employees are concerned, where the state has responsibility and is



the employer, the employees are 100 percent funded with all their contributions, there's no question about that. But you have to look at the bottom line, the bottom line in all of these systems very simply shows, by the Illinois Department of Insurance - the Pension Division shows that in the last two years even with this General Assembly restricting itself the unfunded accrued liability has gone from about 5.6 billion up 22 percent over 7 billion dollars. Now let's relate that to this particular proposal. I'll admit that when you talk about separating the automatic increment payment and separating that out, according to the systems there's enough money there. But what impact is this, if it's adopted, going to have as far as an obligation, a state obligation in the years ahead. It's 204 million dollars added to that over 7 billion already a problem for this state. In my opinion the most serious problem that we have in the State of Illinois. And when you take a look at the bond rating that we have, we now enjoy the Triple A Bond rating. And I have talked to people in the Bureau of the Budget and the administration and they advise me that impact such as this could place our Triple A Bond rating in jeopardy. And I just am here to tell you that I agree that something should be done. I think the Pension Laws Commission is addressing itself to this automatic increment on a program systematic way accompanied by something to be done in terms of a program. A program over 20, 25 to 30 years of reducing that unfunded accrued liability. But we will never be able to address ourselves to this problem if we continue to place ourselves further and further in the hole, obligating state funds for today's services, transferring that responsibility, that payment into the future. And I want to tell you, it's legislation like this that puts us in a posture where we'll



~~never be able to answer it.~~ I would encourage everyone to take a close look at what they're doing on this vote and put this back into a Conference Committee and let's come out with something with a little bit more sense to it."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman. The Gentleman from Marion, Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Friedrich: "I think that Representative Ebbesen answered some of my questions and possibly some of those of the others. The Downstate teachers have talked to me about this and say they have a paid in surplus of some 96 million dollars. Now, just to be sure I understand, is that merely the teacher's portion similar to what they would pay in on the regular and the state match has to come in addition to that? In other words, does that presuppose additional fund...state monies, as Representative Ebbesen has said, which would be the major part of the pension plan? What is anticipated pay in by the...for the state's portion for this increased two percent?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "I think you're asking me about, first of all whether or not..what the teachers have told you is in regard to only their contribution or to the state's, is that correct?"

Friedrich: "Well, is the 96 million dollars to take care of the two percent or does that presuppose an additional payment by the state which would be comparable to what they pay already on the pension plan... What does..."

Stuffle: "The point is that the state, in this situation, is not as Representative Terzich just informed me, is not involved to this particular benefit to the extent it is



in the others because the others do not have a reserve available. The unfunded.... Let me finish. The unfunded liability situation, I think Representative Ebbesen even mentioned that in opposing this, is mainly a function of the other benefits. This is a benefit that is paid separately, Representative Friedrich, paid for separately by a employee - employer match. However, the situation is such that the employee contribution alone, along with the interest on the reserves in this coming year were we to pass this, would still be double the expenditure for the coming year. It would even be greater in the year 1995, in this same system, than would be the expenditure. The reserve is now 95 million dollars just in employee contributions and it would be a reserve 196 million dollars in 1995, just from the employee and the employee interest on the contributions that would serve as a part of the reserve. We're talking about apples and oranges when we talk about this benefit and relating it to the overall unfunded liability."

Friedrich: "Well let's just talk about this one. The employee will pay a half of one percent. What will the state match for that amount to it?"

Stuffle: "The employees pay their share on this thing. The state is suppose to match but they aren't. That's the point. They aren't having to match because we're paying out the full amount. If we were paying out the full half and one half each we would paying out in the coming year, if we took the one half and one half, Representative Friedrich, if we paid them both out..that's being contributed or is suppose to be contributed and is by the employee, it's not by the employer...if we were we'd be spending 17 and a half million dollars on this. 8.7 roughly from employees and 8.7 from the employer. We're not from the employer because we're only expending 7 and a half million dollars for this benefit."



Friedrich: "Is the employee, is the retired teacher getting his two percent increment each year?"

Stuffle: "He is now, yes. He's getting two now."

Friedrich: "And there's adequate funds in the fund to continue for him to get that?"

Stuffle: "There's adequate funds to continue that, there's adequate funds to go to three percent and stay at three percent. As I've pointed out, I've got figures clear to the year 1995 for each of these systems and each system would be able to pay out through that year. Be able to pay out through that year and have more money coming in in each of those years then paying out and having a reserve of substantial millions of dollars."

Friedrich: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle to close the debate."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I'm sorry to see that once again we've tried to separate, we've tried to separate on this side this benefit from the overall problem of the pension systems. Representative Robinson and Terzich and I have worked on this problem all year and in previous years in the case of Representative Terzich and myself. We're talking about a benefit that we ought to all recognize as a benefit that the employees in these four systems are not only meeting the need of paying out for, but substantially committing their own paychecks toward...in amounts that are far, far greater than the payout and that will be far, far greater than the pay out. They pay separately for this benefit now. I might point out to you, as I did just



now on the teacher's system, that the teachers with what they pay into the system, the next fiscal year for three percent, what they pay now will be double the pay out. What the Chicago teachers pay will be triple the pay out. The universities, 2.8 times the pay out. The state employees, three and a half times the pay out. The Republican Staff Analysis even..on you side of the aisle points this out vividly when it says the existing reserves are sufficient for pay out. They go on to say, 'Since these reserves may not be used to retire other unfunded liabilities for other benefits and since these reserves will actually increase at an annual rate, exceedingly unfunded liability of the benefit, there would appear to be no need for further employee contributions in this point in time.' I reiterate what Representative Robinson said, keep in mind what I just said first, it's for future not just now. Currently 85 million dollar reserve surplus for this benefit, state employees. 25 and 6 tenths million, universities. 95.6 million, downstate teachers. .81 million, Chicago teachers. That comes from the Republican Analysis. The Democratic Analysis would agree and does. Senator Shapiro is fighting for this proposal in the Senate. He chaired the Pensions Laws Commission when I worked with it and for it as a Democratic Staffer in the Senate. Representative Terzich, who probably knows more than I do and does about these pension systems supports this. He served many years on that system and I can tell you that Representative(sic) Shapiro and Representative Terzich and I are not people who bring things here to break the bank on pensions. We've consistently opposed things that we thought would further harm these systems. This will not. We're asking for one percent. One percent for increase for people who average 268 dollars a month in pension payments under the



state employees system and comparable amounts under other systems. We granted, to note what Representative Ebbesen said, that the Chairman of the Pension Laws Commission opposes this. We granted a 50 to 80 million dollar business tax credit this year that he sponsored on the sale of machinery and new products. We're asking for one percent. He opposes that. The one percent is essential. Five years in a row the Pension Laws Commission said, 'Let's put the issue on the back burner. Let's think about it next year.' Even yesterday one of those Members of the Commission said let's put it back in Committee and wait again till next year. The time has come now. These are the poorest of the poor. 65 percent inflation has taken place since '69 when we introduced this two percent. You can't tell them they can't have the benefit because the state hasn't paid. They have. I urge an affirmative vote on 1803."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 1803. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wished? There will be no demonstrating in the gallery. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 135 'aye' and 13 'nay' and the House adopts Committee...Conference Committee Report #1 to 1803. Senate Bill 393. Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Conference Committee met on Senate Bill 393 and the Senate receded...the Senate has already concurred in the Conference Committee Report which recommended that the Senate recede and that we adopt House Amendment #2. So the Conference Committee provides that Senate Bill 393 is exactly as was passed out of the House, providing for medical services for diagnostic and evaluative purposes, as



far as special ed. is concerned, provided by a licensed physician or a physician licensed to practice medicine in all its branches to determine a child's need for special ed. and related services. And I move concurrence in the Conference Committee Report on 393."

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

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, I was on this Conference Committee and if you see the report you may see my name missing. That in no way should mean that I did not support this Bill. I was not there, available at the time of signing. I want to commend the Sponsor, Representative Hoffman and Senator Berman for working long and hard on this area and I urge your concurrence with this Bill."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

McClain: "Gene, does it not take off the cap for special education tuition, 4500, if the local sum is greater than 4500?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "That...that issue is in 395. You might want to ask the question then but I'll give you the answer now. There's been no change in that from what it was when it went out of the House."

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

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd point out to the Speaker that we just received Supplemental Calendar #1, dated 12:05, listing certain Conference Committee Reports. The rules state that those Conference Committee Reports cannot be acted upon until one hour. And this thing is dated 12:05, we received it at 1:20 and we don't have those Conference Committee Reports as received as yet so I would respectfully request that we,



even though the Calendar is dated 12:05, it cannot be until sometime around 2:30 before we can hear those on Supplemental #1."

Speaker Bradley: "Sir, your point is not timely. We are not on Supplemental Calendar #1. I think the proper time would be when we go to that order of business. The Gentleman has moved the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 393. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye' and opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 143 'aye', 1 'nay' and none voting 'present' and the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 393. Senate Bill 395. The Gentleman from Cook...DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. When Senate Bill 395 was passed out of the House and went to the Senate it became apparent that we had made an error in the language in terms of a reference in one of the paragraphs using the word 'it'. We intended to refer back to the Rate Review Board and it in fact referred back to the word 'staff'. So to clarify this and take care of one other difficulty we put in a Conference Committee Report all of House Amendment #1 and Amendment #3. The error was in Amendment #3 and we corrected that and we also provided that one of the..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Hoffman, I hate to interrupt you but I just want to inform the Members that the T.V. light is on and they're taking some shots in the House right now for a few minutes. Proceed, Sir."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much. We took one line out of the Bill that was passed in the House which said that the special education or the Governor's Rate Review Board shall establish rules and regulations for...actually



it came out of the 1st House Amendment which said that the Board shall employ professional staff and contract for professional services to verify the ability of each private facility to meet the needs of handicapped children placed in special ed. Since the Superintendent of Public Instruction or his designee will be a member of this board this directive would have been duplicated by the efforts that are already performed in the Illinois Office of Education. And for that reason and the judgement of the Senate Sponsor, in which I concurred that this sentence should be deleted to make it clear that we did not want to become bifurcated on that particular responsibility. So with that explanation, Mr. Speaker, I would move for the concurrence in Conference Committee Report #395. We did not do anything else with the Bill in terms of the...the formula or anything else, it all stays exactly the same."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 395. On that question, all in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 147 'aye', no 'nay', 2 'present' and the House does adopt the Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 395. Senate Bill 1546. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would urge the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 on Senate Bill 1546. What Senate Bill 1546 does is allow the Commerce Commission to give preferential rate treatment to institutions that are necessary...that provide human needs and also for law enforcement facilities. The different between the House and the Senate version is the Senate version applies to both natural gas and electricity and does not define residential



structures and I would urge the adoption of Conference Committee #1."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Schlickman: "What definition, if any, is provided in the Conference Committee Report with respect to the words 'essential human needs'?"

Kane: "There is none. The purpose of the Bill is to allow the Commerce Commission the power to do that defining and also to take into account those kinds of...of elements which they say the statute does not allow them to do now."

Schlickman: "In other words someone could interpret it to include 'Macdonald', others could include it...interpret it to include something else."

Kane: "Well it would be up to the Commerce Commission, not one person rather than another. The Commerce Commission would be up to...as I understand the activities of the Commerce Commission in the past is that they have been reluctant to do this at all. And given their attitude I would think that it is likely that they will define that very narrowly."

Schlickman: "I have not received a copy of the Conference Committee Report and I'm not objecting on that basis but I understand that the House Republican signatures are absent from this Conference Committee Report, is that correct?"

Kane: "The Conference Committee Report was signed by all of the Senate Members and three of the House Members. It was signed by out of the ten Conference Committee..."

Schlickman: "Why were the Republican House Members ignored or why didn't they participate in this Conference Committee Report?"



Kane: "They were there. They preferred the House language which defined what a residence was and also defined hospitals. They wanted a tighter language."

Schlickman: "In other words, the Minority in the House is not represented in this Conference Committee Report."

Kane: "They were represented, they do not agree with it."

Schlickman: "Well they're not represented with respect to the motion that we accept or adopt this Conference Committee Report."

Kane: "The majority of the Conference Committee signed it."

Schlickman: "In other words, the Republican House Members have not. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1546. All in favor... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition of the acceptance of the Conference Committee Report. On a similar Bill earlier we heard Representative Conti opposing identical language. And I supported the Sponsor because I felt we needed to get at least one Bill on the Governor's desk so that there was something. So I think we have an opportunity here with the Senate Bill to correct the language in this Bill. This Bill really doesn't do very much as far as solving the problem of priorities. The language is very, very vague. You know, what is essential human need? As Representative Conti indicated a couple days ago, you can have essential human needs of a supermarket or if you need essential human needs to be clothed so you can have a department store, you can ram a truck through the language. I think the language that was proposed in the Amendment that Representative Conti and I offered is a lot better. It's very specific. It makes very clear that residential facilities and hospitals and governments are what get the



priorities. That's what the Illinois Commerce Commission can understand. I see no need for passing simply a second Bill with this rather vague language. I understand that, you know, the Senate, at least some of these Senators are pretty vehement that they wanted this vague language but I think we can take their Bill and send it to Conference Committee and say to them, 'If you want to pass your Bill you better change the language so it's meaningful. As a result, unfortunately Representative Conti isn't here right now but I'm sure if he were he would echo with me that we should defeat this Conference Committee Report, have a Second Conference Committee and accept the language in House Amendment #2.'

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Kane, do you wish to close?"

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would urge the adoption of Conference Committee #1. I think that the debates in both the House and the Senate are clear for what we need or want with the definition of essential human needs. And what this language does is apply to both electricity and normal... and natural gas and I think that if we're going to do it for natural gas we ought to do it for electricity also and I think that this language is broader and better and gives direction to the Commerce Commission that we would like it to. And I would ask for your favorable vote on Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1546. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm a Member of this Conference Committee and I did not sign the report because I believe that the version that this House passed was much more clearly defined, would do



a much better job of addressing the needs that it sought in this Bill and I urge the rejection of this Conference Committee Report so that we might get some sense out of the Senate. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes. The Gentleman from Christian, Mr. Tipsword, to explain his vote."

Tipsword: "I may be understanding your explanation of this report but it appears to me that the version that we now have before us is far better for the operation of the Commerce Commission because it gives them more general guidelines and lets them therefore expand and contract in their operation and in their decision so that they can cover various and different energy matters as they do arise and as they relate to different people so that we are sure that they can cover all of these emergency matters to take care of all of these kinds of emergency problems that might arise that we may not foresee. When we go to definite language it may satisfy us that we're defining things and that we in our own minds view as good. But by putting in such defining language we're also putting in generally and especially in this instance, confining language, so that therefore the Commerce Commission does not have the latitude that it should have to well serve people in the way that we want them to serve them in this particular Bill. And I urge that we do adopt this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Caldwell, to explain his vote."

Caldwell: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I don't know what the...all of the confusion is about. What we're simply asking here and it was agreed upon by all Members of the Conference Committee who signed the report



that in the event of an emergency and there had to be some selection as to where to use what to consider emergency power and energy, the Commerce Commission, which is our Agency that has the expertise to make that judgement would have broad powers to do so. I don't understand why hopefully we won't have that type of an emergency, but in the event that we do the Commerce Commission is the agency to make that decision and make that judgement and I would urge some more green lights up there and let's get this Bill passed."

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

Schlickman: "Not to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker, but to declare my intention. If this Bill receives 89 votes I'm going to ask for a verification. It's obvious that the votes aren't here. I respectfully suggest that you declare the motion lost and let's have a second Conference Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "Well... Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 82 'aye' and 59 'nay'. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

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

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Adams. Antonovych. Jane Barnes. Conti. Daniels. Jack Davis. Edgar. Ewing. Friedrich. Gaines. Geo-Karis. Hart. Hoffman. Hudson. Huff. Kempiners. Macdonald. Madison."

Speaker Bradley: "Madison, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "McBroom. Mudd. O'Brien. Reed. Schneider. Schuneman. Stearney."

Speaker Bradley: "O'Brien 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Winchester and Wolf."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty, for what purpose do you rise?"



Getty: "Would you please change my 'present' vote to 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record Mr. Getty as voting 'aye'."

Further changes or additions, subtractions? Mr. Mudd.

Mr. Mudd wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Mr. Steczo wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. 85 'aye' and 60 'no' and the House does not adopt Conference Committee Report #1. What do you want to do, Mr. Kane... Want it on Postponed? Postponed Consideration is what he requests. It's on Postponed Consideration. On page 2 appears Senate Bills, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 1864. The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1864. A Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the ordinary and contingent expense of the Bureau of the Budget. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "We've discussed at length...the Bill at length last night, Mr. Speaker, and I urge its adoption...passage."

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

Skinner: "Am I correct in remembering this has the budget of the Governor's Office of Manpower or something like that in it?"

Vinson: "Yes, Sir."

Skinner: "What assurance can you give this General Assembly that that office will not be in trouble next year as it has been, as it and its predecessor offices have been for the last five years?"

Vinson: "Mr. Skinner, you're an expert at posing a difficult question. The only assurance I can give you is that the Governor has taken personal steps to try to insure the best management possible in the agency and I believe it will be run as best as possible."

Skinner: "Well you certainly aren't responsible for having said the same thing for the last five years but somebody else did standing in your place and I would just point out to my colleagues in the General Assembly that this



department, the subset of this budget which is some, almost 100 million dollars deserves the most severe scrutiny of any department in state government and it has received absolutely none in the House because of this travesty that we call the appropriation process. I hope it doesn't happen the same way next year."

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 wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 117 'aye', 20 'no', and the Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 4 appears 1... Mr. Brady on the floor? Mr. Terzich. 841. On the Supplemental Calendar. Conference Committee Reports, appears Conference Committee Report, House Bill 2775: Jane Barnes. Mr. Totten is objecting to the time. It's the opinion of the Chair the time on the Calendar of the printing of the Calendar was 12:05. We're going to concede a few minutes to get the Bills down here, to get the report down here. They...in 15 minutes it would be 12:20 and 1:20 would be an hour later and it's a quarter till 2:00 so we think we're within the realms of the rules to go with the Supplemental #1. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, for recognizing me. I refer you to Rule 68(d), which says one hour of the Conference Committee Report...must be on the Member's desk. I asked our Page to record the time that those reports were received here. They were received here approximately ten minutes ago."

Speaker Bradley: "The Chair is going to rule that there's no time printed on the Conference Committee Report, the time is printed on the House Calendar and the Chair has no other choice but to go with the time printed on



the Calendar. And so we will proceed with House Bill 2775. Mr. Totten."

Totten: "Well, I'm not referring to the Calendar in this particular case. I think the time on the Calendar is in error but the rules clearly state that it's the Conference Committee Report which must be on the Member's desk. I specifically asked our staff to record the time that those were received and we did and it was only within these last ten or fifteen minutes... 1:30 p.m. he recorded on those reports that we received them."

Speaker Bradley: "Let's go to House Bill 2842. That was passed out yesterday."

Totten: "Right, that one's okay."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, this Conference Committee Report has been on the...our desk since yesterday. Due to some inefficient girls upstairs they weren't able to get it on today's Calendar. Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Bradley: "I hope they heard that."

Flinn: "I hope they didn't."

Speaker Bradley: "They're calling."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2842 suggests that we concur with Senate Amendment #1...#2 rather, which it cleans up the language that we had in the original Bill when we sent it to the Senate and says a little more specifically as to what we mean. And we also inserted a...that is Section 1. Now we've also put a Section 2 in, which gives it an effective date. I move for its adoption."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Leinenweber: "I'm reading from the...our staff analysis and



they say the effect of the Conference Committee Report would permit the issuance of license to church or private schools, liquor sales, limited to periods when groups are assembled for the promotion of common objects other than the consumption of alcohol. I'm not sure I understand what that means."

Flinn: "Well let me go back to the original Bill and explain it again for you and you'll understand. Previously the only, the only reason for the state to deny a state license was if you did not have a local license. And the State Liquor Control Commission has been issuing state license in every instance and there are a good many churches and private schools which... I'm being attacked from the gallery, Mr. Speaker, I want some of the doormen to protect me."

Speaker Bradley: "Refrain from any kind of actions in the gallery, please, while Mr. Flinn is debating this issue."

Flinn: "Back to the Bill. I'm told the Attorney General ruled sometime earlier this year, I'm not sure of the date, that the 100 foot rule applies to churches and schools."

Leinenweber: "Excuse me, Representative, I understand that problem. What I'm wondering about though is the language, 'other than the consumption of alcohol.' Now for example, suppose a church or a private school had a cocktail party, the purpose is actually to raise funds. You wouldn't be ruling out that type of activity?"

Flinn: "No, it rules it in. The Attorney General said that the state cannot issue the license."

Leinenweber: "All right, Mr. Speaker, I'll say something on behalf of the Bill. The Attorney General did come, it was longer ago than this year, it was several years ago or two years ago, he came out with an opinion which I think was patently wrong. But unfortunately certain local liquor commissioners followed the opinion, much to



the concern of many private groups who sought to have fund raising activities where...which would include the sale of alcoholic liquor. I think clarification is in order and I would certainly second the Gentleman's motion to adopt this report."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly."

Kelly: "I also rise to support the...Representative Flinn on this issue. Certainly the churches are and have been involved in this type activity to have fund raising events which are very important to their programs and certainly to their communities. And this will be very beneficial and I would ask you to join Representative Flinn with a 'yes' vote."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Beatty: "Representative Flinn, is there anything in this Conference Committee Report or in this Bill that raises or lowers the drinking age?"

Flinn: "No, there was an attempt in Conference Committee to do that but the majority of the Conference Committee Members felt that that's much too much of an important issue to use it as a piggy-back method. And they thought that it should go to the Committee systems and have a full hearing."

Beatty: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen."

Pullen: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates that he will."

Pullen: "Mr. Sponsor, you commented a moment ago about the state refusing to give a license on the basis of no local licenses being given. Something like that..."

Flinn: "I can't hear her, Mr. Speaker, would you get some order, please? There's a little noise around here."



Speaker Bradley: "Could we have some order so the Gentleman will hear the question, please?"

Pullen: "Will this have any effect on issuance of a state license or permit if the local municipality has not given a license or permit?"

Flinn: "No, it doesn't interfere with that system. If they don't have a local one they can't get a state license, that's still applies."

Pullen: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of... Mr. Flinn, to close."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to point out to Representative Kelly for his support of me does not excuse him for taking me off the Roll Call while I was in Conference Committee yesterday. He's my golfing partner and I'm still holding it against him."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Conference Committee Report #1. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 132 'aye', 13 'nay', 2 voting 'present'. The House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2842. House Bill 2929. Who's... Danny Houlihan, the Gentleman from Cook. Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House do adopt Conference Committee Report #1 on House Bill 2929. The Conference Committee Report essentially amends into the Bill House Bill 3117, which passed this House very substantially but got held in the Senate Rules Committee. If you'll recall, I was the Sponsor of House Bill 3117 and that was the provision that, that provided that where a municipality were to foreclose a demolition lein and all



outstanding delinquent taxes and the demolition lein itself would be voided as far as the municipalities right to sell the property free and clear of any outstanding obligations. There is a prohibition on the prior owner reacquiring the property and the prior owner does have the obligation as far as the...being responsible and liable for the outstanding leins applied against the property prior to the foreclosure of the demolition lein. I see that Representative Mugalian has a question so I'll defer to his question."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, Mr... The Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I handled this Bill and I concur completely with the prior speaker and I would ask for agreement with this first Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, now the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, this may be a perfectly fine Bill and a fine Conference Committee Report but I've been saving all my reports and I have them in order and I don't have this one and maybe our Pages aren't very diligent. I'd like to have at least ten minutes to look at all of them."

Speaker Bradley: "It seems as though all Members have them. Everybody should have them I'm informed. Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, everybody has the report. Discussion? Further discussion? The Gentleman from... Well, Mr. Greiman, did you have a question? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Greiman."

Greiman: "As I understand this Bill as it presently stands, if a municipality...let's see, if a... parcel listed had 5 thousand dollars of back taxes on it and a demolition lein of 800 dollars... Danny, could you just move out of the way? And a demolition lein of 800 dollars and maybe



it was worth 50 thousand dollars as a piece of real-estate, the tax liens would be completely wiped out for the 800 dollar demolition lien. Is that, is that right?"

Houlihan: "What we're talking about is whether there's a foreclosure of the demolition lien by the municipality."

Greiman: "I understand that."

Houlihan: "The municipality then would acquire the property which it would then be able to transfer to a third party, would acquire the property free and clear of any outstanding liens against the property either by way of back taxes or the demolition lien itself. However, the prior owner for who was responsible for, who had incurred the lien against the property and also who had incurred the tax obligation applied against the property is not relieved from that responsibility."

Greiman: "Well, except that's rather illusory since I think out of a half of million parcels of real estate that have some back taxes on them or...50 thousand I mean, they'd sue 200 people. So that the personal liability of the owners is really kind of illusory. But we're really saying, we're really giving, are we not, sort of a preferred position to the municipality over the other units of local government that would maybe get some taxes if there was a tax foreclosure. Aren't we... aren't we really doing that when we wipe out their taxes?"

Houlihan: "The intent of the Bill is to put this property, subsequent to the foreclosure of the demolition lien, is to put this property back on the tax rolls in the hands of a subsequent third party who will either improve the property or use it for some purpose other than what it has been. Obviously, you only go to a foreclosure of a demolition lien as the last resort. What it particularly applies to is slum properties in the City of



Chicago. And that is the rationale for the Bill."

Greiman: "Well it maybe...maybe if it had a limitation on it, I might find this somehow a better Bill. I'm afraid that we're knocking out some money that would go to other units of government. I'm not sure, I'll have to look it over."

Houlihan: "Well in response to your question, the other units of local government are not acquiring their tax revenues anyway and that's the reason why the necessity of the Bill to avoid that obligation for the municipality in selling it to encourage the foreclosure of the demolition lein so that the municipality is in the position to transfer the property free and clear of the outstanding leins."

Houlihan: "I would point out to the Membership that House Bill 3117 did pass this House by a vote of 157 to 0 and it is in the same form here in the Conference Committee Report as it was when it passed the House and I urge the adoption of this Conference Committee Report."

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

Schlickman: "Will the Sponsor yield? Recently, recently I understand a court struck down a law that prohibited a company from doing business with the state or a unit of local government if a former employee of that company had committed a criminal act. Is that correct? And I think it involves..."

Houlihan: "I'm personally not familiar with it but our staff person has indicated to me that that is correct."

Schlickman: "Well it seems to me that in light of that decision we have a part of this Conference Committee Report that would not be sustained by judicial review. And the part that I'm referring to is that part that denies any person, however related to a former owner of the property, from acquiring any interest in the property for ten years. Whether or not that relationship had anything to do with the original acquisition of the property



and whether or not that relationship had anything to do with the failure of paying taxes, specifically a blood... a blood relative, regardless of the proximity of a relationship would be denied acquiring an interest in this property for ten years. And I don't think you could sustain, I don't think the court would sustain upon review, that kind of alienation."

Speaker Bradley: "Is that a question or a statement, Mr. Schlickman?"

Schlickman: "It's a statement."

Speaker Bradley: "Are you finished then, Sir?"

Schlickman: "No, he's trying to get an opinion from Lee Schwartz."

Speaker Bradley: "It was a question then."

Schlickman: "Yes, Sir."

Houlihan: "First of all, Gene, what we're talking about is... in both instances we're talking here about the same identical piece of property."

Schlickman: "I understand."

Houlihan: "Secondly, we are attempting with a ten year provision that is placed here to avoid any type of a windfall benefit to someone who had allowed the situation to occur in the first instance. Now, that particular provision was suggested by Representative Mahar and other Members on your side of the aisle to insure that there could not be a windfall benefit to someone who was responsible for allowing the situation to develop in the first instance. I, of course, can not give you a judicial opinion as far as what a court would or would not rule. However, the staff appears here to be satisfied that we would not be within the purview of the courts decision that your are referring to, that the issues are distinct and dissimilar and in consequence that is the best answer I can give you at this time."



Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I appreciate the public policy that is being promoted by this Conference Committee Report, the public policy being to deny a person who caused a lien on account of the failure of paying taxes from being able subsequently to gain title or interest in a property without any tax lien on it. But to go farther and to prohibit any person however related to the original owner from acquiring interest in that property, in my opinion is unconstitutional and I respectfully suggest that we should not adopt this Conference Committee Report so that it can go back to a second Conference Committee and that alienation on the interest in land, which I think is unreasonable and unconstitutional, should be stricken. And I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of the Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2929. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Totten, arise?"

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, to renew my objection to hearing this until the Members have had an hour to have that Conference Committee on their desk. Now if you want to move to suspend the rule, okay, but you're in violation of the rules in doing it right now."

Speaker Bradley: "Well, the Chair is going to rule that the only thing that I have to go by up here is the time printed on the Calendar, on the Supplemental. Now, what you're doing with the time you're printing and when they arrive on your desk is one thing that I have no control over. So I'm going to go along with the 12:05 on the Calendar. The only thing you can do is suggest that I'm wrong and move to overrule the Chair. But I have no other recourse to go by this time. In fact, I'm not receiving the Conference Committee Reports up at the Chair and you're suggesting that the Chair



should write down the time that I get it up here and I don't...I don't receive them and I...the only thing I have in my hand that there's any time on is the Supplemental. So the Gentleman moves that the Conference Committee Report #1 be adopted, to House Bill 2929, and all in favor of that motion signify by voting 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Conti, to explain his vote."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I was in the Conference Committee. When this Bill first came up we had objections to it. Mr...Representative Mahar and myself was the one that introduced the Amendment that has to be for 10 years. Now how has this been changed? I'm sorry, I walked right in in th middle of the Conference Committee... Is the 10 years still on it? Is the 10 years still on it?"

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 126 'aye', 26 'nay' and the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2929. Senate Bill 250. Mr. Sandquist. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing, arise?"

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make an inquiry of the Chair and then if...a comment. Is it not so that the Speaker's Office is in charge of our Secretarial Offices and the equipment over on the second floor of the Stratton Office Building?"

Speaker Bradley: "Correct."

Ewing: "Yes. And it's my assumption that that equipment and machinery and secretaries are over there for use by Members of this House and not by lobbyists?"

Speaker Bradley: "I'm sorry, Sir, I didn't hear your question."

Ewing: "Am I correct to assume that our copy machines, typewriters and secretaries are not to be used by lobbying



groups?"

Speaker Bradley: "Absolutely."

Ewing: "All right. I have in my hand here a letter from the Public Action Committee thanking Legislators for voting for the tax Bill which we passed out of there. Now I know 'Janet Kelty', she was seen in our copy machine in our wing and I'd like to know who's authorizing the use of state copy machines for this Committee. I oppose it. I'd like to know who authorized it in this Body and I think we deserve an answer, Mr. Speaker. You didn't do it, Dick."

Speaker Bradley: "I would suggest, Mr. Ewing, your point is well taken but I think that's the responsibility of the Republican Party on that side to monitor their own machines."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, this is a Democrat machine and I think I know who authorized it and it wasn't anybody on this side of the aisle."

Speaker Bradley: "Well then I would suggest that the Democrats start monitoring their machines. The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I would move we have an investigation by the Legislative Investigating Commission of this travesty."

Speaker Bradley: "Is there a second to the Gentleman's motion? All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the motion fails and the Gentleman..."



Speaker Bradley: "Senate Bill 250, Mr. Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes....."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon me, the Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Schoberlein."

Schoberlein: "A point of personal privilege."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed, Sir, state your point."

Schoberlein: "The time is getting short and let us start getting these Bills out and let us suspend the rules for the rest of day on all of these reports we're getting in here and get the work of the House done and let us go home."

Speaker Bradley: "Your point is well taken. Mr...Mr. Sandquist."

Sandquist: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I urge ...I urge the House adopt First Report of Conference Committee in connection with House(sic) Bill 250. We debated this at length the other day when it was up here on Third Reading. This is the revision of the Mental Health Code that was first started by the Governor's Commission some three years ago. We went into the various aspects of it during that...the hearing on Third Reading. I'd like to say that the Bill is in the same form now as it was passed out of here several days ago. The Senate has agreed to our version. We had a hearing this morning. Many of you, I know, have received calls from psychologists throughout the state. They appeared at our Conference Committee this morning and after the hearing it was unanimously agreed by the Conference Committee that we accept this Bill in the current form. And I should say at the conclusion of that hearing the President of the Illinois Psychological Association, Dr. Holland, and the former President, Dr. Bennett, while they said that they were not pleased with the version that we had accepted because they wanted the original version - and we had gone back to the Governor's Commission - they did say, and that I could announce here on the floor and Senator Netsch could on the floor of the Senate, that they do support the Bill in its present form. So that....I want to make that very clear. This is a great step in the right direction to preserve the rights of people in need of mental treatment. And I urge that we adopt this Conference Report."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman moves the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 250. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion



signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Levin to explain his vote."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to point out that it seems thatfrom looking at the conferees we have a new House Member, Representative Jack Schaffer."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish?"

Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 148 'ayes', 17 'nays', 2 voting 'present'. The House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 250."



Speaker Bradley: "Senate Bill 252, Mrs. Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 252 went to Conference Committee because of technical problems and the first Conference Committee Report comes out accepting the House version of the Bill with a few technical changes and also has a change to insure the ability of a person to petition the courts contesting the appointment of a temporary guardian. This is the Bill that passed out of this House overwhelmingly to allow the appointment of a temporary or limited guardian in the case of a person who is not able to take care of all their own affairs but not sufficiently incapacitated to be ruled incompetent. I urge the adoption of the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady moves the adoption of the Conference Committee Report #1 to House...Senate Bill 252. All in favor of the Lady's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 152 'aye' and 5 'nay' and the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 252. Senate Bill 253. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan. Would Mr. Bowman...record him as voting 'aye' on the last motion. Mr. Huskey, for what purpose do you rise?"

Huskey: "I made a mistake in pushing my button, could I have an 'aye' vote on that, please."

Speaker Bradley: "Record Mr. Huskey as voting 'aye'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move the adoption of the first Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 253. In summary, what the Conference Committee Report does is to incorporate House Amendment #1. It makes certain



technical typographical and clarifying changes. It makes the appropriate cross references to Senate Bill 255, that's the 4th Bill in this package which is the confidentiality of records. It changes 'Regional Board' to 'Regional Human Rights Authority' and it provides that all Members, rather than just the Chairman of the Regional Authority, are appointed by the Commission. The report has been conferred in by all of the House and Senate conferees and I move the adoption of the report."

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

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I was on the Conference Committee and I'm the only Member of the Committee that didn't sign the report and it wasn't necessarily because the report in itself didn't help the Bill, it did. It corrected, at least in one substantial way, a monumental error in the previous Bill and that was the one that Representative Schlickman had pointed out on the floor, that this agency was so independent it wasn't even subject to audit by the Auditor General. That no longer is the case, it's now an Executive Agency. But the main thought with this Bill is that it is going to establish a monumental layer of bureaucracy. And I don't know how many of you, I count myself as one who campaigned on the idea that we need consolidation in governmental bureaucracy, not expansion. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we do not need this huge...and I want to emphasize the word huge layer of bureaucracy that Senate Bill 253 is going to establish. First of all, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we're going to be voting for a Commission. But not an ordinary Commission, this is called the Guardianship and Mental Health Advocacy Commission. And it is going to be an agency of fixed government with its own budget and with



its own appropriation. That Commission is going to be able to establish regions in the state so that its work can filter down from Springfield here all the way throughout the state. They're going to hire director and staff. How many people? Nobody has any idea. The Commission recommends regulations and procedures of other state agencies. This can have untold economic effect on the cost of state government. In addition to that, we established the legal advocacy service to provide lawyers throughout the state. This is to be administered throughout the state. Then there's the Human Rights Authority to be run through regional boards who have the power, as Representative Schlickman again pointed out, the power to go in without even knocking to examine all files of private providers of services to the mentally ill. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, if any of you have campaigned on the idea that government shouldn't expand over and over and over and higher and higher and higher, then you...the only thing you must do is vote 'no' and kill, not just send them back to another Conference Commission meeting because the only thing you could do to help this Bill would be to strike the enacting clause. Let's kill it right now."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman...the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, apparently the Gentleman who sits in front of me has more trust in providers of the state, of mental health services and services for the retarded than I do. There is an awful lot that needs investigation in my own district, which I as a State Legislator who has more access than the average citizen, cannot properly investigate. I just have to disagree with the Representative from Will. This may be going too far but I assure you we need to go farther than we have. It's quite obvious that the Department of Mental Health cannot be trusted to



adequately monitor its own facilities and one must not go any further than one's local mental health institutions and reflect upon the complaints that you have heard about it. Now there's one thing to learn in government fairly soon and that is if you think something's not working it probably isn't. We've known, for example, for five years that, what did we use to call it, 'Gohr' under Walker, was not working. It's still not working, we've known that for five years and we haven't done anything about it. Now we know the mental health institutions and the private facilities, which are warehousing the patients which, under Governor Ogilive and Governor Walker and now continuing under Governor Thompson, we are discharging to the community, are not providing proper care. Up in Zion 12 people choked to death on food because there wasn't adequate staffing in a nursing home. I think these people need advocates. I think that if we spent our full time as Representatives in each of our districts we might be able to provide such service. I know I don't have my full time to spend on that and I welcome the assistance of this proposed agency."

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

Marovitz: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As principal Sponsor of this Bill I can tell you that most of the newspapers media around the State of Illinois have felt that this is the most important mental health Bill pending in Illinois today. In terms of services and caring for people who otherwise would be unprotected and otherwise would not have anybody to look out for their own individual rights. And I think the question now becomes is whether we're prepared to spend a comparatively small amount, and I repeat, comparatively small amount of money to provide efficient advocacy of the



interests of individual patients or we're going to put pork, p-o-r-k, over the rights of individual citizens of the State of Illinois. This is a Bill that's been worked on since 1973 by Members of both sides of the House of Representatives, both parties, both sides of the rotunda, the Governor's Commission. It is bipartisan in nature and most important of all it services the people that most importantly need these services, the mentally ill in the State of Illinois. It's very easy for all of us to talk about serving people who need service. It's a lot more difficult to get off your duff and act instead of talking. Talk is cheap, now is the time for action. Now is when we're going to see who really cares about serving people and who cares about talking about serving them. I recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McClean, Mr. Deavers."

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question.

All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, to close the debate."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As one of the prior speakers has noted this has been a piece of legislation which has been considered now for several years. The sole reason for nonconcurring in the Amendment and placing it into a Conference Committee were for draftsmanship problems. As Representative Leineweber has indicated, the Bill now is much more tightly drawn than it was when we originally passed it. I think there has been adequate debate, we know what's in the Bill and I urge the adoption of the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 2530. In favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye',



opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, to explain his vote."

Schlickman: "In explaining my vote, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Gentleman from Cook, when he described the contents of the Conference Committee said technical changes. Rightfully pointed out by the Gentleman from Will, that a major substantive change was made, a good change. But only one of about a half of dozen that should have been made. We will be establishing a new Executive Agency of government that will not be responsive to the people of this state that will have the opportunity, the authority, to check and to interfere with the activities...activities of other state agencies. Frankly, screw up the whole bureaucracy of the state. If that's what we want, so be it, but I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber, to explain his vote. I think you spoke in debate, Sir."

Leinenweber: "I wasn't going to explain my vote. There's an awful lot of empty seats voting and I don't know how many paper clips there are here but maybe we should try a new Roll Call or I'll ask for a verification."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 103 'aye' and 52 'nay' and the Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber, requests verification of the Roll. And Mr. Houlihan...Mr. Marovitz requests a poll of the absentees. The opinion of the Chair is we have Conference Committees going on and we know that there are Members in the Conference Committee that are within sound of the voice of the Chair. They'll be here for the verification. Do you persist? Poll the absentees."

Clerk Hall: "Deuster. Hart. Dave Jones. Madison. McBroom.



Peters. Polk. Reed. Robinson. Ryan. E.G. Steele.
No further."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Robinson wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Mr. Wolf 'aye'. Call the Affirmative Roll."

Clerk Hall: "Antonovych. E.M. Barnes. Jane Barnes. Bartulis. Beatty. Bianco. Birchler. Bowman."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I wonder if we could have the Gentlemen sit in their chairs and have..."

Speaker Bradley: "The Members please be in their chairs and when their name is called raise your hand so that Mr. Leinenweber can see that you're here."

Clerk Hall: "Brady. Brandt. Bradley. Breslin. Rich Brummer. Don Brummet. Byers. Caldwell. Capparelli. Chapman. Christensen. Corneal Davis. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. John Dunn. Dyer. Epton. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Friedland. Gaines. Garmisa. Geo-Karis. Getty. Giglio. Giorgi. Greiman. Hanahan. Holewinski. Dan Houlihan. J. M. Houlihan. Hoxsey. Huff. Jaffe."

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

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I guess I was right the first time. I should have been 'no' and do you think I could change back to 'no' again, please?"

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman now as voting 'no'. Continue the call."

Clerk Hall: "Katz. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Kucharski. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leverenz. Levin. Lucco. Luft. Madigan. Mahar. Mann. Margalus. Marovitz. Peggy Smith Martin. Matejek. Matijeovich. Matula. McClain. McGrew. McLendon. McPike. Meyer. Molloy. Mudd."



Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Mudd, arise?"

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, may I have leave to be verified?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Leinenweber is...be verified. Proceed."

Clerk Hall: "Murphy. Nardulli. Pechous. Pierce. Porter. Pouncey. Riley. Richmond. Robinson. Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schneider. Sharp. Shumpert. Skinner. Stuffle. Taylor. Telcser. Terzich. Tipsword. Van Dwyne. Vitek. VonBoeckman. R.V. Walsh. Williams. Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Questions to the affirmative."

Leinenweber: "I'm ready, Mr. Speaker, whenever you are."

Speaker Bradley: "We're starting at 104."

Leinenweber: "Antonovych."

Speaker Bradley: "Right in front of you."

Leinenweber: "Bartulis."

Speaker Bradley: "Bartulis. Is he in his seat? How is he recorded?"

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

Leinenweber: "Beatty."

Speaker Bradley: "Just a minute...just a minute. We'll take Bartulis off. Can Barnes be verified? Remove Bartulis from the Roll. Beatty? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the record, please. Now, Mr. Steczo, for what purpose do you rise?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "How is he recorded?"

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

Steczko: "Please, vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. Further questions?"

Leinenweber: "Brady."

Speaker Bradley: "Brady. There he is. He's standing..."



Mr. Friedland, for what purpose do you rise?"

Friedland: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Bradley: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Friedland: "Make that 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'."

Leinenweber: "Don Brummet."

Speaker Bradley: "Just a minute. Mr. Matula, for what purpose do you rise?"

Matula: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Bradley: "How is he recorded?"

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

Matula: "Make that 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'."

Mr. Polk, from Rock Island."

Polk: "Please record me 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record him as 'no'. All right. All right, proceed, Sir."

Leinenweber: "I said Don Brummet."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Brummet is not in his seat, is he in the chambers? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Leinenweber: "Capparelli."

Speaker Bradley: "Capparelli is not in his seat. Is he in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the Roll."

Leinenweber: "Dawson."

Speaker Bradley: "Johnson? Dawson. He's not in his chair. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll."

Leinenweber: "John Dunn."

Speaker Bradley: "John Dunn is in his chair."



Leinenweber: "Farley."

Speaker Bradley: "Farley. Mr. Stearney has just arrived on the floor."

Leinenweber: "I said Mr. Farley."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Farley is in his...he's not in his chair. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll."

Leinenweber: "Monroe Flinn."

Speaker Bradley: "Monroe Flinn is not in his chair. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll."

Leinenweber: "Representative Garmisa."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Garmisa is not in his chair. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll."

Leinenweber: "Bianco."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Garmisa is right here, put him back on. Bianco is not in his chair, how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Madigan wants to be verified. Move Bianco from the roll."

Leinenweber: "Representative Katz."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Katz. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, arise?"

Houlihan: "Did you put Garmisa back on the Roll Call?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Katz. How is he recorded?"

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

Leinenweber: "Mr. Kozubowski."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Kozubowski is in the aisle."

Leinenweber: "Mr. Laurino."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Laurino. How is the Gentleman recorded? Here he comes in the center aisle."



Leinenweber: "Coach Lucco."

Speaker Bradley: "Coach Lucco, how is he recorded? Here he comes. Mr. McAuliffe, for what purpose do you rise? Mr. McAuliffe goes from 'no' to 'aye'. Mr. Stanley wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Mr. Speaker, please change me from 'present' to 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record him as voting 'no'. Mr. Edgar."

Edgar: "Change me from 'present' to 'no', please."

Speaker Bradley: "'present' to 'no'. Representative Matijevich. Mr. Bianco is back on the floor, put him back on the roll. Mr. Matijevich, for what purpose do you rise?"

Matijevich: "Well, he just called my name, I'd like to be verified, I'm on..."

Speaker Bradley: "I see it, John, fine. Mr. Emil Jones, for what purpose do you rise?"

Jones: "Change me from 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'."

Leinenweber: "McClain."

Speaker Bradley: "McClain is in his...in the aisle."

Leinenweber: "McGrew."

Speaker Bradley: "McGrew. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll."

Leinenweber: "McLendon."

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

Leinenweber: "Meyer."

Speaker Bradley: "Meyer. I can't see back there. He's not in his chair. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll."

Leinenweber: "Robinson."

Speaker Bradley: "Robinson. Robinson is not in his chair, is he in the chamber? Take him off the roll."

Leinenweber: "Schisler."



Speaker Bradley: "Oh, wait a minute. Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "It was my impression that Representative Robinson was verified before he started going through the names individually and made that request to the Chair."

Leinenweber: "I don't recall doing that. I stand corrected if I did but I don't recall it Mr. Speaker, will you check the record?"

Speaker Bradley: "In all fairness, I don't think he did. I think it was Mr. Mudd. Robinson just returned."

Leinenweber: "All right. Schisler."

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

Leinenweber: "Terzich."

Speaker Bradley: "Terzich is not in his seat, is he in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Just a minute. Let's take him off the roll."

Leinenweber: "VonBoeckman."

Speaker Bradley: "He's not in his chair. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll."

Leinenweber: "Williams."

Speaker Bradley: "Williams is not in his seat. How is he recorded?"

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

Leinenweber: "Kane."

Speaker Bradley: "Just a minute, we have to take him off... Take him off the roll. Kane is in the chamber."

Leinenweber: "Did Williams get off?"

Speaker Bradley: "I think we took Williams off. Did we take Williams off, Mr. Clerk? Williams is off. The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Bennett, for what purpose do you rise?"

Bennett: "Would you change me from 'no' to 'aye', please."

Speaker Bradley: "Record Mr. Bennett as voting 'aye'."



Leinenweber: "What's the count now, Speaker?"

Speaker Bradley: It's going to take a while to get the count...Mr. Farley has returned, put him back on the roll. Farley. 95 'aye'. Further questions? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Would you make that 96, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Madison wants to make it 96 with his vote 'aye'."

Leinenweber: "I throw in the towel, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "We'll pick it up and run with it. And the... On this question 96 'aye', 54 'no' and the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 253. How about...Senate Bill 255. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a confidentiality Bill. The..."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon me, Mr. Mugalian, the T.V. lights are on again for some still pictures. Proceed, Sir."

Mugalian: "The Conference Committee report deals only with technical changes and rearrangements of Sections. The House Amendments were approved but put in a different place. There are no substantive changes as a result of the Conference Committee and I ask for its approval."

Speaker Bradley: "Discussion? Hearing none, the question is on the adoption of the Conference Committee Report. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 151 'aye', no 'nay' and the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 255. On the Calendar on page 3 under concurrences appears House Bill 3202. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House do concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3202. Senate Amendments 1



and 2 retain the Bill in the same shape that it was when it passed this House and in addition, as a result of these two Amendments, they have certain new material which creates the Illinois Equal Employment Opportunity Act. This Act would establish the new Department of Equal Employment Opportunity and establish personnel and procedures for the Department. It also repeals existing equal employment opportunity legislation. What Amendment #2 does is simply to correct a technical error in Amendment #1. A way of background for consideration of these two Senate Amendments, the present Illinois Equal Employment Opportunity Law that was enacted in 1976 was a part of the Personnel Code and applies to the Executive Branch, including Executive officials and to public colleges and universities. The law provides for equal employment opportunity officer in each executive body, a state equal employment opportunity officer in a five-member bipartisan advisory Committee, to the state, equal employment opportunity officers composed of women, minorities and the handicapped. I would point out that Senate Amendments 1 and 2 are virtually identical to Senate Bill 1690, which passed the Senate with a substantial vote of...and subsequently died in the House Rules Committee. A way of summary, as far as the new Act, which is embodied in Senate Amendments 1 and 2, there is a declaration of state policy that equal employment opportunity and affirmative action are declared to be the policy of the state and all of its decisions, programs and activities. The department itself is created as a new executive state agency. The Civil Administrative Code is there and they have to amend it to conform with the creation of the department and to apply the provisions of the code with respect to employee's hour, reports, departmental conduct, interdepartmental cooperation. The director of the department, under the



Amendment, is appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate to a two-year term at a salary set by the Governor and then... In addition to the requirements established by the department it sets forth that the director must establish rules for agency plans, periodically appraise agency compliance with the Act and the agencies own plan and approve the appointments of agency...Equal Employment Opportunity Officers. It then goes on to dictate the responsibility of agencies over which this department will have jurisdiction and intergovernmental cooperation policy. It has also set up an advisory council, which will be a bipartisan, no more than 8 from any one party on a 15 member body appointed by the Governor with the advice and consent of the Senate. In summary form, that is the background of Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to the Bill and I urge your adoption and concurrence with Senate Amendments 1 and 2."

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

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if what I said in the last Bill had any validity at all and that Bill was not a good one, this is worse. This is creation of another bureaucratic agency but instead of supplying perhaps an area that might need some existing regulations such as Representative Skinner pointed out, there were problems in the mental health field, this agency is designed to do absolutely nothing that's not being done now by state government. The Bill completely duplicates efforts of existing state agencies. Most state agencies already have affirmative action administrators. The Department of Personnel has affirmative action policies for all state agencies. The Department of Labor and the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation already provide job training for women, minorities and handicapped. The Department of General Services is already required to set aside a certain percentage of state contracts for



minority businesses dealing with the state. Now I don't know whether you agree or disagree with affirmative action or establishing quotas for state business, but nevertheless, we're doing it right now. Why do we want to create a new state office of equal employment opportunity? A new bureaucratic layer, spend more money to hire more people? Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, every time we talk about tax relief programs during this past week, everybody has mentioned Proposition 13 in California. Well one of the things Proposition 13 tells us, whether it be in the local property tax level on the state level, we've got enough spending, we've got enough programs, we've got enough bureaucracy. Why...why do we want to establish a new level of bureaucracy to duplicate the efforts that the bureaucrats are already doing? Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, let's not go insane this Session, let's kill this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Miller, to explain his..."

Miller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise to ask your opposition to the concurrence report for another reason. Here we are on the 30th day of June, having placed before us a whole subject matter that we have never had the opportunity to hear, either in Committee or on the floor of the House. We haven't had the opportunity to hear testimony from people throughout the state, either on behalf of the Bill or against the Bill. I think it's a bad practice for us to be introducing totally new subject matter into a Conference Report that we've never had the opportunity to hear. And for no other reason, I ask you to cast a 'no' vote on concurrence."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman... I'm sorry, Mr... Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Robert...the author of Robert's



Rules of Order, is crying from his grave right now, 'Not germane, not germane, not germane.' Would you please make a ruling that this is not germane? This Amendment has nothing to do with the Bill as originally introduced and as passed by this House. This Amendment is completely out of the scope of the title of the Bill as it was passed by this House. I join with Robert, Mr. Speaker, by saying not germane, not germane, not germane. And let's send this back to the grave."

Speaker Bradley: "The Chair is going to rule that it is germane and I see no other possibility that, why it wouldn't be germane. Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't think I have ever made a motion to appeal the ruling of the Chair. And before doing it I should like to have the courtesy of your justifying your decision or ruling that this Amendment is germane. Different subject matter, different Act, different title."

Speaker Bradley: "Not from 3202."

Schlickman: "3202 is an Amendment to the Fair Employment Practice Act."

Speaker Bradley: "3202 is an Act to add a Section to the Fair Employment Practice Act and that's what we're doing here, Sir."

Schlickman: "We're creating a new state agency, a new Act."

Speaker Bradley: "In..within that Act, in the opinion of the Chair."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully move to appeal the ruling of the Chair."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves to appeal the ruling of the Chair. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'.
The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "How is the question stated?"



Speaker Bradley: "He's appealing the ruling of the Chair on the germaneness."

Brummer: "It's a motion to overrule or..."

Speaker Bradley: "That's... It's a motion to overrule the Chair. If you want to overrule the Chair you vote with Mr. Schlickman and you vote green. If you want to support the Chair you vote red. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 52 'aye' and 87 'no' and the Gentleman's motion fails. Further discussion? Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "In speaking to the motion to concur, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I don't think in 14 years I've ever seen a subversion of the Legislative process in the State of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we're being asked on the last day of the Session, June 30, to create a new state agency without having gone through the three reading stage here in the House, without having gone through the three reading stage in the Senate and without the opportunity, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to employ that statutory right, that rule right that we all have of ascertaining the fiscal impact. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, putting aside the merit of this proposition let's stand up and defend the process. And let's tell those who are fooling around in Conference Committees, 'We don't want it. We don't need it.' Certainly the people of the State of Illiniis don't need and they don't want it. And as the Gentleman from Will has so well pointed out on two occasions this afternoon, we've had it with respect to bureaucracy. We've had it with an increase in the number of state agencies. This is not the means to achieve a good end, this is improper and I suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, let's send this Conference Committee



back to the grave with Mr. Roberts and have him sleep in peace. I urge a 'no' vote."

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

Madison: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's amazing how some of my colleagues can speak with such eloquence on the basis of such misinformation. The first speaker that spoke against this measure, Mr. Speaker, talked about the fact that it was a duplication of efforts. Well if he had simply taken the time to read the Bill and the elements of the Bill instead of a misinformation on staff analysis, he would have found out that this Bill, in the same manner that it is presented, reveals that part of the Act that sets up the present office. There is no duplication, there is now an office of equal opportunity...Equal Employment Opportunity, this Bill seeks to make it a code department. I don't know what he's talking about in terms of the spending of additional money, there is not companion appropriation for this Bill. The Bill...the money that's in the Department of Personnel to fund those people is still there, there's no additional money, it is not a duplication. As far as the germaneness question is concerned, I was told specifically when I raised the question that as long as it amended the Civil Administrative Code it was germane. Mr. Speaker, I wish that this House would support this motion to concur. One of the speakers talked about it not having heard before, but I think that's...I guess that's my fault because I was absent the day that this Bill was in Rules Committee. When I got back the next day I found out the Rules Committee was not going to meet anymore. There was no other way I could get Senate Bill 1690 heard except to try to amend a House Bill in the Senate. The Senate voted



this Bill out overwhelmingly, Mr. Speaker, and I think their judgement was good and I hope the House will do likewise."

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

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

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question."

All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, to close the debate."

Houlihan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3202."

Speaker Bradley: "All in favor of the Gentleman's motion will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Gaines, to explain his vote. Mr. Gaines."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it distresses me to see the red lights going on, which is merely a housekeeping Amendment to a office that we created three years ago. We're only making effective an office that has not been effective because it has had to be under the shadow of another office. This is not creating any monstrosity, it's only going to provide an opportunity for black people and women to be properly employed in the State of Illinois. The biggest complaint I get in my district are the facts that the Departments of the State of Illinois are highly biased. I've looked into it and that is correct and we need a strong affirmative action office, E.E.O Office in order to make the State of Illinois proud of its employment practice. So this is to do in house cleaning because when we go out and tell private industry, the FEPC, to hire properly they point out that we don't do it. And this will see to it that we do it. Thank you."



Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, to explain his vote."

Mann: "Well Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I look up there and I see some red lights and some 'no' votes or 'present' votes from people that have in the past supported equal opportunity legislation. And I trust that this is not the kind of area where we want to get into a polarized situation between the two parties but it's been an official plank in the Republican Party platforms and in the Democratic Party platforms that equal opportunity is an essential fact of life, an opportunity for all Americans. Now if we are to return to our constituents today without passing this legislation we will be in effect going back to the early 1950s before we had FEPC, before we had Equal Accomodations Law and this would be most unfortunate, most embarassing to the Body as a whole. And just as I look up there and see some red lights on an equal opportunity Bill, which has been a part of our national fabric for close to 20 years, I just can't believe it. So some of you who at least have not committed yourself, if you will vote 'aye' here, upon reflection I'm sure that you will recognize that we are just implementing the policy of the State of Illinois, which has been enunciated for many, many years. So how about a few green lights for this good Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Ewell, to explain his vote."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is a good Bill. And I want to say that we on this side, I, my colleagues and many others, we listen very attentively to the pleas that you make from throughout the state for the special concerns that you have. Everyone walks out of this place in June with a little something. Some of them get a few bridges, a few dams and lot of feet



or roads. We don't get anything. We walk out consistently never even able to say, 'Well at least we're trying to work on the problem. We're attempting to meet the needs of the particular people.' And all we're doing is trying to say to you and cry out to your compassion, to your understanding, so that you will know that we too have problems and we would plead with you and beg you to hear our pleas and turn not a deaf ear. Don't leave us here in the wilderness or in the darkness, for when it rains it rains on everybody and when your rivers overflow, we respond. We build dams, we fix the sloughs, we work on the...dredge the back waters, we provide piers and we do a lot of commission planning for you. All because we love you, we respect your needs, your hopes and aspirations. And I ask you and I plead with you, please, help us with just this little simple Bill. It only provides a few jobs to look at an extremely important problem. We're understaffed, overworked, and remember on this 30th day, which is just like Christmas, remember, on this day, the eve before Christmas, when you go home to your districts with all of your loot think of us. And remember, the people will ask, 'What treasures have you brought home from Rome to grace your chariot wheels?' And we will respond, 'None, none. We have been turned aside.' I plead with you, Gentlemen, help us as we have helped you so often in the past. Thank you."

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

Porter: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that Mr...Representative Madison put his finger on the problem that we have, or some of the Members have with this legislation. Because there was a lot of misinformation involved here. And there is, because the Members really haven't seen this legislation



before this moment, the last day of the Session. There was a House Bill..."

Speaker Bradley: "Is that cameraman bothering you?"

Porter: "There was a House Bill introduced earlier that did not get out of the Rules Committee and I understand that there was a Senate Bill that passed by one vote over in the Senate but died again in our House Rules Committee. None of our Members have actually seen this legislation and here we are attempting to vote it into law in a few minutes without even knowing what's in it. I think that many of the Members who are voting 'no' or 'present' would probably willingly vote for this legislation if they had had a chance to see it. I think under these circumstances and because the process really isn't working that the proper vote must be a 'present' vote, even though we favor the legislation. So I have to vote 'present' under those circumstances."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Miller, to explain his vote."

Miller: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't want the record to be incomplete by letting Representative Mann point the finger at many people in this Body who are voting 'no' or 'present' on this legislation as being against equal opportunity or fair employment practices. I reiterate my earlier remarks and those made by Representative Porter that we have not had an opportunity to hear it, it does not reflect our attitude toward the subject in any way and I want that record made clear."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins, to explain his vote."

Collins: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is truly an astonishing turn of events. Here on the last day of the Session we're



being asked to take an office that already exists and make it a departmental level without any consideration in Committees of either House of this Legislature as to whether it indeed should be elevated to the rank of cabinet level. It very well may be that this is an office that should be departmentalized, how should we know because none of us have had a chance to examine this before. Obviously, as Representative Leinenweber has already pointed out to you, the efforts of this new department, although I'm sure it would be difficult to define, are bound to be largely duplicative. The Department of Personnel already sets our affirmative action policies for the state. And this agency, as I understand it, does work with the Department of Personnel and maybe properly should continue to do so. I don't know but it's something I think that should be considered in the Committees of both House of this Legislature. The Department of Labor and the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation provide job training for women, minorities and handicapped. This is being done right now. Maybe it can be done better by some other department but this is hardly the time to make that decision on the last day of the Session. The Department of General Services is already required to set aside certain monies in contract form for minority contractors and businesses. Maybe this can be done better elsewhere but how can we make that decision today at the 11th hour. I think this is a ridiculous affront to the Members of this Body. As Representative Porter said, maybe many of those people voting against this proposal would be more than willing to change their vote after due deliberation. But it certainly is unfair to ask them to consider this at this time. I submit to you, we should turn this down, we should entertain a motion to put it on the



Fall Calendar and consider it in the Fall or maybe in the next Session of the General Assembly, but certainly not now. I don't see how we can act responsibly, rationally, or reasonably at this time and I think that we should turn down this concurrence at this time and I urge all Members of this House to vote 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, arise?"

Mann: "Point of personal privilege, Sir."

Speaker Bradley: "State your point, Sir."

Mann: "My name was mentioned in debate, Mr. Speaker, and I just wanted to clarify the intent and meaning of my remark when I said I was astounded by the number of people who registered red lights and who were not voting on this proposition. This is certainly not the first concurrence that has come over here on a House Bill. We've voted on scores of them within the last week. So the argument that this is something new really falls flat on its face, especially when we know that the whole philosophy of the state has been repeatedly enunciated here in the Legislature, in the courts as stabilizing equal opportunity. So my only...my only comment is that I don't think we can have it both ways. We can't say we're for equal opportunity and at the same time beg off voting for it because the Senate put an Amendment on a Bill. And once more, I ask you to consider your vote."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. There are 96 'aye' and 57 'nay' and there's been a request for a verification. Mr. Kelly, for what purpose do you rise?"

Kelly: "Yes, could I be verified? If there's a verification?"



Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Schlickman, are you verifying?"

Mr. Kelly requests to be verified now. Mr. Houlihan wishes to poll the absentees. Mr. Richmond wishes to be verified. Call the absentees."

Clerk Hall: "Rich Brummer. Hart. McBroom. Meyer. Pechous. Reed. Telcser. Tipsword."

Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Randolph, Mr. Birchler arise?"

Birchler: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be verified."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Schlickman. All right, who's verifying over here? Can Birchler be verified, Mr. Schlickman? Fine... Mr. Walsh says fine. Johnson."

Johnson: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Bradley: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Johnson: "Vote me 'no'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as 'no'. All right, let's call the Affirmative Roll. Let's go. Mr. Laurino, for what purpose do you rise?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Record Mr. Laurino as voting 'aye'. Call the Affirmative Roll."

Clerk Hall: "Antonovych. E.M. Barnes. Birchler. Bowman. Bradley. Brady."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Schlickman, for what purpose do you rise?"

Schlickman: "Just to request the courtesy that all Members be in their seats and they raise their hands when their names are called, please."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, Mr. Conti and Mr. Waddell and Mr. Deuster, would they sit down so he could see? No, I want to clear that aisle so you can see through it. The Democrats be in their seats and the Republicans be in their seats and raise their hands. Mr. Leverenz, what



purpose do you rise?"

Leverenz: "I wish to be verified so I can return to a Conference Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Schlickman, Mr. Leverenz. Mr. Lechowicz wishes to be verified. Continue with the..."

Clerk Hall: "Brandt. Breslin. Don Brummet. Byers, Caldwell. Capparelli. Catania. Chapman. Cunningham. Darrow. Corneal Davis. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. John Dunn. Dyer. Epton. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Gaines. Garmisa. Geo-Karis. Getty. Giglio. Giorgi. Greiman. Hanahan. Harris. Holewinski. Dan Houlihan. Jim Houlihan. Huff. Jacobs. Jaffe. Emil Jones. Kane. Katz. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leverenz. Levin. Lucco. Madigan. Madison. Mann. Marovitz. Peggy Smith Martin. Matejek. Matijevich. McClain. McGrew. McLendon. McPike. Molloy. Mudd. Mugalian. Mulcahey. Murphy. Nardulli. O'Brien. Pierce. Pouncey. Richmond. Rigney. Robinson. Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schneider. Sharp. Shumpert. Skinner. Steczo. Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich. Van Duyne. Vitek. Von-Boeckman. R.V. Walsh. Willer. Williams."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Van Duyne. Mr. Schlickman said the last one that could be verified. Is it all right that Mr. Van Duyne is verified, Mr. Schlickman? Fine."

Clerk Hall: "Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Questions of the affirmative."

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

Speaker Bradley: "97 'aye'."

Schlickman: "Brady."

Speaker Bradley: "Brady is in his seat."

Schlickman: "Representative Capparelli."

Speaker Bradley: "Capparelli is not in his chair. How is he recorded?"

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



Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll."

Schlickman: "Representative Cunningham."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Cunningham is not in his seat, how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll."

Schlickman: "Representative Dawson."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Dawson is not in his seat. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll."

Schlickman: "Representative DiPrima."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative DiPrima is standing right here."

Schlickman: "Representative John Dunn."

Speaker Bradley: "John Dunn is in his chair. Mr. Schlickman, verify Mr. Madigan now. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. Luft, arise?"

Luft: "Change me to 'aye' please."

Schlickman: "By the way, where is Representative DiPrima?"

Speaker Bradley: "Standing right here."

Schlickman: "Where."

Speaker Bradley: "I'm sorry, where is he? He was there a minute ago. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Well I can't... Would the Gentleman standing in front of Mr. DiPrima's chair... All right, then take him off the roll. I'm sorry, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "What about John Dunn?"

Speaker Bradley: "He is in his seat."

Schlickman: "Representative Epton."

Speaker Bradley: "Epton is not in his chair. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll."



Schlickman: "Representative Geo-Karis. She's there."

Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose does Mr. Bennett arise?"

Bennett: "Would you change my 'present' vote to 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record Mr. Bennett as voting 'aye'.

We didn't take Geo-Karis off..."

Schlickman: "No I called her name and then I saw her.

Representative Harris."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Harris is not in his chair, how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll. Here he comes, put him back on the roll."

Schlickman: "Representative Katz."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Katz is not in his chair. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll and Mr. Matijevich wishes to be verified. Mrs. Sandquist wishes to be verified, if that's all right."

Schlickman: "No objections. Representative McClain."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative McClain is right in front, your side, right here."

Schlickman: "Representative McGrew."

Speaker Bradley: "Right by the well."

Schlickman: "Representative Mudd."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Mudd. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll. Mr. Epton has returned, put him back on the roll."

Schlickman: "Representative Peters."

Speaker Bradley: "Peters is not in his...how is he recorded?"

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

Schlickman: "Representative Robinson."

Speaker Bradley: "Robinson is not in his chair. Is he in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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



Schlickman: "Representative Sharp."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Sharp is not in his chair. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll."

Schlickman: "Representative Stuffle."

Speaker Bradley: "Stuffle is in the chambers."

Schlickman: "Representative Terzich."

Speaker Bradley: "Terzich...Terzich is right next to you and Mr. Robinson has returned. Put Mr. Robinson back on."

Schlickman: "Representative Willer."

Speaker Bradley: "Pardon, Sir?"

Schlickman: "Representative Willer."

Speaker Bradley: "She's here."

Schlickman: "Representative Williams."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Williams is not in his chair. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll."

Schlickman: "Representative Mautino."

Speaker Bradley: "Representative Mautino... I just saw him back there ten seconds ago, five seconds ago. Mr. Mautino."

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

Speaker Bradley: "He's voting 'present', Sir."

Schlickman: "Representative Holewinski."

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

Schlickman: "Representative Kornowicz."

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

Schlickman: "Representative Kosinski."

Speaker Bradley: "Right here in front."

Schlickman: "Representative Taylor."

Speaker Bradley: "Taylor. Jim Taylor back there? He's in his seat. Mr. Madison, for what purpose do you rise?"



Cunningham has returned to the chamber, put him back on the roll."

Schlickman: "Representative Richmond."

Speaker Bradley: "Richmond? He was one that was..."

Schlickman: "I apologize. No other questions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "What's the count? On this question there are 92 'aye' and 58 'nay' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3202. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Having voted on the prevailing side I move to reconsider the vote by which Senate Amendments 1 and 2 were concurred in on House Bill 3202."

Speaker Bradley: "And on that motion, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brady."

Brady: "I move that motion lie on the table."

Speaker Bradley: "All in favor of the Gentleman's motion that that lie on the table, signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Gentleman's motion is tabled. On page 3, under Concurrence - Consideration Postponed appears House Bill 1470. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a Bill that we just voted on the other day. You probably are as familiar with it as I am. I certainly hope so, since I lost most of my notes. It's the pothole program. 30 million dollars for potholes. The money will be distributed under the formula that has been long established in this state, the funds will be, no-strings-attached money. The major condition is that repairs made with the funds are limited to the restoration of existing highways, roads and streets to a safe and useful condition. And these funds may also be used to repair any railroad crossings that are damaged. That point was raised the other day and the comment made on it was erroneous that was made by one of the Members of the



House. So we're not ignoring railroad crossings. This 30 million dollars would be borrowed from the General Revenue Fund and deposited in a newly created emergency pothole repair and road restoration fund. Once deposited, all the funds would immediately be distributed so that repair work could be completed during the current construction year. To repay this loan from the General Revenue Fund, 1/15 that is now taken off of the monthly motor fuel tax collection would be deposited in the road fund and earmarked instead for the General Revenue Fund. This transfer amounts to approximately 2 and a half million a month. It will continue until the 30 million dollar loan is paid off. Therefore, the Governor's projected available balance at the end of fiscal year 1979 will remain unchanged. We all know that there are many potholes that the repair work has not been completed. We feel that this is necessary and ask your affirmative vote.

Speaker Bradley: "Questions? Hearing none, the question is on the Gentleman's motion. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Mr. Tipsword, push Mr. Tipsword's button back there. The Clerk will take the record. Mr. Mahar requests a verification. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 95 'aye' and 73 'nay'. And with Mr. Tipsword on there, 96 'aye', 73 'nay'. Mr. Mahar requests a verification. Mr. Beatty requests a poll of the absentees."

Clerk Hall: "Adams. Anderson."

Speaker Bradley: "Anderson 'no'."

Clerk Hall: "Campbell."

Speaker Bradley: "Campbell 'no'."

Clerk Hall: "Hart. McBroom. Reed. Stearney."



Speaker Bradley: "Call the Affirmative Roll and all the Members please be in their seats. Raise their hands so Mr. Mahar can see that you're here."

Clerk Hall: "Antonovych. E.M. Barnes. Beatty. Birchler. Bowman. Bradley. Brady. Brandt. Breslin. Rich Brummer. Don Brummet. Byers. Caldwell. Capparelli. Chapman. Christensen. Darrow. Corneal Davis. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. John Dunn. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty. Giglio."

Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose does the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Barnes, arise?"

Barnes: "I was off the floor, Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Clerk Hall: "The Gentleman...the Lady is recorded as voting 'no'."

Barnes: "Please change my vote to 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record her as 'aye'. Mr. Kucharski, for what purpose do you rise?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Record Mr. Kucharski as 'aye' and Mr. McAuliffe wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'."

Clerk Hall: "Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. John Dunn. Ewell. Farley. Flinn. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty. Giglio. Giorgi."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Adams wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. Right?"

Clerk Hall: "Greiman. Hanahan. Harris. Holewinski. Dan Houlihan. J. M. Houlihan. Huff."

Speaker Bradley: "Stanley 'aye'."

Clerk Hall: "Jacobs. Jaffe. Johnson. Emil Jones. Kane. Katz. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Kozubowski. Kucharski. Laurino. Lechowicz. Leverenz. Levin. Lucco. Luft."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Mahar, could we verify Mrs. Byers, please?"



Clerk Hall: "Madigan. Madison. Mann. Marovitz. Peggy Smith Martin. Matejek. Matijeovich. Mautino. McAuliffe. McClain. McGrew. McLendon. McPike. Mudd. Mugalian. Mulcahey. Murphy. Nardulli. O'Brien. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Richmond. Robinson. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schneider. Sharp. Shumpert. Stanley. Steczo. Stuffle. Taylor. Terzich. Tipword. Van Duynes. Vitek. VonBoeckman. R.V. Walsh. Willer. Williams. Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Questions of the affirmative? Mr. Madison, for what purpose do you arise?"

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, may I be verified?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Mahar, Mr. Madison all right? Fine. Questions of the affirmative."

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

Speaker Bradley: "100 'aye', 76 'nay'."

Mahar: "Mr. Antonovych."

Speaker Bradley: "Behind you."

Mahar: "Mr. Bowman."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Bowman. He's in the balcony."

Mahar: "Mr. Christensen."

Speaker Bradley: "Christensen is in the aisle."

Mahar: "Mr. Dawson."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Dawson is not in his chair. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll."

Mahar: "Mr. Farley."

Speaker Bradley: "Farley is in the chambers."

Mahar: "Mr. Farley."

Speaker Bradley: "He's in the chamber, Sir. He's in the aisle."

Mahar: "Mr. Gaines... Mr. J.M. Houlihan."

Speaker Bradley: "Dan Houlihan's in his chair."



Mahar: "I asked for Mr. J.M. Houlihan, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Oh, J.M? Mr. Lechowdycz wishes to be verified. Jimmy Houlihan is not in his chair, how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off the roll."

Mahar: "Emil Jones."

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

Mahar: "Mr. Kane."

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

Mahar: "Mr. Kelly."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Kelly. How is Mr. Kelly? Here he comes."

Mahar: "Mr. Kozubowski...Mr. Laurino."

Speaker Bradley: "He's in the chambers."

Mahar: "Mr. Matijevich."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Matijevich is in his chair."

Mahar: "Mr. Schneider."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Schneider is right here by the well."

Mahar: "Mr. Capparelli."

Speaker Bradley: "He's in the center aisle."

Mahar: "Mr. Brummer."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Brummer, Mr. Brummer is in the chamber."

Mahar: "Mr. Van Duyne."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Van Duyne...how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike, arise?"

McPike: "Could I be verified?"

Speaker Bradley: "Can he be verified, Sir?"

Mahar: "Yes."

Speaker Bradley: "Fine."

Mahar: "What happened to Mr. Van Duyne, did you take him off?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Van Duyne was taken off the roll."



Mahar: "Mr. VonBoeckman."

Speaker Bradley: "VonBoeckman is not in his chair. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "Take him off and put VonBoeckman is here and Van Duyne is back in the chamber."

Mahar: "Mr. Yourell."

Speaker Bradley: "He's in the center aisle."

Mahar: "Mr. Terzich."

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

Mahar: "No further questions, Mr. Speaker."

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

Leverenz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I just returned from a Conference Committee, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Bradley: "You're recorded, I believe, as voting 'aye'. What's the count? ^{Return Dawson to the roll.} On that question then we have 99 'aye' and 74 'nay' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1470. Mr. Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Having voted on the prevailing side to which that was just adopted, I now move to reconsider the vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Henry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "I move that motion lie on the table."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that motion lie on the table. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Gentleman's motion is tabled. On the Concurrence Calendar on page 3 appears House Bill 2632. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I went through all of the Senate Amendments earlier this morning. I don't think I have to reiterate the various Senate Amendments but I would like to point out that the total...the total Bill as before you today, on General Revenue is 7 million dollars less....7 million,



803 thousand dollars less than when the Bill left the House of Representatives a few days ago. The total in General Revenue Grants is 313 million, 950 million dollars. The...including the federal grants, this Bill today, the total funding after the Senate action is 751 million, 518 thousand, 500 dollars. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is not everything, what everyone wants but it is the best that we could offer to the people of the Illinois at this time and I now move to concur with Senate Amendment to House Bill 2632."

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

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, as the Chief Cosponsor of this piece of legislation, I also urge at this time that we now concur with House Bill 2632, in its present form."

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

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think the Amendment that was proposed and adopted in the Senate, particularly in regard to the transportation aspect of the program, in light of the changes that we made in the formula, provide equitable balance. I think, however, that in all fairness it should be pointed out that some of the other line items are higher than they should be. But there's no reason why we should expect that in this process that we can balance everything off perfectly. I think it's important that the Governor play a role in this as well. And he's going to have to take a look at this in light of the level of the funding that we put in the General Distributive Fund and make some decision. But on balance, I think the Senate Amendments do justice to what needs to be done and I rise in support of this concurrence motion."

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



Skinner: "I wonder if the Sponsor would briefly catalogue who the winners are and who the losers are in this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Hanahan, did you hear the Gentleman's questions on the...the... All right, would the Gentlemen surrounding Mr. Hanahan give him a breath of air? The question was, the winners and the losers on...the winners and the losers on the Amendment, what categories."

Hanahan: "Are you asking the grant programs, the winners and losers?"

Skinner: "Yes. Okay, adult education, public assistance..."

Hanahan: We are at 5 million, 400 thousand dollars, the same as the request, the same as the House action and the Senate changed nothing. On adult education we're down 500 thousand dollars. The House sent out...the request is 2 million, 600. The House sent out 2 million, the Senate sent back 1 million, 500. We're down 500 thousand. Adult ed. basic, same all the way across. No change. What the request is, what we sent out and what the Senate did. Gifted, the request was 3 million, 9. The Senate sent back 3 million, 750 thousand, a loss of 150 thousand. The gifted centers, they requested 630 and the Senate action, 630. It was sent out of there at 1 million from the House, down 370 thousand. Special ed., primary tuition, 8 million all the way across, both the requests, the House action, the Senate action. Special ed., extraordinary, 14.4 all the way across, no change. Special ed., personnel, 115 million was requested, the House sent out at 117. The Senate sent it back at 115, which was the request of the state board, a 2 million difference. Special ed., orphanage tuition, 12 million 750 thousand, the same all the way across. The special ed. transportation, 35.5 was the House action, 33.5 was the Senate



action. 2 million lost. Special ed., deaf and blind, 1 million, 382 thousand, 700 dollars, the same all the way across. Special ed., visually handicapped, 350 thousand, same as requested, same in the House, same in the Senate. Bilingual - Chicago, requested 13 million 455 thousand, the House sent it out at 9, 4, 118, 5. The Senate sent it back at 12. A loss from the request of 1 million, 455 thousand on bilingual - Chicago. Bilingual - Downstate, the request was 4 million, 500 thousand, the House sent it out at 3 million, 450 thousand, the Senate action brought it to 4 million. 500 thousand dollars less than the request. Transportation regular, the request is 53 million 150 thousand dollars. The House sent it out that way, the Senate sent it back at 47 million, 835 dollars. Down 5 million, 315 thousand dollars. School foods, 15 million 6 was the request, the House sent it out at 14, 8, 20. The Senate sent it back here at 14, 3, 20. Down 500 thousand. Vocational education requested 26, 8, 70. The House sent it out at 26, 8, 70. The Senate kept it at 26, 8, 70. Text books. The request was 9 million, the House raised it to 11 million, the Senate sent it back at 11 million. Truants, 656 thousand 300 dollars is the request, the House cut it to 500 thousand, the Senate left it alone at 500 thousand. Career Ed was struck entirely, comprehensive health was struck entirely, desegregation was entirely struck. Sub total...the requests were 339 million, 481 thousand 500. The House and Senate...the Bill over to the Senate, it's 321 million, 591 thousand, 200 dollars. The Senate sent it back at 313 million, 787 thousand, 700 dollars. A loss of 7 million, 803 thousand, 500 dollars in the grant action. Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House."



Contrary to the hearings throughout the state on both the School Problem's Commission and the Committee on Elementary and Secondary, this grant program or the categorical program defies some of the things that I think most school districts wanted. For example, the full funding of transportation was probably the single most important question raised throughout the hearings in regard to interest of school districts. We do not reach that 100 percent funding, the least popular of the programs includes text books and bilingual programs, I think excessively funded and I believe that that is of course contrary to again, the wishes of most of the school districts throughout the state of which I heard from and those people, I think, that served on the Committee would share that as a candid analysis of our tour. What is important, however, again is that, as Representative Hoffman has indicated the Governor is going to have to take a good look at these kinds of concepts and really question whether he can deal with the special interest groups that are most ^{are most} directly affected by those two proposals, that is bilingual and text books. I'm going to support the proposal. I'm going to hope that the Governor is willing and courageous enough to bring those two programs down to levels that I think are more realistic and yet not devastating and that would be my support for the Bill, although somewhat less than excited about it. It's better than sticking around for about another two weeks and working it out."

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

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, we spoke on this issue this morning before we took it out of the record. I will not be redundant and completely repeat everything that was said. I just wish to point out one or two things in regard to transportation. I'm



as concerned about transportation Downstate as all elected officials are here today. Last year we were paying out 78 percent of what we had promised on 100 percent. This year we are now going to 90. Where we were...in FY78, where we spent 39, we're now going to 47. In special ed. transportation, last year we were giving our school districts 88 percent and now we're going to go to 94 percent. That isn't everything we wanted. And I understand there are even some movements elsewhere that might have some other money found somewhere else, maybe in the Medely Moving Transportation Bill, or something of that type. That might possible bring it up to bring it a little closer to the 100 percent. So we have gotten closer to 100 percent than we ever have before. It isn't what we wanted but if we don't, if we all stand pat and do not pass this out, it won't be 4:00 this afternoon, it won't be 4:00 in the morning, it will be 4:00 on the 4th. I think this is as good as we possibly could have done and would suggest and concur that we...that we go with Conference #1 on House Bill 2632."

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

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, for the first time in seven terms, 14 years, I move the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Mr. Hanahan, to close the debate."

Hanahan: "All I can say, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, is that it's been a very trying Bill to handle and I'm glad that it was coming to the final stages and I ask for an 'aye' vote on concurrence on these Amendments."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion."



All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. And the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Chapman, to explain her vote for one minute."

Chapman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to respond to the question, who are the losers? The losers, at least one of the losers are people who are interested in adult education. Section 3 has been cut by 42 percent. This I believe is a far too severe cut for an important program. We surely believe, all of us, that we want to help people help themselves. One of the best ways to do this is adult education. I think we are all the losers in this kind of a cut."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 157 'aye' and 2 'nay'. And the House does concur in the...Mr. Hanahan, the House does concur in all of those Amendments that you have on the... Okay, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11 and 12."

Hanahan: "That's it, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Okay, the House does concur in those Amendments to...those Senate Amendments to House Bill 2632. On the Supplemental Calendar appears Senate Bill 771. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty. Under Conference Committee Reports."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the first Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 771 substantially provides that the same Bill that we passed out of the House just a few days ago by a vote of 159 to 1. This is The Bill which provides for a penalty for child pornography that would be a Class 1 Felony. It provides that a child, a person under the age of 16, who is given money by an offender, that the offender may not use the fact that that child has taken money as a defense against the prosecution of indecent liberties. And finally, it provides for the



offense of home invasion. Under this provision where a home is entered by a person who does not have authority and the occupants of that home or either injured or a dangerous weapon is used while the invader threatens you, the person would be guilty of a Class X offense. This is a Bill that we pointed out that I...I think it is imperative that we show to the people of Illinois, that at least in their home they may feel that they may be safe. It should be as it has been in the past, a Class II offense, a burglary. It ought to be the most serious category of offense, a Class X offense. Now we have, through the Conference Committee, made a clarification raised by some Senators that would provide that it must be the home of another so you could not commit that offense in your own home. And also that it would not subject a police officer in the performance of his duty, to any possible prosecution. I believe that the Conference Committee Report is a very good one and I would urge its adoption by the House."

Speaker Bradley: "The camera light is off. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "I have a question for Representative Getty."

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

Leinenweber: "Mike, when this left the House, my recollection was it consisted only on the provision on indecent liberties with a child and also the home invasion, is that correct?"

Getty: "That's correct...The Amendment, as written here, tracks the child pornography section that deals specifically, in exactly the same language. That is, a person who photographs, films, video-tapes or otherwise reproduces an act that would be prohibited in indecent liberties, is guilty of a Class I, or child pornography would be guilty of a Class I offense."



That is the only additional change, so that they would be exactly the same so that there would be no question that it would be covered under either act."

Leinenweber: "In addition to those other two Acts you also now in the Conference Committee amend child pornography for purposes of increasing the penalty from a Class III felony to a Class 1. Is that correct?"

Getty: "Yes, but only in those two Sections that exactly track the indecent liberties Section. You will recall in the Amendatory Veto last year, the Section of 10.10 was lifted out of 10.10 and put into 286. And this would bring that into conformity."

Leinenweber: "Thank you."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves that the House does adopt the Conference Committee Report to 771. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin, to explain his vote."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, I just have a question about this which I wanted to ask."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 164 'aye' and 2 'nay' and the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 771. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Epton, arise?"

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I may, for the purpose of an announcement of a parliamentary inquiry? Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you will undoubtedly recall Senate Bill 1725, which was the Department of Insurance Fair Share Funding Bill. It tied this House up for quite a lengthy period of time on two or three occasions. A Conference Committee was appointed with articulate individuals on both sides of the question. We had 10 Members present



and we had 14 different opinions as to what resulted. As a result of it the decision was that perhaps the second Conference Committee might be appointed. However, cooler heads prevailed and rather than tie the House up at this late hour, at this late date it's our suggestion that with the approval of Senator Pate Philip, the Senate Sponsor, that this Bill go to the Fall Calendar. Now it does seem that the Senate rules differ somewhat from ours. There's some ambiguity as to just what needs to be done here. Senator Pate Philip is going to allow it to remain on their Calendar on the Consent...rather on the Conference Committee Calendar. I would move, ask leave of the House that this be placed on our Fall Calendar either as a Senate Bill or..and/or Conference Committee. I might add that there is no understanding that we would even go ahead at that time. But just in the event that a decision is reached, I would ask leave of the House to proceed in that fashion."

Speaker Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections, the Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I thought he...he first indicated... I have no objection to it going on a Fall Calendar. I thought he indicated that it was going to go on the Fall Calendar in the Senate. How can we put it on the Fall Calendar in both the House and the Senate? The Bill can only be at one House at one time, can it not?"

Epton: "Well the problem...that is a problem because under our rules it may be that the Conference Committee is alive but that we're not in the position to consider a Senate Bill. There's an ambiguity and rather than get very screwed up in any legal entanglement, I thought I would simply ask leave of the House to put it in whatever posture is needed. Frankly, I don't



exactly how that will be ironed out but this does cover all eventualities."

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

Cunningham: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on behalf of many worried and anxious employees in Lawrence County, we publicly say 'thank you' to the incomparable Representative Epton and we would notify both he and the Director of Insurance that a stay of execution for each of them has been granted. Meanwhile, I would..."

Speaker Bradley: "Are you objecting to the Gentleman's motion?"

Cunningham: "I'll get through in a moment here, a little cordiality. In the meanwhile, any of you who are in County Lawrence this summer, we invite you...we will roll out the red carpet of hospitality when you come and you can go and inspect Golden Rule Insurance and come back in the fall....Brummer and Walsh and I will be battling for the small domestic insurance companies of Illinois. I don't object to putting this on the Fall Calendar."

Speaker Bradley: "Barnes, are you objecting? Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not necessarily objecting to being put on the Fall Calendar but I raise a question relative to the procedure and I... I would wish that the Parliamentarian would come by 'cause if this happens I want to make sure I understand what's happening. As I understand the process, a Bill cannot be in two places at one time. And I would wish that the Parliamentarian would come and clear that up for me, because if this happens, I'm sure just as I'm standing here, it will happen again. So I just want to make that clear. I'm not...I'm not objecting or raising objections, I just want to understand."

Speaker Bradley: "I think that the Gentleman would have to



rule...ask for the suspension of 68(e). And it says, 'After June 30 of any year the House may not take up or vote upon Conference Committee Reports to Senate Amendments to House Bills or House Amendments to Senate Bills. With respect to Bills that have, as that date passed both Houses but which have not received final action by both Houses. Such Bills shall not again be taken up by the House and all such House Bills shall be tabled. So the Gentleman asks for the suspension of Rule 68(e). And on that motion, all in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the rule is suspended. All right, now...Now you need to use the Attendance Roll Call and... use the Attendance Roll Call... Mr. Madigan, for what purpose do you rise?"

Madigan: "Parliamentary Inquiry. On that last motion, how many votes are required?"

Speaker Bradley: "We're just going to...we ask leave to use the Attendance Roll Call on that motion?"

Madigan: "The Speaker feels that it takes 89, on a Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, let's have a Roll Call on the Gentleman's motion. All in favor of suspending 68(e) signify by voting 'aye', and opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Conti..."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, if we adopt this motion how are we every going to kill a Bill in this... Everything will be turned over to the Fall Committee. How are we ever going to get to kill a Bill in this House if we suspend this rule, if everything is going to be turned over to the Fall Committee? Another question is, what if the Senate decides to...not to wait for the House any longer and turn all the House Bills over to the Fall Committee, the Fall Session?"

Speaker Bradley: "I think the Gentleman's motion is only Senate Bill 1725."



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

Epton: "In response to that, this is only on one Bill. Plus, the purpose is to avoid an additional four hours of debate at this time. We...it may not even come up again but we're speaking only of one Bill."

Conti: "I'm sorry, I thought you were talking about all Bills."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question we have 119 'aye', 7 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion carries. Calendar, on page 4 appears Senate Bill 1790. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brady."

Brady: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members. I urge the Membership to adopt the first Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1790. The substance of Senate Bill 1790, as amended by the House, already passed the House in another Bill, 2605. So the Conference Committee Report strikes everything that existed in the Bill and the report now accomplishes the goals sought by Senate Bill 1783 of Senate President Hynes and Senate Bill 1678 of Senator Donnewald. It is broken down into two parts and the part of Senate Bill 1783 by Senate President Hynes, we have a homestead exemption Section for all homeowners. This Bill would allow a homestead exemption for all Illinoisians who pay property taxes on their residences. The exemption would be equal to the amount of the home's value, increased during a quadrennial assessment, up to a maximum of 1000 dollars. If the value increased by 500 dollars during a quadrennial reassessment, there would be a 500 dollar exemption. If it increased more...it would be...more than 1000 it would only be at a sealing of 1000 dollar exemption. On part 2 of this Conference Committee Report Senate Bill 1678 is incorporated which has to do with assessment publication



dates. This part of the report changes the statutory deadlines for publishing changes in real estate assessments in other counties outside of Cook County. It changes the dates from...to August 1 what were are a July 10 deadline. And it changes dates to December 31 that were December 15 deadlines. There is a dramatic problem that happened in the...some downstate counties and it was in a section where publications were thought to be termed advisory by township assessing officials. What happened was, there was a court action that took place. Some citizens from Vermilion County took an action to the Supreme Court of the State of Illinois and it was held that these dates were not advisory but in fact they were mandated. And because of that action these citizens were then awarded on that court case a reduction of their assessments back to the pre-existing assessment that came out because the publication date was in error. This in fact, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members, would not affect these citizens who have won their court case. But it does close a large loophole in the law because their existing protest now filed, which possibly could be amended to be incorporated in the court case and there are counties such as Winnebago County in the Northern...Western corner of our state where the assessing official says there with a protested hand, that corporations could come in against their personal property tax and save up to 12 million dollars. This is not a Bill that's going to help the average homeowner and taxpayer. This is a Bill, if we don't close the loophole in this Section, is going to benefit or reap benefits for the corporations who want to avoid personal property taxes around the state. It does not affect Cook County but it's dramatically important to the rest of



the state. The homestead exemption in the first part of the Bill is a taxpayers' exemption. It helps all Illinoisians and I urge your favorable support of this Conference Committee Report #1."

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

Daniels: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Daniels: "Representative Brady, page 4 of the Conference Committee Report strikes the notice provision. Will you tell me why you've stricken that provision out of the law? And then would you also address when that was inserted in the law and the reason for the time of insertion and what your reason and rationale behind striking it are?"

Brady: "Representative Daniels, I do not have the date and time of insertion, if you'd like to quote that then I'll give you the reason that I know for changing it."

Daniels: "Well you tell me first why you changed it then and I'll find the date for you."

Brady: "Certainly. The reason it was changed is because the township assessors...the Supervising Assessors Association came in and said that this was enacted into law under this fashion for this assessment year. And in fact they are not able in many, many assessing areas to comply with this. So what they sought was similar to what Cook County presently has. If you're familiar with Cook County assessment practices, they say on the back of it at what level it was assessed according to state law. What they're asking for here is that they can say that it's assessed at 33 percent of the fair market value according to state law. This leaves one area unattended. And that is where you can take a new house and use the available data to come up with the common assessment of the



median, I believe it is, of the township that they're assessing. So that in fact it may not be 33 percent in some cases. But that's on a new house where the people would not be trying to multiply it out. On any older dwelling you can take your assessment and I'm sure if you have a mortgage and sign a contract for a home, you take your assessment of 33 and 1/3 percent and multiply by 3, you have your market value as the assessor feels, of your house."

Daniels: "Is that in Cook County too? Obviously it's not, right?"

Brady: "In Cook County, Representative Daniels, the assessment is under classification and all the classifications are now shown on the back of the assessment notice when a change comes through."

Daniels: "So in essence what you've done then by this provision is taken a law that was enacted last year into law and then you're now taking it out, which is a notification to people in order to understand the assessed valuation and the appraised full market value valuation on their property. And in essence then what you're doing now is not notifying people like you are required to do under the law as it is today. Is that correct?"

Brady: "No, that's not correct. We're notifying them... we're notifying them..."

Daniels: "Not as required today though, right?"

Brady: "We are not..."

Daniels: "If this becomes law you're changing the notification procedure, is that correct?"

Brady: "If this becomes law we are changing the notification procedure, that is correct."

Daniels: "From what it is today."

Brady: "From what it is today..."

Daniels: "All right, and if you take a hypothetical in



a county like DuPage, where there's an estimated 10 percent of the taxpayers filing under protest, they would not receive the same type of notification and awareness of the assessment levels and how it was computed as they would under current law, is that correct?"

Brady: "They would only receive what we were putting in here as law today, which would amount to a notice on there that their assessment is 33 and 1/3 percent of fair market value according to the law in Illinois."

Daniels: "Which is the current law and that's the assessed level of assessment, correct? That's the level of assessment throughout the state. Isn't that correct?"

Brady: "That is the level of assessment."

Daniels: "But you're not advising them, if this becomes law, of the previous year in current appraised full market valuation, you're giving them less information than they would receive today?"

Brady: "There is not question that the new form has either streamlined or has less available information. I think the homeowner will have enough information to calculate it and I think that the problem that exists now is you're going to see an awful lot of counties in the state who are not capable of, under the abilities that they run their office under and the monies available to them, to comply and give this full information. And so we're going to have a lot of counties operating in violation of the existing statute and I think that's a mistake. We have to have something that everybody can work with and comply..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Daniels, would you wish to talk to the Bill in dialogue?"

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, this is for the Chair's benefit, in the event it slipped your mind. This is Senate Bill 1783,



which your Chair refused to call on Second Reading because it had some meaningful Amendments that you were fearful of a Roll Call on. So we're asking time to ask questions on this Bill to at least address the thousand dollar homestead and the change in the notification provision, which are extremely important to our taxpayers. There's nothing more important right now than property tax relief. We're trying to educate all the Members of the House to make sure we understand what this Gentleman is doing on a Conference Committee Report that came out yesterday, I believe was the date, or the day before, I don't recall."

Brady: "It's been before us at least 24 hours and that was my reason to do it in that manner, Representative, it would give you time to look it over."

Daniels: "And I appreciate that, Representative Brady, I only wish you'd called the Bill on Second Reading so we could address the real issue of property tax relief. What county is currently operating in violation of the notification provision right now?"

Brady: "I don't have a list of any but if you have them I'd be glad to hear it."

Daniels: "No I don't. You're changing the law, Representative. What counties are operating in violation of the law right now?"

Brady: "As I said, I don't have a list of them, Representative."

Daniels: "Do you know of any? Has anybody told you of any?"

Brady: "The Supervising Assessors Association has told me that this will automatically come about in several counties. I did not ask him for the specific names of the counties because this was already incorporated into the provisions of this Bill when I accepted the sponsorship of it."



Daniels: "So in other words, you can't tell me of any counties that currently are violating state law? Right?"

Brady: "Representative Kempiners is standing over on your side waiving his hand. I'm sure if you want a specific you can either ask him or..."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Kempiners, do you have any answer to that question?"

Kempiners: "Well, Mr. Speaker, that question was asked in the Conference Committee when it met and the response and both the attorney for the Department of Local Government Affairs and the attorney for the Supervisors of Assessment Association both agreed that most counties, they didn't give us a specific figure, but most counties in the state are in violation. Because what happened is that they requested an opinion from DLGA as to whether the printing deadlines were advisory or mandatory. And DLGA's response, based on Supreme Court decisions, is that those deadlines were advisory. As a result, most counties in the state did not meet those deadlines and are in violation of the law."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Lechowicz, on a point of order."

Lechowicz: "Did you say that the deadlines are advisory or mandatory?"

Kempiners: "What I said was that at the time DLGA's opinion, based on Supreme Court decisions that have preceded was that they were advisory. However, after that occurred the Supreme Court came down with a decision saying they were mandatory."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That is correct. I just wanted to correct the record because in this dealing when you first said it you said it was advisory, and it is mandatory based upon the Supreme Court ruling."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Daniels, could you bring your questions to a close...do you want to address the Bill?"



Daniels: "No. Representative Brady, you also have a provision in here regarding the thousand dollar homestead exemption. How much do you estimate on the average home in the State of Illinois, that that would save the taxpayer in his tax Bill?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Daniels, this is the last question the Chair will allow."

Daniels: "I have one more question to ask."

Speaker Bradley: "This is the last one."

Brady: "On your question, Mr. Daniels, that will relate to the inflationary spiral and whether it continues or not. What we're doing here with that exemption is placing a cap on future growth to the local taxing body because of the assessment inflationary spiral. But in fact, even if you qualified for the entire thousand dollar exemption that would depend upon what the multiplier was in your county and in fact what the tax rate was as to what savings that would effectively mean to you."

Daniels: "You don't have any estimates then?"

Brady: "Well, coming from a county like Cook, where it's divided into four quadrants, I can give you four estimates on four different average size homes on four different quadrant years, so I..."

Daniels: "Would it take effect...would this Bill take effect in Cook at different times?"

Brady: "Let me give you an example. If you had a thousand dollar exemption and you're tax rate was say around eight dollars and your multiplier was around 1.4, which might be similar to some areas in Cook County, it would mean somewhere between a hundred and a hundred and fifty dollar savings on your tax bill."

Daniels: "You mentioned Cook County. Would it take effect at different times in Cook County?"

Brady: "It certainly does because it's a quadrennial exemption



good for the four years of the quadrennial and so
it would take effect different times downstate as..."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Randolph, Mr. Birchler.
Mr. Birchler."

Birchler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To help answer a question
for Mr. Daniels, I had a call this morning from one
of the assessors in my district that was very much
disturbed and requested that I support this concurrence
today. It's from a small county and I'm sure that he
was speaking for many counties in the State of Illinois,
stating that they were not equipped to comply with
the law as it is. And the State Association of Assessors
is also asking for concurrence on this report on
1790. Now, when you heard him ask, name the counties,
it's practically every little county in the State
of Illinois that is in the squeeze on this particular
law and I ask again for concurrence of this report."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
I'm sorry I was over in my office when I heard this
Bill come up, I meant to be here sooner. I'm not
sure just what has been asked and what has been answered.
But from information I have the one case that has
been ruled in the Supreme Court is the Andrew vs.
Foxworthy of Vermilion County, case of origin, was
ruled in the Illinois Supreme Court in the March division
of this year. This is why the question lies in
so many minds. What we do not know about the Vermilion
County case is whether it was a case of omission of
publication or lateness of publication. Let me point
out one of the reasons why some of these publications
are late. The Supervisor of Assessments must get
the information from the various assessors before he
can turn it over to the County Clerk, who in turn
puts it out for publication. So it becomes something



that sometimes is very difficult to control. I don't especially know what we can do about this validation but I think we should go ahead and do it and I do support the other concept of the Bill, the tax relief part. I think we should recognize also that I have been in Counties and Townships Committee for eight years. And it seems like every year we're validating some levies made in Cook County for some reason or other that we have to come down here and make the validation and it's usually late. I have suggested many times to the Legislators from Cook County, why in the devil don't we clean this up so we don't have to do the validating, why can't you take care of your own business at home? But nevertheless, I am in support of the Conference Committee Report on 1790 and I would urge that everyone vote green in support of that report."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Daniels, to talk to the Bill."

Daniels: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think that this is certainly one area that we can address the question of property tax relief and I have no question about the fact that it's a novel concept. My concern has been with the thousand dollar homestead exemption, is that what we're trying to find right now is some immediate temporary relief until we are able to address the complete revision of the Revenue Act to support some permanent relief in the area of property taxes and to discuss further the various issues dealing with it. I think that it's certainly an area that warrants considerable thought and discussion on both sides of the aisle. I think that Senator Hynes in his proposal has come up with a reasonable approach to the subject of property tax relief. However, some of



my concerns and for all of you Downstate, you might be questioning when is this going to affect the taxpayer in my district? Because you're going to want to go home and you're going to want to tell them what kind of tax relief you gave them. Well, be very careful on that. Be very careful when you tell them that you gave them meaningful property tax relief for some immediate relief next year, because most of you Downstate, you will not feel the impact of this legislation until the year 1980. Because it takes effect after the first quadrennial reassessment year and for those of us Downstate that's next year. For those of us in DuPage County that's the year 1980 before the thousand dollar homestead exemption will take effect. Well now, as usual, Chicago will have some immediate relief because of their quadrant and they will experience it immediately and it's no coincidence that the Sponsor of this Bill is the candidate for the Assessor of Cook County. This is a way to address property tax relief. I suppose we're not going to have any other way, those of us that have been screaming for additional immediate relief like lowering the level of assessment or the question of the freeze on the extension of taxes, we're not going to be able to address that. So I suppose that when you go to vote on this issue you might consider whether or not we are in fact giving our people back home some immediate tax relief without the necessity of going through their rebate procedure, which sets up another bureaucracy. So look at this Bill carefully and be aware of what you're telling your constituents back home."

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

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the



House I strongly support the Conference Committee Report #1 on Senate Bill 1790. Might I point out to this Body that the...I'm sure you all received the Taxpayer's Federation of Illinois tax facts...in addition a supplemental piece of literature which was received from the Taxpayer's Federation in strong support of the original proposal in Senate Bill 1783. But unfortunately, that Bill was called, but fortunately there was a vehicle that could be used to provide some immediate tax relief for the taxpayers of Illinois. And that's in the first provision of this Conference Committee Report and it would primarily provide one thousand dollar homestead exemption against future assessment increases at the time of reassessment. But another important facet in this report, Ladies and Gentlemen, is the extension of time that's been asked by the local taxing officials in Downstate Illinois based primarily upon an adverse opinion by the Supreme Court and it's extremely vital, extremely vital that we do adopt the Conference Committee Report on 1790."

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

Ebbesen: "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'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the Gentleman's motion prevails. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Brady, to close the debate."

Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and fellow Members. I'm happy that we had a chance to give this a lot of debate because I think there are some serious misconceptions about the validation procedures in this Bill. Basically, let me just run through it and say those that are affecting the notice changes, counties of fifty thousand or fewer inhabitants in most cases. The Illinois Supreme Court decision was meant to make people



comply with the law. We want them to comply with the law. We're fixing a date certain and giving them a little more time and telling them they can't have shoddy practices on these publication notices. I think that's important too. But if we leave it without this we leave loopholes in the law. This year alone, as many of you who are familiar with taxes realize, the large corporations will all file protests in the State of Illinois and will reap tremendous benefits on a technicality. I don't think we're trying to do that, we're trying to have meaningful tax reform. This closes that loophole and so adds towards the meaningful tax reform that the Bill is really addressed to, a homestead exemption up to a thousand dollars assessed valuation, which means real tax savings for all the homeowners in Illinois and I urge your favorable support of this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of this Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1790. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Pierce, to explain his vote."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, I was a Member of this Conference Committee and let me tell you I think the Conference Committee did a good job here. Not only has it incorporated the homestead exemption that Mr. Daniels said is much simpler than the rebate provided for my Bill, I want to remind him however that that machinery is already in place for senior citizen's relief, it can be extended to all citizens. But it also contains a validation of a tax in Lake County that will cost our school districts and local governments 25 million dollars unless this Bill is passed. The...the homestead part of the Bill will not wait until 1980. In Lake



County we assess on a quadrennial quadrant basis, each one quarter each year and the first quadrant will receive a benefit in 1979. This is a good Conference Committee Report. It does two very valuable things, it puts in the homestead tax relief that you all can vote for, Republicans and Democrats, and it validates in Lake County for past years and not for future years, I'll emphasize, not for future years the technical error in late publications and I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis, to explain her vote for one minute."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I concur with the prior speaker that this is a good Conference Report. I had hoped the Senate Bill 1783 would hit the House because I have an Amendment which would have given a 5,000 deduction on the assessed valuation at every quadrennial which would have meant a 340 dollar tax savings. This will give it at least about 76 dollars. I think it's a step in the right direction and I'm proud to support this Conference Report."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner, to explain his vote for 1 minute."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, at best, this Bill is a mixed bag. I think it ought to be rejected and sent back for a second Conference Committee Report because on page 4 we are taking rights of information away from the taxpayer. We are telling the local assessor they do not have to give the taxpayer notice in terms that he or she can understand. The law we passed last year, which was a superb law, it took the assessor out from underneath the basket, his information. It made it understandable by human beings rather than by computers, said that the assessors notice had to tell what the previous year's and the current year's appraised full market value was. Under this change on page 4 a



township like my own, which is assessing the new property at 22 percent of market value, which is what the assessment level has dropped to, will send out a notice which says that the assessment is at 33 percent of market value. A taxpayer, if he or she is smart enough to multiply by three will find out they're only assessed at 66 percent of fair market value. That is what the assessor thinks the property is worth, that is. This is allowing assessors to give false information, in fact it's mandating assessors to give false information. Well we know assessors don't want reform of the system, we know the Department of Local Government Affairs doesn't want reform of the system. We know the assessors want to keep the taxpayers in the dark and obviously so does the majority of this General Assembly. You want to grant retroactive immunity to people who can't read..."

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

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, I'm urging a 'no' vote on this and ask for a second Conference. I'm addressing specifically to the tax exemption feature. It is not as the Gentleman who explained the Bill, a benefit to all of the citizens of Illinois. It gives the benefit primarily to those people whose home values are increasing at the most rapid rate and in particular it would give a benefit to the suburban areas over...against the City of Chicago. Home values in the suburbs are increasing much more rapidly than they are in the City of Chicago and it's the City of Chicago that's going to get stuck on this. I find it kind of curious that all the people from Chicago are voting for this. Even in our own district, Representative Brady and I...represent Evanston, it's the lakefront in Evanston,



not West Evanston, not where the bungalows are where the property values are increasing rapidly. And once everyone is able to take advantage of this exemption, once everybody's homes have increased by over a thousand dollars, really the multiplier will then kick in and compensate so that the...in Cook County at least the real value of this exemption will amount to probably only 500 dollars...probably amount to less than 500 dollars. So I don't think this is real tax relief at all. It certainly does not benefit all of the citizens of Illinois and I urge that we get a second Conference Report."

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

Porter: "Well I'm delighted, for one, to hear, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that Representative Brady is taking care of his portion of our Evanston constituents. I think this probably is pretty good stuff to run for office on, both for Senator Hynes and maybe for all of us. It does provide a cushion for our taxpayers but I really wonder how much because assessment levels, give or take a thousand dollars, probably isn't too hard to work around. I think the real tragedy is that we had a chance this Session to give really meaningful tax relief. If Representative Totten's Constitutional Amendment could only have been heard we might have been able to put a cap on real property taxation in this state and allowed it to grow only as the productive capacity of our state economy grew, which I think is the right way to do it to protect taxpayers in the long run. But I do think this is worthwhile and I am voting 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin, to explain his vote for one minute."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the other House Sponsor



of Senate Bill 179...I urge adoption of the Conference Committee Report. In the...in our district last year we had a reassessment and the effect was quite devastating. Myself, Representative Telcser, Representative Marovitz and Senator Merlo attended numerous meetings with senior citizens and others experiencing massive increase in their property taxes. In some cases these increases amounted to 100, 200, in one case even 500 percent. And these are older properties, older buildings. And I think this legislation will help to deal with the effect of these massive increases."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 130 'aye', 27 'nay' and the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1790. On Conference Committee Reports on the Supplemental #1 appears House Bill 2775. The Lady from Cook, Jane Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move to concur in the Conference Report on House Bill 2775. This House Bill is the one that concerns itself with the violation of the child custody order in cases of child abduction. It passed out of the House 151 votes with 'aye' and out of the Senate with 50 votes. And we took it to Conference Committee merely to tighten up some of the language and to add some affirmative defenses. And I appreciate Representative Leinenweber's help in this Bill because he said this was, this Bill has been rewritten more than the magna-carta but I feel that it's in excellent shape, the language is correct and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Conference Committee Report #1. All in favor signify



by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 161 'aye', no 'nay' and the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2775. On that same Supplemental #1 appears Senate Bill 1786. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Matejek."

Matejek: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move the adoption of the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1786. There was some problems with the Amendment involving the language. It was a technical error. It has been corrected to read on page 3, line 8, 'including property held in joint tenancy by two or more persons, all of whom are 65 years of age' and this corresponds with the Amendment which was offered by Representative Conti on Second Reading. I move the adoption of the Conference Committee Report."

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

Holewinski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, if the Gentleman would yield for a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Holewinski: "Representative, just one question, that is the language that is deleted in the Conference Committee Report, what effect does that have on page 3, line 8, by deleting 'secured by a mortgage on such property'?"

Matejek: "The paragraph reads, 'A reverse mortgage loan shall be a loan extended on the basis of existing equity in homestead property of persons 65 years of age or older, secured by a first mortgage on such property or a mortgage on such property.' What we're just stating is that the property has to be in joint tenancy and that both joint tenants have to be 65 years



of age in order to be eligible for the reverse mortgage loan."

Holewinski: "Yeah, I understand that, I'm just wondering what effect deleting that language has, I don't have the Bill in front of me I just have the Conference Committee Report."

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

Conti: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Representative Holewinski, there's no...it has no significance it's just a duplication, it's just a clarification of the ... of the language, that's all."

Speaker Bradley: "Didn't hear Mr. Conti...what's..."

Conti: "I move to concur, the Bill's in good shape now."

Speaker Bradley: "Fine. The Gentleman moves that the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to 1786. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 153 'aye', 2 'nay', 6 voting 'present'. The House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1786. On the Calendar, on the Regular Calendar appears House Bill 1468. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Conference Committee Report, second Conference Committee Report is identical to the first Conference Committee Report which received..."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Collins, for what purpose do you rise?"

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, I don't believe the Conference Committee Report has been printed yet."

Speaker Bradley: "Well I would hope so, it's not...it's the Regular Calendar."

Collins: "Yes, but this is the second Conference Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "That's on the Calendar too."

Collins: "Oh, I beg your pardon."



Speaker Bradley: "The Calendar today is second reports, I surely hope it's been distributed. Continue, Sir."

Collins: "I don't think it has been distributed, would you check..."

Speaker Bradley: "All right, we'll check, we'll check. I'm informed it's been distributed for quite some time. Continue, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1468, second Conference Report is identical to the first Conference Committee Report, which received 86 affirmative votes in the House and was adopted yesterday in the Senate with a vote of 56 to 0. This report makes three changes in House Bill 1468, as amended in the Senate. Two are substantive and the other is technical. The effect of adopting the report will be to place the Bill in essentially the same shape it was in when it passed the House 115 to 7. The first change is it removes Senate Amendment #1, which set up a judicial reviewing procedure for large claim settlements. The procedure was cumbersome and largely unnecessary. Senator Guidice, who offered the Amendment signed the report removing it as did the other four conferees from the Senate. The report also calls for Amendments to the Tort Immunity Act which will allow a local governmental entity which does not levy a property tax but has one levied on its behalf to fall under the provisions of this Act. The practical effect of this change is to allow the Chicago School Districts to exercise the powers of the Act. Because of the way their property tax is levied they do not currently come under the Act. They are the only school district in the State of Illinois so excluded. This change does not affect the powers granted under the Act or in this Bill, it only extends those powers to local governments who have



property tax levied on their behalf. The third change is certain language in the Bill which was not in the Torte Immunity Act when the Bill was drafted. I move for the adoption of the second Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1468."

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

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, since I don't have the Conference Committee Report and nobody around me does I have to ask some questions of the Sponsor."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Yourell, do you wish to respond?"

Collins: "Wait a minute, do I have the wrong Bill? Does this Conference Committee Report grandfather in employees of the State Board of Elections?"

Yourell: "No."

Collins: "Oh, I have the wrong one. I beg your pardon."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Whiteside, Mr. Schuneman."

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

Speaker Bradley: "He'll yield."

Schuneman: "Representative Yourell, it's my understanding that this Bill, in addition to providing a means of self insurance for local units of government it also gives them additional taxing authority, which they do not now have. According to the...to our staff, they had indicated that this Bill would give new taxing authority to local school districts. For example, that local school districts could now levy a specific tax for Workmen's Compensation and General Liability Insurance in excess of those taxes which they presently can levy. Do you...do you agree that that is one of the effects that this Bill would have?"

Yourell: "No, I do not agree and I would remind you and suggest that there is presently statutory provisions for insurance levies to units of local governments of school districts."



Schuneman: "Well, the problem that I understand this Bill would...would create is that this gives specific additional tax authority over and above the present limits of taxing authority that these school districts in particular have. And it seems to me that what this does is create new taxation without referendum. And many of us in this House have consistently opposed giving that kind of authority to units of local government. And this is our concern, it was our concern at the time of the first Conference Committee Report and it seems to me that you've made no change in the Bill in that respect and it continues to be my concern."

Yourell: "Well, I suggest to you the reason there was no changes made and every Member of the Conference Committee...of the Conference Committee in the House and Senate signed the Conference Committee Report. As I indicated to you it was reported out of the Senate without a dissenting vote yesterday, 56 to 0. All this does is allow units of local government to use part of their tax rates to levy for insurance. It's a statutory provision that they already have and I suggest to you that that's all it does. Now this Bill was a product of the Insurance Laws Commission, along with many representatives of county government, local government who met on a Commission..."

Schuneman: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Bill? Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill has had a rather long and rocky history and certainly it was introduced for the purposes that the Gentleman has just expressed. But it appears to me and to others here that the Bill does in fact grant to some units of local government additional taxing authority that they do not now presently have. And particularly in the case of school districts who will



be able to levy taxes over and above those that are presently levied. And I suggest to you that this is granting those school districts the power to levy taxes, additional taxes without referendum. And for that reason I have to oppose the Bill."

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

Epton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Apparently that initial misunderstanding had been perpetuated. How we failed to explain it clearly before is our fault and again, perhaps the same situation still exists. It does not increase anybody's right to tax any additional tax. It simply allows them to use that money which they can presently tax under existing law for the specific purpose to which we refer to. As a matter of fact, although that doesn't answer a particular question, I have in front of me one of several telegrams, for example, from the Village of Downers Grove, which states...urges strongly support House Bill 1468, permitting municipalities to self insure. 'This legislation has the potential of saving taxpayers millions of dollars throughout the state. Please give this legislation your strongest support. James R. Greshemer, Village Manager.'

I concede that the question raised by my colleague is of paramount importance. If this Bill did give additional authority I would concur that it should go back to Conference Committee. But where that impression comes from we're unable to discover. The reason it was held up originally, approximately 18 months ago, is the City of Chicago, which felt it was invading their province to settle claims. When we finally convinced Mr. Dart and his colleagues that it...that was not the case, Senator Guidice withdrew his Amendment. So as my colleague across the aisle explained this simply allows municipalities which presently have taxing



authority to utilize that to pay these premiums or to self insure. If they desire to go above their present limitation they must recede to a referendum, they must get voters approval, this Bill does not in any way change that. And I would concur with my colleague on the other side and solicit your favorable vote."

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

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for a couple questions?"

Speaker Bradley: "He indicates he will."

Huskey: "On this Bill, this backdoor referendum on this Bill for insurance, is there any limitation? Does the city do its own self insuring, are they permitted to pay out their own claims and their own policies?"

Yourell: "To begin with, Mr. Huskey, there's no backdoor referendum on the Bill."

Huskey: "How do they raise the money to pay for the insurance?"

Yourell: "They already have a statutory rate limit and they can use that for insurance...for their insurance levy as provided for in the statutes. There is not... you seem to have a hang-up with backdoor referendums. There is none in the Bill."

Huskey: "I...how do you...how do you pay the... Where there is no home rule unit, how do they raise their money to pay for their workmen's compensation and their new insurance plan? In the counties and the townships without home rule?"

Yourell: "I would suggest to you, Mr. Huskey, the reason that you're...the questions that you're asking me are the reasons why we need this legislation. Units of local government are presently not able to purchase insurance. You know that because we've had letters from county officials, municipal officials, township officials that have said, 'Please help us. We cannot



purchase insurance. All this Bill does is give them the right to self insure and to purchase the service of insurance companies to service their claims. In the area of product liability or unemployment claims against the unit of local government they have the right to use the levy to do away with those claims and pay them. If you don't give them this right that's contained in this Bill, what they'll have to do is go to continued extended proceedings in court to fight these claims which will result in thousands and thousands of dollars."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Bill? Mr. Speaker, in order to raise this money for insurance and there was nothing in your...about...on product liability, but in order to raise this insurance for Workmen's Compensation and Unemployment Insurance there is a tax levy which is without referendum which is millions of dollars throughout the State of Illinois. It's a very bad Bill. It's a tax raising Bill for people that have cried for austerity in government, for saving taxpayers money. The best way in the world to save taxpayers money is to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there seems to be considerable misunderstanding as to what this Bill will do. I agree with Representative Schuneman and the Republican staff agrees with him also. To quote the Republican staff analysis on Conference Committee #2, they say that this Bill allows for open-ended taxation without referendum to pay for Workmen's Compensation insurance. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection whatever to extending the purposes of the levy to paying claims for insurance that are legitimate or to joining and paying their fair share in



a reciprocal insurance agreement. But, Mr. Speaker, the...the Conference Committee, in my opinion, permits the extension of a levy for the purpose of purchasing insurance, including Workmen's Compensation insurance. And I don't feel, since I was not responsible for the tremendous increases in Workmen's Compensation that I ought to be voting to pay for them. And I think maybe we ought to depend on you people over on the other side to put the votes on and to face the voters when they ask you why the property taxes are increased. I would urge a 'no' vote, Mr. Speaker, on this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Knox, Mr. McMaster."

McMaster: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think a lot of you were not listening when Representative Epton spoke. The counties and municipalities already have the right to levy to pay insurance. All this does is include Workmen's Comp. along with that...insures that they can pay for... So I think it's something that we've got to do. After all, they're liable for Workmen's Compensation. If they aren't able to insure, either with a private company or by mutual self insurance, then what are they going to do if they have a big insurance claim brought against them? Then they are going to have to come out and levy to pay for it. You know that and there might be thousands upon thousands of dollars. So, I think this is fine legislation, let's pass it, let's get it over with."

Speaker Bradley: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. VonBoeckman, arise?"

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

Speaker Bradley: "I don't think there's anybody else wanting to respond, so Mr. Yourell, to close the debate."

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



House. It's really curious to me that this vote...this Bill, just a few days ago, got 86 affirmative votes and yesterday in the Senate it had the same Conference Committee Report to consider, voted it out 56 to 0. I would also recommend for your consideration to those who have spoken to the Bill, without exception to those who have spoken against the Bill did not vote against the Bill when it was considered on May 12, 1977. It received 115 'yea' votes and 7 'nay' votes. Mr. Walsh, who spoke against it, voted 'yes' for it on that date. Mr. Leinenweber, who spoke against it, voted 'present'. Mr. Huskey, who spoke against it, voted 'yes'. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, I don't know what the hang-up is today. I'm suggesting to you that without this Bill we're going to have a situation where we're not going to be able to afford to purchase insurance by our units of local government and create a tremendous cost to the taxpayers of the districts that you represent. In the past 2 years many local governments have been unable to obtain adequate liability insurance or any liability insurance coverage in some instances. Often termination of selected coverage or total coverage is made without advance notice. All this Bill does is allow units of local government to self insure to use the statutory provision that's already there, to use the insurance levy and to save the taxpayers millions and millions of dollars. There isn't a county board president, there isn't a county board president that I know of that is opposed to this Bill. There's not an elected public official on the local level that's opposed to it and I suggest it's good legislation and should receive your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion to adopt Conference Committee Report #2. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by voting 'aye',



opposed by voting 'no'. The Lady from Winnebago, Mrs. Martin, to explain her vote."

Martin: "Part of this Bill is good, the self insurance part. But the rest of the Bill is bad. And the rest of the Bill does two things. It may not be a backdoor referendum but it is a very different thing to allow counties to take care of insurance and to add Workmen's Comp. and Unemployment insurance to it. I would suggest, this is a tax increase and I would also suggest that this will mean that the pressure to change the bad Workmen's Comp. and Unemployment insurance we have will be partially removed when other local units of government can just pass on the cost, regardless of the poorness of the legislation. A 'no' vote is the only decent vote in a year that most of you are talking about tax reform and tax savings."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber, to explain his vote."

Leinenweber: "Well, partially to explain my vote and partially on personal privilege. When this Bill was up, whenever it was up and I supposedly voted 'present' on it, I can guarantee, I'm sure this Bill was part of a user list whereby we were forced to vote on huge masses of legislation that nobody knew what it was all about. But I'd like to clarify one thing and I have the Bill in my hand. Both the Sponsor and the opponents are accurate in what they say but they're not talking about the same thing. We're talking about a special tax levy as opposed to the general tax levy. Now, the Bill permits the special tax levy, which has heretofore only been permitted for payment of judgements to be extended to pay for premiums of...from Workmen's Compensation and Occupational Diseases Act. Right now, without this Bill, the local units of government must pay for that out of their



general tax levy. So I suggest to you that we are extending to the special tax levy which will leave the general tax levy free for expenditures in other areas. So it will mean more tax revenue to be raised by units of local government and we should be voting 'no' in this year."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti, to explain his vote."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, just to alleviate some of the concerns that my colleagues have on this side of the aisle, no municipality has to utilize this. And I just want to remind them, back in May 12th, when he was talking I told him just of one incident where we advertised for bids three times and no one would respond to any of the bids on the insurance. We couldn't get insurance. Finally an insurance company came in and told us that our previous premium the year before was 45 thousand dollars but if they would give us the same coverage the following year for 160,000 dollars and we had to take it or leave it. Most fire chiefs and most firemen are afraid to put their equipment out on the street they're afraid we can't get insurance. Now I have the same concern about Workmen's Comp. But the Workmen's Comp, if they really want to, they don't have to, they don't have to after several years of being self insured they would have an accumulated fund. I have not spent more than 30,000 a year on any claims and my insurance is running me 160,000. After 10 years I have an accumulated of 1,000,000 dollars. I can afford my own Workmen's Comp without a tax referendum."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 116 'aye', 33 'nay' and the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #2 to House Bill



1468. On Supplemental #2 appears... For what purpose does the Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan, arise?"

Ryan: "For the purpose of a very important announcement, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Bradley: "Proceed."

Ryan: "If we are fortunate enough to adjourn tonight the Governor has extended an invitation to all but Matijevich to come to the mansion immediately after adjournment for a little party. But John can come if he'll leave the lobster and the caviar alone he can come over, he's invited."

Speaker Bradley: "Well we certainly appreciate the kind invitation."

Ryan: "That's from the Governor and Mrs. Thompson."

Speaker Bradley: "We appreciate that very much. The Chair is trying to keep track of things. For your information I think we are going to keep right on going... The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, the only guy not invited."

Matijevich: "This was... Mr. Speaker, this was at the request of Elmer Conti and I just... I didn't know if I should do this... no... But I walked over to Elmer Conti's desk and that was when George Ryan mentioned I'm invited to the Governor's Mansion and I didn't think he'd dare invite me after the words I said, but I mentioned to Elmer, I said, 'You think I could do this one on the floor?' Do a little impersonation of the Governor talking to the pilot on a plane? But when I do the Governor I should stand up, you know, the Governor gets on the plane, you know he's so much taller than I am... He gets on the plane and the pilot says, 'Good day, Governor.' And the Governor says, 'Good day' to the pilot. And they're on the plane for about 10 minutes and the pilot looks back at the Governor and he goes... He says, 'Governor?' And the Governor



says, 'It's not me.' And the pilot says, 'Governor did you bring those dogs on the plane again?'. "

Speaker Bradley: "It will take a while to think about that one. The intention of the Chair, this evening... All right. We've got another Supplemental coming down, Supplemental #3 with about 4 Conference Committee Reports on it. We'd like to finish up 1 and 2 and go to 3 and at that time we anticipate something like 15 Conference Committee Reports left to do. And so we thought we'd break for one hour while we're waiting for the Supplemental to be printed and the Messages coming over from the Senate. If we're back promptly after 1 hour break we shouldn't...it shouldn't take too long to finish up the work of the House.



Speaker Bradley: "On the Calendar on the Conference Committee Reports, Supplemental #2, appears House Bill 297. Mr. Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, the recommendations of the Committee that we do concur with Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 297 and that the Bill be further amended to specifically exclude unemployment insurance and workmen's compensation insurance provisions of the Act. We went a little farther, too, the Committee did, and we amended it to provide the Comptroller may audit the units of local government to determine the actual cost of state mandate(sic) programs which he has that authority now. And the Illinois Office of Education may audit the school districts to determine the actual cost of state mandate which he really does now. And then we went farther and said, 'The Comptroller shall have access to these audits'. The Committee Members were myself, Representatives Capparelli, Yourell, Lynn Martin, Schuneman, Senators Knuppel, D'Arco, Ziomek, Harber Hall and Representative(sic) Grotberg and we all signed in total agreement. I urge passage, accepting of the report."

Speaker Bradley: "Question? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mahar."

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

I think the Conference Committee, in fact, I know the Conference Committee Report is a tremendous improvement over what we received yesterday. And the two main concerns that I had was one that related to unemployment comp and workmen's comp and also the fact that there need to be some kind of audit which I think is a great step in the right direction. The one question that I have is the fact that we seem to have a reverse structure of government in which it doesn't flow directly from the state to local government, almost vice versa. And I'm just wondering..that this is a very important concept and I know one that local government and the Mayors throughout the state do not want to be forced to find local funds for mandated programs. And I'm just wondering if in this emergency Session that we have now if we aren't rushing something through without adequate hearings. Now, I'm a Member of the Municipal Problems Commission and they're a very active group that hold a lot of hearings around the state, I'm just wondering if we shouldn't be holding some hearings around the state on this matter to



get further input to be sure that we're doing the right thing when we consider to enact this type of legislation."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, when you look at this Conference Committee Report #1 you see two things. Number one, an attempt to make a bad Bill a little less bad. And number two, obviously bad ideas never die around this House. We have contended, coped with this matter for some time and here it comes up again. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the General Assembly is the focal point for legislative activity in the State of Illinois. It is the focal point for establishing public policy. And by the Constitution only the General Assembly has the authority to create units of local government. And by creating units...local...units...creating units of local government, or units of local government, it has the authority and the responsibility for determining how they, as our agents, those units of local government as our agents, will serve the people of the State of Illinois at the local level. We not only have the authority, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we have the responsibility of telling units of local government how they should serve people. Now I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that during the 1970 Constitution, the Local Government Article, Article VII, we gave to them quote, home rule, end of quote. But by that we did not abrogate and the people did not remove from the General Assembly the responsibility for establishing state-wide public policy. Now, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, if we are to inhibit ourselves, if we're to... restrict ourselves in saying that in the future we can't tell units of local government what they should be doing. If we are to tell them what they should be doing and then assume the responsibility for paying the cost of it, we aren't going to be doing anything. And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, a good Conference Committee Report - State Conference Committee Report #2 - would be to remove from these units of local government their share of the income tax, their share of the sales tax, their share of the gas tax. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we have amply provided the units of local government the wherewithal to meet their obligation as agents



of the General Assembly. I respectfully suggest this is a bad, bad Bill - slightly improved, - less bad but it deserves the same treatment that its counterpart received not too long ago, I think yesterday, and we ought to vote 'no' and maintain the integrity of the General Assembly and serve the people of the State of Illinois well."

Speaker Bradley: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, this Bill has been debated and I think many of you know the issues involved. A few...a few problems with the Bill have been corrected but the main problem with the Bill is the Bill itself. The one way to test your vote on this is to consider addressing a high school class in civics or a college class in state government. There's no way that you could endorse the philosophy of this Bill. What this Bill says is that things work backwards. It says that the Legislature abdicates its responsibility. That the Legislature has no business enacting laws for the whole state which would include the obligations and responsibilities of local governments and of school districts. It's just a bad philosophy. I'm surprised that this Bill has come this far. I do acknowledge the psychology behind this Bill. We've been intimidated somewhat by local school districts and others who complain about mandating programs that we don't fund. Now let's face that....let's face up to that in the way a Legislature should. We shouldn't mandate programs that are beyond the known fiscal resources of local government. But we certainly shouldn't turn the whole ball game around and say that the Legislature from now on is impotent....or impotent to exercise its...the responsibility for which it was elected and which is in the Constitution of the State of Illinois. This Bill would in effect repeal or amend our State Constitution. I urge that we resoundingly defeat this Conference Committee and put away this Bill and any Bills like it that would accomplish the same purpose."

Speaker Bradley: "Going to turn the lights back on for some still shots. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You've heard it said that the Bill has been improved by the Conference Committee Report but there's still many problems with the Bill. One of the problems is that the Bill would reverse the structure of government, local units are the creatures



of the state not vice versa. It would tie the hands of the General Assembly. It will increase bureaucracy and the paper work. The Bill makes no differentiation between large and small mandated programs. For example, if the state revises its standard for stop lights so that a certain light or new lens costing five dollars should be used, then the state would have to contact every city, village and county in the state and pay them for each lens. This would also apparently include the cost of the labor. The same argument would apply to any standard or improvement requested by the Legislature or an executive agency. The words 'of necessary appropriation' still remain in the Bill so if a local unit does not get what it thinks is...necessary appropriation to do the mandated program they are freed from being mandated to do that program. The Bill is bad. The philosophy is bad. We ought to wake up and realize that we are tying the hands of this General Assembly if this is enacted into law. We ought to defeat and reject the Conference Committee Report."

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

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think we should defeat this Bill and I'm one who's often supported the fact that we should quit mandating programs and not pay for 'em. But all of us who know that we've sat through hundreds, yes, thousands of home rule exemptions know that it would be nothing to get into that same pattern with this Bill. We're only kidding ourselves and local government by the enactment of this legislation. What we have to do is look at each individual mandated program."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Lucco. Mr. Lucco."

Lucco: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I raise the previous question."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor of the Gentleman's motion signify by saying 'aye', all opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. Von-Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this has been debated pros and cons. It sailed out of the House in... in 1977 with not too much opposition. Some of the people have voted against it that spoke against...voted for it that spoke against it,



so I think it's a good concept. It makes us put our money where our mouth is and it...it curtails taxation on a local level where we're having all of our problems today. And I...I urge a...'aye' vote."

Speaker Bradley: "The question is on the adoption of the Conference Committee Report #1. All in favor of adoption signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz, to explain his vote."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill is an example of our past catching up with us. We enact programs because some lobbying group comes in and sells us on a program. We don't really don't care where the money is going to come from. It would be very excellent and fine if in fact we were responsible and then we wouldn't have to pass a law like this. But we have not acted responsibly and by passing the law maybe we will be more responsible. However, it should be pointed out that this is not a Constitutional Amendment, it is simply a law. The General Assembly having made a law can change the law. If it does not work out in practice we can in fact eliminate the law or we can pass particular laws without this exemption but it is, again, an example of the fact that we go charging into all these new areas of legislation and regulation at the behest of this or that group and maybe we will start thinking about where the money is going to come from. And so I'm going to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk, to explain his vote."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, when this Bill was introduced back in February of 1977, Representative Von Boeckman and I were the principal Sponsors of this legislation. We felt it was a sound concept then, we still feel it's a sound concept. Some of the opposition has been spoken to and corrected. I think it's something, as Representative Katz pointed out, that could be changed over a period of time if we see that it doesn't work out as well as we thought. Now, originally, as I said, we're...there were only two Sponsors of this legislation. But if you look in your Digest you'll notice that a number of people have jumped on the bandwagon of this good Bill including my esteemed



seatmate who has been leading the charges...of the opposition. I don't wish to embarrass Representative Bluthardt in any way but if you look at the Digest you'll see that he's a Cosponsor of the Bill."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bluthardt, asks for equal time."

Bluthardt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think that only proves that you're never too old to learn. And I have learned, my eyes have been opened and I would now ask leave to have my name removed as a Cosponsor of House Bill 297."

Speaker Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have leave? I...I think that'd be against the rules. Have all voted who wish? Yeah, we didn't remove him. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 70 'ayes' and 80 'nays'. The Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to explain my vote."

Speaker Bradley: "No...."

Von Boeckman: "The....no, I'm not going to ask for a Second Conference Committee, Mr. Speaker, but I do want this to be a record because it's going out to all the news media all over the State of Illinois. And I hope that the local governing bodies and the local citizenry really find out who the big spenders are in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Bradley: "I'm....this question there are 70 'ayes' and 80 'nays' and the Gentleman's motion failed."



Speaker Bradley: "On the Calendar appears... So that we will have a complete Session I think we ought to go to Supplemental 3 and House Bill 2981. House Bill 2981. Jane Barnes.- The Arts Council. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to adopt the Conference Committee."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins, on the Arts Council."

Collins: "Well, no, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield to a question?"

Speaker Bradley: "She indicates she will."

Collins: "The Conference Committee Report, I believe, has you receding from Senate Amendment #2. Is that correct?"

Barnes: "Yes, Sir."

Collins: "What was Senate Amendment #2?"

Barnes: "Senate Amendment #2 was to restore 374,000 reduced by the Senate from the Illinois Arts Council. Yes it was."

Collins: "You're restoring..."

Barnes: "Yes."

Collins: "What happened to the Illinois Racing Board, is that still in there?"

Barnes: "Oh, do you want to know about that one too? The other day I did move not to concur on Senate Amendment #2 but on the Senate Amendment #3 and 4 I did move to concur."

Collins: "Well now what is the restoration going to entail, what is it for?"

Barnes: "Well I want to restore Senate Amendment #2 and that's for 374,000 dollars to the Illinois Arts Council."

Collins: "Is this for operations or for projects or just for typical waste?"

Barnes: "W-a-i-s-t or w-a-s-t-e, Representative?"

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the



House, I thought this Bill when it came over the first time from the Senate really was in proper shape, because at that time it had attached to it the appropriation for the Illinois Racing Board. And I thought that the Illinois Arts Council had finally arrived at the place where it's really belonged. Well, all I could think of what that around the stable you're going to find the same type of substances that I've been alluding to the Arts Council for all these many years. But now you're restoring money to further waste money in the name of art. Now Representative McAuliffe read some poetry to you last week that I thought was very illustrative of what is going on in the Arts Council. And now I am reliably informed this agency, has commissioned the Japanese artist who painted the lower level of the Wacker Drive to paint the entire front of the John Hancock building with a gigantic mural and as you know it can be seen from 4 states and millions of tourists a year... And I'm reliably informed that this mural is going to be a portrait of Bluthardt. Now just think of the irreparable harm that we will do to millions and millions of young children. They will be scarred for life after viewing this horrible thing looking out over the City of Chicago. Now, for the last time, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I implore you, let's get rid of...let's get rid of poetry on the buses, let's get rid of these horrible victory garden and organic theaters and once and for all, let's get rid of Bluthardt. I ask you, please turn down this Conference Committee Report and let's get rid of this most wasteful agency."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Bluthardt, the Gentleman from Cook."

Bluthardt: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. A matter of personal privilege?"

Speaker Bradley: "Certainly. Proceed."

Bluthardt: "You know, I listened carefully this morning and



I enjoyed the entertainment but I thought all the clowns were on the other side of the aisle. The first one to get up and make a fool of themselves today happens to be that mad, what do they call them, some kind of an Irishman, from Calumet City. And I don't know, to have my beautiful features plastered on the wall of the Hancock building or on the outside of the building might do good for the City of Chicago. You know, I might be...I am a grandfather and a grandfather overlooking all these children, seeing that they stay out of trouble, seeing that they behave, seeing they don't carouse out around at night...they follow my example through my many years of life, I think it may bring back to Chicago what it was when I was a kid some 61 years ago. And I think you, Phil, for the compliment and for me finally getting some recognition in this House of Representatives. Thank you."

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

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I've been waiting for several long weeks since the Sponsor advised us that Representative Collins wrote a poem on a bus to her. Last...when this was up for concurrence the Sponsor of this Bill refused to tell us what it was and I insist that Representative Collins now enlighten us to what his poetry was. It was written on a bus and it's certainly relevant to this because it may up in the CTA."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker, the only copy of that poem is in the possession of Representative Barnes. I autographed it for her and I don't know if I could remember it just as I composed it. So if anybody's going to read it here she is. If not, I'll attempt to reconstruct it at the Governor's Mansion tonight after adjournment."

Speaker Bradley: "Mrs. Barnes, to close."



Barnes: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Representative Collins, the poem and the autograph is in a position where I can't read it very clearly at this time so I shall take a pass on that. I would like to remind Representative Collins that if you're ever out to dinner with him in the evening he orders the finest and most expensive wines as the rest of the companions who are men, who have to pay for this, will tell you. He is always for the better things of life and that's exactly what the Illinois Arts Council, for all the joking that everybody does for it, all throughout the state... they are trying to bring some of the economic development and the better things of life into many communities that cannot afford them. And this is the reason that I move to adopt the Conference Committee on House Bill 2981. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Bradley: "All in favor of the Lady's motion signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin, to explain his vote."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, actually I'm getting up on a point of personal privilege. I have heard the Representative... the Representative from Cook County on at least a dozen occasions malign Victory Gardens and Organic Theater, both of which are located in the 12th District. It's true that occasionally that we'll have a production with a circus or clowns or something like that, but I would urge you, find another target, find another victim and come visit us in the 12th District. I'll be happy to take you to one or both theaters."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 113 'aye', 31 'no' and the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2981. On Supplemental #2 appears House Bill 2950. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Davis."



Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2950 simply adds these words, 'that the following shall be included when a receiver is appointed. The receiver... it shall be included, the obtaining of all court orders.' We agreed to this for the sake of the utilities people. They didn't want the responsibility of going in getting the court orders. They agreed to everything on here and that's the only thing that's added, that the receiver will be responsible for getting...obtaining all court orders. That's all that's added and I would appreciate the vote of all, that we approve the Committee Report."

Speaker Bradley: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill addresses a very complicated problem that the Gentleman from Cook brought to the Public Utilities Committee on which I serve. When we heard this Bill in Committee there were many issues raised, there were many difficulties with it and I want to tribute the Gentleman from Cook on the fine work that he has done in compromising, sitting down with all the parties involved and working out all the difficulties. When this Bill passed on Third Reading I believe I voted 'present' out of regard for him in his efforts because I still could not support the Bill in its entirety. Now, in the Conference Committee, he has achieved a Bill that I can support and I salute him for his efforts in this to help his constituents and I ask a favorable vote on the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? Being none, the question is on the adoption of the Conference Committee Report and the Gentleman's motion. All in favor signify by voting 'aye' and opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On



this question there are 149 'aye'; no 'nay', none voting 'present'. The House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1...Ebbesen 'aye'...Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2950. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, would the Gentleman from Cook, the Sponsor of House Bill 2950, yield?"

Speaker Bradley: "It's already gone."

Schlickman: "I simply suggest, Mr. Speaker, this may be his last Bill of his legislative career."

Speaker Bradley: "Mr. Davis, is this your last Bill?"

Davis: "Yes, it's the last Bill for this Session."

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

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker, I don't believe this is Representative Davis' last Bill. He has the Equal Rights Amendment on Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Bradley: "Okay, on the Calendar, Supplemental #2 Consideration Postponed, Senate Bill 1546. The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the first Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1546. There is a difference between the House and the Senate language in how we should instruct the Commerce Commission to allow for a central human services and law enforcement in allocating natural gas and electricity during times of shortages. This Conference Committee Report comes in with the Senate language which says only that the Commerce Commission shall take into account essential human services and law enforcement programs in the allocation of natural gas and electricity. The language that the...some of the House Members, the language of the Bill as it went out of the House was tighter. What the dispute is about is whether residential customers should be specifically defined, whether hospitals should



be specifically included and defined and whether electricity, as well as natural gas, should be included. What the Conference Committee Report does is include natural gas and electricity so that we will not have to come back again in future years to include electricity when we have a shortage of electric as well as natural gas powers. I think that this language mandating the Commerce Commission to take into account essential human services and law enforcement needs, hearing periods of shortages is good. It gives them the direction that they need and I would urge the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1."

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

Conti: "Yes, Members and Mr. Speaker...Members of the House, we had quite a bit of trouble with this Bill in Committee and the Sponsor of this Bill has been very cooperative. We suggested it was the last day of Committee hearings, that if he would hold this on Second Reading for me to put my Amendment on it that we would pass it out. Under no circumstances would this Bill have gotten out of Committee if that agreement wasn't made there. The Sponsor of the Bill was very cooperative and accepted my Amendment on Second Reading. However, for some reason or other the Senate has either...has pride in authorship but they seemed to change the wording to suit their needs instead of what we agreed upon in Public Utilities. Now, they had to...who serves essential human needs. And that is very ambiguous in the Bill. As I mentioned the day before, ambiguous...essential human needs is anybody who uses large food processes...it may mean a Macdonalds store. And in Central Illinois there are 10,000 people waiting for gas services and all we're trying to do is provide those people that need gas services without going to the purveyors and to...also



to the food handlers and the institutions, large institutions. For the first time in this Session Ellis Levin agreed with me and put in this Amendment that we also define the word, human...essential human needs to residential customers, hospitals and law enforcement agencies. It defines residential customers. The request is the House recede from the above Amendment thereby requiring preference be given to those carrying essential human needs is just ridiculous. We spelled it out perfectly. It...the utility companies agree, the Sponsor of the Bill agreed but for some reason or other the House...the Senate insists on using their ambiguous line in this Bill. I urge the defeat of this...not to concur."

Speaker Bradley: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is the Conference Committee Report that we defeated earlier today, it's back here on Postponed Consideration. Unfortunately it's not a second Conference Committee Report that might have been improved, it's the same bad report. The reasons we defeated it then were as valid as they are now and they are now as valid as they were then. The Senate language is too wide open. It is a handover to the Commerce Commission of a tremendous amount of power and I think that we should get a second Conference Committee on this Bill so that we can draw a Bill that will satisfy both the House and the Senate. We need some definition, we need some tight language, we need to have more work on this Bill. Please, do not adopt this Conference Committee Report. Please, send it to a second Conference Committee. Thank you."

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

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise again in opposition to



this Bill in its current form. I don't think that it solves the problem that it was meant to. As it's pointed out by previous speakers, it's too vague and it's over broad. It includes both gas and electric and the language really doesn't spell out any standards. This legislation was initially introduced because a convent in the City of Springfield was not included as a priority in the gas allocations in this city when there was a shortage of gas. I would suggest, if we approve this Conference Committee that convents may still not be covered because the language is so broad that the Commerce Commission could decide that that convent is not meeting essential human needs. I therefore suggest that we...we do not concur in this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Bradley: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, to close the debate."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1546 addresses itself to a problem that we have had in the past and that is that the Commerce Commission has not been responsive to institutions and public housing agencies and others in areas all around the state in their natural gas allocations during periods of shortages. What this Bill will do is to tell the Commerce Commission to take into account essential human needs...services and law enforcement agencies during periods of shortages in both natural gas and electricity. This is the language that has been worked out by the Senate. It was signed by two-thirds of the Conference Committee and I'd urge the adoption of this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Bradley: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Robinson, to explain his vote for one minute."



Robinson: "I would like to make a point that this is the same as the Bill that got 89 votes and passed out. I am concerned that...what this Bill does, I am concerned that with the points that Representative Levin and Conti raised. But I also don't want to be accused of pride in authorship and killing one Bill just because it has my name on it. But I do think that we'll probably have to be back here...because it doesn't have my name on it... But I do think we'll have to be back here next year to work out these problems. And I think it shows that we really need an elected Illinois Commerce Commission because the way we have it now it's just now working."

Speaker Bradley: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 93 'aye', 55 'nay'. The Gentleman requests a verification. The Lady from Winnebago, Mrs. Martin, wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Martin 'aye'. Poll the absentees. Mr. Dunn, Ralph Dunn wishes to go from 'no' to 'aye'. Mr...Lynn Martin 'aye', Ralph Dunn 'aye'. Holewinski from 'no' to 'aye'. Bennett from 'no' to 'aye'. Any other changes. Jack Davis from 'no' to 'aye'. Mr. Madigan...Mr. Madigan wants to be verified 'aye', he's leaving, is that all right? Mr. Griesheimer, for what purpose do you rise?"

Griesheimer: "Change me from 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Bradley: "Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'.

Mr. Madison 'aye'. Geo-Karis from 'present' to 'aye'."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, if Geo wants to go 'aye' I'll let her go. I withdraw the request. Geo convinced me."

Speaker Bradley: "101 'aye', 51 'nay' and the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1546."



Speaker Bradley: "On the Supplemental #3 appears House Bill 2554.

The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, before...before I proceed with House Bill 2554, I would ask for leave to be recorded as voting 'aye' on House Bill 2981 since I had temporarily left the chambers."

Speaker Bradley: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objections he'll be so recorded."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2554 made two significant changes. Those of you who recalled the debate relative to the consolidation of elections and the implementation Bill which is House Bill 2554, and Senate Bill 1419, will recall there was much debate and controversy about the effective date of the legislation. In order to fully understand what we're talking about relative to the effective date, you all know that last year we passed into law two Bills that talk about the consolidated schedule of elections and the refinements that were made to that Bill with the passage of House Bill 3 in the Second Special Session. Now that...those...those Acts that we passed last year go into effect December of this year. In 1979, which is the year following this one, we will have the first test of the new consolidated schedule for nonpartisan and consolidated elections. Now it's very important that we decide what we're going to do with the effective date that will implement the two Acts that we passed last year. Now as you recall, when House Bill 2554 left the House, we concurred in Senate Amendment #2 which put a two-year delayed effective date which was a matter again of much controversy in the House. You remember that I promised to honor the commitment that I had made to those Members and elected public bodies to give them what they thought was an adequate amount of time in order to implement what we had done two years ago. We also did something with the aldermanic elections in the City of Chicago. Now what the Conference Committee has decided on is that we would go to a one-year effective date and also to take care of the problems as it relates to aldermanic vacancies in the City of Chicago. Those of you who recall the debate on House Bill 2554 will remember that there were certain Members of this Body who had a...a difficulty



with that situation and so in order to accommodate the problem that they cited to me, we've corrected that in the Conference...First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2554. But the significant change I think is the one that deals with the effective date. Now when I speak to you about a one-year effective date, you must recall and remember that in the odd-numbered years we're talking about the local election, such as, libraries, park districts, townships, cities, villages and towns and other special district. In that odd-numbered year there is a consolidated primary in the month of February. And then we have the nonpartisan consolidated election in April of that year. Following that in November we go to what is called the general election for schools when elementary, secondary and junior colleges will run their offices...candidates for office. We also refer to referendum that was very important to the passage of this legislation and the implementation of the two Bills passed last year. Now, what does the one-year effective date really mean? It means that if we go into a one-year effective....a one-year effective delayed effective date, that will move it into January or December, rather, of 1979. But there is no problem with the even numbered years because that's the year when we...we have the general primary and the general election in November. So if we go to a one year effective date what we're actually talking about and referring to as far as the implementation of this Act is concerned, is really about...from this point in mid-78 until December....December of 1979 which is almost two years. So this is what we've done with the First Conference Committee Report. There's one other item that I want to refer you to and that is that we took out the provision that is commonly known as the Stanley Amendment which extends the voting hours from six to seven in the State of Illinois. Now it was the thinking of those Members who participated in the Conference Committee that it would be a...a majority increase in the revenue needed to keep the polls open one extra hour. I've heard the Gentleman, who I have great respect for, say to us in Committee and on the floor of the House that we're disenfranchising the voters by not allowing them to vote that extra hour. Well you know the schools are only open from 12 to 7 but if you open the polls for an extra hour from 6 to 7 in the evening that will cost a substantial



amount of revenue to keep those polls open. And when you have the situation that we have prescribed in the Implementation Act for the paper ballots you have a situation where those judges - and you know what I'm talking about - well, they will be...they will be staying until 10, 11, 12 o'clock at night. Those are the changes we made in the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2554."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Dan Houlihan in the Chair."

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

Bluthardt: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. You'll note that the Conference Committee Report does not contain the names and the signatures of any of the Republicans of the House and but one Republican in the Senate. The reason for this is that most of us feel that the two-year extension is preferable over the one-year extension. And I think most of the Members of the House felt that way when they put the two-year extension on the Senate Bill. Now what's happened to that Senate Bill? It's been sitting on concurrence in the Senate for about a week now and the Sponsor refuses to call it and he refuses to call it because he's taken order not to call it from his leaders. And I'm almost positive that there are enough...at least from the people I've talked to on that side there are enough votes on that side to approve that concurrence motion and to carry the two-year extension on that Bill. That's the wishes of this House, at least they were at the time we voted on it. I think that we ought to reject this Conference Committee Report and we ought to wait until we see what they'll do over at the Senate, see if they won't call that and pass that two year and that will take care of that. If they don't, I'm perfectly willing to go along with the one-year extension but I don't think that we ought to be sledgehammered into accepting what the Senate wants when the preference of this House is a two-year extension not a one-year extension. I'm advised by the drafter of this Bill he needs additional time. I felt that the main Sponsor of this Bill felt that he needed the two years when he got up on this floor and said that we would get a two-year Amendment on the Bill. I think that we ought to reject it and force the Senate to call the Bill over there."

Speaker Houlihan: "The Representative from Cook, Mr. Bowman."



Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, there's hardly anyone in this House that ~~has been more~~ eager for the immediate effective date than I or more eager to extend the polling hours. But I'm standing to urge my fellow Members' to vote for this Conference Committee Report. I think it represents a reasonable compromise to all interests. I think the one-year extension is a reasonable compromise. I'd like to call... further call the Members' attention to a compromise that was worked out on the filling of vacancies for aldermanic seats. This affects us in Chicago but certainly other areas of the state as well and we have worked out a compromise which narrows the...the range of...or narrows the period of time during which a seat to be filled by appointment (sic). And I feel that it is probably one of the finest compromises coming out of any Conference Committee in the Session. So I would urge that we put our differences aside and support this Report. Thank you."

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

Stanley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Houlihan: "He indicates that he will."

Stanley: "Is it true that that Conference Committee took out the extension of the voting hours?"

Yourell: "That's correct."

Stanley: "Until seven o'clock? Did they move the voting hours down from eight o'clock in the morning to about one o'clock in the afternoon? What are those voting hours now?"

Yourell: "No, 6 to 6."

Stanley: "...Are 6 to 6. Who signed the Conference Committee Report?"

Yourell: "As you know...as you know, Representative Stanley, there are five Members of the Senate and five Members of the House who have been appointed to each Conference Committee. There are eight signatures...I'm sorry, seven signatures on the Report. Do you want their names?"

Stanley: "Please."

Yourell: "Representative...Senator Maragos. Senator Rhoads. Senator Rhoads, Sir, I want you to remember that name. Senator Rhoads. Let's see, Leroy Lemke."

Stanley: "Fine, Senator."

Yourell: "And I can't read...who is that? Charles Chew. On the



Democratic side, there were Michael Madigan, Representative Yourell and Alan Greiman."

Stanley: "Thank you."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Giglio is the acting Clerk. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I urge adoption of this Conference Committee Report. I think that what went on in the Conference Committee is a good example of how compromise can, and in this case, has been effective in this Legislature. This Body a few days ago stood up and refused to concur in Amendment #3 which would have forced a two-year appointment to fill aldermanic elections in Chicago. The feeling at that time was that this was unfair and this took the voice away from the voters. What the Conference Committee has done is, it has come up with a reasonable compromise that gives the voters back their voice. It provides that an appointment can be for no more than about one year and four months. And it gives the voters an opportunity to hold elections to fill aldermanic vacancies on a number of occasions during the four-year period. This way if there are vacancies in Chicago they can be filled and the residents of Chicago can...again be represented. This is the result of a problem in my district where we had two aldermanic vacancies in a period of about two months and there was no mechanism on the books to fill them and it took a federal court to finally bring about special aldermanic elections in the 46th and the 48th Ward. This Amendment...this Conference Committee Report resolves this problem to our satisfaction and we urge the adoption of the Report. Certainly we would have liked to have seen seven o'clock hours but I objectively don't think that that's feasible at this time and I therefore urge the adoption of this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Houlihan: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Collins."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Honorable Acting Clerk and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Listen, Mr. Speaker, I...I...tonight I feel somewhat like the...the father of the deceased who was not permitted to go to the funeral. Or despite the fact that I was the original Sponsor in this House of consolidation of elections, and I am the hyphenated Chief Republican Sponsor of this Bill, I was not afforded



the courtesy or opportunity to serve on this Conference Committee Report...from this Conference Committee so I didn't have an opportunity to provide any input into this final burial of the concept as I desired it. As everyone in this House knows, I have fought long and hard for the Bill in its original shape and for the effective dates that was originally in the Bill of December of...of this year. I...I now realize that this is not possible, although I would have liked an opportunity to go in battle for that just one...one more time. Now the only people that really wanted a two-year extension on this Bill were the lobbyists for the Illinois Municipal League as I pointed out to this Body so many times before. And I think we saw an example just a few minutes ago on the floor of this House of their total disregard and irresponsibility when they did bring to us a Bill as imperfect and as....House Bill 297 which this House overwhelmingly defeated. So despite their very transparent protestations of wanting to work to clean up this Bill which needed absolutely no further work, they did...they did manage to get a two-year extension on the Bill that finally left this House. I protested, others did, and even....of many of those voting for the Bill knew that it was an utterly phony position and one that was designed only - and with one purpose in mind - to kill the concept of consolidation of elections. And I don't blame anyone in here who voted because the lies were monumental, they not only told lies to you, they told lies to their own Membership. They went before Township and Village Clerks Associations Meetings and lied to them in the worst possible fashion. So I'm saying that the responsibility was...was placed right on the shoulders of those two Gentlemen who have done nothing but obstruct and lie to everyone in this...in this entire effort and made absolutely no effort to work with those of us who believe in the concept of consolidation of elections. However, as I stand here tonight, I...I...must realize that while the seven o'clock voting hour as Representative Stanley does. And I know that this Bill doesn't need any further work and could be implemented with the original effective date, these questions are absolutely impossible now. And so I say, and I've been telling myself this evening, the old adage that 'a half a loaf is better' has some merit to it. So if we can't get



the Bill as many of us would desire, and obviously the majority are not on our side, I would urge the Members of this House to vote for this Conference Committee Report. It's better...it's certainly better than nothing. It is not, as a matter of fact it's not bad, it's just going...it's just going to delay the implementation of this much needed concept and one that which so many of us have worked long and hard. I suggest that this House do adopt Conference Committee Report #1."

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

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

Speaker Houlihan: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? All in favor say 'aye', all opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell, to close the debate."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I did want to refer to you some remarks that I think are most appropriate at this time. As a Vice Chairman of the Election Laws Commission that has been studying the concept of consolidated elections for many, many years - and I don't want anybody in this House to think that I deserve any credit if this becomes law - Betty Ann Keegan in the Senate many years ago was a proponent of consolidated elections. The Gentleman that just spoke to you, Representative Collins, was a very vital moving force in the development of legislation that you have before you today. And I know what he's referring to and I have to agree with Representative Collins in many aspects of what has taken place. I saw it today in the House as he did. But I can tell you this, this is good legislation. It's what the people want. And you can thank Representative Collins for serving as a Vice Chairman of the Election Laws Commission for many, many years along with Dan Dougherty, Senator Dan Dougherty, now...now gone from our ranks who did so much to promote what we're talking about today. And I'd be delighted and honored and privileged to have you support Representative Collins' effort to...to join with me in getting to the people of Illinois the concept of consolidation of elections. I urge your favorable response to a Conference Committee on House Bill 2554."

Speaker Houlihan: "The question is, shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2554. All in favor will



vote 'aye', all opposed will vote 'no'. To explain his vote, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman."

Greiman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, first I'd like to say that if I were the Minority Leader I would have appointed Phil Collins and if I had known it meant so much, I would have given up my place on that Committee. I see there's 111 and I could only hurt the Bill, so thank you."

Speaker Houlihan: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich, to explain his vote."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I'm sure this isn't going to change any votes but this isn't any better than it was before. We all agreed on a two-year extension and now the Conference Committee has thwarted the will of this House. I'm still going to vote 'no'."

Speaker Houlihan: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Mann, to explain his vote."

Mann: "Mr...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote I'd like to make reference to my colleague, Phil Collins, because through the years Phil has really played a very, very constructive role in terms of election reform. And frankly, Phil, I was ready to follow you tonight if you had decided not to go along with this Conference Report because through the years I'm sure you would agree if you look at our voting record that we have joined together on election reform Bills many, many times. So, I...I really do think this is a good time for Phil Collins and I'm glad to join him in voting 'aye'."

Speaker Houlihan: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm sure that my comments aren't going to change anyone's vote either but I have two...three comments to make. One, one of the earlier speakers made several disparaging remarks about the Municipal League and as a former past...or former president of that I don't really appreciate those because I think he was a little bit far afield. One of the comments was that they were the only ones opposed to it. Every County Clerk in my district is violently opposed to this Bill and we'd hope that it could be extended for two years. And my other comment is that if this Bill is so damn good why is it still imperative that



it must be implemented immediately? What's the matter with giving it a little time to work it out?"

Speaker Houlihan: "The Gentleman from Cook to explain his vote, Representative Conti."

Conti: "No, Mr. Speaker, Members, that's not to explain my vote, just to remind a few of the newer Members and some of the older Members that have been here before not to be fooled by these misnomer Bills that we keep getting year and year under the guise of reform. This is not an election reform Bill, this is as bad....this is what I call a judicial deformity Bill and this is an election deformity Bill. This Bill is a bad Bill and I know that it's not going to change any votes but we're going to come back like we did with judicial reform and we're going to understand what a horrible mistake we made sixteen years ago when we find out what a bad mistake we made with this one."

Speaker Houlihan: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there 106 'ayes', 46 'nays' and 8 voting 'present'. And this Report, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed, or adopted, excuse me. On Supplemental Calendar #3, House Bill 2986, Representative Neff."

Neff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. On House Bill 2986 on the Conference Committee, it has...the Conference Committee has met, we've all signed the Report. And in this Report... this is...we're...pertaining by the way, to the Department of Insurance Budget. Originally they had asked for 6,165,000 dollars. The Senate had reduced it down to 5,074,700. After meeting with the Conference Committee we finally have come to agreement that they should be given \$5,507,326.52. Now this is a change from the Senate action plus a 432,626.52 but it is less from what they originally asked of 657,673.48. And originally they had asked for 71 new positions and this will provide 'em with 35 new positions. And again I want.... this is a net reduction of the original Bill of 657,673....6,000,000.(sic)"

Speaker Houlihan: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 2986. On the motion, the question is, shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2986? All in favor will vote 'aye', all opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the



record. On this question there are 136 'ayes', 5 'nays' and 5 voting 'present'. And this Report, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared adopted. On Supplemental Calendar #3, House Bill 3113, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank...thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3113 was very similar to a Bill that you heard just a short time ago in the House and that Bill was House Bill 297 which intends to deal with the subject of mandated programs by the state back to units of local government and to school districts. Now the big difference as you...well, I might refresh your memories. House Bill 297 and 3113 were the same Bills. But in Conference, what we've done with House Bill 3113, I think, is to answer the objections of many opponents of this philosophy of state mandated programs back to units of local government. What we have now with 3113 is a concept that I think that most Members of the House can enjoy and support because in the Conference Committee we added Amendments that provided that only new mandated programs would be the subject for our consideration not any extension of existing programs or the extension of...of accelerated coverages for units of local government and school districts. And I think this is what we're really talking about. I...I agree with those opponents who...of the other Bill who suggested that there is no way, there is absolutely no way that we could implement that concept by extending the privilege of state mandated programs to existing programs because we're talking about what Representative Meyer had indicated relative to the EPA Sanitary-District, Pension Funds, school districts' ongoing programs and so forth. So what we've done with 3113 is to answer your objections and say to you that what we have now in this Bill is just new mandated programs. That is all we've done. The federally mandated exemption is still there, the workmen's comp and the unemployment insurance is taken care of and I would be... be delighted to answer any questions you might have with House Bill 3113."

Speaker Houlihan: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 3113. On the motion, the Gentleman from Will, Representative Lienenweber."



Lienehaber: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, as the Gentleman candidly pointed out this is almost...almost identical to the Bill and I might say, I think, the only Bill that we've been able to defeat during the last day or two on...while we've been on the Order of Conference Committee Reports. And even though this Bill is slightly different, I'm sure it doesn't deserve any friendlier treatment than Representative Von Boeckman's Bill did. Now, I'm reading from the staff analysis and it appears that no longer will the Governor and the Auditor General approve fund allocations for these programs but it must be determined by the General Assembly, presumably, in the legislation or in the accompanying appropriation. In other words, if you're going to mandate a program you must, therefore, file a simultaneous appropriation. Well, this just goes to show 'em, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, what an absolute nullity this Bill actually is because if we're going to be that, all we'd have to do is amend this Bill and take that particular program out from under the coverage of the Yourell Bill. So in effect it would be...you would be approving a program and if you didn't want to pay for it with state funds, you'd just say, 'we aren't going to pay for it with state funds because we...we specifically exclude this particular program from the applicability of the Yourell Bill. We aren't going to be accomplishing anything. It may be a very nice noble motive for us to be saying that we aren't going to be doing things but we've all been saying that anyway. And I think, as many speakers have pointed out, it certainly...it behooves us to consider the ability of local government to pay for the programs that we foist upon them. But this should be done as it...as it always is done at the time we discuss and argue a Bill out. This...this type of program is absolutely unworkable. If you want to have a workable approach, I suppose you could file a Constitutional Amendment and put it in the Constitution then it could not be amended and it would mean what it says. And this does not mean what it says. ...The units of local government may be misled and to think that they will not again ever have to dig into their own revenues for mandated programs. But you know it's not true. We're going to be still doing it on occasions and perhaps we should as pointed out by Representative Schlickman and others on the historic relationship between the state with its



plenary powers and the municipalities and units of local government with its specifically delegated powers. So let's not kid anybody. This Bill isn't...isn't...it may be a little bit better than the other approach but not much, certainly not enough to give it a majority vote. So I ask that you resist the Gentleman's motion to ...to concur with this Conference Committee Report."

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

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, since this is so similar to the Bill we just debated, I move the previous question."

Speaker Houlihan: "Gentleman has moved that the main question be put. All those in favor of the motion say 'aye', all opposed say 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Representative from Cook, Representative Yourell, to close debate."

Yourell: "Thank...thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's been said by two Members of this Body that this Bill is just about the same as House Bill 297. And that's as far from the truth as anything could possibly be because the other Bill calls for the extension of existing programs and we're talking about pensions, Environmental Protection Agency impact on sanitary districts, we're talking about extended school district programs, we're talking about all kinds of things. With this Bill we're approaching the problem with a... with a psychological and a philosophical concept. We're saying only in this Bill that the state cannot mandate any new...new programs unless they're willing to pay for it. Contained in Article I, rather Amendment #1 to House Joint Constitutional Amendment #44 on line 23, are the very same words that we're talking about in House Bill 297. This deletes some of that problem that you've been referring to with pensions and...Representative from the 28th District, who I don't think is on the floor, could address himself to that issue because when he broached the subject to me in the First Conference Committee Report I took that out. I attended to that problem. I think this is a good concept. If anybody thinks in this General Assembly that the people back home want you to mandate programs back to them without paying for them, you're sadly mistaken. They're saying to each and every one of you, 'we're talking about the Proposition 13 in California.' They're saying to the State of California, 'don't tell us what to do



unless you're willing to pay for it.' And that's exactly what this Bill does. If you want to mandate any new programs, then, damn it, you better well pay for them. I suggest a favorable vote on House Bill 3113, the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Houlihan: "The question is, shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3113. All in favor will vote 'aye', all opposed will vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson, to explain his vote. The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing, to explain his vote."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Mr. Sponsor of this Bill, this is a good idea but it is a very poor piece of legislation. We all know that we will just set this aside any time we have 98 votes for a program that we want to institute when we don't have the money here and we're going to put it on local government. Now I'm asking you why do we continue to try and hoodwink the people back home? Is it just because we have an election in November and tell 'em how much we've done for 'em when we really haven't done one thing. And I suggest that we put this Bill back with the other, 297, put them to rest. Let's don't go home and hoodwink our people."

Speaker Houlihan: "The Gentleman from Knox, Representative McMaster, to explain his vote."

McMaster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'll grant you any legislation can be improved upon but you know several of us were upon that Mandated Laws Commission of the Governor's last summer and traveled around the state and this is one of the big problems we heard about. Several solutions were possible. Legislation such as this, a group of local government people who would be organized to sit down and put out a fiscal impact statement upon any legislation we pass that would affect local government. I don't think we have gone that far yet, maybe that's the way we should go, I don't know. But it is time that we start thinking about what costs we are passing on down to local government. We have talked about what it is going to cost us in this...various discussions we have had in the last several days. But don't forget one thing that I said earlier today. It isn't what it's going to cost us because if we do not mandate, we do not have to



pay. And, believe me, let's continue to understand, we're the ones that mandate with or without this law we don't have to mandate down to the local government because once you do that you are directly passing the cost on to the local taxpayer. And you know even Totten, I think, is against that. I would suggest a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Houlihan: "The Gentleman from Cook to explain his vote, Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I strongly recommend a concurrence...Concurrence Amendment #1 to House Bill 3113. May I point out to this House that the Governor in his budget presentation to this Membership...on both sides of the aisle...stated unequivocally that he was in support of not mandating anything to units of local government without providing the money. And I can't understand why anyone from the opposite side of the aisle, or on this side of the aisle, would state to this House that, 'yes, we are in a position of mandating programs from the State of Illinois to units of local government and not providing the necessary funds.' This House, Mr. Speaker, has acted quite responsibly in this position just a few months ago and they agreed with this Bill in the concept and it passed in an overwhelming Session. But now here we are today in the closing Session of the General Assembly and are stating that 'no, whatever we mandate let the local units of government pay for the cost.' This is totally unfair and I would hope that the Membership would recall the commitment of the Governor of this state. And, yes, as a former Chairman of the Municipal Problems Commissions the hearings that we had throughout this state a number of times requesting, may I ask(sic), requesting that the respective Mayors saying, 'please, don't mandate mandatory clauses on us without providing necessary funds.' I would hope the House would reconsider and move to concur in Amendment... Concurrence Report #1 on House Bill 3113. It deserves your strong support and an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Houlihan: "The Gentleman from Marion to explain his vote, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, this has been announced as a money saving Bill. I can tell you right now that it is not, it's no such a thing, if this ever passes, the units of local government



will have no incentive whatsoever to save money. You're giving these units of local government a blank check, and say, 'don't worry boys, we're going to pick up the balance.' Nobody knows, nobody knows what it's going to cost. It will require audits. It will require all kinds of things you've never heard of. You better vote 'no' while you have a chance and I will tell you this, that I hope any switch that has been voted 'aye' and the person is not there, whoever is sitting next to him will put it on 'present' or something else because I'm going to be sure that the people voting 'aye' are there if it gets 89 votes. So if you're sitting next to someone whose switch is voted 'aye' and you know they're not there, please change it."

Speaker Houlihan: "The Gentleman from Cook to explain his vote, Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I was going to say that I'd like to ask for a verification too if this reached 89 votes. But I'd like to read Section 6 of this Bill to indicate to you not only how bad it is but it's even worse than the Bill that we defeated before. This is what Section 6 says, please listen carefully. If you can make any sense out of it, I'd like to know what that sense is, and the sense I make out of it is that it's out of the question. Says this, 'If a city, city and county, county or special district has been providing a service or program at its option that is subsequently mandated by the state, the state shall pay such local governmental jurisdiction for such mandated service or program. And the local governmental jurisdiction shall reduce its property tax and so forth.' Now does that make any sense to anybody?"

Speaker Houlihan: "The Gentleman from DeKalb to explain his vote, Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just briefly would like to explain my 'no' vote. I'll just talk about... the word 'pension' was used by Representative Yourell on this and I ...I can see at some time with a 7,000,000,000 dollar unfunded accrued liability that the state has the responsibility for in the years ahead, somewhere, sometime in the immediate future, hopefully, that both the House and the Senate and the Administration - whomever it might be -



is going to have to address itself to some program to bring some sanity back into the funding of the state system. And that's going to be a mandated program, I'm sure, over a period of 25 to 30 years. And I can see some Legislature in the future not knowing what legislative intent was meant by a proposal such as this, probably mandating local government to do the same thing to take care of their unfunded accrued liability. And I'm...I'm here to tell you if you think that the state's got problems take a look at the pension systems and how unfunded they are as far as accrued liability at the local level and talk about the millions of dollars involved there. And I'm here to tell you this is a terrible piece of legislation that could open the door for responsibility in terms of billions of dollars in the years ahead by some Legislature, legislative group, at that time that just doesn't understand. I think it deserves...the concept is great. The idea is great and I'm for what it tries to do but this is not the Bill to accomplish it."

Speaker Houlihan: "To explain her vote, the Lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I note that the Conference Committee Report exempts unemployment and workmen's compensation and workmen's...occupational disease expense and it does add to the Comptroller to audit records of the units of local government to verified cost. Ladies and Gentlemen...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have to draw the line somewhere. I think that this is a Bill worthwhile...trying and let's see how it will work out. We can certainly always amend it and change it if it's disastrous in any form. But the people back home are clamoring... to us, 'why do you mandate programs when we can't pay for them?'"

Speaker Houlihan: "To explain his vote, the Gentleman from Tazewell, Representative Von Boeckman."

Von Boeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House..."

Speaker Houlihan: "Excuse me, Representative Von Boeckman, the camera light now will be off. Please continue."

Von Boeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, first I would like to say that I think a Page lost a five dollar bill and I found it. If they can tell me where they lost it at.....I'll return it. Hell with you big time



spenders. Mr...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is similar to my Bill. I think it's one of the best concepts that we can approach in state government. I have spoke..... many times and have worked hard in trying to get this type of legislation passed. California, for instance, saved a million dollars in one...each month that this Bill was in...in...effect in California. I was on the Commission that the Governor appointed. He got a lot of p.r. all over the State of Illinois for stopping mandated programs. He was for this type of legislation. But, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Governor is the one that wants this Bill defeated. He doesn't want this Bill. I know it and everybody else knows it. I'd like to see passage of this one."

Speaker Houlihan: "The Gentleman from DuPage to explain his vote, Representative Hudson."

Hudson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think there's an aspect of this that perhaps hasn't been addressed and that is the possibility of opening up this...opening up an invitation to the municipalities to literally rip off the State of Illinois. Now I don't think it's beyond the realm of possibility that what a Bill such as this would encourage would be either direct or indirect effort on behalf of the municipalities to conjure up new ideas for new programs and then suddenly sell these ideas to the State of Illinois. And I will also predict that if a Bill such as this passes, we won't have fewer mandated programs, we will continue to have mandated programs but the municipalities will have their lobbyists here convincing us that these programs are absolutely essential to their communities and that they have to be...they have to have the programs but the State of Illinois should pick up the tab. I think this is a very real and present danger in this concept. And that is partially why I'm voting 'no' and would urge others to on this Bill."

Speaker Houlihan: "The Lady from Winnebago to explain her vote, Representative Lynn Martin."

Martin, L: "Perhaps if you look at this merely as a statement of policy from the General Assembly, that no longer will we willy-nilly impose on local governments costly programs, unproven and unworkable. Perhaps, too, if you looked at it and said to yourself this is a Bill whose



the aisle have said, that we're giving the municipalities a blank check. Let me tell you something, I defy each and every one of those red votes that are up there today against this Bill to stand in an auditorium with a hundred people, or two hundred people, and asked them who their State Senator or who their State Representatives are and they can't name them. But they'll tell you who their town hall man is. They know the people who are running their local elections. You're not giving them a blank check. If they're not doing a good job, they remove their local election officials a lot sooner than they remove their elected officials in the legislative halls of Springfield and in Washington. Don't kid yourself. The electorate knows what they're doing and they'd rather deal with the local man than the people down in Springfield and in Washington."

Speaker Houlihan: "The question is, shall the House adopt the First Conference-Committee Report on House Bill 3113? All in favor will vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Poll the absentees, please."

Speaker Houlihan: "The Clerk will poll the absentees. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich..."

Friedrich: "I have no desire to delay this House but people are still voting switches. Miller's not here, that's obvious. I can name others. I don't want to have to do that and if...and if we have to do it, it takes fifteen minutes to verify. I think that's a waste of time."

Speaker Houlihan: "Your point is well taken, Representative Friedrich. The Members will vote only their own switches. Poll...poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Giglio: "Jane Barnes. Byers."

Speaker Houlihan: "Jane Barnes wants to be recorded as 'aye'. Record the Lady as 'aye'."

Clerk Giglio: "Christensen. Collins. Domico. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Hart. Holewinski."

Speaker Houlihan: "Record the Gentleman as 'no'. Was that Representative Holewinski? All right, record Representative Holewinski as 'no'."

Clerk Giglio: "James Houlihan."

Speaker Houlihan: "Record James Houlihan as 'no'."



Clerk Giglio: "Jaffe, Emil Jones."

Speaker Houlihan: "Record Representative Emil Jones as 'aye'."

Clerk Giglio: "Keats. Kempiners. Klosak. Kucharski. Peggy Martin. McBroom. Meyer. Molloy. O'Brien. Peters. Reed. Robinson. Schneider. Stearney. Stanley. Steczko. Tipsword. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Houlihan: "Representative Matejek. Representative Matejek wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Representative Giorgi wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Representative Kempiners wishes to be recorded as 'no'. Representative Garmisa, for what purpose do you rise?"

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

Speaker Houlihan: "How is the Gentleman recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Giglio: "Garmisa, absent."

Garmisa: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Houlihan: "Record Representative Garmisa as 'aye'. For what purpose does Representative Steele, arise?"

Steele: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Houlihan: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Giglio: "Recorded as voting 'aye'."

Steele: "Please vote me 'no'."

Speaker Houlihan: "Record him as 'no'. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Huff, arise?"

Huff: "Well, at the proper time, Mr. Speaker, I wish to be verified."

Speaker Houlihan: "We haven't got to that time as yet. Are there any other Members who wish to be recorded? What's the count, Mr. Clerk? On this question there are 88 'ayes', 54 'nays', excuse me, 58 'nays', 7 voting 'present'. And for what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell, arise?"

Yourell: "If I get a Roll Call on this, if I go to Postponed Consideration, inquiry of the Chair?"

Speaker Houlihan: "The Parliamentarian informs me that there is no official Roll Call on this if it shall be placed on Postponed...."

Yourell: "Take the record."

Speaker Houlihan: "All right. On this question, then, there are 88 'ayes', 58 'nays', 7 voting 'present'. This Report, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Yourell, request the



appointment of a Second Conference Committee? He indicates that he does not. Ladies and Gentlemen, this will be the last Bill before the scheduled break. No, the next Bill that I'm calling will be the last Bill. This will be Senate Bill 1861, the Lady from Lake, Representative Geo-Karis. This is on page 1 of Supplemental Calendar #3."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Members on the Conference Committee on House Bill 18...Senate Bill 1861, all have endorsed the Senate First Conference Committee Report. And I would like to move for its adoption. This is the Bill that unites the Division of Energy with the Institute of...Environmental Equality. And the reason why I had asked it to go to Conference Committee is because one Amendment was misdrafted in the House which threw the other ones off and now everything's corrected and it's in good shape. And I move for its adoption."

Speaker Houlihan: "The Lady has moved the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1861. On the motion, the question is, shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1861? All in favor will vote 'aye', all opposed will vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 139 'ayes', 1 voting 'nay', 4 voting 'present'. And this Report, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared adopted. Representative Bradley moves that the House stand in recess until the hour of 7:40 p.m. All in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. That will be the order."



Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order, the Members please be in their seats. Director of Operations, do you have anything to report?"

Tom Ohler: (plays banjo)

Speaker Redmond: "Do you want to accompany Representative Tipsword on the next song? Representative Tipsword."

Tipsword: "I think I ought to accompany the Speaker because I've been on a few singing binges with him."

Tom Ohler: (plays banjo)

Speaker Redmond: "Where's 'Tomato'? Reading of the Journal. Dave Robinson."

Clerk O'Brien: "Journal for the 157th Legislative Day, Tuesday, June 20, 1978. The House met..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robinson..."

Robinson: "I move that we dispense with the reading of the Journal and that Journal #150 of June 20, and 151 of June 21, 1978, be approved as read."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries and the Journals are approved as read. Message from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of Amendments to Bills of the following titles, to wit: Senate Bill 1595. Action taken by the Senate June 30, 1978. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Greiman, do you seek recognition with respect to your motion with regard to House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 55? I think it's the Equal Rights Amendment. That motion to discharge the Executive Committee and advance to the Order of Second Reading? Is that the motion, Sir? The Gentleman has indicated that that's the motion."



Question...Representative Robinson. Representative Robinson has second it. Okay, all those in favor indicate by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This requires 89 votes. Representative Steczo."

Steczko: "I think if Representative Greiman were here he would want leave for the Attendance Roll Call. So I move that we use the Attendance Roll Call on that."

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave to use the Attendance Roll Call in support of the motion? Hearing no objection leave is granted. The Attendance Roll Call will be used. Mr. Clerk, do you want to read House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 55?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #55."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Vitek. Representative Vitek."

Vitek: "Mr. Speaker...(Speaks in foreign language)"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis in rebuttal."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. (Speaks in foreign language)"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Robinson."

Robinson: (Speaks foreign language)

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Maragos."

Maragos: (Speaks in foreign language)

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "The County Chairman for DuPage...sitting in the Chair presiding over this House... What are you going to do for property tax relief, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "I refer everybody to a very fine law firm that has a new building with no vacancies in Elmhurst on the South side of the Northwestern railroad tracks."

Daniels: "I would refer them there too. Thank you very much. Let that be a warning to all you people that want to come into DuPage."



Speaker Redmond: "We'll take this one out of the record for about a half an hour. We'll go to House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 22. Representative Simms."

Simms: "Why don't we use the Attendance Roll Call for the adoption?"

Speaker Redmond: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Leave to us the Attendance Roll Call for the adoption of House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 22? Hearing no objection it's adopted. Representative Kozubowski, are you able to contribute anything? Representative Vitek, do you want to tell Representative Kozubowski something, or what you told us? Maybe he can respond."

Vitek: "I would refer to my dear running mate from the other side of the aisle, Bill Margalus, he speaks fluently in Polish."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Margalus."

Margalus: (Speaks in Polish)

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kozubowski."

Kozubowski: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, but I'm a little bit too busy trying to make everybody happy with 3392."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels. Roman Kosinski's... You speak English in that and it comes out Polish."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker...(unintelligible)"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peggy Smith Martin."

Daniels: "Thank you. I remember a very momentous occasion last Session, at the close of the evening, I think it was about 4:00 in the morning when the Speaker of the House serenaded the Members of the House with a little Irish tune. And I see that you have your minstrel over there on your right ready to come up...and maybe this is an appropriate time, since we're all are more attentive right now and not sleeping. Would you give us the honor



and the privilege of showing the people what DuPage County means to the Irish?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster...Deuster."

Deuster: "Where's my Section of the Bill? (Woman's voice).

Mr. Speaker, this is just a matter of simple justice. And you nasty men with all your red lights on, you know what you're doing to us. You're just trying to keep us barefoot and pregnant. You've taken our shoes away from us and that's not all you've done, you naughty boys. So let's put some more green lights on there and let's clean up the Illinois Statutes. We don't want any sex in these books, now take it out. Mr. Speaker, this is not funny, this is very serious and I've been seeking recognition all day long. You stop that."

Speaker Redmond: "Maybe a little later. Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I had a fund raiser last year and I sent a special invitation to the Speaker of the House to come up there and mingle with the bipartisan crowd in Lake County and particularly I was hoping that you would be able to favor us with that beautiful song that we enjoyed a year ago. And I'm sure that a little later the spirit will move you. And I was just astounded to realize that a graduate of St. Ignatius High School, from your humble background, would be such an accomplished singer."

Speaker Redmond: "I'd like to...you know, I circulated that quiz yesterday, nobody really did very well. I had another quiz to find out who the real spenders and profligate wasters of money were and the... The task was pretty simple, I asked the Pages which side they liked to work on a which side they got the most money out of, they said the Republicans by far. And that's the truth. Representative Simms."



Simms: "Mr. Speaker, on your quiz you didn't pass out the answers. And I am puzzled at the answer to your last question, what is the highest building?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, the Capitol in Springfield.
Representative Wolf. Wolf."

Wolf: "I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, about the Republicans giving all the big tips, it's easy to do when it's your own money."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I learned something interesting about the Capitol this afternoon from Doc the photographer. He explained to me that those fountains down there are not just to make the place look pretty for the tourists but the reason for those fountains that are sprinkling away on the East lawn is that they're part of the system which removes hot air from this chamber and equally it removes the hot air from the Senate chamber. And I understand that the engineers have found that that was necessary because there's been an amazing geometric increase in the amount of hot air in the last few years. And I don't know what side of the aisle is accountable or whether it's bipartisan hot air, Mr. Speaker, maybe someone knows."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "I was just going to say, Mr. Speaker, that the Capitol in Springfield is probably the only building in the whole county that freely furnishes heat when we're in Session, when it's very cold out, I'm sure it's warm in here from all the hot air and I'm glad to hear that the fountains are taking care of some of it... Not enough, as you probably would want to say. Incidentally, I want to tell you, the Quiz that you passed out, you're probably responsible for a dozen Legislators passing out too... You know the story of the answers... I was one of them."



Geo-Karis: "I see... thank you. I get it. I'm glad you called E.R.A., Mr. Speaker, that's the only way we can get them all back."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis, the answer to the quiz. The first question is, what does the huge mural on the west wing depict? It's George Rogers Clark effecting a treaty with the Indians. Near the Governor's Office hangs a portrait of the former Illinois Congressman and Speaker of the U.S. House, Henry T. Rainey. Lincoln's Gettysburg Address is on the south side of the east wing on the first floor. The statues on the second floor are Lincoln, Douglas, Richard Barr of Joliet, Lottie Holman O'Neill, Governor Woods and David Shanahan, the former Speaker of the House. In the Rotunda... Representative Daniels practicing."

Daniels: "Thanks a lot. I don't think it should go unrecognized that the statue of the former Senator, Lottie Holman O'Neill, the first Senator...woman Senator in the State of Illinois in its history is and was...or was a resident of the famous County of DuPage, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct and Senator Barr, although he lived in Joliet, also represented DuPage County. And his son, a Representative, served in this House. Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just got a very interesting communication. I understand that Steve Williams of WCIA T.V., Champaign, has to suffer through the June 30, 1978 date every year and it happens to be his birthday. And I would appreciate it and I got this information...Intern rather Lindsay Goetz, who I believe is formerly from my county.. my district."

Speaker Redmond: "I thought that was Matijeovich's county."

Geo-Karis: "Well it's his but it's mine too, it depends. I



Geo-Karis: "I see... thank you. I get it. I'm glad you called E.R.A., Mr. Speaker, that's the only way we can get them all back."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis, the answer to the quiz. The first question is, what does the huge mural on the west wing depict? It's George Rogers Clark effecting a treaty with the Indians. Near the Governor's Office hangs a portrait of the former Illinois Congressman and Speaker of the U.S. House, Henry T. Rainey. . Lincoln's Gettysburg Address is on the south side of the east wing on the first floor. The statues on the second floor are Lincoln, Douglas, Richard Barr of Joliet, Lottie Holman O'Neill, Governor Woods and David Shanahan, the former Speaker of the House. In the Rotunda... Representative Daniels practicing."

Daniels: "Thanks a lot. I don't think it should go unrecognized that the statue of the former Senator, Lottie Holman O'Neill, the first Senator...woman Senator in the State of Illinois in its history is and was...or was a resident of the famous County of DuPage, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "That is correct and Senator Barr, although he lived in Joliet, also represented DuPage County. And his son, a Representative, served in this House. Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just got a very interesting communication. I understand that Steve Williams of WCIA T.V., Champaign, has to suffer through the June 30, 1978 date every year and it happens to be his birthday. And I would appreciate it and I got this information...Intern rather Lindsay Goetz, who I believe is formerly from my county.. my district."

Speaker Redmond: "I thought that was Matijeovich's county."

Geo-Karis: "Well it's his but it's mine too, it depends. I



let him have it sometimes. But I think it would be nice if you'd turn on Rollie Tipsword's switch and everybody else's, let's sing happy birthday because poor Steve Williams has to suffer with us every 30th of June. How about it?"

Speaker Redmond: "It's up to Rollie Tipsword."

Geo-Karis: "Okay, Rollie? Go ahead, start it, I'll join you."

Geo-Karis and Tipsword: "Happy birthday to you, happy birthday to you, happy birthday dear Steve, happy birthday to you."

Speaker Redmond: "High in the Rotunda the bronze cast, Ninian Edwards, Shadrach Bond, Edward Coles, Sidney Breese Lyman Trumbull, Ulysses S. Grant, General John A. Logan and Ralls Morrison. Representative Tipsword. Incidentally, he was the only one that knew the answer to the first question."

Tipsword: "By the way, what...who is Congressman Morrison? Where is he from, who is he, why is he up there?"

Speaker Redmond: "He was evidently prominent in early civil and military history of the State of Illinois. I really don't know any more about it than that. It was a very strange surname, or given name rather, Ralls. The statues on the Capitol grounds are the coal miner, Senator Dirksen, Lieutenant Governor Menard, John Palmer and Richard Yates. To whom is the large evergreen tree, located near the east end of the north side, dedicated? The answer is the Prince of Peace. John Tanner was the Governor of Illinois from 1897 to 1901. The inscription on the Stephen A. Douglas statue was to his children, which follows: 'Tell them to obey the law and support the Constitution.' The granite slab in the rear of Lincoln's statue is his farewell address to Springfield. The Land of Lincoln^{slogan} was adopted in 1955. Outside of the Comptroller's Office is a painting of which one of Lincoln - Douglas debates? The answer is Charleston. First floor north side of the



east wing is a placque of the order from John Logan for the Memorial Day observance. And the Capitol of the State of Illinois is 74 feet taller than the U.S. Capitol Building. I've been advised by the Deputy Clerk or the Assistant Clerk, George Schoening, that General Morrison is from Monroe County. John Vitek, do you want to ask Mr. Lechowicz any questions? Representative Lechowicz, will you yield for a question? Representative Lechowicz, I mean Vitek and Lechowicz."

Vitek: (speaks Polish)

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it's a very important question. The Gentleman raised the question, what time are we going home? Let me respond to him. (speaks Polish) Translated, Mr. Speaker, as I interpret the Calendar the number of Conference Committees that have not been reported...is about 12:30 or 1:00. Hopefully the Conference Committees would come back a little bit sooner so we can get out of here by midnight. Thank you."

Vitek: "(Thank you in Polish)"

Lechowicz: "He said thank you and I responded, (Polish)."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann. Representative Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the winner of the baseball quiz had been determined yet? There were certain quizzes that were handed out, I among other filled out the names of those with batting averages and pitching, won and lost and so forth. Has that been determined yes, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "You were the only one that turned anything in and you were absolutely right on every question."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker... Thank you, Sir and what do I get and Mr. Speaker, please don't..."

Speaker Redmond: "You get an autographed picture of Ted Lechowicz."



Mann: "Hey listen... Listen, if you can put it on one of my blank checks, Mr. Speaker, I'll be in great shape. Teddy, I'll take that autograph."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "I think Representative Lechowicz wanted to follow through on that so I won't interrupt."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Mr. Speaker, while we have a moment of interlude here, let me just point out to Bob Mann that he's served a lot longer here than I have and the people of his district have reelected him a lot longer than I have, the people in my area have. I've supported Bob Mann in many, many proposals. I've opposed him on certain proposals. But always...I always respected Bob Mann in his position on his respective issues. And, Mr. Speaker, while I have the floor, I want to compliment you and the Clerk's Office for the first time...and I hope the Membership would realize that on the desk is the copy of the Conference Committee history updated periodically every two or three hours by the Legislative, this is our own branch now as far as the computer system, giving you a detail of what Bills are in Conference Committee and the action on them. And the last Conference Committee history that we have from the Legislative Information System on my desk is 509. It's never been the case before and Mr. Speaker, this is the first time in a good number of years that we've had actual Committees meeting, Conference Committees meeting. And to you and to the Clerk and to the system, I want to thank you for keeping us informed."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lechowicz and all of the Members, I would like to take credit for the innovation of the history of the Conference Committees being on your desk but unfortunately I can't. But I would like



to add my voice to yours and congratulations to the Clerk and to all of his staff for the absolutely superb work they have done throughout the entire 80th Session. There's only one little area that Jack has a little trouble with. He says the performance in that area would satisfy pretty nearly everybody but me. But I think the dedication and the devotion and cooperation of the people in the Clerk's Office, Jack and Chalkie and George and everybody has been absolutely wonderful. Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, while you're talking about the Clerk's Office and what a fine job they've done I would like, at this time, to take back what I said earlier today about their inefficiency in not getting my Conference Committee Report on the Calendar today."

Speaker Redmond: "Would you repeat that?"

Flinn: "No, Sir, I will not."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, am I turned on, Mr. Speaker? On sort of a point of personal privilege. I wanted to thank Representative Lechowicz for his words of praise and also to add my own, Mr. Speaker, to the manner in which you have presided over this House as the Speaker of the House. And I want to observe one other thing about this Body which I think everyone who's ever served in it would agree upon. And I think that it's this, that when we come here we may have very very fixed notions about what is right or wrong or about what is best for State Government, what is worse for State Government, which Bills are most important, but the House has kind of a leavening effect on the people that serve here. And there's sort of a combination of comradery and respect for differing points of view that sets in in a Body like this. And these are the things that you take away with you. I know that at



times it's been fashionable for us to downgrade ourselves in sort of a self ridiculing manner but I really do think that when you think about it, you think about the men and women that serve in the General Assembly it really is a very unique institution. And I've never met a person, man or woman, who after serving here has not remarked that they felt that they were a better person for having served in the House. And I think, Mr. Speaker, with all the terms under your belt and the two terms as Speaker that you would agree with that observation because I've heard you say it."

Speaker Redmond: "I certainly do. Representative Monroe Flinn."

Flinn: "Well yes, Mr. Speaker, again I will repeat what I said a while ago because now all of Jack O'Brien's staff is up in the gallery and they've got knives and guns and everything else with them and so I do apologize for the very unkind remark I made this morning, which of course everybody knew I had my tongue in my cheek when I did. So girls go back to the office and work hard for Jack O'Brien."

Speaker Redmond: "I think it would be a good idea if we gave the Clerk's Office a hand as long as they're up there. Representative Robinson."

Robinson: "Mr. Speaker, in all fairness perhaps we should inform some of the Members that before they got here we adopted E.R.A. on an Attendance Roll Call. It probably wouldn't change the outcome but maybe some would like to change their vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Oh yes, we forgot to remind you, Representative Collins, that Representative Greiman moved the motion with respect to House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 55 and it carried. And then we went to a vote and we've adopted House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 55 and we did it with the Attendance Roll Call."



Representative Totten."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, while you're on the subject of Constitutional Amendments, could I have leave for the same Roll Call for H.J.R.C.A. 44?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dyer, do you have anything to gloat about in this hour of triumph?"

Dyer: "I understand E.R.A. passed as an Amendment to H.J.R.C.A. 44, is that right?"

Speaker Redmond: "No, we took Representative Greiman - Sandquist 55 up and put it on Second Reading."

Dyer: "Beautiful."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Yes, I'm advised by my good friend, Representative Giddy Dyer, that they're using the same ploy here they used down in Kentucky. The problem is, Giddy, the Lieutenant Governor down in Kentucky who vetoed that recision was the woman. Now, when this Amendment ratifying E.R.A. flies greased through the Senate we've arranged for Jim Thompson to be out of the state so Dave O'Neal could consider it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This evening we've been handing out sort of bouquets and compliments to many groups, all of whom are very, very deserving of all the things that we've said. But I think we've neglected two groups, one are the permanent Pages that are wearing the red jackets, which I think have done a terrific job and the other ones are the very much neglected people that I think we sort of take for granted and those are the various Doorkeepers and those that have been very courteous and respectful in the treatment of all of us here. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huff."

Huff: "Monsieur le Speaker. (Speaks in French)."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Cunningham."



Cunningham: "Monsieur...(speaks French)."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Mr. Speaker, I do translate French and those
Gentlemen both move to go to the Order of Constitutional
Amendments, Second Reading."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giglio in his seat? Representative Wikoff in the chambers? Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, through the years as you well know southern Illinois has produced a bunch of characters who came to the Legislature. Some were characters and some were characters plus being orators. None the least of which was Paul Powell who was one of the few guys I've known who could change a vote by making a speech. We also had people like C.L. McCormick and Roscoe Cunningham who has aspired to higher offices and so won't be coming back and we're going to miss him. But I've got in training next to me Bob Winchester. Now Bob yesterday rose to new heights with his appeal on, when he thought he needed 89 votes. But I want to tell you that they've got a mosquito problem down in Johnson County and next spring we're going to have a Mosquito Bill and Bob's going to introduce it. So I've got him in training all summer under the guidance of C.L. McCormick and I want you to look forward to next Session so you ought to campaign just a little harder so Bob can make the mosquito speech that C.L. McCormick's made in the past."

Speaker Redmond: "I was here when C.L. did that and I'd just like to remind you that he... the appropriation was only six thousand dollars. Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Well, I must admit, Mr. Speaker, that C.L. McCormick was quite an orator and many times I wanted to try to imitate his mosquito speech. And each time that I sought recognition, my stomach developed a tremendous amount of butterflies and I backed off and my friend, Representative Friedrich, has somewhat put me on the spot and somewhat relieved me. So if I might, I'd just like to try it. I don't remember what he said, but I'd like to make up some things as I go along just to see if I can do it. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as you know, I am the 1978 Sponsor of the Mosquito Abatement Bill for southern Illinois and I live in Johnson County. And my cousin, Billy Bob Johnson, has got mosquitoes on his farm that are bigger than mules. They're bigger than jumbo jets, Mr. Speaker. When they fly by, they leave a trail of smoke, Mr. Speaker. I appeal



to you, Mr. Speaker, we're only asking for five hundred thousand dollars in 1978. In 1962 when I asked for this Bill, it was only six thousand dollars, Mr. Speaker. And every year thereafter, Mr. Speaker, we've been back for more money and we pass it out of this House and we pass it out of the Senate, Mr. Speaker, and it goes to the second floor and they never sign it. Mr. Speaker, is that fair? Is that fair, Mr. Speaker? I ask you. So I'm back before you again, again, Mr. Speaker, to ask for the Members of this House in honor of Representative C.L. McCormick to adopt by unanimous vote the 1978 Mosquito Abatement Bill, Mr. Speaker. And I want you to know that my running mate, Representative Harris, has curly hair because one of those mosquitoes chased him down the highway, chased him down the highway. Believe it or not, his hair was as straight as Lee Daniels' hair until those mosquitoes got after him in Johnson County and now he's got curly, kinky hair. Mr. Speaker, I beg you, I implore you, support me on this measure and talk to the Governor for me. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Speaker, C.L. got this Bill passed out of the House and brought it over to the Senate and I was in the Committee when he was hearing it. And he made such an impassionate speech that when it came to the Senate, I think I broke a precedent. I asked the Senate Governor and the Leadership on both sides if a House Member could speak on a House Bill in the Senate. And he again made his impassionate speech, but one of the things he said, 'I want to tell you the Sun Times says this is a no-good Bill, but they don't sell enough copies of the Sun Times in my district to cover a tramp on a park bench.'"

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

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was wondering if Representative Winchester will yield for a question."

Speaker Redmond: "I think he will."

Taylor: "Representative Winchester, would you take this Bill out of the record. I have an Amendment I'd like to put on there. One for Medley Movers."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipword."



Tipsword: "I was just wondering if Representative Winchester could do C.L.'s famous mother's best story?"

Speaker Redmond: "Which one was that?"

Tipsword: "His mother's best story about the poor old...the poor old Judge's wife when he was trying to get a Judge's Pay Bill up and bending over the washtub."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I was just thinking about that very same story. And those of you who did not have the pleasure of serving with C.L. McCormick at least one Session down here to hear his impassionate mosquito abatement, his other great project, as Tip was saying, was always trying to get a pay raise for the Circuit Court Judges. And I remember that story because I've told it up in Chicago many times and I'd like to take a crack at that, if I may. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, you fella's from up around Cook County, especially around Chicago, you don't know how bad the roads is down in Johnson County. And so, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, sometime after the 1st of July when the Session is over, I invite all you guys from upstate, especially up around Cook County, to come on down to Johnson County and you'll see how bad the roads is, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. And I want to tell you a little story about that, Mr. Speaker. When you fella's come down you ride those bad roads back there in the back roads of Johnson County. I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, years ago back in the depression days, they use to have two brands of flour. One was at a Sarasota, Gold Medal and the other one was Mother's Best. And Mother's Best always sold much more than the others because that come in the muslin sack where the other one come in a paper. And the folks down in Johnson County are so poor the women use to make bloomers



out of those sacks when they was finished with the flour. And so you fella's from Cook County, when you come down to Johnson County this summer and you ride around the back roads and you look over out there in the fields and you see the women with the Mother's Best written across the seat of their bloomers when they're picking tomatoes you'll know they belong to the wives of our Circuit Court Judges because they can't afford to buy none."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would like to reluctantly announce that the winners of the World Series of Golf, we played 30 matches during the last few weeks, are Representative Bus Yourell and Representative Joe Lucco. And Representative Flinn and I have been playing them for quite a while and anybody that wants to get up with us next year at 5:30 in the morning to shoot 9 holes of golf, you're welcome. But these guys are tough and I just wanted to recognize their outstanding abilities and they're willing to give lessons next year to anyone who wants to try out."

Speaker Redmond: "Who won though, you didn't tell us that?"

Kelly: "I said Bus Yourell and Joe Lucco are the champions of..of the World Series of Golf."

Speaker Redmond: "On the Supplemental Calendar, House Calendar #4 appears House Bill 1264 on the Order of Conference Committee Reports. Representative Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move that we do accept Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 1264."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you rise?"

Geo-Karis: "Just a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."



Geo-Karis: "Representative, does your Bill have anything to do with cluster zone voting?"

Garmisa: "I didn't hear that."

Geo-Karis: "Does your Bill have anything to do with cluster zone voting where they lump two or three precincts together?"

Garmisa: "No it doesn't."

Geo-Karis: "All right, I move... I speak in favor of Representative Garmisa's Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you kind of took us by surprise there, I thought we were still on the Arts Council and Mother's Best and we're back to serious business. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would rise in opposition to this Conference Committee Report. I want to ask you to seriously consider what is being done here tonight. When we enacted and over my objections, I must admit, the new State Board of Elections one thing that was agreed was that the employees of the State Board of Elections would be under the Personnel Code. This was something that was agreed to by all parties and as a matter of fact I think in this House there would have been a far greater battle both in Committee and on the floor of the House if this had not been the understanding. But somehow all of a sudden this came back to us with a grandfather or a grandmother clause, whatever you may want to call it, because slipping through this Legislature again is an attempt to lock in all the dead weight, the flotsam and jetsam that they have loaded upon us in the State Board of Elections. I have asked this Body to get rid of this odious board so many times I'm blue in the face. I can't do that but let's try and reform the practices of this Board."



Now this Board, which we enacted some years ago and I shamefully admit I was the original Sponsor of the legislation to create this Board, has become the political dumping ground of both parties. We even went so far as to let them devise their own merit plan a few years ago, which was the most laughable thing that has come out of this House in a long time. Now, in apparent agreement to the principle that we espoused earlier this year, they say, 'Sure, let's put them under the Personnel Code but let's lock in everybody who qualified as of the start of this year. And furthermore, let's not submit any of them to a probationary period.' This is rubbish, Mr. Speaker. I say, if we're going to have a Personnel Code, and I'm not sure we should, maybe everybody should be patronage, let's abide by the Personnel Code for everybody. And if we are going to have a brand new State Board of Elections, which we evidently do now, and if it is going to qualify under the law, as it evidently does now, then let's have the provisions of the Personnel Code applied to everybody. Let's not make a sham of the thing right from the start. Now I warned everyone of you what was going to happen when we enacted this thing earlier this year. We should have abolished the agency. It is a worthless useless agency. As I said before, it is a dumping ground for every bit of dead beats we have in both political parties. But if we have to have it let's try and make a fresh start. Let's apply the Personnel Code to everybody. Let's not try and fool anybody and let's not try and slip anything through at the 11th hour like this. I, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ask everyone of you, reject this Conference Committee Report. I believe



it's the first one. Let's go back into Conference Committee and honor the agreement, honor the principle in which this agency was created earlier this year. This is...and I'm not casting any aspersions at the Sponsor of this report, but I do say this is a very shabby method of trying to circumvent the agreement that was made by all parties when this agency was recreated. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let's reject this odious, 'odiferous' report, let's go back to Conference Committee and let's see if we can't come out with something that at least could appear to be honorable."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Houlihan: "Representative Garmisa, I see that this Bill in its history through the House was on a Consent Calendar and there were no Amendments offered during its term in the House, is that correct?"

Garmisa: "Do that again, somebody came by and sounded off."

Houlihan: "The Digest indicates that this Bill was on a Consent Calendar and went through the course of its history in the House without any Amendments, is that correct?"

Garmisa: "There were no Amendments put on this Bill in the House, that is correct."

Houlihan: "But we are now considering a Conference Committee Report where we could put in an Amendment?"

Garmisa: "That is correct."

Houlihan: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let me speak to the Bill. I realize the concern of any Member from our side of the aisle who wants to close the election process...to wish to have this Bill on the Consent Calendar and not to have it available to have Amendments tacked on, particularly



if it's dealing with the Election Code and preferring not to have maybe the open primary Amendment considered. But one of the things that I'd like to point out is that our side of the aisle has made a great deal of effort in placing on legislation that deals with the Election Code an Amendment and the Amendment deals with the position on the ballot of those officials running for Congress. And it's been the party position on this side of the aisle that by changing that placement and position we could protect the interests of some of our Congressmen who are running in a tough fight and that on every other election Bill there has been an effort and an intensive effort to place the election of the Congressmen above some of the other offices so they would be readily noticed and that would increase the turn out for that election. I'd like to ask the Sponsor if there was any effort then why that Amendment was not placed on this Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huskey."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, that was a question to the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Pardon me, pardon me. Proceed."

Garmisa: "Mr. Speaker..."

Unknown: "Mr. Speaker, I believe he wanted...he had asked a question and he should have an answer."

Speaker Redmond: "Who was the question..."

Houlihan: "The question was to the Sponsor of the Conference Committee..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Garmisa."

Garmisa: "Representative Houlihan, nobody at the Conference brought up about the placement of Congressmen on the ballot or about any ballot position. It was not brought up in the Conference, it was not considered."

Houlihan: "Would it be your feeling that we might be able to consider that if we went to a second Conference Committee? I know that Representative Katz has been



a strong supporter of that among some of the other Legislators here. I think, in fact, Representative Houlihan and Representative Madigan have been strong supporters of this Legislation and that in the second Conference Committee we might well be able to include that position. It was derailed, unfortunately, in the course of the Legislative Body, but I think the majority of the Body would prefer that addition. I would like to ask the Chairman if he might wish for a nonconurrence so we could include that particular Amendment?"

Garmisa: "In answer to that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that had any Member of this General Assembly expressed an interest in the ballot position as far as Congressmen are concerned, that...they could have tacked it on to this Bill, they should have evinced that interest in the conference itself, which was not done. This late hour is the first I've heard of it and I don't believe that we should back up now in order to do something that evidently somebody has overlooked and then tack it on at the last minute."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, let me address myself to the Bill. I have some reluctance because the Sponsor is probably accurate in saying that it should have been raised at an earlier date and I have some apology in raising that issue at this late date because I know how Representative Garmisa has worked very diligently on this Bill through the House Calendar and through the Conference Committee Report. But I am aware of the Conference Committee makeup and there was nobody who had evinced any interest in this area appointed to that Conference Committee. And while it's a late date I think there's always time, particularly in these last couple of hours to reconsider the action. I would



urge Members to vote 'present' on this particular provision so that we could have a second Conference Committee appointed and that there could be Members that would be able to raise this issue. I know Representative Porter is greatly interested in this issue. And if he would argue on his side of the aisle we might put to rest what his concerns are on that legislative...or that Congressional District. Both of the Congressional candidates feel it would be in their interest to have a greater turn out and I think there would be little objection to that issue being added to this Conference Committee Report in its second report. And I would urge all the Members, whether you're Republican or Democrat to vote 'present' so that we could put it into a second Conference Committee Report and that issue could be raised and addressed in that report. I think there's agreement among the Members that are involved and I...my only reluctance is the inconvenience it would present to Representative Garmisa in having a second Committee Report. But I think the matter is important enough that we all consider it and I would urge a 'present' vote on House Bill 1264, Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support Representative Garmisa in this Bill, even though he took his point of personal privilege out on me yesterday, I still think what he's doing is the right thing. There's going to be a new bipartisan board take over, I don't have the date in front of me, but in the very, very near future. And I feel that their hands shouldn't be tied. This will give them a chance. This board has worked with most of us very, very good. They're deserving of a fair chance and I think the new board should be deserving a fair



chance and let them do their own thing and not be followed by a bunch of mandates from this General Assembly until they get their feet on the ground and come through the General Assembly and ask for these mandates. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think in all fairness this House should go along and support Representative Garmisa in House Bill 1264. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Garmisa, to close.

Representative Bradley, pardon me."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to support Representative Garmisa on House Bill 1264 for a number of reasons. It simply addresses two problems that we have in the Election Code that certainly need to be cleared up. It's been suggested here tonight that we'll address ourselves to Amendments through a second Conference Committee so that some of the election problems that some Members might think are very important could be addressed. However, we had that opportunity with a Bill in the General Assembly that I happen to be handling that became a Christmas tree Bill, a Christmas tree full of lights and ornaments a little bit for everybody and it became impossible for everybody to agree to support that piece of legislation. We couldn't even get all the Members who were supporting Woody Bowman's concept, we couldn't get those kind of Members to agree to other pieces of legislation or other changes in the Election Code that were in that Bill. This piece of legislation here tonight that we have before us that Representative... from Chicago is offering to us for really two minor changes in the Election Code, certainly are worthy of our attention and we certainly should support the Gentleman's motion on the Conference Committee. I simply suggest to you to go back and put all those



Amendments on as might be suggested by other Members, we're going to end up with nothing as we did with the Bill before. We get...we get commitments and we get words that we need this and we need that and then it gets so bad, it's got so much on it that nobody can support it. And that's what happened with the Election Bill that went down the tube here just the other night and I think...I hope and respectfully request that all the Members on the floor of the House support the Representative's motion to concur and to adopt Conference Committee Report #1. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Garmisa, to close...

Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I was on this Conference Committee and while I didn't sign the Conference Committee Report I think we would be better off supporting the action and the recommendation of the Conference Committee Report than sending this back to a second Conference Committee. The Bill contains more than just the question of the Personnel Code of the State Board of Election, it contains something involving the appointment of the residency requirement for the appointment of a commissioner to a local election board. And all in all it's not a bad compromise, it's not a bad Bill. We did change the grandfather in of the employees of the State Board of Elections who have taken merit board examinations. We've changed it to cover only those we had already taken a test and who had passed a test and were employees as of January 1 of this year. The original Bill would have covered them up until the end of July of this year. So the Bill is in better condition than it was when it went into Conference Committee. And I would suggest that rather



than send it back that we do approve the report."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Garmisa, to close."

Garmisa: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, what is the purpose of a Conference Committee? To come up with recommendations that we can use in the formulating of the type of legislation that we can live with. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out some remarks that were made on the other side of the aisle in regards to this election board being a dumping ground for political hacks or words to that effect. Now let me tell you, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, that that election board, our State Election Board is made up of professionals that have been there for over four years. That election board is made up on a nonpartisan basis. Geographically and politically it's divided right down the middle. We have as many employees that are on that board that come from the Northern counties as we have from Downstate. We have as many Republicans on that board as we have Democrats. They have administered their oath of office fairly and as fine as can be administered. We have some professionals on that board that have taken...the professionals that make up that board today have already taken two tests. They...if they were to come up with one more test it would amount to where we would be discriminating against these employees. We would find that we would be without a board and any time that you treat people or professionals in the manner that you're asking them to be treated you're not going to have any board at all. And if you do have one it's not going to be a professionally constituted board. This is a good, solid Conference Committee Report. I ask that the Members of this General Assembly ...to support it and I ask for a green light on...from every Member of this Assembly."



Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House adopt the first Conference Committee Report to House Bill 1264. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Lucco."

Lucco: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I want to rise in support of Representative Garmisa and ask you to vote 'aye' and to concur with the Conference Report here."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 105 'aye' and 13 'no' and the House does adopt the first Conference Committee Report. Senate Bill 82. Representative Polk."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, Senate Bill 82, as we discussed earlier, has been around here for some time. We moved to concur. The House receded from the 1st Amendment and the 2nd Amendment exempts peace officers and I appreciate the opportunity to open and I would like Representative Kosinski to close in case there's any questions at all."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #3, passed by the Conference Committee is our Habitual Criminal Act or three time loser Bill. It has been approved in Conference Committee, which was called to make certain technical changes in language to conform with Class X penalties."

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Gentleman order, please. Representative Huskey, Representative Garmisa... All unauthorized persons leave the floor. Representative Huskey, Representative Kosinski is addressing this Body."

Kosinski: "In our Habitual Criminal Act the only substantive change that was included by the Conference Committee was to extend coverage to all states and federal



jurisdiction. Passage of this measure will insure that the violent offender who is judged habitual will not walk unrestricted among us people to perpetrate further violent crimes. I ask for your vote, I ask the Speaker to please hold off on that switch until the 115 Cosponsors can get on it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "I have a question of the Sponsor, Representative Kosinski, who I understand is the Cosponsor, if he'll yield."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Houlihan: "What's the 10-year provision in the Conference..."

Speaker Redmond: "This is a very serious Bill. Please come to order."

Houlihan: "What is the provision in the Conference Committee Report referring to the 10-year provision as respect to the...for want of a better term, the Habitual Criminal Act?"

Kosinski: "There has been no 10-year period accepted in the Conference Committee."

Houlihan: "I thought in the Conference Committee Report that there was a 10-year provision as far as..."

Kosinski: "Commission of crime?"

Houlihan: "Yes."

Kosinski: "No, Sir. I will read it to you. 'Every person who has been twice convicted in any state or federal court of an offense that contains the same elements as an offense now classified in Illinois as a Class X felony or murder and is thereafter convicted of a Class x felony or murder committed after the two prior convictions shall be judged a habitual criminal. The two prior convictions need not have been for the same offense. Any convictions which result from or are connected with the same transaction or result



from offenses committed at the same time shall be counted for the purposes of this Section as one conviction. This Article should not apply unless the third offense was committed after January 1, 1979. If the third offense was committed after conviction... and the second offense was committed after conviction on the first. Except when the death penalty is imposed anyone judged a habitual criminal shall be sentenced to life imprisonment and shall never be released other than by Executive Clemency. This Act takes effect January 1, 1979."

Houlihan: "So then if I understand correctly what you have read to me from the proposed Conference...or from the Conference Committee Report which you're seeking to have adopted, there is no time frame as to when the first two felony offenses were...had been committed in relation to the third offense. It's totally openended, is that correct?"

Kosinski: "As much as I can hear what you're saying, Dan, I think I agree with you."

Houlihan: "All right."

Kosinski: "There was preconference consideration of a possibility of putting a 10-year time frame in and judgement was that there would be situations where a person might be in a prison at that period of time or a person, or other extenuating circumstances that made the Committee...(tape failure)."

Houlihan: "Let me, if I may Mr. Speaker, address the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Redmond: "Please, give the Gentleman order."

Houlihan: "I'm well aware that the attitude and mood of this General Assembly has been to support hard lined law and order proposals. One of the problems though however is a failure to realize the situation that this will actually put a local prosecutor in. What he



is talking about here, the Sponsor, in asking us to adopt the Conference Committee Report is referring to a felony offense of the same elements as are now redefined Class X felonies. Now as a practical matter what faces the local prosecutor when he has to determine if an offense committed out of state is an offense which does have the same elements as our Class X redefined offense. I suggest that this is completely unworkable as far as a local prosecutor is concerned. And once this gets off the headlines and I suggest then a large part that is the attraction of this kind of a measure it is your local state's attorney who's going to be faced with the problem of attempting to prosecute pursuant to the so-called Habitual Criminal Act. And I would also point out what the history of this type of legislation has been in our state. It has proved to have been unworkable. It was the reason that this Legislature in 1961 rescinded the Habitual Criminal Act. You are placing your local state's attorney in an absolute straight jacket as far as going forward with this type of habitual criminal...count.. it isn't going to work. It hasn't worked in the past and I suggest that it's ill advised to support this Conference Committee Report and I would urge a negative vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Mann: "Roman, who were the House Members of the Conference Committee Report that did not sign the report?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kosinski."

Kosinski: "(tape failure)...he did not sign it, Mr. Katz did not sign it."

Mann: "Who was the first one?"

Kosinski: "Mr. Stearney had left the chambers..."



Mann: "Who? I can't hear him."

Kosinski: "Stearney."

Mann: "Oh. Stearney and Katz did not sign and who on the Senate side?"

Kosinski: "Well I'll read you the signers. Senator Bowers, Senator Egan, Senator Regner."

Mann: "Who didn't sign?"

Kosinski: "Senator Netsch and I believe the other one was Senator D'Arco."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address myself to the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, this is an extremely important Bill, Mr. Speaker. And for the reasons stated by Representative Houlihan I would ask every Member to carefully consider what you will be doing, not only to the state's attorney but to defendants in terms of handling plea bargaining and the whole criminal justice system. This Bill retroactively, retroactively includes people in offenses that were not originally crime x'ers but were felonies. Now, that's correct...retrospectively or retroactively, in any event they now become Class X felonies and Mr. Speaker, I think that for the reasons stated by Representative Houlihan that this Bill should be very, very carefully scrutinized, notwithstanding the well intention, motivation and expertise of the principal Sponsor. It is a bad Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in 1973 I introduced the first mandatory crime Bill into the House of Representatives in the General Assembly dealing in the area of dangerous drugs. I want to compliment our Sponsor of this proposal, Representative Kosinski. He's been an outstanding leader in the area of crime fighting and crime control. Representative



Mike Getty was the, we all know, was the chief draftsman of the Class X legislation which was passed and signed into law by the General Assembly and signed by the Governor of this state. Ladies and Gentlemen I am a law and order Legislator and I'm very proud to admit this because I'll tell you something else, the people of the State of Illinois have two priorities, one is crime and the other is taxation. They want hard criminal control and this legislation will give it to you and I'm glad to stand in support of Representative Kosinski's proposal."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk, to close."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I think that many people who've talked here this evening have found it interesting that Bob Mann and I have been on the same side many times in relation to the death penalty. But I think it's time that we talk to those people who have a tendency to commit the crime on the streets of... We talk about those who talk about the Class X felony and we're simply saying to those people, 'We're going to give you a story, Sir. We're telling you once and for all, you can commit that first, you commit that second but if you commit that third you know that you're going to be incarcerated for the rest of your life.' I've never voted for a death penalty since I've been in the General Assembly in six years because I personally feel against it. But, I do believe that a person who is on the streets who would commit a Class X felony should be put away and should be put away permanently. And this is why I'm supporting this and I would ask your support Report #1 of Senate Bill 82."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House adopt the first Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 82. Those in favor vote 'aye',



opposed vote 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Huff."

Huff: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was going to make a few comments with regard to this Bill. I'm voting green on this because I'm sure you may not be aware but I'm sure there are Members in this House who know that, and I'm not ashamed to tell you that there have been parts of my district that I'm afraid actually to walk the streets. And I'm sure that statement can be made by some of the other colleagues here in this House. But just let me tell you this, Ladies and Gentlemen, in order to make this Bill somewhat palatable to you. If I had my way, when this Bill came up last Session I was thinking very seriously of putting an Amendment on this called, 'Hands Off Amendment' What it did quite simply was take off the hands of any offender caught in the commission of a crime with a weapon. The theory is quite simple. It would have been an effective deterrent but I found that it was repugnant to the sensitivity of most of the God fearing people in this state or in this House. But let me tell you this, if it was repugnant in your minds don't you think it was repugnant also in the minds of the offenders who are recidivist? It's no wonder, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that many of the crimes that are perpetrated on us are done with such arrogant brazenness because the criminals who listen to some of these liberal talking, they laugh at us. I think this is a good Bill and if you think this Bill is too harsh you let the crime rates continue to soar and I assure you they'll come begging for my Hands Off Amendment. Thank you."



Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 120 'aye' and 34 'no' and the House does adopt the first Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 82. On the Order of Nonconcurrency appears Senate Bill 1595, Representative Wikoff. Representative Wikoff. Is that Representative Wikoff? Take it out of the record. Representative Ray Ewell. Ray Ewell, for what purpose do you rise?"

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, everybody has given somewhat of a rendition of something and in an effort to comply I would like at this time to give my rendition of Muhammad Ali. Everybody be talking about Joe Frazier, the Manila Gorilla. Now I don't want to amaze ya, but I'm going to kill Joe Frazier and at the sound of the bell I'm going to get Howard Cosell."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ray Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, there's a little bit of fraud in all politicians and this was a little bit of fraud on my behalf. I want you to look to my right over there, Tomato, the real Muhammad Ali. Do it for them once again, Tomato. We just switched the switches and allowed him to come in. So I just want you to know everything you see is not real."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Laurino's phone."

Tomato: "Everybody be talking about Joe Frazier, the Manila Gorilla. Now I don't want to amaze ya, but I'm going to kill Joe Frazier and at the sound of the bell I'm going to get Howard Cosell."

Speaker Redmond: "On the Order of Nonconcurrency, Representative Wikoff. Representative Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you rise?"

Geo-Karis: "I'd like to be voted as 'aye' on Senate Bill 82. It won't make any difference..."

Speaker Redmond: "On what one? Representative Wikoff."



Wikoff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would move that we do not recede in House Amendment #2 on Senate Bill 1595 and request a Conference Committee."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Weaver(sic) has moved that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1, 2 and 4 to Senate Bill 1595. Wikoff. Those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the... Simple majority on this. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries, the House refuses to recede from Amendments 1, 2 and 4. Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, are we back on the order of impersonations?"

Speaker Redmond: "We're running...we're out of Supplemental Calendars right now so on the order of impersonations, Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Well, could you turn Representative McPike's microphone on, I need a little more running room?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan, what do you want? Representative McPike's..."

Bowman: "I'm not going to tell you who this is, I want everyone to guess, okay? Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer this very good Amendment to a very, very good Bill. It's a very good Bill already, but this Amendment will make it absolutely very, very, very good. And I think that all of us in this General Assembly can support this Amendment so I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mann, do you want to go in the...your repertoire? Representative Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, you may not have noticed but on the Republican side of the aisle in the last few days we have a new song bird over here, a real chirper... Representative Robert Winchester from deep Southern Illinois. And I've been working a little bit today on it and I'd just kind of like to give you the Republican impressions of Republican Members. Mr. Speaker,



Members of the House, now I'm just a little bit tired of all of you people maligning deep Southern Illinois. Now you've got to give us the seven million dollars for the law school at Carbondale and you've got to give us the Edwardsville money for that gymnasium. And Mr. Speaker, why do you want to take that fish hatchery away from us in Southern Illinois? What about the forestry projects, Mr. Speaker, what about those? What's the matter with you people on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Speaker? Don't you realize that Southern Illinois is one third of the county? It should have one third of the eleven billion dollar budget. Mr. Speaker, it deserves it. I know we don't have any people, Mr. Speaker, but that doesn't make any difference. We need three billion dollars. And Mr. Speaker, most of all, most of all, Mr. Speaker, we resent, we resent in deep Southern Illinois, Representative Harris and I resent very deeply the plan that's afoot in this General Assembly to lower the 33 counties in Southern Illinois by 100 feet and flood them. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Adams."

Adams: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Winchester, I have the answer for you. If you would realize how we're getting ripped off where that E.R...or R.T.A., E.R.A... I blew that one, didn't I, Cal? I'll tell you what's happened to all of our money, it's gone to Chicago, that's where it's gone, right down to the R.T.A. I'll tell you what's happening to all that money. They're taking two dollars and twenty-one cents out of every license plate...out of the State of Illinois. Do you realize that's 64 million dollars a year? If you want tax relief let's get rid of the R.T.A."

Speaker Redmond: "Supplemental Calendar #5. Representative Mann."



Mann: "Mr. Speaker, Bill Walsh, on a point of personal privilege and a parliamentary point of order. Now, Mr. Speaker, you know that that is the most reprehensible ruling that has ever been handed down in the 300 year history of this Illinois House. You are lower than a snake in a wagon rut, Mr. Speaker. You ought to be beheaded, you should be dragged from that podium by your ears and your legs across the whole State of Illinois. To tell the truth, Mr. Speaker... Mr. Speaker, I love you, please grant my motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "Supplemental... Representative Harris, for what purpose do you rise?"

Harris: "Mr. Speaker, I'll take a rain check right now, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Is that in the budget? Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "Mr. Speaker, we've heard Representative Houlihan do the Majority Leader in the morning. Representative Houlihan would like now to do the Majority Leader in the evening. So he asked me to introduce him. Very few other Representatives have their own introduction but Representative Houlihan demands an introduction and would like to do Mike Madigan in the evening."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Billy, keep the boys at play. We haven't yet worked it out, it will take a little longer. Keep them all happy in our new spirit of friendliness, we don't want to ram it to them. And you know our pet brain up there, Davey Epstein, tell him that we're happy that he's still up there. But if he makes one more parliamentary ruling against Chicago he's no longer with us. Bill, if you're not listening to my... Let's get the train going, we've got to bring the bacon home



to Mike and the rest of the boys in Chicago so let's get back to business. Mr. Speaker, the next call you get will be from Tom Donovan. We want you to listen clearly."

Speaker Redmond: "Supplemental Calendar #5. Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, Mr. Speaker, only to break... While we're on the order of silliness, I did find out what the poem was that is connected with the Arts Council and I'd like to read it to the Assembly."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Leinenweber: "There once was a lady named Jane, who's legislation is always inane. She said with a smile, 'I'd walk a long mile to give your rearends a big pain.'"

Speaker Redmond: "Maybe we'd better get these off of Supplemental 5 and then we'll be back. Supplemental Calendar #5. 2987, Order of Conference Committee Reports. Representative J. David Jones. Out of the record. 3276. Representative McBroom here? Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, I have a suggestion for the Clerk, everyone has complimented the Clerk on the astounding job that's been done during this Session but I've consulted with my wife and some of the other wives that are in the gallery and I think that we ought to have a special Supplementary Calendar for the people in the gallery because they don't know when we're being funny and when we're not being funny."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Emil Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of personal privilege. Will you kindly recognize my distinguished colleague, Representative John Matijevich."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, are we still on the order of silliness



or what? Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, not many of us here know that in this House of Representatives we have two boxing champions. Two in fact that were light heavyweight boxing champs. And I want to tell the...as long as we're on this order of business I think that we ought to clear the center aisle, Mr. Speaker, for a very short demonstration because I want to introduce those two light heavyweight champions of the Illinois Legislature. In the center ring...and this match is being promoted by Emil Jones. In the center ring, representing, I think the 16th Democratic Ward Organization, wearing purple trunks, the light heavyweight olympic champion, canvas back Jim Taylor. Let's hear it for Jim Taylor. Jim, will you take...with your purple trunks will you get in the middle of the aisle there in the center ring? Big Jim Taylor is...big Jim Taylor is sponsored by Medley Movers. Wearing green trunks, the former Navy champion...light heavyweight champion, big jumbo elephant Jack Davis. Can Jack Davis come out?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Refereeing this final event, wearing no trunks a true independent and you know it's going to be fair, Jessie Madison. Now, let's break clean and let's see this fight, it's going one round."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, I think a few things should be corrected by the promoter and the wonderful ring announcer. The first being that I only got to the light heavyweight semi-finals. And then I caught my lunch. Secondly, in the bathroom today when this bout as being promoted by the great promoter, Emil Jones, I found out standing next to Jim Taylor that he knocked out 'George Foley', who was a great heavyweight and Jim was



was spotting as a light heavyweight at that point in time. So with the permission of the promotors, since the final t.v. rights haven't been signed for this bout, I'm going to insist, Representative Jones, I'm going to insist on a few conditions. First, that the Marquis of Queensbury rules be definitely followed. Second, that I should really have two years to train because I'm a little out of shape. Third, I need three referees in that ring because he comes at you from all sides. Fourth, I want a 40 foot square ring and then under Harry Leinenweber's Amendment #19 to 250 I want two M.D.'s, two psychiatrists and two clinical psychologists to sign that receipt for me so I can be committed involuntarily for taking a match. But I'll continue and show you. Representative Taylor, meet me out in the middle aisle and I'll show you how I used to win my bouts."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker, would you admonish the two other Representatives from the 42nd District to practice a little bit more decorum, please?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative James Taylor, do you want

to tell them about your fight with Floyd Patterson?"

Taylor: "No, Mr. Speaker, the only thing that I want to say to Representative Jack Davis is that if he gives me Medley Movers I'll give him what he wants."

Speaker Redmond: "Supplemental Calendar #5 appears House Bill 3394. Representative Kempiners. Let's get Supplemental #5 finished here is we can. Representative Kempiners. Representative Levin, for what purpose do you rise?"

Levin: "Point of order. Looking at the Calendar, it's dated 9:15 and we don't have any of those reports on our desk."



Speaker Redmond: "They've been out. He got it. They were out at 8:15. Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I know that 3394, the first Conference Committee Report was out a long time ago but but I'll save the Gentleman some trouble of worrying about it because I would move that we do not adopt the first Conference Committee Report and we ask that a second Conference Committee be appointed."

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

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "Why?"

Kempiners: "The reason being that one tenth of the Department of Personnel's budget was cut and none of it was put in except for five jobs..."

Schlickman: "I join with you. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion that we do not adopt the first Conference Committee Report to House Bill 3394. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative James Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, there may be people that want to concur. I believe that the Gentleman should have fully explained it. You should have listened to Representative Levin in his point of order and we ought to proceed orderly. I mean we can have some silliness but we ought not trample over the rules."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners."

Kempiners: "I think I can save the House a lot of time. The Senate has already not concurred in the report and requests a Conference Committee so it's moot right now."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Point of inquiry, Mr. Speaker. The earlier Speaker indicated that he...in terms of the time rule. He was



going to follow the time on the Calendar. Are you saying that that was an incorrect statement? I...what is the time that you're going to follow?"

Speaker Redmond: "3394, I've been advised, has been printed and distributed and consideration of that meets the rules and he moves that we do not adopt the report. Representative Levin."

Levin: "In looking at Supplemental Calendar #5 it states 9:15. An earlier Speaker ruled that the time that he would follow for the three-hour or one-hour rule will be what is on the Calendar. It says 9:15."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle. Please come to order. Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend that rule. 68(b)."

Speaker Redmond: "For the rest of the evening or just this one?"

Stuffle: "For the duration of the Session."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Yeah, I object to suspending it for the rest of the evening, that's all."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Well since I think the rest of the evening hopefully will be the rest of the Session I'd persist in my motion to suspend that particular rule."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the suspension of the rule. Representative Totten."

Totten: "May I speak to the motion, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Totten: "I too object to suspending of the rule. I can remember this General Assembly several years ago debating the problems we had in the last waning moments of the Session. And we finally arrived at the rule to protect the Members that says we have a three-hour consideration for a certain number of days prior to the end of the Session. And then the last two days of the Session we go to a one-hour rule. That rule was adopted to



protect the Members from having Conference Committee Reports that may be of significant substantive matters put on our desks at the last minute. So I'm as anxious as anyone to get out of here but I think that that rule is an important rule and that there are many matters of serious consideration before this General Assembly. That one-hour rule is a protection for our deliberations. It's as liberal as we should be and I think we should oppose the Members motion so suspend that rule."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "I normally would agree with at least part of that argument. However, given the time constraints under which we are operating I think any Member who wants to see a Conference Report can rise and state his position and it ought to be on his desk. The rule refers to the number of hours involved and I must persist in my motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle has moved that the provisions of 68(d) be suspended for the rest of tonight. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well, Representative Stuffle, that is an unreasonable request and it's unreasonable for this reason. When you suspend that rule, which is a rule that is there for the protection of the ordinary Member then you...those people who are doing the planning and plotting and deciding what will be our fate and what will be voted on, you give them all of the advantage against the rest of us. I submit that it is not right that we should not suspend that because the very purpose of that is for periods like this, when we find ourselves here horsing around for the most part but waiting while others of us and a few of us are planning and scheming and deciding what is best for the people of the State of Illinois. Your district, my district and the rest of our districts."



We deserve to know and I submit that we ought to know and if you want to submit it...you want to suspend the rule for a particular measure, do it, let us know what the measure is and your reasons for wanting to suspend the rule. But not for everything. And I would move to vote against the Gentleman's motion."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, even though it's June 30, 1978 and approximately 9:30 p.m. we still are the most vital branch of state government, the Legislative Branch. And what we do here tonight, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, has a vital effect on the operation of State Government and on the lives of 11 million people. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I appreciate that one hour is a short period of time. But I do think, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, as a deliberative Body we should be assured that we're going to have...we are going to have on our desks copies of Conference Committee Reports and we're going to have the opportunity of looking them over. You know Bill Redmond, as well as I do, the mischief that is implicit in the Conference Committee process. And you know the mischief that can be imposed upon us in the General Assembly and the people of the State of Illinois with respect to these Conference Committee Reports. I oppose, as the Gentleman from Cook who previously preceeded me opposes any suspension of the rule relative to the necessity of having on our desk for a minimal period of time, the Conference Committee Reports. So that we have the opportunity of looking them over. And I would oppose the suspension of any rule at this point in time regardless of the date, regardless of the time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I sit here this evening



I know that we've been here a long time and that some of us want to get out of here. But I also would like to remind the Legislators who are not from the Cook County area, from the Chicago area that we've had it pretty good this Session. But we can lose everything that we've gained in a very short time when a Conference Committee Report is thrown on our desks and we are asked to vote on it without reading it. If they want to take it Bill by Bill and suspend the rule we have a different story but to suspend all...the rules for all the Bills for the rest of this evening I think is a bad choice. This motion requires 89 votes and should it receive 89 votes I would request a verification."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "I would withdraw my motion and seek recognition to make an amended motion."

Speaker Redmond: "The motion has been withdrawn by Representative Stuffle. Dump the Roll Call. Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "I would now move to suspend the rule that I cited earlier, 68(b), that it be suspended with regard to particular issues as the issues arise. And I would ask that it be suspended... Are we still on the particular Bill that we were on before? Supplemental #5?"

Speaker Redmond: "That's correct."

Stuffle: "Okay. I would move then that it be suspended with regard to that particular issue at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "It's one Bill? 3394?"

Stuffle: "Take them one at a time."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay. Representative Stuffle has moved that the... Representative Geo-Karis."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think we better take stock in ourselves. We are here



spending the people's money. And much as I admire my colleague on the other side the suspension of the rules for particular Bills certainly may have great propensities to it will be doing a disservice to the people of the State of Illinois. We've spent so much time up until now. I think it's incumbent upon us, it's our duty and we've had our hour of levity and goodness knows we needed it, it's incumbent upon ourselves to go through those Conference Reports and as fact, as equitably as we can but I do not think the rules should be suspended for every Bill that comes through because it just isn't right to the taxpayers. We're here to do a job and if we have to stay over 12:00, we'll stay over 12:00."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kempiners...Representative Kempiners is recognized."

Kempiners: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I've indicated the Senate has already not adopted this and requested a Conference Committee. While you're arguing about this could I request a Conference Committee be appointed by you so I can go up and meet with these people?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Parliamentarian advises me that inasmuch as the Senate has rejected it all you have to do is request a second Conference Committee. You don't have to make any motion with respect to the report. Representative Madison."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, I just left the Senate one minute ago and the information that I have is that the Senate did not move to nonconcur on this, this matter has not been heard in the Senate yet. This Bill, 3394, has not been called for Conference Committee Reports in the Senate as of yet."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I was off the floor and I was over in the Senate having some conversation with the Chairman of



the Appropriations Committee, Senator Carroll, when this matter came up. And Senator Carroll indicated to me that this has not been heard in the Senate and as far as they were concerned they were going to concur with this Conference Committee Report. Now I don't know what the fracas is here but it has not been heard in the Senate as yet."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, I think probably the orderly thing to do is to go to Representative Stuffle's motion that the rule be suspended with respect to House Bill 3394. Representative James Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I would be inclined to support Representative Stuffle's motion on this particular issue. But I would like to raise to the Body a serious problem we might find ourselves in. On the previous motion, which was to suspend the rules for the entire time, the Speaker and all the Leadership voted 'aye'. At least that was my recollection. And what we're talking about is our right to know on issues, important issues, that come before this House. Now, if Representative Stuffle moves on this motion, on this Bill, we don't have the opportunity to discuss what's in the Bill prior to the motion being put and prior to the rule being waived. And I've found out through various sources that the Department of Transportation's budget, which went through this House without any reference to crosstown, is going to come back in a Conference Committee Report with a crosstown Amendment, a reappropriation of dollars. And, Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully suggest to you that's just the problem that Representative Madigan raised during our silliness time is true. We may all be lulled into a sense of happiness by the imitations. We may all be at ease and less vigilant, but those issues which we have fought during the Session,



we ought to be able to address in these closing hours and nobody ought to be able to ram those through without any discussion. Now I realize on many issues there will be a coalition put together that will be able to carry the day. But I do believe the public and the Legislators that were elected to represent their districts ought to be given the opportunity to challenge and raise issues with regard to every particular matter that comes before this House and if we move to suspend the rule for any specific Bill prior to discussing the merits of that Bill we'll get into a posture of suspending the rules each time before we know what's in the Bill. Then we'll vote on the Bill before we know what's in the Bill and in effect will have done what the original motion attempted to do, waive the rules for the entire Session and the entire evening. And I think that would be a little bit premature and certainly somewhat irresponsible."

Speaker Redmond: "Congratulations on confining your remarks to Representative Stuffle's motion. Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Well, I think I need to make my motion a bit clearer to Representative Houlihan. My motion and I hope I state it clearer this time than I did before, if that's the case, my motion would be to suspend that portion of the particular rule with regard to the one-hour limitation only. I would still want to see within my motion the provision that the particular issue be on a Calendar and that the particular issue be printed and on our desk, whether that might be 15 minutes or 10 or 45. So my motion is to suspend that rule, 68(b), I believe it is, only with regard to the one-hour provision. It would still include having the motion on the issue on a Calendar, a Supplemental Calendar and on the desk."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Which rule was the Gentleman referring to?"

Speaker Redmond: "68(d), page 364. You know, it really is kind of distressing for the Chair for the Members to keep interrupting on a point of order and when you arise you find out that you're really disagreeing with somebody. Representative Schlickman is recognized, the Members please honor and respect his right, he's making an inquiry."

Schlickman: "The Gentleman is seeking suspension of which rule?"

Speaker Redmond: "68(d) and only the part of it that requires the one hour notice."

Schlickman: "And he's doing it with respect to one Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "This Bill, 3394."

Schlickman: "I thought we had already acted upon that."

Speaker Redmond: "No we did not, we dumped that Roll Call. Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "If it's proper, I just wanted to ask the mover of this motion a question. As I understand, you are moving to suspend the rule that would require us to have this report for a period of time but I'm wondering, is the report available?"

Stuffle: "I didn't hear your question. Let me make the motion clear. I said that my position would be that we ought to rise on each Bill where we thought this should be suspended. I am rising on this particular Bill to suspend that portion of that rule that deals with the one-hour provision only, not with regard to distribution at all."

Deuster: "Yes, I understand that and the question I'm asking you, Sir, is do we have the report available but not printed and distributed? Is that your problem?"

Stuffle: "I was told that the report was distributed. And other



people have it. Three people on your side are holding it in their hands at this time."

Deuster: "All right, so we have the report and the only thing you're trying to accomplish is to let us consider that report a little earlier than the rules would provide is that correct?"

Stuffle: "With regard to the time limit only, I said I would rise on this Bill for that purpose and possibly on others. My motion at this time is only with regard to that Bill. I withdrew my original motion to cover the duration of the Session. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think that this would prove to move us along a little quicker and I think that if we could proceed this way and go along with these reports, because most of us know...will end up knowing what are in them by debate and if there's objections from the leadership on either side of the aisle then we'll abide by the rule. That might prove to help."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Well you know, Mr. Speaker, on reflection it would appear that this motion that the Gentleman makes with respect to House Bill 3394 is an effort to speed things along and to get us out of here earlier. And Lord knows everyone wants to do that. But I submit to you that it doesn't accomplish that at all because we're not going to leave here until the last deal is made, until there is compromise on the last Bill before us. Now there are just some 15 or 16 or perhaps fewer Conference Committee Reports or concurrences to consider. So I see really no reason at all why we should entertain this motion for this particular Bill. Why don't we abide by the rules? Why don't we have the Conference Committee Report on our desk one hour before we consider them. Because I submit to you, as has been pointed out



to me that if we let this Bill, if we suspend the rules for this Bill then the flood gate is opened and those of us who are regular Members of this organization and not leaders lose control totally. And if someone gets up to object to the suspension of the rules he will be laughed down and we will ride over like a herd those who are crying in the wilderness to have some kind of an orderly procedure. So I object, Mr. Speaker, to the Gentleman's motion though I see nothing ulterior in it, "I object to it because of the precedent that it makes for the rest of the evening."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, the motion provides for this one Bill only. The reports are on your desk, certainly you can consider each one at a time but it follows at 11:00 if we have to wait for a 1 hour thing we just as well go home because you're dead. We're only talking about 1 Bill. The report is on your desk, I don't see any reason why he can't act on it and I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries. Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, I would... Mr. Speaker and Members, I would persist in my motion. I think Representative Walsh just gave the best argument for it. That if we wait for later in the evening there probably will be a stampede to get out of here. We might as well speed things up now. If the Bill...printed Bills, Conference Reports or whatever are on our desks we might as well proceed with them. I would persist in my motion."



Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion that that portion of the rule which requires that the Supplemental Calendar and the report be on the desks one hour before consideration, be suspended. Just that portion which refers to the one hour. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 90 'aye'... Representative Holewinski."

Holewinski: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like a verification of this Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "On this question there's 90 'aye' and 52 'no'. Representative Holewinski has requested a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Luft. Representative Luft 'aye'. Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I made the motion to speed things up. I would withdraw the motion if this is the view of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Does he have leave to withdraw the motion? The motion is withdrawn. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "I don't know if this is the time for explanation of vote, Mr. Speaker, but as a matter..."

Speaker Redmond: "Too late. Representative Schlickman, it's too late to explain the vote, the motion has been withdrawn, there's nothing pending before the Body."

Schlickman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Ease till 10:15. Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, perhaps we can take advantage of the time. I think we have a Gentleman in our midst, that like some of the other people, will be leaving us shortly and this may perhaps be one of his last evenings in Springfield. If I might have a little quiet, since



this Gentleman will be leaving. Mr. Speaker...Bill."
Speaker Redmond: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I might have your attention for just a moment, on more of a serious note I'd like to just take this opportunity and ask all of you to join me in perhaps saying good-bye to one of our very fine Members who's been here in Springfield for a number of years. And regardless of which side of the aisle you're on I know that we all wish him well in the upcoming months and the very tough campaign that he's facing. A campaign that will bring, I'm sure, national attention. And regardless of your viewpoint, whether it be Republican or Democrat, I know that we can all join in wishing our very, very good friend, John Porter, all the good success in the future and much happiness in the endeavors that he chooses to seek. I've had the privilege of sitting next to John now for close to two years. He's certainly a fine Legislator. I'm sure that all of us here include him as one of our fine friends. And if you would all join me in saying, God bless, John, and best of luck to you in your future endeavors, John Porter. Good luck to you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Porter."

Porter: "Well, Mr. Speaker...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is now the end of my third term, six years, in Springfield. And compared to some of our very distinguished Members such as Deacon Davis, that seems like a very, very short time and it really is. It has been my privilege to be a friend and to be associated with the finest group of people in the State of Illinois. Not only those in this chamber but those that served here previously and have retired or left the chamber since that time. I've spent six years in a kind of ambivalent



state, as many of you have, being kind of half a Legislator and half a lawyer. And feeling in a certain way that it was...I was not able to to a really good job at either one. I've tried to do my best during this time and in part, my decision to run for Congress was based upon the fact that I either wanted to be one or the other. That decision is going to lie in the hand of the people of the 10th District. I'm willing to accept their judgement and I just want to say that it has been a wonderful six years for me. I've loved every minute of it, I've learned a very great deal from a lot of fine people and I'm proud to have served in this Body. Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Hall: "House Resolution 1074. J. Davis - Leinenweber. House Resolution 1075. Griesheimer. House Resolution 1076. Steczo. 1079. Kent - McClain. 1080. McClain. 1081. Terzich."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijeich."

Matijeich: "Mr. Speaker, 1074 is the Death Resolution so I think we should hold that. 1075. Griesheimer. Congratulates Major General Donald Smith upon his retirement from the O'Hara Air Reserves National, the Commanding General of that National Guard. 1076. Steczo. Contratulates Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Zawisza on the occasion of their 25th Wedding Anniversary. 1079. Kent - McClain. Congratulates George Irwin on 30 years of cultural service to the community of Quincy. 1080 congratulates the Quincy High School softball team. House Resolution 1081 that's been requested by Representative Terzich, it's a congratulatory Resolution to Mr. and Mrs. Ed Kornowicz and Bob Terzich would like to have that one read, Mr. Speaker. Bob Terzich is going to read Ed Kornowicz's."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, we do have an occasion coming up



on 4th of July. On next Tuesday, July 4th, 1978 we will be celebrating not only as the 202nd anniversary of American independence, but also as the 35th anniversary of the ininterdependence of our friend and colleague Ed Kornowicz and his lovely wife, Betty. Ed Kornowicz, who was married on July 4, 1943 at St. Cyril and Methodi^s Church by Monsignor Bobal, have two daughters, Sharon (Mrs. Ron) Natanek and Deborah Kornowicz and two grandchildren; and whereas, Representative Kornowicz, who has served in this House with honor and distinction for two terms, has had 35 years of practical experience in state, county and municipal government, is active in many civic and fraternal and religious organizations; and whereas the enduring marriage and exemplary family life of Ed Kornowicz, serve as an inspiration to all of us who know them; I am sure that all of us wish to extend sincere congratulations and his lovely wife, Elizabeth, on their 35th wedding anniversary, July 4th. Ed, congrat^ulations and another 35 years of wedded bliss."

Matijejvich: "I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijejvich has moved the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The Ayes' have it, motion carries."

Matijejvich: "And Resolution 1074 is the Death Resolution expressing our sorrow upon the death of Wallace Falk, Captain of the New Lenox Volunteer Fire Department. I move the adoption of the Death Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of the Death Resolution. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The motion carries, the Death Resolutions are adopted. Further Resolutions?"

Clerk Hall: "House Resolution 1078. Stanley."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee on Assignment."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, although this year will mark my 36th year in the Legislature of the State of Illinois and when my successor is elected and installed I will take my place among those who have served and who have retired. But I want this House to know that I have been pleased beyond words to have been a Member of this great deliberative Body. I also want you to know that I have been very much impressed with a young man who's only been here with us a short time. He's brilliant, he's courageous, the great masters of old have enriched him with his political wisdom and I have lived my three score and ten. I'm in spitting distance of four score. I want him to know and I want this House to know that I'm sorry he's leaving this House. I'm sorry he's leaving this House because he's so worthy and well qualified to stay in this House and he would be a blessing if he stayed here, to especially some of the Members on my side of the aisle. And certainly he towers like the great Gibraltar over many Legislators that have graced the walls of this House. He's going to retire at this early age but I wish it was possible for young Jesse Madison to remain in this House, because his kind of wisdom we need and I do want to congratulate him for what he has done here in this House and the time he's spend here over these years."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Can we go to the order of announcements, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Announcements."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, after I was first elected to the General Assembly I was told by the then Executive Editor of 'Field' Enterprises that



that aisle that divided the Republican and Democratic Party was not a gulf to separate us but rather, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, was a passageway to unite us. And I was advised by Mr. 'Akers', now deceased, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, that of all the Bills that are introduced in the General Assembly, no more than 5 percent are of partisan nature 95 percent of the Bills unite Democrats and Republicans relative to the interests of the people of the State of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I can stand here as a Republican and say some of my best friends are Democrats. And what unites me with those Democrats, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, is my love for the Chicago Cubs. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, last year we inaugurated the first annual Legislators Day at Wrigley Field. This year, Bill Redmond, Class 08, Marquette...Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Walsh says, 1876... This year, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, on August 9th, Wednesday, we will be celebrating the second annual Illinois Legislator's Day at Wrigley Field. A day that will bring us together, Democrats and Republicans and enjoy the national pastime, baseball. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it will be a glorious day. We'll see the Cubs beat Pittsburg, we'll see the Cubs on their way to a division championship. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we have a nonpartisan... we have a bipartisan Committee heading up this glorious event. Earlier today we honored a retiring Member of the media. And he's a Member of our Committee, Alan Crane. We've got Henry Leinenweber...Harry Leinenweber. We've got Dick Mugalian. We've got Glen Schneider, Terry Steczo and even, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in the spirit of the American way, we've got Bill Walsh. Mr. Speaker and Members of



House, contact one of those Committee Members. Place your reservation for that great day when the winner will not be the Democrats, will not be the Republicans but will be the Chicago Cubs. And what we have scheduled for that day, Mr. Speaker and Members of this House, is meeting at the Cubby ^{Bear}, kitty corner from the entrance to Wrigley Field at 12:15. We'll go under the field, we'll visit with the manager, Herman Frank, we'll visit with the ball players, we'll watch the Cubs win and then afterwards we'll have dinner with some of the Cubs. Contact Alan Crane, if he's still around. Contact Harry Leinenweber, contact Dick Mugalian, Glen Schneider, Terry Steczo, Bill Walsh and if you're nonpartisan you can even talk with me. Have a good day that day, see the Cubs play and win. And, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, earlier this day I equated a E.R.A. was the national pastime and I am going to buy Giddy Dyers ticket. Giddy's going to be there for a nine inning game, no extra innings Giddy, you know you win or lose within 9 innings. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "In addressing my friend from the other side of the aisle, Representative Schlickman, talking about my constituents, the Chicago Cubs and the Chicago Cubs...seeing the Chicago Cubs moving their way onto a division championship... These are my constituents many of the ball players live in my building, Gene, I'd like to know if the cigarettes you're smoking have a label on them?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bianco."

Bianco: "I rise on a point of personal satisfaction, Mr. Speaker. I... Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would just like to say something. I'd like to do a little bit of Larry DiPrima, my very good



friend. In the next Session when I have a Bill I just want to say that you better pass it because if you don't you're all going to have your legs broken. But seriously, I would like to say to everybody in here that I came into the House here about 6 months ago...or 6 weeks ago and under very unusual circumstances and I want to thank everybody here for all their help and the advisory capacity that everybody has been advising us and helping us, my seatmate here, Representative Margalus and myself, in getting through all the business of the House here. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedland. Matula, I guess. Representative Matula, are you seeking recognition?"

Matula: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. On a point of personal privilege. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Mr. Speaker, I want to state that I had come to this House as a replacement for a Gentleman that has sat with you people for a number of years, the late Joe Sevcik. (unintelligible). I was given the privilege of replacing Mr. Sevcik. I would like to state at time time, I appreciate very much all the help that each and every one of you have bestowed upon me. And I will never forget being a Member of this House. I did hope to fulfill my duties as a Legislator from my district and for the great State of Illinois. And at this time, again I wish to say thank you and I wish you to all have a very, very nice holiday and a nice summer. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "We have a lost Tab. A lost Tab. A Page has got a can of Tab and he doesn't...he can't find the Member who sent him. It's Elmer Conti's grandson. Who asked this young man to get him a Coke? You think it's Ryan? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in the order of fairness and justice and all that's right and good, I move that



we go to the Order of Constitutional Amendments, Second Reading. House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #44. Is that okay with you?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "I will agree to that motion if you will entertain a motion to table Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment 44. That calls for the prohibition of state mandated programs back to units of local government."

Schlickman: "I'll go for that."

Yourell: "All right, let's go."

Schlickman: "Then we join. Okay. The House has spoken, Mr. Speaker, Bus Yourell and Gene Schlickman."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "I conclude, Mr. Speaker, that we're back on the order of silliness. Is..."

Speaker Redmond: "Not yet. Right at the moment we're trying to find out who asked this young gentleman to get him a Coke. Now, if can't make that decision God help the people of Illinois. There he is, Representative Ebbesen, the fella back there. He has Joseph's pants on today. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I persist in my motion and I am pleased to be joined by Represen...the Gentleman from Cook from the other side of the aisle and I think that we ought to get to that order of business. And everything is in order about it, Mr. Speaker and I'm supported by the Gentleman from Schaumburg. Mr. Clerk, read House Joint Resolution C.A. 44, please."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Katz."

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, if you are in fact going to that order of business, I have a parliamentary inquiry. I'm waiting till you make a decision as to whether to go to that order, but I have some serious parliamentary questions to raise."



Speaker Redmond: "I didn't intend to go to that order of business. The hour of 10:15 having arrived and Supplemental Calendar #5, together with the Conference Committee Reports having been on the Members desk for an hour... Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, I posed a legitimate motion and that was that we go to the Order of Constitutional Amendments, Second Reading, HJRCA 44."

Speaker Redmond: "We weren't even in Session at that. We were at ease, Representative Schlickman. Representative Kempiners is recognized on House Bill 3394. Senate Bill 736. Representative Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, House Bill 736 exempts the manufacturer of machinery equipment from sales tax. I would ask that we concur with the Conference Committee. The changes in the Bill are as follows, the Conference Committee leaves in the phase in part that will be the same as Amendment #5. From there there will be a feature allowing local governments to opt out. They will be automatically in but they can opt out. This Bill also eliminates the rebate provision and makes it a true exemption. And 5, the user of such exempted machinery or equipment must furnish the Department of Revenue a Certificate of Exemption. I would ask that we would concur with the Confirmation Report. Thank you."

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

Schlickman: "Would the Gentleman who is posing the motion to concur or to adopt the Conference Committee Report yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "Specifically, what does the Conference Committee recommend that differs with the Bill as we originally



passed it?"

Capparelli: "Well originally...originally it was a rebate and now it's a true exemption. It would rebate over a six-year period and now it's a true exemption you write it off right in the beginning."

Schlickman: "If I can ask another question, when will this Bill go into effect if approved?"

Capparelli: "January of this year."

Schlickman: "January of 1979? And what will be the loss to the General Revenue Fund of this State for the next full fiscal year? What will be the loss to the General Revenue Fund for the next full fiscal year? Fiscal year 1979."

Capparelli: "Fiscal year 1979 it would be 19 million."

Schlickman: "And how about 1980?"

Capparelli: "40 million."

Schlickman: "And 1981?"

Capparelli: "63 million."

Schlickman: "And 1982?"

Capparelli: "108 million."

Schlickman: "108 million dollars in one fiscal year? Mr. Speaker, may I address the Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we have here a Bill that in the first fiscal year, total fiscal year would result in a loss to the General Revenue Fund in the amount of 40 million dollars. In the next fiscal year 81, 63 million dollars. Is that correct? The next fiscal year 108 million dollars, the next fiscal year 150 million dollars, the next fiscal year 182 million dollars. Is that correct?"

Capparelli: "The first year was 19 million and you said 30 million."

Schlickman: "No, I said Fiscal Year '80 would be 40 million dollars."



Capparelli: "That's right."

Schlickman: "Fiscal Year '79 is only for 6 months. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I don't know how, quite frankly and I don't mean to be self-righteous, but I don't know how any Member in this House, with all of the needs that the state has, could vote for a Bill that in its first full year of implementation would result in a reduction in General Revenue Funds of 40 million dollars, in the next year 63 million dollars, in the next year 108 million dollars, in the next fiscal year 150 million dollars and in the next year 182 million dollars. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, each of us, each of us, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, have got to balance our own budget. We do that as individuals and as we sit here in this chamber we've got to balance a budget. Now, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, how could we vote for money to increase the appropriation for text books, public and non-public. How can we vote for money to fund a new agency for the mentally ill? How can we vote for money to fund a new agency for affirmative action? How can we, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, vote for a new formula for state aid to public schools? And how can we do all of this, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, without on one hand either increasing taxes or on the other hand giving relief to a particular area. It is nonsensical, it defies rationalization. Mr. Speaker, we can ill-afford giving this kind of relief, reduction to a very special interest. And I might suggest to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the area in which we are giving tax relief by Senate Bill 736 are not the homeowners, are not the Senior Citizens, are not the middle income people but in the main are companies outside of the State of Illinois. I



respectfully suggest to you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this is probably the most irresponsible fiscally unsound, the least well thought out to come to us in this 80th General Assembly and I urge you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, to vote 'no' on the adoption of this Conference Committee Report. Please vote 'no' if you want to do all the other things that you've committed yourself to."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I wish that we could have some attention for this Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes, could we have some attention, please? Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is the Business Tax Relief Program which we have been talking about in this House all through this Session. This is the sales tax rebate, which has been touted as the way to bring new business and industry into this state and to keep our business here at home. I think there's a few things though that you ought to know about this Bill as it presently stands. First and foremost the Governor had asked for a rebate instead of an exemption. By that I mean that you would pay the tax at the point of purchase and you would get it back upon application to the state. The business community has fought this provision with everything at their disposal. They want the money taken off at the point of purchase. Now there's one very important point here, Representative Schlickman talked about what it's going to cost us. Well with the rebate provision we do have control over cash flow. With the sales tax coming off at the point of sale the state loses that. The state also loses the method to determine how much this is really costing us. That's



the big important change in this Conference Committee Report. The other change, which I think is worthy to mention, that repair and replacement parts are not included in this Conference Committee Report. I think that's good. The sales tax exemption in this report is only for capital items and let's face it capital items are what create new jobs and put people to work in this state. I think that we should remember when considering this Bill much of what Representative Schlickman said. The costs are high and in a year or so when the till goes dry I'm sure that we're going to look to business and industry to make up a big part of the new revenues that we're going to need in this state. And then the cry's going to go up that we're running business and industry out of this state. Keep these things in mind. If you don't like this report, if you don't want to spend the kind of money that it calls for, if you want the state to have some control over this money, vote 'no' and send it back for a second Conference Committee Report. Maybe business and industry will get the message."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, it's strange that, you know, many of the people that have supported House Bill 3168, which has been passed and is on the Governor's desk, which is similar to Senate Bill 736, has a higher fiscal impact. Now I don't know where the Governor's people got their figures but to me that's just is still a tokenism to our manufacturers of the State of Illinois and our employers. That this has a six-year grade and rather than the four that House Bill 3168 had. It does control the tax exemption since they do have to file for it. It is an indication to industry that we want you in the State of Illinois. There are 36 states that have this type of an exemption and are we



to turn back our faces on the people who supply the jobs in the State of Illinois? Are we going to say to industries that want to come into the state that we are not a favorable state, to go out to the sun belt? Do we have to ignore one of the largest contributors of tax revenue in the State of Illinois by voting 'no' on this Bill? We have to appreciate the fact that this will attract business in the State of Illinois. That it will make us more competitive and it is over a six-year period. And let's not forget that Governor Thompson said that he has 19... 20 million dollars, he has 20 million dollars in his budget for this type of legislation. So let's support the Amendment. It's... I would prefer to have House Bill 3168 because it is more comprehensive. But there have been concessions made on this, there is a six-year grade-in, there is a control factor and certainly I believe it would attract industry and manufacturers to do business in the State of Illinois and create a better job climate which will in turn...which will in turn increase our tax base and I'm sure that the money will be coming back ten fold."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I do want to point out, Mr. Speaker, the difficulty with our rules on this one hour situation. Senate Bill 726, the first Conference Committee Report, is a 23-page Conference Committee Report that was distributed at the time we took up this particular issue. There are some significant changes in this Bill, as the previous speakers have brought out. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we use the time of the distribution of the Conference Committee, even though the rule is vague, rather than the



distribution of the Calendar for deliberations on matters this evening. I think there's a number of significant changes in this Bill that are hard to digest in five minutes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Mugalian."

Mugalian: "Mr. Speaker, you all know how I feel about this. I've made two or three speeches on this Bill. I just want to say that this may be your last opportunity for salvation of your political soul. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipword."

Tipword: "Mr. Speaker, I just have a couple of questions, if I might."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed."

Tipword: "Representative Capparelli, I've been trying to listen to the explanations that you've been giving here and I just wanted to know if I now understand it correctly. This no longer...this does not apply to replacement or repair machinery, is that correct?"

Capparelli: "It applies only to new equipment. Well, for replacement of machinery but not to pay for parts."

Tipword: "Okay, no repairs or parts but it applies to replacement machinery, it applies to new machinery for expansion or used machinery for expansion or for a new industry that comes into the state?"

Capparelli: "It covers that, yes."

Tipword: "And in addition now, there's now certificate of exemption from the seller instead of having to apply for a rebate?"

Capparelli: "He will no longer have to apply for a rebate, no."

Tipword: "It's a certificate just given from the seller of the machinery who files it then with the State of Illinois... There is a certificate of exemption from the seller?"



Capparelli: "Right, there is a certificate to the seller, right."

Tipsword: "So that it will no longer be as costly to keep the records and make rebates as it had been under the Bill as it previously came here?"

Capparelli: "It's a lot easier and it will be cheaper, yes."

Tipsword: "Thank you, I appreciate that very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ebbesen."

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

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries. Representative Capparelli, to close."

Capparelli: "Mr. Speaker, this is a good compromise. All ten Representatives and Senators signed this Conference Committee Report and I would ask for a 'yes' vote on this. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House adopt the first Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 736. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 111 'aye' and 31 'no' and the House does adopt House...the first Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 736. Representative Edgar. Representative Edgar votes 'aye', Representative Reilly desires to vote 'aye'. Representative Huskey 'aye'.... Representative Huskey 'aye', Representative Porter 'aye'. Representative Mann, 'no'. On the Order of Conference Committee Reports, Supplemental Calendar #5. House Bill 2987. Representative Jones. J. David Jones. Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "I'd like to have my vote changed to 'aye' on 736."



Speaker Redmond: "The Lady asks leave to have her vote recorded as 'aye' on 736. Is there any objection? Hearing none it will be so recorded. Representative Jones."

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2987 was the...was the appropriation for the State Historical Library, but amended into that was the appropriation for the Department of Administrative Services. And we have the Conference Committee Report, which I recommend that we adopt that addresses some changes in the...in the Department of Administrative Services' budget. The report has been signed by all 10 Members and I move its adoption. If there are any questions in regard to the Administrative Services, defer to Representative Winchester for the reply."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the... Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, would Representative Winchester yield for some questions?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Winchester."

Totten: "Representative Jones has indicated there were some changes made in the Conference Committee Report in regard to the Department of Administrative Services, what are they?"

Winchester: "Well, as you recall, Representative Totten, the Senate cut 1 million 497 thousand dollars. In the Conference Committee we added only 103 thousand 700 dollars. I.I.S. was cut 59 thousand 500, the Office of Fiscal Management received 12 thousand 600 dollars. Procurement got 28 thousand 700 dollars of General Revenue. The O.M.I.C. got 22 thousand 800 out of General Revenue and we got 23 thousand 652 dollars back for Property Management. All total that's 103 thousand 700 dollars. As well as 100 thousand dollars



for the Geneva Youth Center."

Totten: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? Representative Darrow."

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

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Darrow: "Representative Winchester, in this report you're adding 42 thousand to the Illinois Information Service, is that correct?"

Winchester: "Well, we're not adding, if I recall we were originally cut 104 thousand dollars. The Conference Committee ended up giving us 45 thousand, 400...somewhere, 42 to 45 thousand. We're now being cut 59 thousand 500 dollars."

Darrow: "What areas are being cut?"

Winchester: "Pardon me."

Darrow: "What areas are being cut?"

Winchester: "All new positions are being cut."

Darrow: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Would the Gentleman tell us if we'll still be getting our press summaries? Did the Democrats leave us enough money for the clippers and pasters and printers or are we..."

Winchester: "I understand that we will, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Oh, Alleluia. Thank you."

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

Winchester: "I just move that we adopt the first Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2987."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion that we do adopt the first Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2987. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative, I think you're right.

Mr. Clerk, is this House Bill or Senate Bill? House Bill.



Representative Steczo desires to be recorded as 'aye'. Yeah, but he's standing over there. Representative... Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 134 'aye' and 13 'no' and the House does adopt the first Conference Committee Report to House Bill 2987. One minute. Senate Bill 1555. Representative McClain. Senate Bill 1555."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1555, I would move to concur on our action. What we did is...basically the Bill's in the same shape as when it came...when it left the House. In other words, the Illinois State Scholarship Commission has its accelerated awards like we intended for it in the House. The Illinois State Scholarship Commission is not under the jurisdiction of the Board of Higher Education. What we did do is, if you'll recall one of the main controversies was Mr. Boyd, who's the Executive Director of the Illinois State Scholarship Commission, has just been increased... his salary to 52 thousand dollars. What we did is we line itemed into this substantive Bill so that it would be a range of 44 thousand to 47 thousand, which was agreed to by all parties. You'll see that nine of the ten people signed the Conference Committee Report. Mr. Edgar was not on the floor when we were looking for signatures but he concurs also and I would move to concur with Senate Bill 1555."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Gentleman yield? What are the arguments for and against having the State Scholarship Commission under the Board of Higher Education?"

McClain: "Well first of all this Bill specifically says it's not under the jurisdiction of..."

Schlickman: "I understand that. The Senate Amendment placed it under the jurisdiction of the Board of Higher Education,



is that correct?"

McClain: "It did but we removed that."

Schlickman: "Well, I..."

McClain: "Let me give you an answer."

Schlickman: "I'd like to know what are the arguments for and against are. I think it's very important and critical."

McClain: "Well for, the argument would have been that the Illinois State Scholarship Commission basically hangs out there on the limb. It's not reportable by statutes to anyone. It has by tradition reported its funding and its actions to the Board of Higher Education with no statutory authority. So those people that believe that there ought to be one cohesive movement on the part of Higher Education they believe that the Board of Higher Education ought to have the jurisdiction of the Illinois State Scholarship Commission. Okay? And that would be the one side. The other side of the issue, which is my position, is that the Illinois State Scholarship Commission ought to be independent of the Board of Higher Education. It has been in the past, should be in the future. By tradition it offers its budget and its activities to the Board of Higher Education. My fear is that right now the private schools get 40 percent of the actual awards but 60 percent of the money of the Illinois State Scholarship Commission. Whereas the public schools get 60 percent of the awards and 40 percent of the money. I fear that if the entire jurisdiction of the I.S.S.C. was under the authority of the Board of Higher Education soon that whole concept would be reversed. So my concept was that it ought to continue like it has been in the past."

Schlickman: "I'm sorry, I heard your argument...I heard you restate the argument for placing it under the Board of Higher Education but I didn't hear your argument



against as you restated it. Do I understand you to say that you feel that if it's under the Board of Higher Education it would be public institution oriented vs non public school orientation?"

McClain: "No, public school oriented totally with private getting the short end of the stick, in other words not even having a fair shot. The Board of Higher Education would have 17 members. As you know, there are a couple alumni from privates on that board and the President of the Illinois Federation of Independent Colleges is on that board but other than that it would be a...basically a vote of 14 to 3."

Schlickman: "Okay, well let me ask you one other question. If I was for or if any Member of this House was for a diversity in Higher Education, which way would I go?"

McClain: "With me, Gene."

Schlickman: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Edgar."

Edgar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to just correct something the Sponsor said. Maybe he misunderstood me, I said I agreed...I could support the Bill in its original form. I do not support increasing the Scholarship Commission Executive Director to 47 thousand dollars. Though this ranges from 44 to 47 we all know they're going to set it at 47 thousand dollars. I think that's too much money to pay the head of the Scholarship Commission. That's more than we pay most of the Directors of State Government of a lot more important agencies. When this Bill passed out of the House this salary was at 37 thousand dollars a year, which I think is a more realistic figure. So I would like to have my position on this stand corrected."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House do adopt Senate Amendment...or the



Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1555. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 102 'aye', 44 'no' and the House does adopt the first Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1555. Supplemental Calendar #6. Representative Houlihan, for what purpose do you rise?"

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, this lovely young lady here who's a Page today is distributing Supplemental Calendar #7, earmarked...or postdated or time dated 10:20. Is that an error in the clock or an error in the lady or an error in your office or am I wrong?"

Speaker Redmond: "What's the question?"

Houlihan: "Well, I believe that it's a quarter till 11:00."

Speaker Redmond: "Well I don't know, I'm not in the printing room. All I know is that this is dated 10:20 and it's been distributed."

Houlihan: "Well you and I are together in the fact that we both know that this is dated at 10:20. The time is a quarter till 11:00 and that it's just being distributed now."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, I follow you. Let me check some rules here and I'll call on Representative Kozubowski on 3392. There's no question on that one. 3392. Supplemental 6."

Kozubowski: "Has the report been read, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well I don't know, the Calendar shows that 9:25 was the time..."

Kozubowski: "What I'm asking, Mr. Speaker, has the Clerk read the Bill?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well this is a Conference Committee Report, you just proceed with your motion."

Kozubowski: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House do concur



in Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3392. This is the Bill that started out as the appropriation for awards made by the Court of Claims, through and including June 26, 1978. Since that time we have included numerous commissions which were killed in the Senate in the argument over the Omnibus Bill. This Bill now totals some 47 million, 875 thousand, 681 dollars. And I would move that the House do concur in Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would call the attention of the Membership to the desegregation money, which I believe is in one of the Section... And I would ask..."

Kozubowski: "Section 83, Representative."

Schneider: "Thank you, Representative Kozubowski. The amount is 12 million dollars and I have no problems, I think... I have no problems, I do believe, with that concept. And I think I've talked with Mr. Barnes, Eugene Barnes, the Chairman of Appropriations, off and on over the last two or three days about that concept. I have real problems, however, with the figure. When we are at 12 million dollars for an appropriation for desegregation that I don't believe there is any substantive legislation for implementation, I have some questions. Even if the Armstrong Act, which I think Gene would argue would allow for the allocation of that 12 million dollars as implemented...I do think, however, that there are some questions that I would raise regarding a number of reasons. One question I would have is how much of that 12 million goes for school districts that have not complied since 1964 with desegregation? I would raise questions about those districts that have complied and if they are or are not being penalized. And I would further ask if we



can really afford 12 million dollars. My suggestion was to Gene at that time, a couple of days ago, that I would be agreeable to 2 million or 3 million dollars as part of the role that the state would play in dealing with desegregation. I don't think Section 82 on page 15 resolves any of those questions. I'm not even clear as to where that money comes from. If it's General Revenue money remember we have just attempted to pass a school aid formula that went out of this House at 174 to 1. And most of people felt it was fair. If that was fair, 12 million dollars out of GRF, which may very well be interpreted as school earmarked money, this certainly creates some problems with that formula. Secondly, we let 2632, the categorical escape without designating by line item that particular problem of desegregation. Again, I have no problems with 2 or 3 million dollars. I have problems with 12 million and I would ask that Section 82, at least from that one Section at least, is not a fair concept, is not the kind of concept that I think we should play in this proposal and I would oppose this concurrence at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Gentleman order.

Bluthardt. Representative Kozubowski..."

Kozubowski: "If I may answer the Gentleman's question."

Speaker Redmond: "Proceed. I didn't interpret that as a question but..."

Kozubowski: "Representative Schneider, I certainly appreciate your concern for this Section of House Bill 3392. And I think it's only unfortunate that Representative Barnes is not on the floor at this time because this award...this appropriation... He's not in his chair...I didn't see him in his chair, I'm sorry... Because this appropriation for 12 million dollars for the desegregation is taken exactly from the wording



that appeared in Representative Barnes' Bill and the figure, I believe, is his. So I wish you would defer your question to Representative Barnes."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Gene, are you here somewhere? Emil Jones is up, I understand and..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes..."

Schneider: "...I'm curious as to how the money, which is 12 million, is going to be distributed. I'm curious as to the authority for that and the authority of the Armstrong Act. I'd like a reading of that and how that affects the rest of the State of Illinois. And I know he has a serious concern about it but I think it's excessive."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I really couldn't answer the question because I just came back from the Senate so I came in when all of this was going on so I don't really know what the question was. I came in on the end of what Representative Schneider was indicating. I'm not sure, Glen, I think what I heard you say when I came in was, what was it related to? Is that...was that the question?"

Speaker Redmond: "Repeat the question, Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "The question is, Gene, how do you plan to allocate the money and according to which appropriate language in the statutes? Why 12 million when you and I have talked about 2 and 3 million? And I know that's informally. Where in the world is that money going to go? I have a feeling that a lot of us who share your consideration for desegregation who have watched that concept work its way through the fabric of our culture, have really wondered why we would reward with 12 million bucks those districts that have been delinquent and not reward those districts



that have done so much toward integration as we understand it, or at least as I understand it, for our society. I'm very dead set against rewarding...rewarding delinquent districts."

Gene Barnes: "Well the last question first. The whole idea and the whole concept related to, as you know, that part of the Section that sets out the Armstrong Act. The reason for the...the figure of 12 million is 3 million less than what was requested by our IOE in its original budget as it relates to the subject matter. It would be my thought, and I can't tell you how the money will be allocated because I'm just not privileged to that procedure that would be set out. But as I understand the Act, the Act relates to the state as a whole. I...in essence can agree with the gist of what you are saying but it is...it is my intention and it is the intention that is put forth here in this part of this particular piece of legislation to insure that there is sufficient monies for the Office of Education to... in fact, under their procedure to allow a granting process that will not reward any particular school districts but to help those school districts that have yet, as you have indicated, implemented these programs. and those that are wrestling with that concept now to implement the plans, so that those dollars...those sorely needed dollars that they have used for...what they had to take from other purposes, could be reimbursed to those school districts so that they would not have a short fall."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bluthardt. Pardon me, Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the Bill then, with that kind of generality and that kind of...that kind of..."



Speaker Redmond: "Please give the Gentleman order."

Schneider: "That kind of nebulous response, which I know again that Gene would like to be more precise on, I think it's really...reluctantly that I have to oppose that. I know there's a lot of grease around in the last day of the Session and maybe this proposal is ready to roll and slide out of here but I think we ought to be serious about looking at a couple of facts. One is that these funds are not designated for various districts. We have federal money, which was used for planning purposes. The Illinois Office of Education has once again done that job on us, and that is, has been reluctant about identifying sources of information in terms of how those 12 million dollars will be spent, whether it be on transportation, administration or educational programs, workshops or whatever. This is way too general. I don't think I want to place in the hands of the Illinois Office of Education 12 million dollars to use as they see fit, given their ability and their general response to political pressure, I ask for a...very reluctantly, however, a motion to object to and ask for a 'no' vote on this first Conference Committee recommendation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Bluthardt."

Bluthardt: "Well thank you, I've almost forgotten the question although I think part of it's been already answered. I would appreciate some order because we're talking about an appropriation of 12 million dollars for a desegregation program. I take it, Gene Barnes, I think you can answer it, that where the Section for the appropriation of 12 million dollars for a desegregation program refers to Section 1021.3 of the School Code, that's the Armstrong Act, is that right?"

Barnes: "That's correct."

Bluthardt: "That's the one that mandates some affirmative action



for desegregation by the schools."

Barnes: "That's correct."

Bluthardt: "Any you've just taken the lump sum of 12 million dollars and said that ought to do it?"

Barnes: "No, we didn't just take a lump...."

Bluthardt: "Well how did you arrive at the figure of 12 million dollars?"

Barnes: "We did not just take a lump sum, the Office of Education originally requested 15 million dollars for this purpose. And in looking at the other recommendations from the Office of Education in its original budget and looking at the general reductions that have been made in various lines, this corresponded with those reductions. To give you an example, Special Ed., it was reduced 2 million plus, generally around 3 million. Transportation, Pupil Transportation was reduced a like amount. The request for overall between upstate and downstate, because it's split, the request for bilingual education was increased proportionately right around the same amount. So when I went in and sat down with this figure, it seemed to me the fair thing to do. If we were going to make this request, would make a request at a figure that it seemed to have been generally...generally accepted in the budget that has been put forth that was embodied in 2632."

Bluthardt: "How much was appropriated for this purpose last fiscal year?"

Barnes: "Nothing."

Bluthardt: "So you're going from zip to 12 million dollars? Was there a recommendation in the Governor's budget? Was there a recommendation for any expenditure or any appropriation for this purpose?"

Barnes: "Yes, 15 million."

Bluthardt: "15 million?"

Barnes: "Yes."



Bluthardt: "Not the Governor's budget? The Office of Education, that's not the Governor's budget."

Barnes: "It was the Office of Education and...and...and contact with the Governor's Office. Representative Gaines, who is on your side, had the enabling legislation that came out of the Governor's Office to implement that 15 million dollar request that the Governor supported for this purpose."

Bluthardt: "The Governor's Office only takes whatever the recommendation is and puts it in their budget, is that what you're saying? And that was 15 million dollars?"

Barnes: "No. I'm saying that the 15 million dollars in question was a figure that was determined, as I understand, by the Office of Education in consultation with the Governor's Office and others that have concerns in this area. From that, from that a 15 million dollar item was inserted in the request that came to the General Assembly. In incorporation with that from the Governor's Office came substantive legislation embodied in a House Bill, and I forget the number, that Representative Gaines had this Session."

Bluthardt: "In other words, you're saying that the Governor is recommending that the State of Illinois expend 15 million dollars this next fiscal year, this coming fiscal year, on a desegregation program for the schools?"

Barnes: "Representative, I can't say what the Governor is..."

Bluthardt: "You said it was the Governor's budget and that he recommended it."

Barnes: "I can say it was in the budget that was presented to us and along with that was a piece of legislation that came out of the Governor's Office to implement it."

Bluthardt: "For 15 million dollars?"

Barnes: "That's correct."

Bluthardt: "So he's recommending this?"



Barnes: "Well, that's for you to decide."

Bluthardt: "Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor, Representative Kozubowski, yield to a question?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Stuffle: "Given the fact that the City of Chicago is in a situation, I understand, where they now have a program where they voluntarily propose some ideas about desegregation in where the state, through the State Board of Education, has proposed that they may well indeed be forced to do some things there, would it be possible and is the intention to use any of this money for bussing purposes?"

Barnes: "First...I'm sorry, because someone else was talking to me."

Stuffle: "I asked Representative Kozubowski about that question."

Kozubowski: "It's very possible that this would be the case."

Stuffle: "Well I would like to speak to the Bill then. I would be willing to support a moderate amount of money for desegregation purposes. However, I do not believe, as an individual, in the concept of forced bussing. As well, I would point out that the mandate in this particular piece of legislation, to spend 12 million dollars which I think is excessive, for any type of desegregation program, the reference in this Bill is to 10-21.3 of the School Code, the Armstrong Act, which refers to setting up units of attendance centers or revising them. That was passed in 1963. In 1973 Governor Walker signed into law Senate Bill 48, which specifically says that the State Board of Education shall not mandate any bussing program at all or require any bussing program



at all and I suggest to you that whether you support desegregation, which I do but do not support forced bussing, that there is no mandate for using any of this money statutorily for the purpose of bussing. That the purpose of the appropriation is indeed potentially for that purpose, that it is too high. Representative Gaines indeed realized that when he initiated his Bill, which we defeated in the Education Committee overwhelmingly. And this Bill ought to be rejected for those reasons."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Emil Jones."

Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I wanted to ask the previous speaker a question because I have become rather confused when individuals talk about bussing or transportation. Now I happen to sit on the Appropriations Committee and I know we appropriated millions of dollars for transportation of students. And these students are forcibly bussed to the various schools throughout the State of Illinois. But I see nothing in this legislation that deals with forced bussing. So let's not use a play on words. The State of Illinois spends millions of dollars to bus students to the schools throughout this state. And I see no difference between bussing, as some children as some on the other side or downstate may call it, pupil transportation. It is all the same but there is nothing in this legislation that deals with bussing. All this legislation deals with is the implementation of the School Code. I see nothing in here concerning bussing so let's not play on that word. Why don't we call it pupil transportation."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker... Mr. Speaker, Representative Stuffle asked Representative Kozubowski a question a



few minutes ago and Representative Kozubowski sort of mumbled an answer and I didn't understand what he said. He asked if any of this money could be used for bussing in the City of Chicago and I'd like to get an answer from the Sponsor."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kozubowski."

Kozubowski: "Mr. Speaker, if I mumbled the answer to Representative McAuliffe I'm certainly sorry. There's some problems with my microphone. I answered that I thought some of this money could be used for bussing."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gaines."

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, since my name has been referred to by several Members of the House I feel that I have to set several Members straight. Number one, the distinguished Chairman of the Education Committee, on which I serve, is well aware of what this money is going to be used for. It was discussed in two terms by IOE representatives and Mr. Stuffle knows that it was not buried, that the Chairman held it until almost everybody was gone and it was two votes short of passing. So I want to get those two things straight. And there's no hidden bussing Amendment in this appropriation. I talked with IOE both before, during and after the hearings on my Bill. And these funds are to be used all over this state. They're to give technical assistance to those who have, are or thinking about desegregating their school systems. There is going to be no penalty for anyone because they have, have not or are in the process of desegregating. Now if anybody wants to ask any further questions about it I'd be glad to answer them."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Yes, will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Walter, getting on to a different area, would you turn



to page 6 of this Amendment and go to the Commission on Water Resources. The entire budget for the Commission on Water Resources is 75 thousand dollars, the personal services are 18 thousand, the travel expenses are 38 thousand dollars, more than half the budget. Why do they need 38 thousand dollars for travel when personal services are only 18 thousand dollars on this particular commission, where are they going to?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kozubowski."

Kozubowski: "Representative Jaffe, I've been advised by staff that this is probably a typographical error but if Representative Jack Williams is on the floor I'm sure he'd be able to clarify it because this is his commission."

Jaffe: "Well before he responds to that there's another commission I wanted to ask about, that's the Commission on Economic Development."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kozubowski. Please be in order."

Kozubowski: "Could we have some order, I can't hear the Gentleman."

Speaker Redmond: "Please be in order."

Jaffe: "Walter, on that particular commission, as I indicated, half of the money is 38 thousand dollars and it's for travel solely and the figures add up, I mean that's actually half the money. But you go down to the Commission on Economic Development, their total budget is 146 thousand dollars and yet their travel expenses are 49 thousand dollars. One third of their budget is for travel. Where are they going to? I wish you'd respond on both of these particular Commissions."

Kozubowski: "Well on the last commission you mentioned, Representative Tipword is on the floor, that's his



commission and I direct you to him."

Jaffe: "Okay, I'd like to hear from...on the Commission on Water Resources and the Commission on Economic Development."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Tipword."

Tipword: "I'm advised there's an increase in the travel item in that budget for the reason that about a third of this budget is to be devoted to a comprehensive study of all of the ports, the river ports and lake ports of the State of Illinois, which is going to require some travelling, considerable travelling back and forth to all of those various areas on more than one occasion to try to bring back to the General Assembly a comprehensive review of all of those ports, both river, barge ports and the lake ports, as to how they fit together if they do or if they do not. What they are accomplishing in the areas in which...where they exist and what, if anything, can be done to improve them or to see that...bring them into a situation where they can work together. So about a third of that, at least, and I don't know how much for the travel budget but about a third of the total budget is going into that one major project."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deavers. What's the matter, Representative Jaffe, I'd recognized you before."

Jaffe: "I'm asking some questions and you turned me off."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Jaffe, finish your question."

Jaffe: "Tip, do I understand that then you're saying that one-third of the budget, 49 thousand dollars is for travel in Illinois only?"

Speaker Redmond: "The House will be at ease until we're a little bit more quiet. It's absolutely impossible to hear anything. Members, be in your seats. All unauthorized persons leave the floor. Doorkeepers, please



enforce that order, will you? All unauthorized persons leave the floor."

Jaffe: "Tip, do I understand you to say though that more than a third of this particular budget is for 49 thousand dollars for travel in Illinois only?"

Tipsword: "No Sir, I'm telling you that a third of that budget is for the project that I was just describing to you and a great portion of that travel item is in that, not all of it."

Jaffe: "How much of that is actually travel, because see I really..."

Tipsword: "I don't have those specific figures here to provide for you. Now, I think that Representative Williams..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Capparelli and Laurino and... Please, be quiet."

Tipsword: "This commission has had a travel budget in each of its years and it has travelled to other states from time to time meeting with their...what would be their comparable Economic Development Commission on various occasions or attending various economic trade conferences throughout this country. There is no travel so far as I am aware in here that is outside the country. Now there was a trip made by this commission...there have been two trips made by this commission under the...under the name of this commission outside of this country. Only one of which there were any members of the commission that participated or legislative members of the commission participated and that was a trip to...for the establishment of the Illinois Office in Sao Paulo, Brazil. The other trip that was made outside of the country was not even paid for by the commission, it was paid for by public subscriptions throughout the state and no legislative members went on it and that



was the investigatory trip for the establishment for the Illinois Trades Commission Office which was eventually established in Hong Kong for the Far East area. But none of this travel budget, I do know, none of it is scheduled for any travel outside of the United States nor outside the continental limits for that matter..."

Jaffe: "No, I didn't say that, all I'm saying to you is that you have more money for travel in that particular budget than you do for personal services. And to me that seems a little bit outlandish."

Tipsword: "I regret that I don't have that total budget here for you but it came in originally..."

Jaffe: "Well I'm looking at the budget now, there's 38 thousand for personal services, for travel 49 thousand dollars."

Tipsword: "You're absolutely right but what I'm trying to tell you is that came in in two different budgets and they have been put together here. It first came in as a budget for the commission and then there was the additional budget came in for the port development study for the State of Illinois. And it's now been amalgamated here so I can't tell you any more but you wanted to know what the budget was about and only generally can I tell you."

Jaffe: "Okay, I don't think I'm getting any response really because of the fact of your not being able to tell me. Now, can Representative Williams tell me, on the Commission on Water Resources why we have 38 thousand dollars for travel when our personal services on that commission is only 18 thousand dollars and the total budget is only 75 thousand dollars? So we're having more than half that budget go toward travel on that particular commission."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Williams. Can you respond to



Representative Jaffe's questions?"

Williams: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That item is in there. Actually, the Water Resources Commission is the only really statewide Commission that does actually deal in all areas of the state with any problem. Now we have gone in any area, I'm sure, that most Legislators on the floor have seen our Commission in their district. And the other main thing...that travel is in there is if you recall we are working very closely with the Attorney General's Office and with the Division of Water Resources and we have met actually with the sister states, actually that's the seven states because any problem dealing with an allocation from Lake Michigan, actually by the 'Mehra's' 1967 decision has to have the ratification of the sister state. We also have to touch base, actually, with the dominion of Canada. And so that item is in there and we are very close to getting this thing ratified right now so that's why that travel is in there."

Speaker Redmond: "For what purpose do you rise, Representative Simms?"

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, under Supplemental Calendar #7..."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you addressing 3392?"

Simms: "I am addressing a serious infraction of the rules..."

Speaker Redmond: "The matter before this House is 3392.

We will get back to you in due course... We'll be back to you when we get through with 3392. Representative Gene Barnes. Representative Gene Barnes, do you seek recognition? Representative Madison... I'll be back to you but it's impertinent to have brought it in when we're on this order of business. Representative Gene Barnes. Representative Gene Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, if I could have just a little order."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Gene Barnes. Please, give the Gentleman order."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I want to draw your attention, Members of the House, to some questioning earlier on this piece of legislation. I want to draw your attention to the... that page of the Amendment that you have before you, which is page 15, Section 82. And I want to direct your attention to that language in that Section that deals with Section 10-21-3... Mr. Speaker... Well Mr. Speaker, thank you. I want to say to the Members of this House so that they fully understand that Section that I...that I related that language to. That Section was written in 1963. What is commonly known as the Armstrong Act. In the Armstrong Act and I have it here before me, in the Armstrong Act it says specifically that those funds...the purpose of this Act is to establish within the districts as soon as possible, time thereby for the board to change or revise any existing units or create new units which takes in consideration the prevention of segregation and eliminates segregation of schools by ethnic origin. Nothing, I want you to listen very closely because that question was raised, no money appropriated for this Section can be spent on pupil transportation, not one red cent can be spent for bussing. It's right here in the Act if you wish to read it. No money, no money in this request has anything whatsoever to do with bussing."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "This Bill, as it was passed by the House as amended, was an appropriation to the Court of Claims. Is that correct?"



Kozubowski: "That's correct."

Schlickman: "And the total amount of the appropriations to the Court of Claims was 2 million, 845 thousand, 148 dollars, is that correct?"

Kozubowski: "That's correct."

Schlickman: "Now the Bill went to the Senate and it came back to the Senate still as a Court of Claims Bill. Is that correct?"

Kozubowski: "That's correct."

Schlickman: "And you ask us to nonconcur with the Senate Amendment. Is that correct?"

Kozubowski: "That's correct."

Schlickman: "And you asked us to nonconcur on the basis that you wanted, on behalf of yourself as the House Sponsor and on behalf of the Senate Sponsor and particularly on behalf of the Court of Claims, to update the Bill with respect to claims. Is that correct?"

Kozubowski: "That's correct."

Schlickman: "Okay, now we have a Bill here that we lost control of, apparently, and it goes far beyond Court of Claims. Is that correct?"

Kozubowski: "That's correct."

Schlickman: "Now, after the Bill left us in the amount of 2 million 845 thousand, 148 dollars, what is the total amount of the appropriation in this Bill as it's now being presented to us on your motion for concurrence with this Conference Committee Report?"

Kozubowski: "Well, Representative Schlickman, if you had been listening, in my opening remarks you would have heard me say that the now is worth 47 million, 875 thousand, 681 dollars."

Schlickman: "Did you say 47 million?"

Kozubowski: "That's correct."



Schlickman: "875 thousand odd dollars?"

Kozubowski: "You got it... That's absolutely correct."

Schlickman: "After it left us with an appropriation to
2 million 845 thousand dollars?"

Kozubowski: "That's correct. I would suggest to you that
that's not the first time you've seen something like
this happen, nor will it be the last."

Schlickman: "Well, I agree with you, it's not the first
but I trust, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, by
our action on this Bill it will be the last time,
it will be the last time this House will be subjected
to this travesty on the deliberative process. Now,
Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this Bill
originated as an Appropriations Bill for the Court
of Claims and I accept them as being legitimate claims.
They were processed through a legislative agency.
Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we now have a
Bill that goes far beyond, far beyond what poor Robert,
now in his grave, determined should be germane.
Appropriations to how many state agencies, Mr. Sponsor?"

Kozubowski: "I'm sorry, I can't hear you."

Schlickman: "How many state agencies other than the court
of claims is this an appropriation for?"

Kozubowski: "Approximately 60."

Schlickman: "60?"

Kozubowski: "6-0."

Schlickman: "64?"

Kozubowski: "6-0."

Schlickman: "For 47 odd some million dollars?"

Kozubowski: "That's correct."

Schlickman: "Has any...has any of the appropriations for
these other 59 agencies ever been deliberatively
considered by this House or any Committee thereof?"

Kozubowski: "Yes."

Schlickman: "How many?"



Kozubowski: "All of them."

Schlickman: "What was the recommendation with respect to the Electronic Fund Transfer System Study Commission?"

Kozubowski: "Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, I can't hear the Gentleman."

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

Ewell: "Point of order. This has never been used as an inquisition. Representative Schlickman can read. He knows the answers to the problems that he's propounding. If he wants to speak to the Bill let him speak to the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of this House there are 11 million some people in the State of Illinois and each of them by one means or another is being taxed for the operation of state government. Now, we have nowhere near those 11 million some odd people represented in this House. But, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there are approximately 177 of us on this floor representing those 11 million some odd people. And I ask, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to an appropriation of 20 thousand dollars... Now that may not be much to each one of us sitting here, our salaries being 20 thousand dollars as Members of the General Assembly, but I can assure you that's a hell of a lot of money for a hell of a lot of people in the State of Illinois. And I want to know, I want to know, Mr. Speaker, as a Representative of a part of those 11 odd million people in the State of Illinois, what are we getting for our 20 million dollars for the Electronic Fund Transfer System Study Commission? And what deliberation has been given to that? I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, it's my right as a Member of this House and as a duly constituted Member of this House.



one elected. I want to know for each of those 59 commissions or agencies other than the Court of Claims, what in the hell is the money for and what consideration has been given to it? Now what about it, 20 thousand dollars? 20 thousand, what consideration has been given?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Kozubowski."

Kozubowski: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I really take great joy in the opportunity to answer the Gentleman on the other side of the aisle because I would suggest to him that anyone who knows anything about the legislative process would have an understanding of House Bill 3392. But to answer his question in regard to the Electronic Data Processing, I would suggest he just walk across the aisle to Representative Bruce Waddell who's the Chairman."

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to conclude this. I shouldn't have the burden of going to 59 different people on this floor and get an accountability from them with respect to each of these appropriations. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, what this Conference Committee Report does is to point up that there has been a breakdown in the process. We're being asked with about 34 minutes to go before midnight, June 30, to vote for a multiplicity of appropriations. And I would urge a 'no' vote in terms of deliberative process, in terms of the taxpayers of this state. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deavers."

Deavers: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Redmond: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? Those in favor say 'aye'; 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries. Representative Kozubowski, to close."



Kozubowski: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just ask the House to give a favorable Roll Call on the Concurrence Report #1 to House Bill 3392."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is, shall the House adopt the first Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3392? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative James Houlihan, for what purpose do you rise?"

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, to explain my vote. In this.. in this Omnibus Bill which has all of the commissions, it does have commissions which we considered in the appropriations process but all of the commissions in the appropriations process that I was the Chairman of, the Subcommittee which was considered, the Bills which had commissions over 50 thousand dollars were all line itemed. In this Bill they're not line itemed and I think in terms of the legislative process we had best send this back to a second Conference Committee and ask the conferees to line item those Bills so that we would know what's in it and for what purposes they're there. Otherwise, I vote 'present'."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 37 'aye' and 88 'no' and the motion fails. Representative Kozubowski."

Kozubowski: "Mr. Speaker, I would now move that the House nonconcur in Conference Committee #1 and that a new Conference Committee be established."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the... The Gentleman has moved that the House do not adopt the first Conference Committee Report to House Bill 3392. Those in favor of the motion say 'aye'; 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries. Representative Simms."

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. On Supplemental



Calendar #7, if I could have some quiet please? On Supplemental Calendar #7 there appears a listing of 10:20 p.m., House Bill 3177. In checking with the Clerk three separate times, the latest 10 minutes ago in your presence, that Conference Committee Report has not yet been filed with the Clerk of the House as of 11:30. Is this the policy that the Conference Committee... the Supplemental Calendars do not show the correct time, that when reports are not filed... Or is this the policy of you, Mr. Speaker, to allow...anticipatory reports that might be filed?"

Speaker Redmond: "I think if you look at Rule 68 there are two items to the rule. One is the Calendar and the other one is the report. Consideration of any report on 3177 will not be undertaken until the report is on the desk at the prescribed time. When...when a Conference Committee has been..."

Simms: "That's one hour."

Speaker Redmond: "If you want my answer...when a Conference Committee has been ordered or requested and set up I don't see anything wrong with anticipating that there will be a Calendar included in...in which those will be included but until the report is on your desk it cannot be considered."

Simms: "Well, that still doesn't answer my question. It must be filed with the Clerk 1 hour previous to our voting, is that correct?"

Speaker Redmond: "The report."

Simms: "The report must be filed."

Speaker Redmond: "Right."

Simms: "And as of 11:30, at the present time has the report been filed?"

Speaker Redmond: "I don't know. Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, the report was signed by Democratic Members and presented. I would like to



point out. I would like to point out that that first Conference Committee was convened at 9:30 this morning and ended at approximately 1:00. Since that time I have presented to the Republican Members a Conference Committee Report of which they would not sign. I also presented to Republican Members a sheet that asks for a second Conference Committee, which they would not also sign. So therefore, we have been meeting throughout this whole day and the Conference Committee Report was listed at 10:20. And I'm sure that through the pipeline it will be on everyone's desk in about a minute or whenever the printer gets here. But it was filed. I have a copy of it here and as soon as everything gets down you're all in good shape, I think. I'll be happy to discuss it then."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ewing...Schuneman, for what purpose do you rise?"

Schuneman: "For that same point."

Speaker Redmond: "Who's that Gentleman standing next to you? I see him wandering all over the floor. Do you have the privilege to the floor? Let me see your pass, bring your pass up here."

Schuneman: "He's on the House Republican staff, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker... Mr. Speaker, that is one of my staff people and I..."

Speaker Redmond: "Okay, I never saw him before."

Ryan: "Well you probably haven't seen a lot of my staff people and I'm sure glad to hear that."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To that same point, Mr. Speaker, I inquired of the Clerk at about 10 minutes after 11:00 as to whether or not the report on House Bill 3177 had been filed. And at that time, Mr. Speaker, I was advised by the Clerk that the report



had not in fact been filed. Now, it was because of that, Mr. Speaker, that we are questioning the time that the report was actually filed."

Speaker Redmond: "I don't think there's any necessity to go into a dialogue about whether it was or it wasn't. It hasn't been here for an hour and we're not going to consider the Bill. We're not going to consider the report. Representative Mudd."

Mudd: "Mr. Speaker, am I to understand that the Representative from the other side of the aisle objects to hearing this type...this piece of legislation at this late date today? Is he objecting to this type of legislation being passed in the House tonight?"

Speaker Redmond: "Supplemental Calendar #7. 3727. Representative Ryan. Representative McMaster, for what purpose do you rise?"

McMaster: "Mr. Speaker, I was inadvertently off the floor when Senate Bill 736 passed... when Senate Bill 736 passed, the Conference Report on it and I did not have the opportunity to vote on it. I would like to have the permission of the floor to have my vote added as 'aye' to the Conference Committee Report on 736."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any objection? Hearing none, leave is granted. Representative Ryan on 3237."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I would move to suspend Rule 68(d), the one-hour rule for House Bill 3237 only."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan has moved for the suspension of the provisions of 68(e)...68(d), for the consideration of 3237. Any discussion? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the mover yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan, will you yield?"

Schlickman: "What is the subject matter of this Bill?"

Ryan: "If it isn't too tough..."



Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Schlickman: "What is the subject matter of this Bill?"

Ryan: "This is House Bill 3237. It's the collective bargaining agreement and it's the money for the... contracts."

Schlickman: "This is an appropriations Bill?"

Ryan: "Yes, it is."

Schlickman: "And what's the amount of the appropriation?"

Ryan: "34 million...23 million, 954 thousand, 957 dollars."

Schlickman: "23..."

Ryan: "23 million, 954 thousand, 957."

Schlickman: "24 million dollars?"

Ryan: "And that's down some 10 million dollars from the initial legislation."

Schlickman: "What was the amount of the appropriation when the House...when the Bill passed the House?"

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

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, Representative Schlickman is asking the Sponsor about the substance of the Bill. I believe there's a motion before us to suspend the rules and I don't believe we should be talking about the substance of the Bill until we decide whether we're going to suspend the rule and consider the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "I think you're right. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, before we're asked to suspend a rule and a rule as vague, uncertain, you know it's cloud #9 until we know what the subject matter is. Now, I can suspend the rule for one reason but not to suspend a rule for another reason, I just want to know what we're suspending for and I think that's a legitimate inquiry. It's ... If I may say to the Gentleman from Cook, it's like not being able to speak to a substantive Bill simply because we're voting on a Bill



that deals with an appropriation for that substantive Bill, which I think was an unfair ruling on the part of another Gentleman. And I would object to the suspension of the rules for something that has in it 24 million dollars, 21 minutes to 12:00 on June 30, 1978."

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

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I understand the Gentleman's problem in terms of wanting to know what is in the Bill before the Bill is...the rule is suspended to hear the Bill immediately. And that's why I objected to Representative Stuffle's motion before. Because we're in a predicament when we move to suspend the rules, we cannot ask about the substance of the Bill and in fact I would suggest that Robert's Rules of Order indicate that the motion to suspend the rule is non-debatable. And so I think we have to oppose all of those motions because of the very predicament it puts Gentlemen like Representative Schlickman in, they don't know what the substance is so they don't know whether they want to suspend the rules or not. And so I think we ought to vote 'no' on the suspension of the rules."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on Representative Ryan's motion to suspend the provisions of Rule 68(d). Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 110 'aye' and 22 'no' and the motion carries. Representative Kozubowski desires to be recorded as 'aye'. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on House Bill 3237. I explained earlier, it's the appropriation for the collective bargaining agreement reached between the administration and the AFSCME people



and it's for 23 million, 954 thousand; 957 dollars and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House do adopt the first Conference Committee Report to House Bill 3237. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I really wanted to have an opportunity to ask a question of the Sponsor. Perhaps before I vote we could have Representative Ryan respond. Does it mean that the Governor's projection for the revenue for the current fiscal year were in error? Is that why the amount is now being given to the employees according to that bargaining agreement?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "No, Representative, there was...nobody was wrong here, this was based on estimates."

Satterthwaite: "Based on who's estimates?"

Ryan: "AFSCME and the Bureau of the Budget."

Satterthwaite: "But I thought the agreement between the Governor and AFSCME was that there was to be an increase to the employees if revenue exceeded earlier projections of revenue."

Ryan: "You're exactly right."

Satterthwaite: "May we ask then how much is currently the difference between the previous estimate and the current estimate, to know whether this seems to be an accurate figure."

Ryan: "Well there's no new estimate. This is not the end of the fiscal year and I'm not trying to give you a bad time but we won't know that probably until tomorrow sometime."

Satterthwaite: "So are we saying we might have to be in here with a deficiency appropriation if the estimate is off?"



Ryan: "No, I don't think so. I think that this should be sufficient and anything that's left over of course is lapsed."

Satterthwaite: "Well my real question, however, is how much the current estimate differs from the present estimate on what that revenue for this fiscal year is?"

Ryan: "There is no current estimate, Representative. The Bureau of the Budget made an estimate last January and that's what this is based on."

Satterthwaite: "There must have been some kind of an estimate to arrive at these figures."

Ryan: "Well what I'm trying to tell you is that the Bureau is sticking with their estimate of last January and that's what these figures are based on."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 129 'aye' and 17 'no' and the House does adopt the first Conference Committee Report to Senate...to House Bill 3237. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, would the House give me their attention for a very important motion? Could we have some order?"

Speaker Redmond: "Please, give the Gentleman order."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, all Members should understand that Rule 68(e) provides that after midnight all Bills in Conference Committee or on the Order of Concurrence will be tabled."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Skinner, be in order."

Madigan: "And because of that rule, Mr. Speaker, I now move that we suspend Rule 68(e) through July 1, 1978, which is tomorrow."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Yes, I agree with the Majority leader, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the Gentleman make the



motion for particular Bills and that we consider them one at a time and not a blanket suspension."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative..."

Madigan: "Maybe Mr. Walsh misunderstood me. Bill, why don't you open your rule book to page 364 at the bottom of the page."

Walsh: "Let me respond, Mike. I've been looking at it, I have one or two things that I would just as soon the rules were not suspended for and I would like to die. Now, if you'd like to consult with a few of us maybe you can make the rule applicable to more than one Bill. As a matter of fact, you can make it applicable to all Bills except for one or two. But I object to making a blanket suspension."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "I request a Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on Representative Madigan's motion that the provisions of Rule 68(e) be suspended through July 1 of 1978. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 122 'aye' and 22 'no' and the Gentleman's motion prevails and the provisions of Rule 68(e) are suspended. Representative Madison, for what purpose do you rise?"

Madison: "An inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. I would like to know from a Parliamentary standpoint if the suspension of the provisions of Rule 68(e) also means that any Bills passed after that...after midnight only require 89 votes?"

Speaker Redmond: "No, it does not. It means that they will not be tabled. I think that's what the rule says. Supplemental Calendar #5. On which appears House Bill 3394 and Representative Kempiners is recognized."



Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In starting, I owe an apology to the Members of the House because when I first presented this Bill earlier this evening I gave some inaccurate information, I did so inadvertently and not deliberately. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that on the first Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3394, the majority of which deals with the appropriation for the Department of Personnel, that we do not adopt the Conference Committee Report and that we request a second Conference Committee."

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

Matijevich: "Only to support Bill, Representative Kempiners, because there was some discussion on this and I just wanted to support him. We've worked out practically everything on this and there should be no problem on the second report."

Speaker Redmond: "That was that we do not adopt, is that correct? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House do not adopt the first Committee Report (sic) to House Bill 3394. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The motion carries. The Gentleman requests a second Conference Committee. Parliamentarian, please come to the podium. Parliamentarian, please come to the podium. Oh... Supplemental Calendar #7, Conference Committee Report, the order of business, House Bill 2851. Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would move that we accept Conference Committee Report #1. The report, the the Amendment...Senate Amendment #1, the Senate recedes to that and it's the 50-50 Amendment, it takes it off the equipment line item. The House concurred in Senate Amendment #2, which is the effective date. The next change would be for the additional employment of a printer in the Service Unit and one research person."



The final Section is the printing of the House and Senate Calendars and I would move that we accept Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House adopt the first Conference Committee Report to House Bill 2851. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 136 'aye' and no 'nay' and the House does adopt the first Conference Committee Report to House Bill 2851. Representative Edgar, can we proceed on 3374? Representative Edgar. 3374."

Edgar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the Conference Report on the Department of Public Health. Conference Committee took approximately 3 hours and I'll go into some detail and explain what was agreed. First of all there is the supplemental appropriation which we passed out of this House last week. Also there is added on the department's appropriation for fiscal year '79, which totals 83 million, 270 thousand dollars. It's an approximate increase of a little over 2 million dollars to what was originally asked for. I think we have added into this budget everything that the people have asked for. We have a half million for renal dialysis, 51 thousand for rheumatic fever, 150...I'd be happy to answer any questions on it."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House adopt the first Conference Committee Report to House Bill 3274. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker, just to indicate to some of the Members that was asking back whether or not certain projects was in here, all



of the project's that have been brought to the attention of the Appropriations Committee is included and embodied in this Bill and I support it. I see that you are supporting it. Overall, it is still a reduction of about 277 thousand dollars from the original request."

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

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, just for those who have asked, the money for the PKU testing and the cystic fibrosis is in this Bill and I thank the Committee for their work."

Speaker Redmond: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question 144 'aye' and 4 'no' and the House does adopt the first Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3374. 1523. Representative Ebbesen."

Ebbesen: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd recommend that we concur in the Conference Committee Report #1 for 1523. All that this does now is it makes an arithmetic error correction of 1 thousand dollars, a technical error and it adds 10 thousand dollars into personal services, leaving the total appropriation now at 97 million, 223 thousand 897 dollars."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Ebbesen, would this have the sum in there for Mr. Borg's salary now? Is that what we did with 1555?"

Ebbesen: "Yes, that is correct."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House adopt the first Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1523. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 'aye' and 13 'no'. Representative Lucco desires to be recorded as 'aye', Richmond 'aye'



and by an extraordinary majority the House does adopt the first Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1523. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, what time is it?"

Speaker Redmond: "I think it's pretty close to midnight. 1672."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, it's after midnight. We are now July 1, 1978 and I believe by the Constitution of the State of Illinois for a Bill to become effective upon approval requires 107 votes."

Speaker Redmond: "1672. Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 1672 is the CDB..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "We don't have a copy of the Conference Committee Report, could the Gentleman take it out of the record?"

Speaker Redmond: "Out of the record. Representative Young, is she on the floor? Representative ^{Wyvetter} ~~Yvetta~~ Young, do you want to go to the Order of Postponed for House Resolution 97? You'll be back, okay. Representative Giglio on the floor? On Supplemental Calendar #1. S.J.R. 55. Representative Giglio is recognized."

Giglio: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Joint Resolution 55 is the Resolution we heard the other day or yesterday and it was put on Postponed Consideration. It pertains to the investigation of the 55 mile an hour speed limit. The Secretary of the Department of Transportation, the Director of the Department of Business and Economic Development are directed to conduct a joint investigation into the effects of the 55 mile an hour speed limit in Illinois pertaining to the effectiveness of the...the traffic accidents and the fatalities in Illinois and also the economic impact. It's only a study and due to the



facts many people feel that it's not working on especially our main highways, the federal highways running from New York to California and Florida to Illinois, that perhaps they should be increased. This is no way to mandate that they are going to be increased but only to investigate and see whether or not it's feasible and recommend to the Department of Transportation on the federal level that perhaps it should be at a later date."

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

Schlickman: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, since the Federal Government requires the state to go to 55 miles per hour as a condition for the receipt of federal funds, there have been ample studies to show that by the reduction of the speed limit to 55 miles per hour there has been a dramatic decrease in the number of accidents, a dramatic decrease in the number of lives lost and Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, a dramatic increase in the conservation of fuel. I don't think, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that the national studies and the studies that have been conducted in a variety of the 50 states would show anything different with respect to the State of Illinois. I think this is a useless, unnecessary venture and I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, on account of the studies that have already shown that 55 miles per hour does save lives and it does conserve energy that we vote 'no' on this Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield to a couple questions?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Leverenz: "Is it true, Frank, that there has been a dramatic



decrease in accidents or is it that it pretty well maintained the same number?"

Giglio: "No, there's been a decrease but not in the fatalities."

Leverenz: "And only that the fatalities have dropped and not too much. Is that correct?"

Giglio: "Correct."

Leverenz: "Thank you very much. To the Resolution, I support the Resolution, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think it is important and I think we should allow the Department of Transportation to conduct it. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, most of us do get tired of the Federal Government, the bureaucrats in Washington, the Members of Congress telling us how it's got to be in all 50 states. Now all you have to do is open your eyes when you drive home or drive down here and you'll see that the citizens of Illinois, many of them including I think, people who are sitting around this chamber tonight, do not abide by the 55 mile an hour limit. Many of our citizens think it is wrong. Many of our citizens are asking us to look into it. Many of our citizens are asking us to contact our Members of Congress and say, 'Why, why do the fellows in Washington tell us how it's got to be all over the State of Illinois?' I think that we have an obligation to arm ourselves with the facts, to get the truth and there's absolutely nothing wrong with studies. If you're afraid of a study vote 'no'. But if you're not afraid of the truth and if you want to get some facts about the economic impacts and the safety impacts then vote 'yes' and vote for this study so that we can respond to our constituents and at least say that



we looked into it, that our minds are not closed, that we're willing to consider this and that we hope this information will be helpful not only to us but to our Members of Congress in dealing with this federal mandate that is so oppressive to many people and about which I've gotten a lot of mail. I would urge an 'aye' vote for this good Resolution."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Holewinski."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Holewinski. The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put. Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries. Representative Giglio, to close."

Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would only add that the...one of the largest motor clubs in the country, the Chicago Motor Club, advocates this study. And if anybody knows anything about the Chicago Motor Club I don't think they'd advocate this study if they didn't mean it. And I'd ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of SJR 55. Those in favor indicate by voting 'aye', opposed voting 'no'. Representative Conti, to explain his vote."

Conti: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'm not going to use any adjectives to describe this horrible Bill that was mandated on the State of Illinois because I don't need the adjectives, I have been following the statistics. We are killing 53 thousand people a year on our highways and then all of a sudden we have a...supposedly, energy shortage. There were at least 250 thousand miles per state traveled less and that's the reason why the drop in the



death rate has fallen to 49 thousand per year. Speed does not kill, it's reckless driving that kills. We are spending hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars to build super slabs all over the State of Illinois and then we get some idiot that's sitting in the left lane going 55 miles an hour when somebody is trying to pass him weaving in and out of traffic. This is the most asinine law that I've ever heard of that was ever mandated under the State of Illinois. I think it should be thoroughly investigated and let's quit taking the...accepting the mandate from Washington because the highways today and the motor vehicles that are made today are not made for 55 miles an hour. We are killing 47 thousand people this year and our worst year we killed 53 thousand."

Speaker Redmond: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 98 'aye' and 20 'no', the motion carries and the Resolution is adopted. On the Order of Motions, page 8. House Resolution 988. Representative Doyle is recognized. Representative Doyle... Representative Schlickman, for what purpose do you rise? State your point."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, as Speaker you have the discretion of going from one order of business to another. But Mr. Speaker, by our rules when you go to an order of business you are to take the items within that order in numerical order. And there is on page 6 motions, there is on page 7 motions, and there is on page 8 a number of motions before the motion dealing with HR 988. And I would respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this is out of order and it's without your province or discretion as Speaker at this time to go to the order within...within the Order of Motions to House Resolution 988. And I don't even



know what it's about but I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, as we enter a new fiscal year let's start anew Mr. Speaker and let's go back to the old Bill Redmond who sat back there in the back row and said let's play by the rules. You're out of order, Mr. Speaker and let's start...if you want to go to the Order of Motions House Bill 1274."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, my good friend the Gentleman from Cook who just spoke sounds like a bloody orangeman. If he would take a look at this Resolution I think he would not only highly endorse it but he'd...he would applaud you for calling it at this time."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schlickman, repent."

Schlickman: "I withdraw my objection, this is an extraordinary matter. I apologize."

Speaker Redmond: "It may be too late. Representative Doyle."

Doyle: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. At this time I want to ask that you suspend Rule 41(a) for immediate consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion. Those in favor indicate by voting 'aye', opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 111 'aye' and 2 'no' and the motion to suspend Rule 41(a) carries."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Clerk. Representative Doyle. I'll get to that, Mr. Anderson, I know what you've got up your sleeve. Representative Doyle on the Resolution."

Doyle: "With this Resolution we make an appeal to the House to pass this Resolution and forward it to the President of the United States, the United States Congress and the United States Senate. This is for an international investigation and also the commission on



human rights...And this is to have an international investigation of the persecution of the Irish by the British. And I know that you will all want to join me in this. So at this time I want to turn the mike over to the great Irish historian and a made who made Irish history on his last recent visit to Ireland, Phil Collins."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as Representative Doyle just acknowledged, I did travel to the old sod last summer and reveled in a bit of Irish history and Irish lore and while I must apologize for some of my traveling companions...we did have a great exposure to the great Emerald Isle. However, at that time we, as many others, did become acquainted with the fact that there are prisoners languishing in jails, charged with political crimes and suffering untold privation in...especially in the jail at Lankesch. This Resolution, I would call...hardly would call inflamatory, especially looking back upon my own family history I would think that it is somewhat restrained. But we have called upon amnesty international to look into these allegations of extreme brutality to Irish prisnors by the English army, which is nothing new and it's been going on since before our nation was founded. But I would...I would ask you to join with us and I'm not being funny, I shouldn't be at this later hour of the night, this is a serious matter. We've heard much...we've heard much about brutality and oppression of many people on the floor of this House. There is no longer history than oppression of the Irish people and we would merely like to satisfy ourselves and the world that these allegations are either true or untrue...maybe unfounded but I think very well



founded and this Resolution would memorialize amnesty international to look into these charges of untold brutality to people who have been charged with crimes but have not been tried for their crimes. And we would appreciate the support of the House and I would ask...attempt to answer any questions that I could."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Emil Jones."

Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Sponsor would yield to a question? Every one of the Sponsors."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Doyle."

Jones: "Yes, what I would like to know, Mr. Sponsor, would you be willing to hold this Resolution so that I could offer an Amendment to it so we could include South Africa?"

Doyle: "No, but I'll support yours."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Doyle... Representative Martin."

Martin: "Yes, I don't think I explain my vote often and this really isn't an explanation of vote but I have a conflict of interest, I'm half Irish and half English and I know where my heart is but...I'm not quite sure what to do but I'm sure Representatives Doyle and Collins will convince me."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as Representative Collins and Representative Doyle, who presented this Resolution, have indicated and I know it is late at night and we're tired and things have been going on but this is a very, very serious subject. As we know...as what has happened in the history in the background and the history of our own country and ask what is happening around the world in many nations not just solely in the Emerald Isle of Ireland, such things as related to suffering as it relates to human suffering of



many people in this world is things that we should address, should address in a very serious manner. I believe the Sponsor of this Resolution is attempting to do that in concert with the kind of direction that has been coming out of Washington under the direction of our current President, President Carter. I think we all should support this Resolution and support it in a very serious way, a very serious way because there are people that are being oppressed. There are people that are having serious serious problems living under oppression in the land of the Emerald Isle in Ireland and we should support this and do it in a very serious manner and I urge the support of the House."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Hudson."

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

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

Doyle: "I just ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of House Resolution 988. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye'. Opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the motion carries, the Resolution is adopted. Representative Kucharski."

Kucharski: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. On House Resolution 150 we questioned..."

Speaker Redmond: "Where does that appear, Representative Kucharski."

Kucharski: "Excuse me, Sir?"

Speaker Redmond: "On page 4 of the Regular Calendar? On the Speaker's Table, page 4 of the Regular Calendar. House Resolution 150. Representative Kucharski."

Kucharski: "Yes, Sir. This Resolution directs the Legislative Investigative Commission to study the certain aspects of



self service gasoline stations. Now that self service has become a reality in Illinois for the past 14 months I think that it is time now that we can ascertain the information that we need to find whether or not it is a benefit to the consumer or a benefit to the industry itself. Just recently, last Wednesday, the U.S. Supreme Court had ruled and upheld a law in Maryland..."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ray Ewell, please come to the podium. Proceed."

Kucharski: "Upheld a ruling that the oil companies themselves cannot own and operate oil stations. I believe that if the Resolution addresses itself to the problem of what the consumer receives from the producer itself and the questions that are pertained in this Resolution may lead to legislation that will, I believe, benefit the consumer and I ask for your beneficial consideration."

Speaker Redmond: "Is there any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion... Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This particular Resolution has been on the Calendar for over a year. The subject of this Resolution is self service gasoline stations in the State of Illinois. That program has been implemented in the State of Illinois for over a year. The thrust of this Resolution is to study whether there should be self service gas stations in the State of Illinois. That subject was studied and restudied by the Illinois Legislative Council. Two reports were made. The thrust of this Resolution is to ask for another report to see whether we should study the question of implementing self service gas stations, which have already been in implementation in the State of Illinois for more than one year. We don't need another study about whether to put in self service gas stations. Vote 'no' on this



Resolution."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I speak in favor of this Resolution because as those of you who were here the last term will recall the self service gas stations...gas stations are allowed to have self service stations by Resolution of the Fire Marshall...as long as they have pumps that were not self service. Well I'll tell you what's happening, some of your big oil companies don't care because in my district, in my county I can tell you at least one station I know, I stop for gas on my way to Springfield and believe it or not, the pumps are all self service. I think it's high time we take a good look at the situation because I don't care, I don't like to pump gas myself and there's a lot of other people who don't like it. There are a lot of safety features that should be considered. I've seen with lighted cigarettes around those stations, so I ask you to vote 'yes' for this Resolution."

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

Your light's on, Sir. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to support the Gentleman from Cook's Resolution and let me add that none of us really know what the outcome of the Gentleman's Resolution would prove. There's no question but that this subject has been one of great interest and some degree of controversy. Let me also remind the Members that it's not too often that the Gentleman from Cook rises to ask something from his colleagues in the House. I would also like to remind all of you of the Gentleman from Cook's deep and abiding interest in this particular subject. Let me repeat that I do not know, nor do the Members of the House know just what the outcome of this



Resolution would be. This is something we can't predict. The results may fall either way. No matter how you feel about the issue I...I rise to support the Gentleman from Cook's Resolution and I hope enough Members in the House also do the same."

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

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

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

Kucharski: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The studies that have been reported to the House, I do not believe tell the whole story. I do not believe that the industry in itself has been totally honest with the consumer. As I just read two days ago that three oil companies in Texas are being charged with, by the U.S. Government, with charging prices that were higher than before the price freeze occurred in 1973. I'm also talking about and what I'm questioning and I'm asking about and what I'm hoping to find out in this Resolution is how many small businessmen, how many service station managers have been put out of business by self service. I am also asking and looking for the answer to what the Supreme Court ruled last Wednesday as to how many of these service stations are owned and operated by the oil companies themselves. That number can fluctuate by testimony here in the Illinois House, by one oil company saying 1 percent and by the same oil company in a private conversation as saying that they own 10 percent and by taking other large oil companies and saying that they charge more to their independent gas station operators and they charge less to the service stations that they own. Now I think that's a very



serious question that we should address ourselves to. If you want to go to a service station that may charge 75 cents for a gallon for a premium or for ethyl or for whatever because they own it and you could go to another and of that same...and of that same service station, charge you 79 or 80 cents because they don't own it and they charge that independent service station owner more. That is a rip off on your part. Gasoline is no longer a luxury, it's become a utility. It becomes a part of our life. Can any one of us here on the House floor do without going to a gas station or do without when our car? Can we do without electricity? Can we do without people's gas or can we do without any other utilities that we receive? I say to you that answer is 'no'. And the answer is 'no' that we cannot deal, we cannot do without. We must be treated fairly, we must be treated with justice from these oil companies who...who control, from the oil head to the tank of your car. And if that's what your interested in then I say you vote 'yes' and I appreciate your interest."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House adopt House Resolution 150? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. This will take 107 votes. The Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am surprised to hear the Democrat criticize this great Resolution sponsored by the distinguished Representative from Chicago. I don't see any reason why we shouldn't have an investigation into self service gasoline sales and I'm surprised that the Gentleman from Macon County would even dream that there might be some nonpurpose for having this investigation. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, I suggest



that we all give our colleague and friend a vote on this issue."

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

Skinner: "Yes, this Resolution has less to do with self service gas stations at this point as it does with the vertical integration of the oil industry. The question...the Bills ruled upon by the U.S. Supreme Court in Maryland had to do with whether oil companies could be prohibited from owning outlets in the oil industry. Here are some of the questions that we're asking the Legislative Investigative Commission to answer. Is there evidence that major oil companies, and some of them are listed, are attempting to force their franchise gasoline dealers out of business by cutting profits, requiring longer operating hours, refusing to renew dealership contracts or other practices directed at replacing franchise dealers with employee station managers. Now, the father of one of my teenage file clerks got fired by Clark Oil Station. He was a district manager who had come up through the dealership route. There was no reason for his being fired, as to the best of my investigation, except that..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Your time is concluded, Sir. And may I point out to Mr. Kucharski that this Resolution only requires 89 votes. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, I'm supporting it and if it only requires 89 then I'll just sit down."

Speaker Lechowicz: "89, that is correct. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 98 'aye', 49 'nay' and the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 154, Mr. Taylor. House Resolution 400, Mrs. Catania. 406, Mrs. Catania. 404. House Resolution 457, Mr. Steczo. Take it out of



the record. House Joint Resolution #11, Mr. Yourell.
Bus? House Joint Resolution #11."

Yourell: "I move to table that."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves to table. All
in favor signify by saying 'aye'; 'aye'. The Resolution
is tabled. House Joint Resolution 26, Mr. Stearney.
House Joint Resolution 42, Mr. Porter. Senate Joint
Resolution 62, Mr. Barnes. Senate Joint Resolution
62, Gene?"

Barnes: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of
the House. Senate Joint Resolution 62 is a Resolution
that deals with...in...investigations in conjunction
and carried out by the Legislative Advisory Committee
on Public Aid. It deals with the reimbursement
program and the level of reimbursement to physicians
in the public aid program relating to that. This
Resolution was heard in the Executive Committee and
was reported out, do adopt, 24 to 0 and I would
solicit the support of the House for Senate Joint
Resolution 62."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall
the House adopt Senate Joint Resolution 62. All those
in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have
all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The
Clerk will take the record. On this question there are
119 'aye', 3 'nay' and the House does adopt Senate
Joint Resolution 62."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall the House adopt Senate Joint Resolution 62? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 119 'ayes', 3 'nays' and the House does adopt Senate Joint Resolution 62. On the Calendar on page 6 is House Joint Resolution 97. Out? On the Supplemental Calendar #7 is House Bill 3177, Concurrence Conference Committee Report. Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's a very controversial piece of legislation and I'm sure that there's going to be charges hurled back and forth. Before I get into House Bill 3177, I would like to note for the record that this Conference Committee convened at 9:30 this morning and went until approximately one o'clock. After a proposal was submitted, it was then presented by our Clerk to Members of the Conference Committee. That First Conference Committee draft was not signed by Members. They would not also, Members of the other side of the aisle, sign the appropriate form to call for a Second Conference Committee. I'm sorry that this legislation was not heard before midnight. What I am saying to you now is the Senate passed this Concurrence on a 32 to 17 vote. It's a matter that you've been reading about and hearing about and seeing it in the newsletters of interest groups around the state. I would like to tell you exactly what's in this legislation that appears before you as a Conference Committee on House Bill 3177. We've made significant changes in this legislation, changes that many employers around the state had demanded. We are still being very fair and beneficial to the employees of the State of Illinois and we also have areas of concern that were addressed in here by local government entities, by educational institutions and the telegram that was presented to us by the Federal Government concerning areas of nonconformity. We have addressed all these areas..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Mr. Mautino. For what purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Farley, arise?"

Farley: "Mr. Speaker, I'd ask that you'd bring the chamber to order. This is a significant piece of legislation and the noise level is



pretty high."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Your point's well taken. Would the Ladies and Gentlemen of the House kindly give the Gentleman your attention? The Gentleman from Conti... the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti, what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Conti: "I want to thank Bruce Farley for... this is a very important piece of legislation and while we interrupted Mr. Mautino, I want to know how many votes it takes to pass this House at this time."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll get back to you on that. If the Parliamentarian is in the chamber, kindly come up to the Speaker's rostrum."

Conti: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Dick. Let us get a little order. Mr. Simms, would you kindly give the Gentleman your attention?"

Mautino: "Many employers throughout the State of Illinois were incensed at what happened with Senate Bill 6 in the conformity issue that was passed by this General Assembly in November of last year. Since that time, the smaller employers of the State of Illinois with excellent experience ratings under the unemployment compensation formula had their rates increased nine hundred to one thousand percent. Those in other categories increased approximately three-tenths of one percent. We have created quite a burden in that area with the federal compliance which is a most important area of this piece of legislation. I'd like to digress for a moment here and address the question of the telegram which all of you received from the Federal Government concerning this question of who is covered and who is not covered under unemployment compensation. It is my firm belief that the legislation that has been enacted by the State of Illinois at the direction of the Federal Government is in error and I say in error because I believe that many of those public employees, for example, jurors, members of board of reviews, members of planning commissions, et cetera, volunteer fireman should not be covered under this Act. I don't know how they qualify, but that's part of their telegram that was presented to us. We have taken them out of this legislation. But we do have some other areas which we can have... we have included within this Conference Committee a repealer clause so that if, in



effect, any of those areas are considered in nonconformity, they would be immediately taken out of this legislation if and when enacted. I'd like to run down briefly every issue that is in this Conference Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Mautino. There has been a request to have pictures taken. The request is denied. It's quarter to one in the morning and I believe that the Membership's been in a full day and it would be un... totally indiscreet to the Membership to have that permitted. So pictures are not permitted. Please continue."

Mautino: "Some... Senate Bill 1350 originally introduced in this Session, the 80th General Assembly, we have removed the cap from that category of a working person with a spouse and children. This is the only area within the statute that has a cap of a hundred and thirty-five dollars on it. The other two areas that being... that of a single person does not have a cap. The base there is fifty percent of his prior weekly wage. The second category is a married person with a nonworking spouse. That also does not have a cap. The current posture of that funding as of probably July 2, will be a hundred and twenty-one dollars for the single person; a hundred and fifty-one to a hundred and fifty-four or possibly a hundred and sixty for a married person with a non-working spouse and one hundred and thirty-five dollars for a married person with a family. This corrects that inequity originally introduced in this Session. The second part of the Conference Committee, it's included in this legislation is that we are increasing, I want to make that very clear, increasing the qualifying wage requirement from the present one thousand dollars in a year to fourteen hundred dollars and three hundred and fifty dollars outside the highest quarter. This addresses the question of seasonal, part-time student workers in the summertime. We are also increasing the disqualifying period for a person's eligibility. In the area of voluntary quit, currently it is eight weeks. We are increasing that to nine weeks. We are increasing the disqualification for persons discharged for misconduct which is currently six weeks to a fifty percent increase. We are now



making it nine weeks. We are also increasing the disqualifying, disqualification period for persons refusing suitable work from the current six weeks, fifty percent once again to nine weeks. That's an increase of... to a consistent nine weeks, nine weeks and nine weeks for disqualifying periods. We also are providing that when an employee is laid off for a certain period of time, holidays which may occur during that period shall be considered as single vacation day of paid wages. This is the General Electric Amendment which addresses a decision made approximately two years ago on the vacation period on unemployment compensation. This is at their request. We are also providing that the Director of the Department of Labor shall prescribe a minimum of ten days for meeting of notification in which an employer may respond to a claim. This increases that period of time from seven days to ten days or approximately two weeks. We are increasing the time in which parties may appeal, both parties - employee and employer, to two weeks, fourteen days. We are providing, providing within the fraud provisions of the U.C. Act, two major provisions adopted by this House at about 159 or 163 to nothing, allowing the Comptroller set aside for employees and employers for recoupment. We are also providing for a one percent contribution rate for non-profit private schools that are not of higher education, putting them in the same category as we do the public schools under the same formula. We are also providing in here the issuance and the situation that is addressed by the voluntary quit. When an employee leaves one employer voluntarily and goes to work for the second employer, consequently is laid off there. Under the current law, whatever that employee draws is charged against employer number one that had nothing to do with that layoff. We are correcting that so that the system overall and not just the person who had nothing to do with the layoff is not charged for those benefit levels. We are also including in this Conference Committee, providing that any monies due from any employer, governmental or public, for provisions under this Act can be picked up and recovered in accordance with the State Comptroller's Act similar to what it has been for the employees in the previous portion.



As I stated earlier, we have taken out the jurors and the boards and volunteer fire department, et cetera. We have the situation with the... which the crossing guards who I believe should not be included, but we have them in the legislation with a repealer clause. I call your attention to the last page of the report which states in Section 2, 'Any provision of this amendatory Act which under the provisions of Title XXVI, United States Code Section 30, 3304 and following a final unappealed administrative or judicial decision, results in noncertification of the Illinois Unemployment Insurance Act by the Secretary of Labor is repealed.' That means that this State of Illinois, these people should be excluded. And unless and until the Federal Government states otherwise, they will be excluded. Also we have the credit savings clause in the legislation as well as the school crossing guards under the provision of the Educational Service Agency. All with the repeater clause included and I'll be happy to answer any questions you have on this legislation."

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

Simms: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to the Conference Committee Report #1. Representative Mautino is correct in his indications that the Conference Committee did meet from 9:30 until one this afternoon. However, if you will notice, there are no Republican signatures on this particular Conference Committee Report as this report was not offered to the Republican Conferees. But getting into the basis of this Bill, the Conference Committee as it now stands, there are some good benefits as Representative Mautino has said. But here are the bad points. There is a net cost of thirty million dollars to the trust fund that is already seven hundred million dollars in deficit. Secondly, what it does do, it places the State of Illinois in the posture of noncompliance with the federal legislation. Even though there is a severability clause that is indicated in the legislation, the whole issue would bring Illinois into non-compliance at which point the employers of the State of Illinois whether they be in the private or public sector stand to lose the tax credit which is applicable towards their federal tax liability."



Also under this provision, credits to local units of government with monies in the trust fund at the Bureau of Employment Security makes payments to claimants later found ineligible and the Bureau cannot recoup such payments. Basically the units of local government would not be responsible for the repayment of these individual claims that were erroneously or fraudulently paid. This makes a serious and a very difficult obligation upon the already serious... depleted trust fund which is in debt now to the Federal Government in excess of seven hundred million. This adds another thirty million dollars to that plus the chance that this will be found to be in noncompliance which will be a noncompliance and whereby the State of Illinois would lose the tax credit. In summation, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Conference Committee Report should be overwhelmingly rejected by the Members of this Body and returned to a Second Conference Committee for consideration. And, Mr. Speaker, I would pose these questions... a question to you, being July 1, 1978, am I correct in assuming this Bill does take 107 votes for passage?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Simms, in reply to Mr. Conti's inquiry as far as the number of votes that are needed on the passage of this Conference Committee Report, according to the review of the Parliamentarian, as far as the Bill becoming effective, signing into law, it would take 107 votes at this time."

Simms: "Okay, in either... if it should receive that amount..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Wait a minute. Let me also point out to you, Mr. Simms, that if it does not receive 107 votes, that means we'll probably go into another Conference Committee and we'll probably be here for another three or four hours."

Simms: "Well, that could well be the case, Mr. Speaker. But when you're dealing with this kind of money, time is not an element and we're here to do the people's business."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I concur wholeheartedly."

Simms: "If it should receive 107 votes or... 107 votes or that amount necessary for passage, if it should, I would like a verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You're entitled to that, Sir, and you'll get it. The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk."



Tuerk: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the previous speaker covered many of the bad points of this Conference Committee. Let me just add a few words relative to 3177 when it went out of the House. We opposed it then because it was really no substantive change to the law. It didn't do enough good to merit the support of the House. When it came back from the Senate, it was actually in pretty good shape. Had the House concurred in the Senate Amendments, we could have accepted those and considered that we had done something worthwhile in this Session of the Legislature. Now what the other side of the aisle wants to do is purport to make this side of the aisle and others in this chamber all Members of the Legislature mindful of the fact that there has been some substantive changes made. There have been one or two small changes which are salutary. However, the total impact of this Conference Committee would not make it such that would make it worthwhile for this Body to accept the Conference Committee Report. Therefore, I suggest to this Body that we reject the Conference Committee Report, send it back to the Second Conference Committee and see whether or not some of these problems can be ironed out. Representative Simms pointed out that the trust fund is now in debt some seven hundred and fifty million. I might correct that and tell him that's..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Kozubowski, could you come up to the Chair for a second?"

Tuerk: "It's in debt by nine hundred and fifty million. If this Conference Committee Report is accepted, it'll go into debt much, much further and add to the woes of employers throughout the state, not only private employers, but public employers as well. I suggest that this be resoundingly defeated, send it back to Second Conference Committee, whether it takes three, four, five, six, eight, ten hours in order to iron out some of these difficulties."

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

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In House Bill 3177, we have what the Sponsor, I think, likes to call a compromise. But I'd like to point out to you what kind of a compromise we're giving the employers in this state who



pay unemployment compensation premiums. The cost of the Bill to increase the benefits for unemployment compensation and that's really what this Bill is all about, let's not be fooled about it, the purpose of this Bill is to increase the benefits under unemployment compensation. The cost of doing that is some thirty-five to forty-five million dollars per year. Now that, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, is a debt which would be added to the present nine hundred and fifty-some million dollar debt in the Unemployment Insurance Trust Fund. So what we're really going for here tonight, Mr. Speaker, is a debt of over a billion dollars in the Unemployment Insurance Trust Fund. Now there are some crumbs in this Bill for the employers in the state and Representative Mautino has mentioned some of those upgrading of the eligibility requirements, but you should know that those changes will only result in a credit of some eight million dollars to the fund. So the net of what we're doing here is to cost the Unemployment Insurance Trust Fund more than thirty-seven million dollars per year. And we should be aware of that, Mr. Speaker, before we vote on this Bill. One other point I want to make clear and that is the possible problem that we may be causing the Unemployment Fund in this state. The United States Department of Labor has written to Governor Thompson and sent him a telegram and I have that telegram in my hand. And reading from that they say House Bill 3177 contains a number of Amendments to the Illinois Unemployment Insurance Act which we believe are inconsistent with Federal Unemployment Tax Act. Then they go on to say that if a state is not certified for tax credit, that is, if we lose our federal tax credit, all employers in the state become liable for the full federal tax of 3.4 percent on a six thousand dollar wage base instead of the 0.7 percent rate. That would be in addition to taxes for which they are liable under the State Unemployment Insurance Act. Now, Mr. Speaker, if Illinois should because of this Act and because of the noncompliance provisions that are in this Act, if the State of Illinois should lose our tax credit, this is going to mean some six hundred or seven hundred million dollars in taxes to private employers in the State of Illinois. And I



submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that at this late date, this is the wrong time to pass this Bill. And I would certainly urge a 'no' vote on this Bill and send it back to Conference Committee or whatever has to be done with it to permit us to get the necessary changes that have to be made in unemployment compensation insurance. If we don't address them now, we're going to have to address this issue next year and again and again and we might as well do it now. I urge a 'no' vote."

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

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

As I listen to the rationale being offered from the other side of the House, I find myself somewhat confused. I'll have you only to recall that a few hours earlier when the Majority Leader from this side of the aisle in Resolution 97 asked the Legislative Investigative Commission to investigate the experience rating with regards to the employers in this state, the opposition from the other side of the aisle pointed out four reasons as to why this shouldn't be done. I submit, Ladies and Gentlemen, that as I said then, it was brought up just recently by another Representative from the other side of the aisle that the U.C. fund was some seven hundred million dollars deficient. The reason the U.C. fund is deficient is because the Unemployment Bureau of Securities Administration, the way it operates, is so liberal that it's simply paying out benefits faster than it can collect the taxes. I submit that if we adopt Representative Mautino's measure here, it'll go a long ways to straightening this matter out particularly with the administration of the fund. I submit to you again, we're losing money as it's presently constituted because the administration is simply too liberal, Ladies and Gentlemen. And I can't understand how the Members on the other side of the aisle can make one word have so many meanings. Now I'd like to put him to explain to me how one Member can get up and say that we don't need to investigate the experience rating and now we have the Members on this other side of the aisle saying we don't need to pass this legislation. I will submit if we don't pass this legislation, we will simply watch the U.C. fund go bankrupt again. This will call



for an increase in the tax rate at the local levels and it'll go on and on and on until we tighten up the administration which is what this proposal attempts to do. I think it's good legislation and is highly deserving of our green votes."

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

McPike: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

McPike: "Previous speakers have indicated that this Bill will put us in noncompliance with federal legislation. Is that true?"

Mautino: "That is not quite true, Representative McPike. I would like to comment because I have the telegram before me. I detest the idea that things are taken out of context because I have taken the last paragraph of that telegram and transposed it into Section 2 of the Conference Committee Report. Representative Schuneman read from the telegram but he didn't read the final paragraph. I would like to quote from it for anyone who has the telegram. It says, 'If it appears that the Bill will be enacted in its present form, we would urge inclusion of a savings clause providing that the provisions identified above will not become effective unless and until the United States Secretary of Labor, excuse me, 'advises that they are not inconsistent with federal law requirements.' I've taken that right from the telegram. I've included it in this Conference Report in this Bill for protection as per they have requested from the Federal Government in Washington, D.C."

McPike: "All right, in other words, if any provision of this Act is found in noncompliance, then that provision is automatically repealed. Is that correct?"

Mautino: "Immediately and automatically, yes."

McPike: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address myself to the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Sir."

McPike: "Well, I think the reason... the conversation we just had speaks for itself. It has been implied that this will put us in noncompliance. Well, indeed it is possible that it could; but if it so does, then those provisions that would put us in noncompliance are automatically repealed. So I think we're addressing ourselves



to a phony issue. It's also been stated that we're removing a cap and thereby benefiting a few of the people that are unemployed and throwing the employers a few crumbs. Well, we are removing the cap but I think everyone in here recognizes inequities that now exist. If you are unemployed and have no children, you receive more money today than if you're unemployed and do have children. Clearly an inequitable position and that's what we're trying to correct. And the crumbs that we're throwing the employers are just a little bit more than crumbs. We're extending the ineligibility from six or eight weeks until nine weeks. We're increasing the base wage, we're increasing it by forty percent; from a thousand to fourteen hundred dollars. I don't think that you can say that when you increase the base wage by forty percent that that's merely a crumb. We're addressing ourselves to a problem. In fact, we're addressing ourselves to the problem about three times the increase in inflation in the last two years. I might also add that sometimes the hypocrisy of this House is indeed comical. About an hour or so ago, we passed out of here House Bill 736 by an overwhelming vote of 118 or 120 to 30. Now that Bill is just a gift to the employers. It's a grant to them of some five hundred million dollars. Actually, it's over a half a billion dollars in the next five fiscal years. It's a gift to them. And not one Republican that I can recall got up and spoke against it. They all applauded it as increasing job opportunities in this state. Well, the first time that we tried to give the unemployed a little bit, the first time that we want to try to pass along a few of these savings to the business community to those that are deserving, to those that have worked for a living and are now legitimately unemployed, immediately the cry goes up that the business community is once again being attacked in this state. Hypocrisy is just overwhelming. I just can't believe it when these things take place on this floor. That we would want to help the working man and refuse to do it, but once we want to give... once we want to give an outright gift of a half a billion dollars to the employers to purchase capital equipment or for incentive to purchase capital equipment when... when there's just no reason for it whatsoever, when



plant capacity... when plants today are operating at seventy per cent capacity and everyone realizes that any incentive along the lines of tax credits when plants are operating at this level is absolutely ridiculous. This is a decent Bill. It addresses itself to some of the problems that the working people face. It addresses itself to some of the problems that the business community faces and it is indeed a true compromise. I would urge an 'aye' vote on it."

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

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, I... I sometimes wonder listening to the people on the other side of the aisle where they're coming from. I think Representative McPike addressed the issue of the repealer clause quite well. He pointed out that if any provision of this is in nonconformity, it would go out the window and he's right. It's a sham to argue otherwise. It's interesting, however, to listen to the other side of the aisle. I think there were four speakers over there. Not one of those speakers said anything about the lowly paid hourly wage earner. The only issue they brought up was the cost to the trust fund, the cost of business. Not one question about the equity of what the wage base is or ought to be. Not one person over there talked about the cap, the cap on those people with multiple dependents. Not one person over there said that the change in the wage base wasn't up to what it would be if we raised the base by inflation which I understand would be eleven hundred and forty dollars for the year and three hundred and fifteen for the quarter. Instead, this Bill is fourteen hundred and three hundred and fifty. That's a long way from the increase. Not one of them said that and I submit to you most of them, most of them don't care. Most of them don't give a damn about the working man and woman and it's too bad people don't know that who work for a living. This is a fair compromise. I don't care if they like what I say on the other side or not. We've stood here and listened time and again to a attacks on Democrats..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Give the Gentleman your attention."

Stuffle: "...attacks on Democrats as Representative McPike said who has the guts to stand up here and vote for tax relief for business like



we did earlier today in 736. And we pointed out that we realized there was a need for that kind of break for business, but when it comes to a Bill that compromises well beyond the increase in the wage base, they don't talk about that compromise, they don't talk about the people who work for a lot less than the prevailing wage, they don't talk about the lowly paid wage earner, they don't talk about any of those issues. The only thing they want to know is, how much does it save business? Cause they don't give a damn. We ought to vote 'yes' on this issue."

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

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

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

All in favor signify by saying 'aye', all opposed. The previous question's been moved. The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino, to close."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What you have is the proposal before you. A proposal that goes much further, much further than when this legislation was originally passed by this same House with 112 votes. That being the legislation to take the cap off of that category of a working man with a spouse and children. We've increased the wage base forty percent. We're saving twelve million dollars, at least twelve million dollars. Most importantly, we're increasing the disqualifying period. And with that, I'd like to say a few words if you will, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir."

Mautino: "Because it kind of burns me. We sit down here in the General Assembly and I'll tell you right now there's not a man or a woman in this House of Representatives that could get along for nine weeks without a paycheck. I defy anybody in this House to tell me that they can get along for two months without any paycheck coming in. I think that in itself should tell you how serious we are. Think about this. An adjudicator has a case before him. The person makes a hundred and fifty bucks a week. The existing proposal that we have will give him fifty percent of his salary - seventy-five dollars a week and we're saying that if it's a voluntary quit or a refusal to take suitable work or misconduct,



you won't receive that seventy-five dollars a week for nine weeks. I know very few people who can get along without money for that period of time. The second thing that I'd like to bring up is the average claimant in the State of Illinois is between ninety and one hundred dollars a week. It's not at the top end of the schedule. It's around ninety to one hundred dollars a week. In most cases, that won't even pay these Member's telephone bills at their legislative offices. It won't do it. I'm telling you now. Your bills are all over three or four hundred dollars. Why do we take off on the person who is not economically advantaged as others in our society. We've made good changes, we've got the fraud provisions to tighten up the Act that everyone agrees with. We've got the repealer and I think it's a good piece of legislation. To be honest with you, it's one of the best compromises I could come up with. And I ask for your support."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 on House Bill 3177? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Griesheimer, to explain his vote. The timer's on. 'On moment.'"

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote, I do not wish to impugn the motives of the Sponsor of this Bill in any way because I believe he has honestly attempted to make some changes in the unemployment compensation law which is an abysmal law in this state. But to the two speakers over on the other side that tried to make this a party issue, I now understand why they're in government. They couldn't run a business if they tried. If you can imagine, we're paying unemployment compensation to people that voluntarily walk away from their job when they could be working. Now you talk five weeks, six weeks, seven weeks, eight weeks. Listen, if you walk away from your job, you shouldn't be paid a cent. You shouldn't get anything from the government or your employer. So for God's sake, both of you, stay in government. You'll never make it on the outside."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Ebbesen, to explain his vote. The timer's on."

Ebbesen: "Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the chair. Since the Senate



passed... Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Ebbesen: "Since the Senate passed this Conference Committee Report with 32 votes before midnight and if this receives more than 89 but yet less than 107 in this House and on this report, if he did not ask for a Second Conference Committee Report, would this then become law at... a year from now?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ebbesen, the Chair's already ruled that this Bill at this time is going to take 107 votes to pass."

Ebbesen: "I'm talking about... would it become effective, Mr. Speaker, if it got 89 votes and less than 107 and he did not ask for a Second Conference Committee Report with the Senate having approved it with 32 before midnight, would it become effective a year from now?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "If it does not receive 107 votes, it will be declared lost. Because of the effective date on the Bill. So why don't you just read the Bill and then the Conference Committee? It all ties in. Have all voted who wished? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Schlickman, your lights on. Want to explain your vote?"

Schlickman: "I'm conferring."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gene. Mr. Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Is there an effective date?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, there is."

Schlickman: "Where is it?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's in the Bill. Section 2, in the Bill. In the original Bill, Sir."

Schlickman: "That's not affected by the Conference Committee Report?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "It is not. It is not. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, to explain his vote. The timer's on."

Madison: "Not to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker, to make an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir."

Madison: "Speaker, did I understand you to say if this Bill gets 89 votes but less than 107, you will declare it lost?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "That is correct, Sir."

Madison: "Speaker, I seem to recall, and I wish you'd correct my memory,



that our rules provide that if it gets 89 but less than 107 where the Bill has an effective date, the Sponsor has a right to bring the Bill back to Second and remove the effective date."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That is correct as far as when the Bill is on Third Reading when you can call it back to Second and correct it. But you can't amend a Conference Committee Report after it goes to a Second Conference Committee."

Madison: "Will you declare the Bill..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It'll be taken care of there."

Madison: "Will you declare the Bill lost, Mr. Speaker, or can the Sponsor..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Conference Committee Report."

Madison: "Thank you."

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

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise to explain my 'aye' vote on this Bill. There has been quite a bit of criticism from the other side of the aisle regarding the provisions of the Bill. I think that the entire Membership should understand that the Bill represents a compromise between the two competing interests in this area. On the one hand, in some of its literature, the Chamber of Commerce has actually proposed that the ineligibility periods and that the benefit levels be taken back to levels which existed more than twenty years ago. I think that all of you, Democrat and Republican, should understand that. That when they talk in terms of some of the changes asked for by certain elements of the business community, they're suggesting that we retrench more than twenty years. And I'm sure that very few Members of this Body are willing to take that much of a benefit level away from the working men and women of this state. This Bill does represent a compromise. Please understand that the base wage is raised four hundred dollars - from a thousand to fourteen hundred dollars..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman kindly bring his remarks to a close? Please proceed, but bring your remarks to a close."

Madigan: "The Bill represents a compromise. It is the only Bill that



will be available to bring about changes in unemployment compensation. If this Bill fails, it can go back to a Conference Committee, the effective date can be changed. But then, there will be pressure brought upon all of us from now until the next time we adjourn to change that effective date to bring this law into immediate effectiveness."

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

Katz: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, does this Bill address itself to some of the major problems that employers have? And the answer is 'yes'. We've talked about increasing the benefit amount, increasing the base period wages to fourteen hundred dollars. What does that mean from one thousand dollars? It probably means that, oh, I would guess twenty-five thousand or so presently eligible claimants will not be eligible for benefits. The effect of increasing the qualifying amount is to render ineligible people whose earnings are less than that amount and that will be a very large number of people. It increases to nine weeks the disqualification period in the kinds of cases that employers complain most about. The... these voluntary leavings, the suitability of work, the discharge for misconduct, it eliminates the eligibility of education people, of students who are now eligible. All that it gives to workers is only one thing. It provides that workers who have children will..."

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

Katz: "Yes. Workers who have children will be paid as much as those who don't have children now, we pay them less. It was simply a mistake in the law. No one could ever justify paying workers with children less benefits than those without it, but that's what we're doing now. And so, based on my experience, I would say this does address itself to the major problems and is something that really, I think, as well as workers being interested in it, provides some significant and tangible benefits for employers."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Stiehl, to explain her vote. The timer's on."



C.M. Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I've been listening to all of the benefits that are going to be accrued and to how good this Bill is and there's something here that concerns me. I just heard the previous Gentleman say that by increasing the base period earnings from one thousand dollars to fourteen hundred, you are going to include about twenty-five thousand people who were in the lower earning categories. But what interests me is that according to the B.E.S. figures in 1977, this would only cover twenty-five hundred workers. Twenty-five hundred out of three hundred thousand claimants. Now this isn't the good deal that people are telling us. This isn't a help for a working man. And I would urge a 'no' vote."

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

Telcser: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Majority Leader has tried to tell the Members of this Legislature that this is a compromise piece of legislation on this very critical subject matter. I think the Members ought to realize that this so-called compromise will decimate the trust fund. It will cost the trust fund some forty-six million dollars and in its place, they are only putting in five million dollars. Had the Members of this Conference Committee adopted Senate Amendment #5, the trust fund would have had some eighty million dollars in extra money. Instead, they're winding up with a forty million dollar deficit. That, my friends, is one hundred and twenty million dollars difference which is not in this particular Conference Committee Report. Now if this was a great compromise which the Majority Leader is trying to tell us, why then is it that not a single Member of our side of the aisle signed the Conference Committee Report from either the Senate or the House? The simple fact of the matter is..."

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

Telcser: "The simple fact of the matter is that this is another cover-up that the other side of the aisle wants to accomplish because they're the ones, they're the ones who brought this state to this critical problem by their irresponsible attitude toward the issue of workmen's comp. and unemployment comp."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Jacobs, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Jacobs: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If you notice, I'm voting 'present'. Chairman of Labor and Commerce. And you know why? This Bill is a Bill that is not good for labor. Stop and think. If this Bill fails, industry will get nothing. Stop and think about it. I don't think that you really realize what you're doing."

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

Cunningham: "Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, at last cosmetic eyewash designed to conceal from the public which party caused the situation now that it's so inimical to the best interest of industry and all the people throughout the state. It should be pointed out here that no amount of firewater induced shouting and no of these efforts that are to conceal from the public where the blame lies that do not address the real problems that are presented here. These small changes that are offered are no solution. It would have been helpful if the Representative from Glencoe would have pointed out a moment ago that the meaningful challenge was not met. You remember when the Amendment was offered by Representative Wikoff that said that when you refused to cross picket lines, yet you're eligible for unemployment benefits. That was one of the watershed tests to know whether or not you're willing to take any meaningful steps. And those of you who treasure your four flags, you ran for cover again. You have no right to stand before the people of the State of Illinois and say that this is a meaningful compromise. It goes about ten percent of the way. You need to go fifty percent of the way. You'll not fool the voters with this kind of record. The monkey is on your shoulders as you'll find that out when they count the votes. The party on this side of the aisle..."

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

Cunningham: "You've got a fast watch, Speaker. The monkeys are on your back."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The same for everyone, Sir."

Cunningham: "Good night."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Mautino: "Mr. Speaker, what I'd like to do at this time before you announce the Roll, I'd like to have this Bill taken out and have leave of the House to ask for a Second Conference Committee and one be appointed. I think it's my right, Sir, to ask for a Second Conference Committee as Sponsor of the legislation."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Why don't we just make the announcement that the First Conference Committee Report is lost and all you have to do is request a Second Conference Committee? Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "So be it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On this question there are 86 'ayes', 80 'nays', 2 recorded as 'present' and the House does not adopt First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3177. Now the Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino, requests a Second Conference Committee be appointed. And a Second Conference Committee will be appointed. Yes, Sir. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Wolf, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Wolf: "Well, Mr. Speaker, seeing it is the hour that it is, how about a Roll Call for attendance?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excellent idea. Roll Call for attendance. It's the Roll Call for attendance. Robinson, are you here? Your light isn't on. Have all voted who are present or in Conference? Clerk will take the record. On the Supplemental Calendar #9 is House Bill 2981, the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Jane Barnes. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Barnes."

J. Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2981 addresses itself to the Illinois Arts Council. Now we have had a lot of fun with the Illinois Arts Council and several Legislators and myself have kidded one another but we are in the final hours of the Session so I would like to address myself to a very serious part of this Bill. The first time that I addressed the Bill I told you that when I was in high school that we were very fortunate in a private school because they exposed us to a lot of the arts and I learned a lot of appreciation. Representative



Collins and myself and a lot of other people, including my husband, did tour Ireland this past summer, and let me tell you when you go around the entire Isle of Ireland, the people were very poor but they were very proud. And let me tell you, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, I wish that I were a member of the Ireland Legislature so I could be part of the Ireland Arts Council so I could bring a little bit of art to those people, but I am not. Many times we do not travel in our own home state, but let me tell you people are poor and they are rich in every state and I am sure that in the State of Illinois there are many people that are poor and they would like a little bit of the Arts Council. You can put people on public aid and you can give them food stamps, but let me tell you one-fourth of the people will take advantage of it, three fourths will feel degraded. With the Illinois Arts Council, I will tell you, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, you can upgrade people. You can give them a little drama. You can bring a little symphony to their lives. You can bring many things to many poor people. Let me tell you, Ladies and Gentlemen, I think all of the time for laughter has been long gone. I think it's time that we take this Bill very seriously and we light a little light in the window of every person in the State of Illinois. Let's bring a little music, let's bring a little drama, let's develop a lot of talent in a lot of people in Illinois. I think the Illinois Arts Council is a very worthy council and I think that it deserves a 'yes' vote on the House Floor. Ladies and Gentlemen, I ask you for a 'yes' vote on this. And I wonder where my counterpart, Phil Collins, is on this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's probably singing at the Old Shillelagh.

The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison."

Madison: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the Representative's lecture on the attributes of the Illinois Arts Council but what I would like to do is raise a question if she'll yield."

Speaker Lechowicz: "To me, Sir? She indicates she'll yield."



Madison: "Representative Barnes, the Conference Committee Report indicates that the Senate receded from Senate Amendment #2. Can you refresh our memory in terms of what Senate Amendment #2 did?"

Barnes: "Representative Madison, I have an awful lot of respect for you and I certainly can refresh your memory. They want to decrease the appropriation by 374 thousand."

Madison: "Representative Barnes, can you tell me if House Bill 2981, as it presently stands, includes an appropriation for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Illinois Racing Board?"

Barnes: "Representative Madison, yes it does. And this is not the first Bill that I have been a victim of where they have amended another Bill into mine."

Madison: "Well, Representative, can you tell me what action the Senate if any has taken on the second Conference Committee Report?"

Barnes: "They're not too big on the Illinois Arts Council."

Madison: "Is it not true, Representative Barnes, that one of the reasons why the first Conference Committee Report was not adopted by the Senate was because the Illinois Racing Board was attached to the Appropriations Bill for the Illinois Arts Council?"

Barnes: "Representative Madison, I would say that's just a very... I was over in the Senate and just a very few Senators felt like you did. They really were not all that big on the Illinois Arts Council."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Bill?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Sir."

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2981 started out as a very simple Bill that appropriated the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Illinois Arts Council. This Bill had attached to it the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Illinois Racing Board. In addition, if you look at House Bill 3392, you will find in House Bill 3392 the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Illinois Racing Board. It seems to me that the Racing Board has more lives than a cat. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that somebody is trying to hide the



Racing Board in the Illinois Arts Council. I would suggest that we not adopt this Conference Committee Report until such time as we can get somebody to take the Illinois Racing Board out of this Bill and let's vote on the Arts Council. The gentle Lady described in her initial remarks, talked about the value and the attributes of the Arts Council. Not once did she mention that the Illinois Racing Board was a part of this Bill. Maybe it's because the Illinois Racing Board should not be a part of this Bill and a second Conference Committee Report should have taken it out. I know our rules don't provide for a third Conference Committee Report, so perhaps the gentle Lady would like to take this Bill out of the record and see if that Conference...that second Conference Committee cannot have a second meeting and divide the question of whether or not we're voting on the OCE for the Illinois Racing Board or the OCE for the Illinois Arts Council."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Barnes, do you want to proceed with this?"

Barnes: "Representative Collins, did you want to speak? Representative Madison, I would like to tell you that I am not a gambling lady myself. I don't place any bets on any horses but everybody knows in Springfield that sometimes, you know, you turn around and there's something amended into a good Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Ma'am. Let me tell the photographers a final time, no pictures are allowed, it's 20 till 2:00 in the morning. The Lady from Cook, I'm sorry for the interruption."

Barnes: "I would really like to yield to Representative Collins for a few comments."

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

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a unique experience, I think this is the first time in 12 years that the Sponsor of the Illinois Arts Council has asked me to say a few words and I am overwhelmed by the honor. I...I'd like to say, I have to commend the Lady for her battle in the interest of the arts. Now, I have done everything I can for the arts and the Arts Council in Illinois. Mrs. Barnes,



I have labored among the...the great illuminati, I have fought the great leviathan, I have done everything I can to bring these people in this chamber in contact with art culture and refinement. They have scorned me for my efforts to try and elevate the arts to the level that they should be in this state. We are so far behind the rest of the nation that it is scandalous and you know and I know we have done everything we can and everything in our power to bring the Chicago Symphony, the 'Lyric Opera', 'Ravinia' to the people of the State of Illinois and what has the General Assembly given us? They've given us Redmond and the Rose of Tralee. We have tried to expose them to poetry at the highest levels. We have Carl Sandburg in Illinois, we have Gwendolyn Brooks, we have tried to give them poetry in the schools and I say..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Collins. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madison, seek recognition?"

Madison: "Mr. Speaker, while Phil is at his eloquent best would he also explain the attributes of the Illinois Racing Board, since that's a part of this Bill?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He'll get to it. Please proceed, Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Jesse, I was getting to 'ficus aqui' later. But as we got into the field of poetry...I've told you some of the great poets we have in the State of Illinois and what have we? We've been exposed to it tonight, we've got Leinenweber and his limericks. We've tried to bring to you the free street theater, the Abbey Theater and even the old Vic in Chicago, but what have we? We've got Ellis Levin growing in the Victory Garden Theater. And I was invited up there tonight and I'll be there, Ellis, thank you. I think you are partially responsible for my conversion. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, when I first started."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Collins, what type of conversion is that?"

Collins: "You know, Larry DiPrima made an unfortunate remark along those lines the other night, Mr. Speaker, I will not say the same



thing... But... Mr. Speaker, when I started fighting for the Arts Council back in 1967 this was an appropriation of 25 thousand dollars and thanks to my efforts the appropriation today, if Mrs. Barnes is successful, will be nearly 3 million dollars. And God bless her, we have done a job in this state and I think...I'm growing old and tired, I am not going to take this burden on but I will just encourage her to go forth, continue the battle, don't give in. Let's let us turn down this Conference Committee Report, go back to the Senate, make them give us the money for arts, get rid of the Racing Board. We don't need anymore of that substance in the stables, there's been too much of that associated with our Arts Council, it's time to go forward. Tell those barbarians in the Senate that we'll pay millions for Debussy but not one cent for trivia. Mrs. Barnes, culture will prevail. Fearlessly go over to the Senate, fight them, you may be brought back on your shield and by God, what a pretty picture that would be. But remember, as you fight, go forward with hope in your heart, with the courage of your conviction and in the words of Bard of Antiquity, 'Yakka hula, dinky do'."

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

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Lady might yield for a question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "She indicates she will."

Brady: "This is the second Conference Committee Report, I'm wondering if you know if they've had a report or a vote over in the Senate on the second Conference Committee Report?"

Barnes: "I was over in the Senate when they voted on the Conference Committee and it was 27 to 25, I do think we have converted just a few. I mean, if we can get Phil Collins on our side, my God, we can conquer the world."

Bradley: "I'd like to talk to the..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Bradley: "If I might, in answer to some criticism, I suppose, that nobody has defended the Racing Board and I find myself in a rather awkward position but I have to confess, Mr. Speaker and Ladies



and Gentlemen of the House, that I don't go to the track very often but I have to confess that I enjoyed watching Secretariat win the Triple Crown and I enjoyed watching Affirmed win the Triple Crown in Coffey and being elected, voted the Athlete of the Year. I think there's something very stylish about those horses and about that young man and if we're going to have racing in Illinois, good Lord knows we've got to have a board to regulate them and we've got to fund that board. And if they have been defeated time and time again and Mrs. Barnes has found in her heart a place to put the Racing Board into this legislation, I think my good friend Jesse Madison would agree that we're stuck with racing. We've got to regulate them, we've got to have a...we have racing and we've got to have a board to regulate them. And I personally believe we underfund that board and put a lot of duties on their backs and we ask them to do a lot of things and then we say we're not going to fund them and we shortchange them. And my gosh, it's a great sport that we should fund so that it's regulated properly and so we'll have good racing in Illinois if we're going to have racing at all. And I certainly support the Lady's motion to adopt the second Conference Committee Report and I'll base my vote on the Racing Board and let Phil Collins base his on the Arts Council."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; 'aye'. The previous question has been moved. The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Barnes, to close."

Barnes: "All right, while I am not a betting Lady I did watch that very artistic race with my husband...what has been the more artistic than the Belmont Race of Affirmed and Alydar? Probably once in a lifetime when you saw those two jockeys get into the home stretch and that one jockey took the whip out of his right hand and put it in his left hand and he went down in that home stretch, I'll tell you I'm not a gambling Lady but that



had to be a sight. One of our former Legislators said, 'Long after we are gone all that will be left is a thin veneer of our arts.' And Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, I would ask you to show the Senate that we do have art in our hearts and vote a 'yes' on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #2? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, very briefly and I want to make it clear and I don't care if it gets 176 votes up there, I'm not opposed to the Arts Council and there's no one here that has not supported the Arts or have supported the Arts Council anymore than I have. But I am opposed to the Racing Board being tied to this council. I've sat here today and I've worked on Conference Committees where Members have come to me and said that we should remove people from agencies because they couldn't get response from their telephone calls and that agency being responsive... This agency, the director and the board of this agency would not respond, if you will, in a letter that was written to them by 15...15 State Legislators. The arrogance of that Lady that heads that board that would not even give those 15 Legislators the courtesy...the courtesy of a response typifies the kind of attitude embodied in that Racing Board. It may get out of here tonight. It may get out of this House tonight, I'm not sure it's going to ever get out of the Senate, but I guarantee you, I guarantee you every possible chance I get in my waking days in this General Assembly, until that board straightens up its act, somewhere, someday, sometime I will continue this fight against that board."

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

Deuster: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my 'yes' vote I'd like to recite a poem that I believe must have been written by Representative Collins



because of its obvious clarity. 'Twas Brilligan the sly thee...'

(Recites 'Jabberwocky', by Lewis G. Carroll.)

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

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in explaining my vote, quite simply that when the archeologists first ventured into the first cave to study the paleontology of man they found the figure of a horse, the highest expression of no kind of man and believe me that was are then as much as it is today. You're voting right."

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

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, I think we are pointing up here the most asinine method of appropriating money to run state government I've ever seen. We've got the Arts Council in with the Racing Board and you have a choice of voting for both or none. I would echo some things that have been said across the hall, I am not impressed with the Chairman of the Racing Board and the actions of that board. So I'm going to have to vote 'no'."

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

Mann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I really think we're expecting too much of Mrs. Barnes. It's big a task enough given the opposition of our colleague, Phil Collins, to carry the Arts Council. But for her also to carry the Racing Board I think is too big a burden for anyone. And while there may be some arty:sides to racing some of the conditions under which the men who labor in and around the horse races labor is certainly not arty, certainly it has nothing to do with the humanities, it has no culture about it. And as far as I'm concerned, if this is the only way



that we can pass the Arts Council and the Racing Board, let them both go down. I urge a 'no' vote."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, when I first got down here we had a little problem with the Racing Board then and I want to tell you, you talk..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Ray. If the Parliamentarian is within hearing of my voice will he kindly come to the rostrum?"

Mr. Epstein. Please continue, Mr. Ewell."

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, when I first got down here we had some problems with the Racing Board. They had a problem that looked something like this. There were two brands of horses running, one were called the thoroughbreds, the great beautiful nags of the world. They were imported horses. But the other part of the story was that the American nags, who were home bred, born here in Illinois, talking about the appaloosas, couldn't even run at the track. In other words the cow pony, the American pony, the only one that ever got here the right way, they said that they couldn't run at the track. Now, the thoroughbreds have something that's unique about them. It's so unique that in the last time we ran through the cases where the thoroughbreds had V.D., they would rather have still imported them than use artificial insemination and lose the revenue because of the study. The horse racing industry is indeed a sick industry and it has a lot to be criticized and I say this and I argued the same point then, when you want to get so that you're going to let the appaloosas, the American horses..."

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

Ewell: "Run at the races, I'm with them. I think it stinks, I think they both ought to go down. Although I like the Arts Council, I favor them, but believe me when I tell you, not the racing industry."

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

The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 121 'aye'.



30 'nay' and 12 recorded as 'present'. The House does adopt Conference Committee Report #2 on House Bill 2981. Too late. Senate Bill 1595. Mr. Wikoff. Mr. Wikoff."

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Collins - Barnes act is a hard act to follow but having walked behind a few horses in some parades sometimes I'll try to watch my footwork on this. The Senate Bill 1595 came out of the Conference Committee. We had previously concurred with Amendment #1 and #4. Senate Amendment #2, which was added on...or House Amendment #2, which was added on on the floor added 101 thousand 700 dollars above the original Senate cut of 193 thousand 400 to the Fire Marshall's operating expenses. Conference Committee reduced this 52 thousand with a net increase of 48 thousand 900 dollars above the Senate total. The Senate has adopted this Conference Report and I would move for the adoption of this Conference Report."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Jack, it's a Senate Bill. Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question. Was there a cut in the Fire Marshall's Office for six positions of inspectors?"

Wikoff: "The Conference Report on the second one as it came out was a reduction in personnel in the...and I assume it's from the... Bob, would you repeat your question? I've got my answer here..."

Terzich: "Well it was my understanding that because of some federal law that they had to pay the inspectors the overtime for anything over 8 hours and therefore it was necessary to keep the costs down to add on some additional inspectors, which they call public information officer, so they wouldn't have to go into overtime salary and therefore they cut those six positions out. Is that correct?"

Wikoff: "I'm not aware of that. I'm not doubting your word but I'm not aware of it."

Terzich: "Are these men investigators or information officers?"

Wikoff: "There are four or five areas here, the boiler pressure vessel



safety was cut, personnel services were cut some 15 thousand. Fire prevention personnel services were cut some 19 thousand 500. And then there was a cut in the personnel standards in education in the amount of some, just a little less than 18 thousand."

Terzich: "All right, thank you, Representative."

Wikoff: "I might add, the original Bill on this was for the operating expenses of the Universities retirement systems. And this was added on as a...in House action last night, night before last I guess it is."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House concur in Conference Committee Report #1 on Senate Bill 1595? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 139 'aye', 10 'nay', 3 recorded as 'present' and the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 on Senate Bill 1595. On the Calendar on Supplemental #8 is Senate Bill 82. Mr. Polk. Mr. Kosinski will handle the Bill for him."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you remember several hours ago with 120 votes we passed the Habitual Criminal Act out of this House."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Excuse me, Mr. Kosinski. For what purpose does the Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite, seek recognition?"

Satterthwaite: "Point of order, just a correction. I believe that was the second Conference Committee Report on the last Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "According to the Calendar, Ma'am, it was the first Report. I'm going on as... Are you talking about Senate Bill 1595, Ma'am? It was the first report, Ma'am."

Satterthwaite: "Oh, I'm sorry."

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

Kosinski: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. We passed our Habitual Criminal Act out from the Senate with 120 votes. They wished a second Conference Committee to inject a time frame in terms of



the penalty into the Bill and this has been accomplished. I will read that addition to the Habitual Criminal Act. The additional...addition by the second Conference Committee was, 'The third offense was committed within 15 years of the date the judgement was entered on the first conviction. Provided, however, the time spent in custody shall not be counted.'

Now I ask that the this House put those votes back on the board and return this to the Senate for further consideration. Thank you."

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

Johnson: "Well first of all, Mr. Sponsor... Mr. Sponsor..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Roman. He's listenting, he's resting as well."

Johnson: "Am I correct in saying that under this legislation, not the way you originally proposed it with specified crimes but under this legislation if someone were to commit a burglary, which is a Class II felony, in 1968 and be convicted, another burglary in 1971 and be convicted, still a Class II felony, this Act is then enacted and then next year the Legislature decides that burglary is a sufficiently serious crime, that we make burglary then Class X and an individual commits another burglary the next day, even though at the two times he'd committed the previous offense they were only Class II, he'd be subject to this and we'd throw away the key. That's right isn't it?"

Kosinski: "Mr. Johnson, may I answer you categorically? If next year the General Assembly determines that spitting on the sidewalk is a Class X offense it would apply."

Johnson: "Okay, another question of the Sponsor. The language of the statute as it's now drafted in this Conference Report #2 refers to Class X. We seem to have a proclivity in this House to want things to sound as dramatic as possible. What if we made the most serious offense Class Z and then all the things that are now Class II and Class III felonys became Class X. This would be applicable to that situation as well, wouldn't it? So then we'd have theft, shoplifting, aggravated shop lifting, if the House wanted to go that direction. The Act would cover the statute the same way, wouldn't it?"



Kosinski: "There are many hypothetical situations that could be applied here, Mr. Johnson. I presume we could go on interminably with them. The answer obviously would be yes, but still the General Assembly, in its wisdom, will make certain considerations in all instances."

Johnson: "The first Bill...the first time we passed House Bill 1500 or Class X, depending on what you want to refer it to, we made this applicable only to crimes committed after the effective date of the Act. Why do we want to go back now after we've only been operating into the Class X sentencing system for less than a year and make this dramatic change that clearly has some constitutional questions if not constitutional infirmities, when we haven't seen how the system works already?"

Kosinski: "Because, Mr. Johnson, with 115 Sponsors of this legislation in the General Assembly, would feel like idiots to go to their people and tell them, 'Yes, we have a Habitual Criminal Act but it won't go into effect for 16 years.' They would feel like idiots going into Statesville tomorrow and saying, 'You fellas who are in here for the 4th and 5th conviction, don't worry we love you. Go out and commit another 3 major crimes before we hit you.' This is...(tape failure)."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Class Z just went into effect, I think. Roman, why don't you use Byers' mike?"

Kosinski: "This was not the original intent of this General Assembly, the intent was to provide a deterrent, to prevent the third occurrence of that forcible felony, that Class X. This is the will of the people of the State of Illinois as evidence in the 115 and 120 votes. We are responding to the needs of the people, they're afraid to walk the streets, they're afraid of home invaders. The elderly are hiding under their beds, it's about time that we do something constructive."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Johnson, there are a number of other people that are seeking recognition."

Johnson: "No more questions, I just want to conclude then. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as evidence, I think, by my close friend-



ship and association with the Sponsor both in Judiciary II and on the floor, I have the highest respect for Representative Kosinski and his motive, but I think sometimes we can go so far in the name of simply classifying something as law and order and classifying something as being a beefing up of the criminal law that we lose sight of what we're really doing. And I would think people have got to look into the substance of this Act and to see what we're really doing here. We're saying that 15 years ago an individual can commit something that's classified as a Class III or a Class IV felony and that five years ago he can do the same thing. Then we can completely change the rules in the middle of the game and make everything apply retroactively to that particular offense. I think it's...I understand that law and order is important. I think we can say to the people of Illinois today that if you want to commit three felonies or you want to commit three of the specified series of crimes after the effective date of the Act, the deterrent's there, don't do it because if you do we're going to throw away the key. But to go back 15 years in history and have...to make them subject to whatever the General Assembly is going to do in 80 or 82 or 83, is that absolutely retributive and it's wrong? And I think that while we've got to have law and order, we've got to have a little balance because we're talking about people. We're talking about a person who has...has committed two offenses that the General Assembly will say two years from now somehow has been upgraded. And the direction we're headed, I think aggravated shoplifting is an offense that may be added to Class X or Y or Z is not unreasonable. This isn't an anti law and order vote to vote 'no' or 'present' on this. It's simply saying, 'Let's put some common sense and Constitutional safeguards into our criminal justice system. Because if we're going to have the respect of the people I think we've got to have both protection for the right of society and a little bit of balance with respect to what we're doing to the whole system of criminal



justice. And that's what we're after, is justice, and I think this Bill is not in the direction of justice but in the direction of retribution."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Rock Island...I'm sorry, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, I'll yield to the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Houlihan, and then I'd like to speak."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Houlihan. Dan Houlihan."

Houlihan: "Well very briefly because we have very recently considered this in the first Conference Committee Report, which the Conference Committee Report passed overwhelmingly out of this House but was defeated in the Senate. I think that the Sponsor is optimistic in the extreme if he feels that this second Conference Committee will correct the defects as perceived by the Senate, simply by putting a time limitation and I suspect that time limitation is 10 years...or 15 years. All of the things that Representative Johnson has referred to, I think, indicates that the Bill, as presently drafted, is seriously and in my opinion, quite obviously defective. Aside from the philosophy of your law and order approach to the criminal justice system I have suggested in my previous remarks that what you are doing is creating an unworkable law and you will absolutely straight jacket all of the state's attorneys of this state if you expect them to be able to work within the framework of this Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, this particular Bill needs a very substantial reworking, it simply cannot work in practice and I urge a negative vote."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Mann: "Who were the two Senators that did not sign the second Conference Report?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Kosinski."

Kosinski: "They were Senators Netsch and D'Arco."

Mann: "Senators Netsch and D'Arco? And who...who was the House member



that did not sign the report?"

Kosinski: "Representative Katz."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we've got two Chairmen of Judiciary Committees that did not sign the report and the Senator who is not exactly soft on law and order, Senator D'Arco. And this is just more testimony to the fact that this Bill is badly flawed, it will accomplish a result that was never intended with regard to the original Act and we've...we've sent it out of here once I think we ought to retire it now for this Session and vote 'no'."

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

Mugalian: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I...I think on this kind of a Bill it might not be a bad idea to sort of think with our gut or with our heart. Maybe you ought to remember what it was like when we were 19 and 20 or in our early 20's and think about the possibilities that we might have been in a couple of bar room brawls. Probably many of us are too old or too respectable to remember those days, maybe some of you saw a movie that might help you identify with the sort of thing we're really talking about. There was a movie with Burt Reynolds called 'The Longest Yard', he sort of went on a spree and he committed about three felonies in the process. Then he got in a prison, in a Georgia prison, I think it was and committed a couple more felonies. He wasn't really a bad guy but one thing led to another and he was an individual and he was a human being and he resented these cruel prison conditions that he had to endure because of his first commitment, which was a result of driving an automobile recklessly and it was a felony. It might have been a Class X felony and maybe we ought to think a little bit with our hearts about what it might be like to have done that in our youth and then have something happen maybe 20 years later...15 years later and then think about a life sentence, a complete total life sentence. Ladies and Gentlemen, I don't know but I think the greatest thing this General Assembly could do would be to



show that it has some heart, some understanding of the human condition and to not say that, 'Yes, we will automatically throw the key away and commit a human being to a life sentence in a penitentiary.'

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

Daniels: "I move the previous question on a very fine Bill."

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

All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; 'aye', opposed. The previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Houlihan, Jim Houlihan, are you seeking recognition?"

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's your point?"

Houlihan: "I believe that we are not permitted under our Rule 68(d) to vote on this Conference Committee Report until tomorrow."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We suspended that rule. The Gentleman from..."

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, I think before you move on you ought to check with either the other Speaker or the Parliamentarian or some consistent back up there because I don't believe that rule 68(d) was suspended."

Speaker Lechowicz: "This report was filed at 11:30 p.m. yesterday.

It's in order. The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk, to close."

Polk: "Well thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let's...let's recognize the fact that it's now ten minutes after 2:00 and this is the second time we've had an opportunity to vote on this tonight. You've heard much dialogue in relation to it and what Mr. Kosinski and I have attempted to do with our work in the Senate is to get something that would be acceptable to both sides of the rotunda. This isn't something we've taken very lightly, we've...been very, very serious in our deliberations with the Senate. We think we've given an Amendment now that should make it acceptable with the 15 year...going back 15 years and we would sincerely appreciate an 'aye' vote now so we can get this thing back in the Senate and conclude it tonight."



Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House adopt the second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 82? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Kelly: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think, I hope I indicated to you earlier the importance of crime and taxation with people. Now I'll tell you something, we aren't talking about the poor, innocent individual who has committed the first crime. We're talking about someone who has committed a triple crime, a three time loser. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 80 percent of the crimes are committed by repeated offenders. If we get rid of these repeated offenders we would not have the crime in the street that we have today. People could go and feel free and easy, walk the streets, to be in their home... we wouldn't need laws to protect them in their homes. This proposal is another in the line of crime prevention and I'm very much in favor of Representative Kosinski's proposal."

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

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, please remember that we've been three and a half years in work, we in the General Assembly, for this Bill. It follows the House's original legislative intent. We have now responded to the Senate's recommendation of a time frame in the second Conference Committee. You've been asked to remember your youth. I'm sure it was not filled with Class X felonies. May I ask you to CTA driver who was recently murdered by someone who."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Kosinski, the Gentleman has raised a point of order. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, on a point of order."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, I may be mistaken but I think he's already spoken to the question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's the Sponsor he can explain his vote. Please proceed."

Kosinski: "May I ask you to remember also, while we're playing our violins, the people who have been murdered by multiple offenders, the



people whose homes have been violated. We've attempted to do something here in the General Assembly, this isn't my Bill it's your Bill. Send it back to the Senate, please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Mrs. Martin, to explain her vote. The timer is on."

Martin: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'd like first of all to say that if this vote reaches 107 I'd like to verify it. But more than that I would like to say that we know what we're doing here tonight with this piece of legislation is very unconstitutional and we feel or at least we know that we're suppose to be very responsible people representing, as I heard tonight, 11 million people. And for us to pass a piece of legislation like this is totally irresponsible. And I would certainly wish that everyone would consider what they're doing here and look at this piece of legislation very carefully. And I would like to verify the vote if it reaches 107."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Yes, Sir. The Lady already requested a verification, Sir. Mr. Polk asks for a poll of the absentees. I can't hear you, what?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. E.M. Barnes. Brandt. Corneal Davis. Ewell. Flinn. Gaines. Geo-Karis. Getty. Hart. Jacobs. Kane. Keats. Klosak. Madison. McBroom. Nardulli."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Would the Parliamentarian come to the rostrum? Mr. Epstein."

Clerk O'Brien: "Reed. Skinner. Stearney. Taylor. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McClain, for what purpose are you seeking recognition? Kindly change Mr. McClain from 'aye' to 'no'. Mrs. Martin, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Martin: "I'd like to verify Mr. Domico first of all."

Speaker Lechowicz: "First of all we've got to go through the... You want to abstain the necessity of going through the...having the Clerk read the Members?"

Martin: "The Oral Verified Roll Call, Mr. Speaker. Okay, read them."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Domico as 'present'. That's 106. Mr. Flinn wants to be recorded as 'aye'. The Clerk will proceed to verify."

Clerk O'Brien: "Adams. Anderson. Jane Barnes. Bartulis. Beatty. Bennett. Bianco. Birchler. Boucek. Bradley."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Mr. Polk, for what purpose are you seeking recognition?"

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, can I have the consideration of Postponed Consideration and save the time of the House tonight?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's all right. Postponed Consideration on the second report. Postponed Consideration. You better check with the Parliamentarian, that's what he told me he can do. On page 6, House Joint Resolution 97. Just relax for a minute we'll get you a ruling. Okay now on the point on 36(d), page 338 of your rules it says, 'Concurrence to Senate Amendments to House Bills in the adoption of Conference Committee Reports are votes on final passage.' And the votes on final passage are subject to Postponed Consideration. And on that point the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Well Mr..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Mann, please."

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, you put it where you put it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. House Joint Resolution 97. Mr. Barnes. You got a point of order, Mr. Bowman?"

Barnes: "A point of order, Mr. Speaker. Specifically, specifically from the Parliamentarian the language and the ruling that you ruled relative to Postponed Consideration, not on final action on Conference Committee Reports. Not on final action on Conference Committee Reports. That's the issue here."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "I'm waiting for the ruling because the ruling that I heard does not relate to Conference Committee Reports."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What was that...One at a time, all right? Mr. Polk, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Polk: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, at the time that



we had the vote, the last vote, we had 107 votes and I was really concerned whether there were actually 107 people here who had voted for the Bill. My intent and purpose of taking it out of the record was to make sure that we did not delay the House. Apparently by asking to put it on Postponed Consideration I may be delaying it even more. If the Lady persists in verifying her Roll Call, fine, I'm simply trying to move and speed up the business of the House tonight. And I will abide by the Parliamentarians' decision."

Speaker Lechowicz: "First of all, it's your decision. We called the next matter, we ruled on it, it's dead. Yes, Mr. Barnes, you had a point that was raised and I don't believe we responded to them. Mr. Barnes. Kindly put Mr. Barnes on."

Barnes: "My light is on, Mr. Speaker. I raise a specific question to a specific point and I haven't had any reply."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Okay. Page 340, 38. Postponed Consideration. When a Bill is voted on final passage and receives at least 70 affirmative votes the Sponsor may, before the result is announced, place the Bill on the Order of Postponed Consideration. A Bill may be placed on the Order of Postponed Consideration only once and may be called for passage only once thereafter. The final...and this is a vote on final passage according to the Parliamentarian."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentarian... I redirect my question to you and I know you are professional with the English language. My specific, specific request was relative to a ruling of whether of not a second Conference Committee Report, Report could be placed on Consideration Postponed. I did not ask you about a deal. I did not ask you about the ruling relative to Consideration Postponed, I asked you about the ruling relative to a second Conference Committee Report. And I have a reason for asking you about that and I'd like a ruling on that direct question. Again, Mr. Speaker...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Wait, don't remark on anything because David gives you a five minute explanation, okay, and at 2:25 we're going to



be very careful. Proceed. Come on now before I get upset. The vote on a second Conference Committee Report has not been taken, it's been Postponed. Under Rule 38. House Joint Resolution 97. Page 6. Excuse me, is Mr. Phil Crane on the floor? There's been some objection to you being on the floor, would you kindly remove yourself? Yes, Gene. Mr. Barnes."

Barnes: "I directed that question to ask another question or to add another question and I am sure the Parliamentarian is well aware of that. 36 is not the proper rule relating to the situation, it speaks to neither 38. The proper rule relating to this situation is 68(e) and he knows it and he knows we weighed it. You can not put a Conference Committee Report on Second...on any Postponed Consideration after you waive 68(e). And Mr. Parliamentarian, you stood right there while we waived that rule. 36 nor 38 relates directly to final passage on Conference Committee Reports and you know it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Barnes, that rule was suspended till midnight, July 1. House Joint Resolution 97. What's your point, Mr. Mann."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, does he get to put this on Postponed Consideration, this second Conference Report, twice?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Just once, Sir."

Mann: "He gets how many more shots, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He gets one more shot if he does it before midnight tonight and I don't think we're going to get there, my friend so I wouldn't worry about it. House Joint Resolution 97. Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Joint Resolution... I'm going to handle House Joint Resolution 97 and I'd like to ask the adoption of the Resolution."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1. Amends House Joint Resolution 97 by inserting after the first resolved clause, the following: 'Resolved that the Special Joint Committee shall consist of 10 Members appointed as follows. Three by the Speaker, two by the House Minority Leader...'"



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

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, I think that was adopted this morning because we were working on that Bill this morning and it was adopted and we left that order of business."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It wasn't printed, the Amendment was withdrawn at the time. The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #1. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye'. Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman on House Joint Resolution 97, as amended. Yes, Sir. Pardon me, Mr. Beatty."

Beatty: "We've just adopted an Amendment, is it customary that we should come right back to the Bill or should there be some time lapse before we could consider this Bill?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's a Resolution, we can move right to it. It's on the desks. Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in the past few years there's probably been more...probably been no other issue that has given the Illinois House an incentive, more concern than trying to resolve some of the problems with Workmen's Compensation and the administration of the Workmen's Compensation Act. And this Resolution addresses itself to that problem and asks that we in the Illinois General Assembly investigate and determine what the problems are in the administration of Workmen's Compensation in Illinois and come back with a solution to the Illinois General Assembly and I offer and I respectfully request an 'aye' vote on the Resolution."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On the Resolution, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Beatty."

Beatty: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Beatty: "Could you tell me who it is that wants an investigation and what it is that's suppose to be investigated? Have there been complaints? What are the complaints or is this a political witch hunt?"



Bradley: "No, I would certainly say it's not a political witch hunt and I'm...very sure that Mr. Beatty is concerned as I am about the Resolution but in the opinion of the...in my opinion and the Gentlemen who are offering the Resolution are very sincere in their concern for the problems of the administration of the Workmen's Compensation situation in Illinois. As he well knows, as I do, that we've had people who have been unable to get their claims resolved and..from the Industrial Commission as quickly and as readily as accurately and as fairly as he and I would like those determinations and those judgements made by the Industrial Commission. And that might be part of the area that would be encompassed in the examination in this Resolution. And I hope that he joins me in voting 'aye' on the Resolution."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a few more questions. When someone wants an investigation the normal conotation is that there's something wrong. Somebody must be pointing out there's something wrong. Who specifically has asked you, as a Sponsor, to investigate the Industrial Commission?"

Bradley: "Well I've had people in my district, Mr. Speaker, that have come to me with the stories that they've had a lot of difficulty and probably their greatest concern is the length of time that it takes between the time that they're injured and between the time that they get to the Industrial Commission and get a judgement and get a settlement on their particular case. That alone, I think, would be enough to suggest to the Members of the House that we should have some kind of a investigation to see why it takes so long for the Industrial Commission to take... to make a decision as to what might be fair compensation for an injury to a man or a woman while they're working on the job, cannot work any longer possibly, are unemployed, so to speak, unable to work. And for the Industrial Commission to take the time that they do with no consideration at all for those men or those women who have families that they're supporting, those children are wondering if their parents are going to be able



to pay the bills to supply clothing and food. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't understand why in the world the Gentleman standing on my immediate right would not have those same concerns. And I know that he's going to see before we're done here this morning why we should have this examination. And I know people in his district have come to him with those same complaints and he will join me and I will suggest that his name be placed as one of the Members on this examination team."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, I'd appreciate if the...if I would ask a question if the Gentleman would answer the question and not expound on it. I want to know what this investigation is all about. What he has said has encouraged me because I believe working men who are injured should receive their compensation at the earliest possible time. But I wonder, is there a limitation to this investigation? What further things might you want to investigate?"

Bradley: "Absolutely no limit at all. We're going to investigate the whole realm of Unemployment Compensation. And I think that if we're going to get into it at all we should get into it completely and make a full scale investigation and come back here and report to the General Assembly and to the Illinois House with some recommendations, Mr. Speaker, some recommendations that will solve the problems for working people."

Beatty: "One other question I'd like to ask is, there was a Bill relative to the funding of the Industrial Commission and their funding was cut. Their funding was asking for additional help to process the claims so that the working people could have their claims honored at a sooner time. I don't know how you voted on that Bill but you apparently would want to support an additional budget to hire additional people if the need is there for additional part-time help."

Bradley: "Well I would want to wait until we got the investigation completed to make that kind of a determination as to whether that is the cause and that's why...why we're not....why those people are not receiving their benefits in time."

Beatty: "Thank you very much. It's getting late..."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Or early, it depends on how you look at it.

The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly."

Kelly: "I just want to move the previous question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', all opposed? The previous question has been moved. The Gentleman from Maclean, Mr. Bradley, to close on House Joint Resolution 97."

Bradley: "Well I've never had anything quite...debated quite extensively as we've just had on so many questions and I hope I've responded to the questions Mr. Beatty was asking and I simply ask that we get an 'aye' vote on this Resolution. I sincerely mean it, I think, Mr. Speaker, it's something that must be done, that should be done. We all know that, it's late...early in the morning, late in the day or something and we...late in the Session. We need this Resolution and I respectfully request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House adopt House Joint Resolution 97? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk, to explain his vote. The timer is on."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we don't need this House Joint Resolution 97. All we need to do is establish some standards, make some changes in the statutes. We know what has to be done. We don't need to establish another Commission to study this problem. We've studied it to death, we know what has to be done and we don't...we just don't need it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis, to explain her vote."

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have to concur with Representative Beatty because if you know anything about Workmen's Compensation trials they are stacked knee high and they just don't have enough help and this Commission is not going to do the job. Representative Tuerk hit it right."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will... The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino,



to explain his vote. I'm sorry, I didn't see your light."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to explain my vote because I think it's a needed proposal in the area of the Illinois Industrial Commission because of the backlog of cases that are there, primarily caused by the attorneys that are involved in all of those cases, at least 85 percent of them. And Mr. Beatty, I'm sure, did an excellent job of questioning Representative Gerry Bradley, but the problem is that in other states there only about 10 or 15 percent of the cases that are handled by attorneys. In the State of Illinois we have approximately 85 to 90 percent. And the backlog is caused, of course, because we didn't have a Commission Chairman for about 7 months and we had problems in that area. I don't see anything wrong with investigating the ways that those policies are handled. What the projections are for the future year and I think it would be a good study."

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

Jones: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. And referring to the previous speaker, all he has to do is put that language in 3177 and that problem would be resolved."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from McLean Mr. Bradley."

Bradley: "I'd like to explain my vote, Mr. Speaker, by suggesting that some of those red lights up there that are generally on the other side of the...on the other side of the issue who are always saying that the Democratic side is always working in favor of the Workmen's Compensation Act, I would suggest that this is a very, very sincere effort by us to take a strong look at the problems in Workmen's Compensation. And there will be Members on your side of the aisle appointed to this Resolution and I...I think that you're making a mistake by not supporting is and we need a few more votes. I think we ought to have them and go ahead...go ahead with the Resolution."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Adams, Mrs. Kent, to explain her vote. The timer is on."



Kent: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am voting 'no' because if we are going to study the Workmen's Compensation laws and how we can better them we must not have a partisan Committee as this is."

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

Tipsword: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm voting for this Resolution and the reason I am is because talking with many employers throughout our district one of the things that has always come up is their objections to the Workmen's Compensation Act...that have been raised here many times. But the other thing that comes up is the delivery system under the Workmen's Compensation Act. This is something that must be looked into not only from the worker's standpoint but also from the employers' standpoint. They allege that this is one of the great costs in Workmen's Compensation, is the manner in which it is handled. We need to find out and know whether or not this...there is something wrong in our delivery system or if there's something that needs to be changed. Something far more, perhaps, than saying that they don't have to have an attorney to go before them or there should be someone else to counsel the workers that go before the Industrial Commission. That may not be the answer but it may be, we need to know what the real answer is and I would urge everyone to support this Resolution and let's find out. Because we've heard lots of complaints about the kind of procedure we have, regretablely, with the Industrial Commission."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Beatty, your light is on do you want to explain your vote?"

Beatty: "Well the Majority Leader was out here a few minutes ago and he said, John, have you explained your conflict of interest? And so he's nudged my conscience and the fact of the matter is that I've been involved in Workmen's Compensation since 1954 and I really know what the basis of this investigation is and of course it's to embarrass to the Republican administration,



they didn't appoint the commissioner soon enough when the Governor took office and the claims are still behind. But I represent working people and I cannot vote for an investigation, a political witch hunt because if I go before an arbitrator or a commissioner and I voted for an investigation, the man I represent will not receive the fair treatment and so even though I'm a Democrat, I'm a lawyer, I owe it to my clients to represent them properly and I cannot ask for an investigation that will hurt the working men that I represent so I do have a conflict."

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

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At this late hour this is quite ridiculous so I vote we go to Constitutional Amendments, Second Reading for the purposes of a recess."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 70 'aye', 74 'nay', 16 recorded as 'present' and the House does not adopt House Joint Resolution 97 and it is hereby declared lost. The Gentleman from McLean Mr. Bradley, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, if my figures are correct we have four pieces of legislation left for this evening. I don't know where the Conference Committee Reports are, who's working on them. We have, I think to the best of my knowledge, DOT, Personnel CDB, the Omnibus Bill. Those four and possibly if 3177 comes back on the second Conference Committee Report. I certainly hope that we continue to bring those four pieces of legislation to a conclusion as rapidly as possible. I hope... I don't know where those meetings are. Evidently we have one of the... Conference Committee Report in front of us and after all one of our Members has a big date tomorrow and he's concerned about... Wednesday? Oh, he's got plenty of time. But I sincerely mean that, let's stay with it and let's complete the job that's before us. It's been a long Session the last three or four months, we're



very close to ending it, let's go ahead with the work of the House."

Speaker Lechowicz: "On the Calendar, Supplemental #7, Senate Bill 1672. Is Mr. Telcser in the chamber? Mr. Telcser. Where's he at? The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur with the first Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1672. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed? The House does not concur in the first Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1672 and he requests a second Conference Committee be appointed. A second Conference Committee will be appointed. We will stand in...at ease for approximately 20 minutes and hopefully we will have another Conference Committee Report on your desks in the meantime. I want to thank the Membership for their attendance and their decorum in this late Session. We'll stand at ease for approximately 20 minutes...the call of the Chair."



Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Daniels in Mr. Polk's chair."

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, earlier this evening the Speaker of the House promised that he would sing to this group his famous Irish tunes that he closes out the Session with and it's just about the time of the evening in which he normally serenades the group. So I was wondering, Sir, if you have any idea what time the Speaker was going to sing his songs to us?"

Speaker Madigan: "Soon...soon."

Daniels: "Now you may take his place if you'd like."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen. We just opened the drapes for your convenience so that you'd all enjoy the beautiful sunrise. I was pointing to the Republican Members so they'd know exactly where the East is at, it's the other way. Too bad we're not in Chicago, I can tell you where I use to go. No, you know, if I was in Chicago, from the East...Mr. Collins, I'm sure you're quite familiar with the Southeastern section of this fine City...suburban area, Italian-American and all that area? It's been a long day. We're waiting for one correction on one Conference Committee Report. We're waiting for another Conference Committee Report from the printer. We've got a total of about five items to be completed. We're in the process of having, waiting for one more. That's the status as of now.

Good morning, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we'll reconvene and come to order. The Clerk...the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Porter for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Porter: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if someone shouldn't call the Governor and tell him we're going to be a little late."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the Doorman kindly clear the floor? Put the Doorman on. Oh, he's up and around."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Listen to this announcement. Introduction and First Reading. Believe it or not we have some."



Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3415. Kucharski. A Bill for an Act to prohibit producers and refiners of petroleum products from owning and operating retail service stations. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3416. Polk. A Bill for an Act to permit the broadcasts of House and Senate proceedings by the electronic news media. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Committee on Rules. Adjournment Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 103. Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Eightieth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein that when the two Houses adjourn on Saturday, July 1, 1978, they stand adjourned until Tuesday, November 14, 1978 at 1 O'Clock P.M."

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

Madigan: "I move the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. Any discussion? All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; 'aye', all opposed. The Resolution is adopted. Stick around. Okay, Jack, let's do something. House Bill 3394. Mr. Kempiners."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask leave of the House to use the corrected of version of this that was distributed to the House...the second Conference Committee..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to use the corrected version. Any objection? Hearing no objection we will use the corrected version. Please proceed on House Bill 3394 on the second Conference Committee Report."

Kempiners: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill does two things, the first is appropriating 144 thousand to the Department of Business and Economic Development with regard to a court settlement on some condemned land in my district. That was the original intent of the Bill. Something happened in the Senate though, the Appropriation Bill for the Department of Personnel was added to this Bill. The total request was 88 million, 420 thousand, 200 dollars. And the second Conference Committee Report cuts approximately 438 thousand, 200 dollars and the new total is 87 million, 982 thousand dollars. You'll notice all conferees signed the



Committee Report and I would ask for your support."

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

Houlihan: "Bill, did that report just leave out that one bottom line number?"

Kempiners: "Yeah, on page 4 of the original report...had that 565 thousand, 300 dollars missing, that was the only thing corrected in the reprint."

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

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker, is the report the one that has the word, the correct report I mean, reprint on the top?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes Ma'am, there's the word, reprint. The question is, shall the House adopt Conference Committee...the second Conference Committee Report on HouseBill 3394, the corrected version? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 137 'aye', 8 'nay', 3 voting 'present' and the House does adopt the second Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3394 and that Bill is declared passed and it received a three-fifths majority. Senate Bill 1672. Mr. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 1672 is the authorization for the CDB Bill. It brings everything up to the proper level and I'd appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The question is, shall the House adopt the second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1672? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, on the question."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, is this a corrected version? I don't think it is."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Telcser, the second Conference Committee Report, is there a question as far as the accuracy of the second Conference Committee Report?"

Telcser: "Yes, I don't know which one you've got distributed but the second one was printed that was in error and I've just signed a corrected second report. Is it, you have to ask the Clerk, I don't



know if it is..."

Clerk O'Brien: "My copy doesn't indicate corrected."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let's take it out of the record. It's supposed to be the corrected version. Dump the Roll Call and get the corrected version up here and we'll act upon it then. House Bill... on the Calendar, Supplemental #5, House Bill 3276. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. McBroom. Mr. Ryan's going to handle that? The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan."

Ryan: "Pursuant to Rule 10(b), Mr. Speaker, I move that we go to Constitutional Amendment 44. I have five Members to sustain me."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Ryan, you've been recognized on House Bill 3276, if you'd like to go to that order of business you'll be more that happy to hear your plea and concern on adopting the first Conference Committee Report."

Ryan: "They won't let me do it... House Bill 3276, which is the annual biggy for the Department of Transportation and after some hard negotiations with Senator Hynes and Representative Madigan we were able to restore 4 million, 688 thousand to the Senate version in operations. We were able to restore 2 million, 450 thousand in permanent improvements, that's from the Senate version. We got 100 thousand dollars back from the Senate version in contractual. And we have reductions as follows, there was a total cut in operations of 1 million 478 thousand, contractual was cut 65 thousand, traffic safety was reduced 886 thousand dollars. Aeronautic contractual services were reduced 110 thousand dollars from the introduced level and the total appropriation is 2 billion, 956 million dollars and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

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

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

I wonder if the Gentleman would yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Holewinski: "Representative Ryan, Senate Amendment #4, which was the implementation of last year's cross town agreement, is in this Conference Committee Report, is it not?"



Ryan: "Yes, Sir."

Holewinski: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House then on the Bill, I know we're all tired and anxious to leave the Capitol, however, I would urge you to give some thought to opposing this gigantic Appropriation Bill. That's right, we can go to another Conference Committee Report but primarily, as you will recall, last year we fought for many hours, some six and a half or seven hours over the question of the cross town expressway. This Bill contains money that is...was part of that deal at the time. I think many of us felt strongly about it at the time, still feel strongly about it now, the political pressures of last year are off of many of you who may have supported it and I would urge you to vote 'no' on Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stanley. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan, to close."

Ryan: "I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 on House Bill 3276? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Mann, to explain his vote, the timer is on."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, as has been noted by many of us during this past biennium, there has been a series of summit meetings between the distinguished Governor of the State of Illinois and the distinguished Mayor of the City of Chicago, Mr. Thompson and Mr. Bilandic, at which time they have reached agreements on matters vital to the General Assembly and the people of the State of Illinois, have emasculated our purpose and our power by executive fiat, completely running around the legislative prerogatives of the Illinois General Assembly, invading the sacred precincts of the balance of powers of the three governments. And now we find once more that we are saddled with an agreement about which we were never consulted, about which we had no input, about which we've had no..."

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



close, Sir?"

Mann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I didn't know I had talked that long... About which we have had no Committee discussions or the like and here we are ready to be bullied and cowering in our corners ready to sacrifice all our prerogatives and buy the rest of the cross town. Now I say to you that it's ridiculous, it's demeaning, it's meaningless for us to adopt this Conference Committee Report at this time with the cross town money in it."

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

Mann: "Yes, Sir, I'm bringing my remarks to a close and I think before we do agree on this Conference Committee Report all this stuff with regard to cross town has got to go through the normal legislative processes. If we don't have time now we'll come back after November and do it then. But as far as tonight's concerned, Mr. Speaker, we ought to vote 'no'. Both sides of the aisle ought to vote 'no' to this Executive Government between Mr. Bilandic and Mr. Thompson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 108 'aye', 36 'nay', 12 recorded as 'present'. And the House does adopt Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3276. On...Senate Bill 1672. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Jim Houlihan, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Houlihan: "Mr. Speaker, just to point out to the Speaker of the House that the reason we're in Session at this hour is not because of a log jam, not because of tremendous legislation but it's because of the will of a few people who want to pass legislation which they couldn't pass at a normal hour when there was due consideration. There's a tremendous amount of pressure on Members not to raise a stink about any of the Appropriations Bills coming up, not to verify those Roll Calls and to let everything go and the pressure is because we've been in Session for 21 hours. It's not because we have a tremendous amount of Bills to handle and a tremendous amount of substantive work to do, it's



because a few people want to make the decisions and they want to make them privately, they want to make them against the grain of most of the Members who wouldn't vote that way if it was during the normal Session. And I think that's a travesty and I think the Speaker, rather than putting out the Calendars on Bills, should put out the issues that will be debated in the last couple hours from now on."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Jack, is the corrected version completed on 1672? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Telcser, on Senate Bill 1672, the corrected version."

Telcser: "We have the corrected version?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, Sir, we do."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill 1672 is the authorization Bill which we discussed earlier and I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Pardon me... It hasn't been distributed yet? According to the Clerk it is not distributed yet. I'm sorry, we will not be able to consider this second Conference Committee Report until it is distributed and we will stand at ease until the call of the Chair. The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Geo-Karis, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Geo-Karis: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, could we not have the Sponsor of that Bill tell us what the correction is in the report that we do have, perhaps we could get it amended on its face?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, we do have the corrected version here, Ma'am... Oh, I see, as far as the changes on the report that's been distributed? With leave of the House that could be done. Is there any objection? Hearing no objection would the Clerk kindly inform the Membership as far as the difference between the second Conference Committee Report and the second corrected Conference Committee Report? So the Membership can kindly correct their own copies."

Clerk O'Brien: "I'll read from the corrected copy." We the undersigned Committee of Conference appointed to consider the difference between



the two Houses in relation to House Amendments to Senate Bill 1672, recommend as the action to be taken by the Senate and the House of Representative respectfully that, one, the Senate concur in House Amendments 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 15. Two, the House recede from House Amendments 3 and 8 and three, Senate Bill 1672 be further amended as follows. On page 1, line 28, by deleting the underscored amount and inserting in lieu thereof, 555 million. And on page 2, line 27, by deleting the underscored amount and inserting in lieu thereof, 118 million. On page 2, line 34, by deleting the underscored amount and inserting in lieu thereof, 110 million and on page 3, line 7, by deleting the underscored amount and inserting in lieu thereof, 114 million. And on page 3, line 28, by deleting the underscored amount and inserting in lieu thereof, 17 million, 950 thousand and on page 4, line 3, by deleting the underscored amount and inserting in lieu thereof 29 million. On page 4, line 15, by deleting the underscored amount and inserting in lieu thereof, 34 million, 200 thousand and on page 1, line 14 by deleting the underscored amount and inserting in lieu thereof, 1 billion, 118 million, 400 thousand."

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

Telcser: "Does the Gentleman have a question, Representative Bowman, I think?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Bowman, do you have a question? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Yes, I'd just like to have my memory refreshed about what Amendments we're receding from, numbers 3 and 8? I know they're 3 and 8 but what do they involve?"

Telcser: "Amendment #3 had a category for industrial parks and Amendment #8 was a category for school construction bonds, which is a duplicate picked up in Amendment #9."

Bowman: "Thank you."

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

Mann: "Art, what's the difference between the report that was distributed



and the corrected report? I mean we heard the different figures but substantively what's the difference?"

Telcser: "In the corrected report there's 28 million dollars less than was in the report originally distributed."

Mann: "Can you give us the major amounts and for what they're appropriated?"

Telcser: "There's an item of 555...we went from 573 million to 555 million in an education category. We went from 119.3 million to 118 million in Conservation and DCFS and DMH went from 110.9 million to 110 million. We went in various state agencies from 115.3 million to 114 million. We went from 32.9 million in water resources to 29 million. We went from 36.2 in century 3 to 34.2. And I think that really makes up the bulk of the change."

Mann: "That's all essentially on one piece of paper, the reprinted, recorrected report, isn't it, Art?"

Telcser: "That's correct."

Mann: "An the total amounts to how much?"

Telcser: "Roughly 28 million. A reduction...a reduction of about 28 million."

Mann: "And the total amount appropriated?"

Telcser: "This is the authorization."

Mann: "I mean the authorization."

Telcser: "The total amount authorized is 1 billion, 118 million."

Mann: "Well it's...it's your turn, Art, it's a pretty skimpy report of over a billion dollars but the balls in your court."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman moves... Mr. Mann, I thought you were completed, I'm sorry."

Mann: "No. Well, Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Representative Holewinski was saying and I concur with him, that it is really fantastically absurd that this is the way we account for over a billion dollars in our expenditure here on the ... on the last day. It's only 10 percent of our budget after all and I don't know whether the Members know anymore than I do about what's there but I guess sometime during the summer our staff will let us know but it's one



hell of a way to run a railroad."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well just in defense of the staff, if I may, there is an analysis on this Bill and you can get it. The question is, shall the House adopt the second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1672? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. The corrected version. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 115 'aye', 27 'nay', 7 recorded as 'present'. And the House does adopt the second corrected Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1672 and this Bill was hereby declared passed by a three-fifths majority. The House will stand at ease until we get the other Conference Committee Report completed. I won't give you a time, we'll be at the call of the Chair. Let me inform the gentleman up on the gallery that there will be no pictures taken at this hour."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The House will come to order. On the Calendar on page 1 of Supplemental Calendar #2 is House Bill 3392. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kozubowski, on Conference Committee... second Report on House Bill 3392."

Kozubowski: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would now move that the House now do adopt Conference Committee Report #2. The total appropriation value of this Bill is now at 38.5 million dollars."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Totten: "Is the Section in there dealing with the 1.3 million for the Indo-Chinese Relief Assistance Act?"

Kozubowski: "Yes, it is, Representative Totten and I might just remark to you that that is all federal money. It requires no state appropriation of own state money."

Totten: "Okay then. Let me speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker."



Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Totten: "The Illinois Office of Education has indicated that from this fund last year they had 600 thousand dollars that they haven't been able to spend. So the Federal Government is going to give us another 1 million 300 thousand dollars to spend on the Indo-Chinese Relief Assistance Act. Well let me tell you, I don't know how many Chinese there are in this House and I don't know how many Chinese there are in this state but 1 million 300 thousand dollars for a program that's not being used is one we ought to tell the Federal Government that we want to forget about. 1 million 300 thousand dollars is enough to buy 'Ramaki' for everyone in this state. It's enough to buy egg drop soup for everybody in this state and I'll bet you yen to 'wongta' that we're getting ying-yanged on this whole appropriation and it should deserve a 'no' vote."

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

Mann: "Walt, would you yield to question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Mann: "With regard to Section 66, on page 10, I see the sum of a million dollars appropriated to DOT by the Division of Water Resources for channel cleaning and improvement of the Mazon River located in Grundy County. I'm not too familiar with that part of the state, how big of a body of water is that?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Grundy, Mr. Christensen, can you answer that question? Mr. Christensen, do you recall that project?"

Christensen: "Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker. That is a river that drains about five counties and it's an area that floods almost every year and the object is to clean it out and be able to completely drain these counties and save the buildings and the crops."

Mann: "When was the last time that this was done, this channel cleaning and draining?"

Christensen: "To my knowledge it's never been done."

Mann: "Then why does it have to be done now?"



Christensen: "Because it's all grown up in shrubs and trees and blocked with wood drifts."

Mann: "How long would you say this river is?"

Christensen: "Well I don't have any idea in miles but I know you cross it twice on the way down to Springfield so I would estimate it maybe 50 or 100 miles, I don't know how long it is."

Mann: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether this is for the Mazon River or the Amazon River but it seems to me a lot of money for a waterway that nobody seems to know too much about and which hasn't been studied by the Environmental Protection people or any of the conservation groups but after all, it's only a million dollars."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The question is, shall the House concur with the second Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3392? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Barnes, to explain his vote, the timer is on."

Barnes: "Thank you very much. Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House we've gotten down to the final Act here, I believe and I'm not sure that I was going to say anything but I think I should because I worked on this Bill and worked with many of the Members relative to their projects that are in it. I'm going to vote 'present', I can't bring myself to vote for it. I shall be very brief. One day soon, I believe that the people of this House and the people of the State of Illinois are going to come to realize that it costs much less to educate a child and make them a productive citizen than to keep them ignorant and create generations of drains on the state for welfare purposes. It's unfortunate that we can take here almost every segment of the population of this state within this appropriation but we could not for whatever reason and I realize that people have very strong feelings about this, but we could not for whatever reason, address a problem that I say to the Ladies and Gentlemen in this House simply will not go away. It will be there, I see



it's 106 votes now and as I said when I started, I did plan to vote 'present'. I'm not going to do that, I'm going to vote for it. One day we're going to realize that there is a segment of the population of this state whose needs are going to have to be met."

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

Caldwell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just simply like to say that in my humble opinion, those of us who have attempted to carry on the responsibilities of the government, we're in a minority and we don't beg or bow or scrape but we simply try to perform as men and women in the hopes that those of you who are in the majority, even though you're divided somewhat philosophically and by geography, when it comes down to the bottom line of splitting up the taxpayers' money you manage and have managed to admire 11 plus years here to divide it up and see that everyone gets a pro-rata share except blacks. I hope to live long enough to see America cease to be a two party society. There's no question in my mind that those of us, some of us considered agitators, are convinced that America consists of two societies, one black and one white. I would hope that at some point in the future you would get off that bag and make this country realize its full potential, the greatest nation on earth but we have a long way to go when you search your conscience and seek to develop justice and disburse the resources of the nation as they should be. I think that this is unfortunate but I for one intend to keep trying. Thank you."

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

Mann: "Mr. Speaker, I don't think that we ought to be critical and I certainly am not going to be, of the people that worked on the Appropriation Committee and on the Conference Committee Reports. Obviously for every good Section in this omnibus report there's a bad one and a needless one. And it isn't a question of



self chastisement but I hope that there's a lesson involved here. And that is that when outsiders call the shots and I call the Governor and the Mayor of the City of Chicago outsiders insofar as the legitimate business of this Body is concerned, when they call the shots the needs of the people are not going to be met. We're much closer to the people, we have to account to them much more often. And this is a sad example, in my opinion, this Omnibus Bill, of a situation where at the summit meeting the Mayor and the Gov. cut up the state and the people did not come out with much left."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 'aye', 33 'nay', 13 recorded as 'present'. And the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #2 on House Bill 3392 by a three-fifths majority and it's hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend Rule 68(e) for House Bill 3177."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; 'aye', all opposed. 'Ayes' carry and the rule is suspended. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "I move that we adjourn, Mr. Speaker, to November 14."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House stand adjourned till November 14, 1978. Have a nice summer, the House is adjourned. The Gentleman from Kankakee, Mr. Ryan, on an announcement."

Ryan: "The mansion party is still on so if you want to go over to the mansion the Governor is there waiting with Jayne."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well also, Mr. Bakalis is also having a breakfast, I believe, now at the State House Inn and both Democrats and Republicans are invited. Have a nice summer and thank you. Good night."



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
1	10:00	Speaker Redmond	House to order
		Rev. Morehead	Prayer
		Speaker Redmond	
		Polk	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Friedrich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Jacobs	
2		Speaker Redmond	Roll Call for attendance
		Matejek	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matejek	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kempiners	H.B. 3288 to Fall Calendar
		Speaker Remdond	Leave granted
		Richmond	Table H.B. 3384
		Speaker Redmond	
		Younge	H.B. 1089, 3071 to Fall Calendar
3		Speaker Redmond	Leave granted
		Boucek	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Totten	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	Agreed Resolutions
		Speaker Redmond	
4		Matijeovich	Explains Resolutions
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Mann	
		Matijevec	Discussion
		Speaker Redmond	
		Adams	
		Matijevec	Discussion
		Speaker Redmond	Agreed Resolutions adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	H.R. 1071, H.R. 1072 Death Res.
		Speaker Redmond	Death Resolutions adopted
5		Cunningham	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	H.R. 1073
		Speaker Redmond	
6		Mann	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Epton	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Macdonald	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mann	
7	10:40	Matijevec)	Imitations
8		Speaker Redmond)	Imitations
9		Bowman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leinenweber	
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bowman	'Kane's Seat'
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mulcahey	
		Speaker Redmond	
10		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Redmond	
		M. Maske	Auctioneer
11		Speaker Redmond	
12		Houlihan, J.	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mann	
		Speaker Redmond	
13		E.M. Barnes	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijevich	
14	11:05	Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Chapman	Concur in C.C. #1 to H.B. 562
		Speaker Redmond	C.C. #1 adopted
		Friedrich	H.B. 2843 C.C. #1
15		Speaker Redmond	C.C. #1 adopted
		Macdonald	H.B. 3225, C.C. #1
		Speaker Redmond	C.C. #1 adopted
		Stiehl	H.B. 3351 C.C. #1
16		Speaker Redmond	C.C. #1 adopted



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Martin	H.B. 1562 C.C. #1
		Speaker Redmond	
		Johnson	Questions Sponsor
		Speaker Redmond	
		Martin	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Johnson	
		Martin	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Tipsword	Question
		Martin	
		Speaker Redmond	
17		Hoxsey	Questions Sponsor
		Martin	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan	Parliamentary Inquiry
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 1562, C.C. #1 adopted
18, 19		Hanahan	H.B. 2632
		Speaker Redmond	
		Brady	Opposes
		Speaker Redmond	
		Pullen	
20		Speaker Redmond	
		Wolf	Opposes concurrence
		Speaker Redmond	
		Stuffle	
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
21		Polk Speaker Redmond	
22		Skinner Speaker Redmond	H.B. 2632 out of the record
		Hanahan Speaker Redmond	Objects
23		Ewell Speaker Redmond	Personal privilege
24		E.M. Barnes Speaker Redmond	
		Speaker Redmond	
25		Hanahan Speaker Redmond	
	11:39	Caldwell Speaker Redmond	
		Mudd Speaker Redmond	
		McGrew Clerk O'Brien	
27		Speaker Redmond Byers Speaker Redmond	
		Katz Speaker Redmond	
		Friedrich	H.R. 727
28		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Catania	
		Speaker Redmond	
29		Griesheimer	
		Friedrich	Discussion
		Speaker Redmond	
30		Madison	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kent	M.P.Q.
		Speaker Redmond	Previous Question moved
		Friedrich	Close
		Speaker Redmond	
31		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	
32		Dyer	
		Speaker Redmond	
33		Cunningham	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Huskey	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Neff	
34		Speaker Redmond	
		Greiman	
		Speaker Redmond	H.R. 722 adopted
		Madison	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Katz	
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
35		Darrow	H.R.833 Amendment #1
		Speaker Redmond	
		Katz	
		Speaker Redmond	Amendment #1 adotped
		Walsh	
		Speaker Redmond	
36		Katz	Moves adoption of H.R. 833
		Speaker Redmond	
	12:03	Collins	Against H.R. 833
		Speaker Redmond	
		Hoffman	
37		Speaker Redmond	
38		Kosinski	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Katz	close
39		Speaker Redmond	H.R. 833 lost
	L2:14	Marovitz	H.R. 1070
40		Speaker Redmond	
41		Daniels	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Marovitz	
		Speaker Redmond	
		J. Dunn	
		Speaker Redmond	
	12:17	J. Davis	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Darrow	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bowman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Marovitz	
		Speaker Redmond	
42		Cunningham	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Caldwell	questions
		Marovitz	discussion
		Speaker Redmond	
43		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madison	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Pierce	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Miller	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	
44	12:21	Griesheimer	
		Marovitz	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Nardulli	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bowman	
		Marovitz	discussion



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madison	leave to reverse roll
45		Speaker Redmond	
		Daniels	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Marovitz	
		Speaker Redmond	H.R. 722 adopted
46		Murphy	H.R. 974
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madison	Yield?
		Murphy	
47		Speaker Redmond	Resolution adopted
		Madigan	H.R. 1053
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	
		Madigan	
		Speaker Redmond	
48	12:30	Levin	
		Madigan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Keats	questions
49		Madigan	
		Speaker Redmond	
50		Mann	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Waddell	Yield?
		Madigan	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
51		Conti	Yield?
		Madigan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Caldwell	
52		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	to close
		Speaker Redmond	H.R. 1053
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Redmond	Resolution adopted
53		Madigan	H.J.R. 95
		Speaker Bradley	
	12:42	Vinson	
		Speaker Bradley	
54		Kent	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Bradley	
55		Mudd	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Ebbesen	MPQ
		Madigan	to close
		Speaker Bradley	
		Huff	Explains vote
56		Speaker Bradley	Resolution adopted
		Madigan	H.J.R. 96
		Speaker Bradley	Resolution adopted



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Madigan	H.J.R. 97
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	Amendment #1
		Speaker Bradley	
57		Madigan	Moves adoption
		Totten	Doesn't have Amendment
		Madigan	explains - hold it
		Speaker Bradley	TOOR
		Antonovych	H.J.R. 99
		Speaker Bradley	Amendment #1 adopted H.J.R. 97
58		Antonovych	H.J.R. 99
		Speaker Bradley	
59		Darrow	question
		Antonovych	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Polk	question
		Antonovych	
60		Speaker Bradley	Resolution adopted
		Stuffle	H.B. 1803 CCR
		Speaker Bradley	
	1:00	McCourt	Yield
61		Stuffle	
		Speaker Bradley	
62		Robinson	
63		Speaker Bradley	
64 - 65		Ebbesen	
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Conti	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Ebbesen	continues
		Speaker Bradley	
		Friedrich	Yield?
66		Stuffle	discussion
67		Speaker Bradley	
		Hoffman	MPQ
		Speaker Bradley	
68 - 69		Stuffle	to close CCR #1 H.B. 1803
		Speaker Bradley	House adopts CCR #1 HB 1803
70		Hoffman	CCR #1 SB 393
	1:20	Speaker Bradley	
		Brady	supports
		Speaker Bradley	
		McClain	Yield?
		Hoffman	discussion
		Speaker Bradley	
71		Totten	Inquiry - Rules?
		Speaker Bradley	CCR #1 HB 393 House adopts
72		Hoffman	CCR #1 H.B. 395
		Speaker Bradley	House adopts CCR #1
73		Kane	CCR #1 SB 1546
	1:25	Speaker Bradley	
74		Schlickman	Yield?
		Kane	discussion
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
75		Levin	Opposes
		Speaker Bradley	
		Kane	Close on CCR #1 SB 1546
	1:30	Speaker Bradley	
76		Pullen	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Tipsword	supports
		Speaker Bradley	
77		Caldwell	explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		Schlickman	Verification
		Speaker Bradley	
		Kane	Poll the absentees
	1:35	Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk O'Brien	Polls absentees
		Speaker Bradley	
78		Getty	'present' to 'aye'
		Speaker Bradley	CCR #1 SB 1546, Postponed Cons.
		Clerk O'Brien	S.B. 1864, Third Reading
		Speaker Bradley	
		Vinson	Explains S.B. 1864
		Speaker Bradley	
79		Skinner	questions
		Vinson	
		Speaker Bradley	SB 1864 passed
80		Totten	Rule 68(d)
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Flinn	CCR #1 HB 2842
	1:45	Speaker Bradley	
81		Leinenweber	yield
82		Flinn	discussion
	1:47	Speaker Bradley	
		Kelly	
		Bradley	
		Beatty	questions
		Flinn	
		Speaker Bradley	
83		Pullen	question
		Flinn	
		Speaker Bradley	House adopts CCR #1 HB 2842
84		Houlihan	HB 2929 CCR #1
		Speaker Bradley	
		Ewing	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Mugalian	
		Speaker Bradley	HB 2929 CCR #1
	1:55	Greiman	question
85		Houlihan	
86		Speaker Bradley	
		Schlickman	yield?
87 - 88		D. Houlihan	discussion
		Speaker Bradley	
		Totten	renews objection
89		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Conti	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	House adopts CCR #1 HB 2929
90		Ewing	Inquiry of Chair
		Speaker Bradley	
		Vinson	
		Speaker Bradley	S.B. 250
		Schoberlein	PPP
		Speaker Bradley	
91		Sandquist	
92		Speaker Bradley	
		Levin	explains vote
93		Speaker Bradley	House adopts CCR #1 SB 250
		Pullen	SB 252
		Speaker Bradley	House adopts CCR
		Huskey	Votes 'aye'
		Speaker Bradley	
94		Houlihan, D.	SB 253 CCR #1
	2:11	Speaker Bradley	
95		Leinenweber	
		Speaker Bradley	
96		Skinner	
		Speaker Bradley	
97		Marovitz	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Deavers	MPQ
		Speaker Bradley	Previous question moved
		D. Houlihan	to close



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
98		Speaker Bradley Schlickman Speaker Bradley Leinenweber Speaker Bradley	possible verification
99		Clerk Hall Speaker Bradley Leinenweber Speaker Bradley Clerk Hall Speaker Bradley	Polls absentees and affirmative Roll Call Proceeds
100		Mudd	
	2:35	Leinenweber)	questions affirmative Roll
101 - 102) Speaker Bradley)	
103, 104, 105) Clerk Hall) Speaker Bradley Madison Speaker Bradley Leinenweber Speaker Bradley Mugalian Speaker Bradley	'aye'
106		D. Houlihan	H.B. 3202 SA #1 and 2
107		Speaker Bradley	
108		Leinenweber Speaker Bradley	



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Miller	Opposes
		Speaker Bradley	
109		Schlickman	Amendment not germane?
		Speaker Bradley	Amendment is germane
		Schlickman	Opposes ruling of Chair
		Speaker Bradley	
110		Brummer	question
		Speaker Bradley	motion fails
111	2:50	Schlickman	speaks on motion
		Speaker Bradley	
112		Madison	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Deavers	MPQ
		Speaker Bradley	
		Houlihan	to close
		Speaker Bradley	
113		Gaines	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		Mann	Explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	
114		Ewell	
		Spekaer Bradley	
115		Porter	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Miller	
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
116, 117		Collins	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Mann	PPP
		Speaker Bradley	
		Kelly	
118	3:05	Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk Hall	Calls absentees
		Speaker Bradley	
		Birchler	Leave to be verified
		Speaker Bradley	
		Johnson	'no'
		Speaker Bradley	
		Laurino	change to 'aye'
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk Hall	Affirmative Roll Call
		Speaker Bradley	
		Schlickman	Requests Members be in seats
		Speaker Bradley	
119		Leverenz	leave to be verified
		Speaker Bradley	
		Schlickman	questions affirmative roll
120		Speaker Bradley	
		Luft	votes 'aye'
		Speaker Bradley	
121		Schlickman	questions
		Speaker Bradley	
		Bennett	'aye'



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Bradley	
122, 123		Schlickman	continues question
	3:21	Speaker Bradley	House concurs
123		Houlihan	moves to reconsider vote
		Brady	move motion lie on table
		Speaker Bradley	motion tabled
124		Beatty	H.B. 1470 S.A. #1
		Speaker Bradley	Mahar requests verificatio
125		Clerk Hall	polls absentees
		Speaker Bradley	
		Clerk Hall	calls affirmative roll
		Speaker Bradley	
		J. Barnes	change to 'aye'
		Speaker Bradley	
		Kucharski	change to 'aye'
		Clerk Hall	Affirmative Roll Ca-1
126		Speaker Bradley	
		Madison	requests verified
		Speaker Bradley	
127		Mahar	questions affirmative roll
		Speaker Bradley	
		McPike	leave to be verified
		Speaker Bradley	
128		Mahar	continues
		Speaker Bradley	
		Leverenz	question
	3:38	Speaker Bradley	House concurs SA #1 HB 1470



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Stuffle	move vote be reconsider
		Hanahan	move motion lie on table
		Speaker Bradley	motion tabled
129		Hanahan	HB 2632
		Speaker Bradley	
		Brady	urge concurrence
		Speaker Bradley	
		Hoffman	
		Speaker Bradley	
130		Skinner	question
131		Hanahan	
		Speaker Bradley	
132		Schneider	
		Speaker Bradley	
133		Polk	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Pierce	MPQ
		Speaker Bradley	
		Hanahan	to close
134		Speaker Bradley	
		Chapman	explains vote
		Speaker Bradley	House concurs in SA to HB 2632
135	3:50	Getty	SB 771 CCR
		Speaker Bradley	
		Leinenweber	question
136		Getty	
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Levin	
		Speaker Bradley	House adopts CCR #1
137		Epton	leave to place S.B. on Fall Cal. S.B. 1725
		Speaker Bradley	
		Brummer	question
138		Epton	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Cunningham	
		Speaker Bradley	
		E.M. Barnes	
139		Speaker Bradley	rule suspended
		Madigan	Parliamentary Inquiry
		Speaker Bradley	
		Conti	
		Speaker Bradley	
140	4:01	Epton	
		Conti	
		Speaker Bradley	motion carries
141, 142		Brady	SB 1790 CCR
		Speaker Bradley	
143		Daniels	yield
144, 145, 146		Brady	
		Kempiners	responds
		Speaker Bradley	
		Lechowicz	question
		Kempiners	
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
147		Daniels	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Birchler	
148		Speaker Bradley	
149		McMasters	
		Speaker Bradley	
150		Daniels	
		Speaker Bradley	
151		Lechowicz	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Ebbesen	MPQ
		Speaker Bradley	Previous question moved
152		Brady	to close
		Speaker Bradley	
153	4:25	Pierce	votes 'aye'
		Speaker Bradley	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Bradley	
154		Skinner	
		Speaker Bradley	
155		Bowman	urges 'no' vote
		Speaker Bradley	
		Porter	
156		Levin	
		Speaker Bradley	House adopts CCR
		J. Barnes	HB 2775 CCR
157		Speaker Bradley	House adopts CCR #1



GENERAL ASSEMBLY

 STATE OF ILLINOIS
 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Matejek	S.B. 1786 CCR
		Speaker Bradley	
158		Holewinski	
		Speaker Bradley	House adopts CCR #1
		Yourell	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Collins	Not printed ?
159		Speaker Bradley	
		Yourell	HB 1468 CCR
		Speaker Bradley	
		Collins	question
160		Yourell	
		Schuneman	question
161	4:40	Yourell	
162		Schuneman	Speaks on Bill
		Speaker Bradley	
163		Epton	favours CCR
		Speaker Bradley	
		Huskey	questions
164		Yourell	
		Speaker Bradley	
165		Walsh	
		Speaker Bradley	
		McMaster	
		Speaker Bradley	
		VonBoeckman	MPQ
		Speaker Bradley	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
166		Yourell	to close
167	4:55	Speaker Bradley	
		L. Martin	explains vote
168		Speaker Bradley	explains vote
		Leinenweber	explains vote
		Conti	explains vote
169		Speaker Bradley	House adopts CCR #2
		Ryan	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Matijevich	impersonations
		Speaker Bradley	
		VonBoeckman	HB 297 CCR
		Speaker Bradley	
		Mahar	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Mugalian	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Bluthardt	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Ewing	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Lucco	MPQ
	5:13	Speaker Bradley	Previous question moved
		VonBoeckman	to close
		Speaker Bradley	
		Katz	explains vote



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Bradley	
		Tuerk	
		Speaker Bradley	
176		Bluthardt	leave to have name removed
		Speaker Bradley	
		VonBoeckman	
		Speaker Bradley	motion fails
177		J. Barnes	HB 2981 CCR #1
		Speaker Bradley	
178		Collins	yield
		J. Barnes	
		Speaker Bradley	
179		Bluthardt	PPP
		Speaker Bradley	
		Leinenweber	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Collins	
		Speaker Bradley	
180		Barnes	to close
		Speaker Bradley	
		Levin	explains 'aye' vote
	5:26	Speaker Bradley	House adopts CCR
181		C. Davis	HB 2950 CCR
		Pullen	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Davis	
182		Speaker Bradley	House adopts CCR



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Taylor	
		Speaker Bradley	
183		Kane	HB 1546 CCR
		Speaker Bradley	
184		Conti	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Pullen	
		Speaker Bradley	
185		Levin	
		Speaker Bradley	
		Kane	to close
		Speaker Bradley	
186		Robinson	
	5:38	Speaker Bradley	poll absentees
		Greisheimer	'no' to 'aye'
		Speaker Bradley	
		Schlickman	withdraws request
187		Speaker Bradley	House adopts CCR #1
188		Yourell	leave to vote 'aye' HB 2981
			HB 2554 CCR
		Clerk O'Brien	
189		Speaker Houlihan	
		Bluthardt	
		Speaker Houlihan	
190		Bowman	Supports



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Houlihan	
		Stanley	Yield?
191		Yourell	discussion
		Speaker Houlihan	
		Levin	
		Houlihan	
192		Collins	
193		Sp. Houlihan	
		Taylor	MPQ
		Speaker Houlihan	
	5:59	Yourell	to close
194		Speaker Houlihan	
		Greiman	explains vote
		Speaker Houlihan	
		Friedrich	'no'
		Speaker Houlihan	
		Mann	'aye'
		Speaker Houlihan	
195		Wikoff	
		Speaker Houlihan	
		Conti	
		Speaker Houlihan	House adopts CCR
		Neff	HB 2986 CCR #1
196		Speaker Houlihan	House adopts CCR
		Yourell	HB 3113 CCR
		Speaker Houlihan	
197		Leinenweber	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
198		Speaker Houlihan	
		McPike	MPQ
		Speaker Houlihan	Previous question moved
199		Yourell	to close
		Speaker Houlihan	
		Ewing	
		Speaker Houlihan	
200		McMaster	
		Lechowicz	explains vote
		Speaker Houlihan	
201		Friedrich	
		Speaker Houlihan	
		Mugalian	
		Speaker Houlihan	
202		Ebbesen	
		Speaker Houlihan	
	6:25	Geo-Karis	explains vote
		Speaker Houlihan	
203		VonBoeckman	
		Speaker Houlihan	
		Hudson	
		Speaker Houlihan	
204		L. Martin	
		Speaker Houlihan	
		Conti	
		Speaker Houlihan	
		Friedrich	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Houlihan	
		Lechowicz	
		Speaker Houlihan	dump roll
205		Conti	explains vote
		Speaker Houlihan	
		Yourell	poll absentees
		Speaker Houlihan	
206		Giglio	questions roll
		Speaker Houlihan	
		Garmisa	'aye'
		Speaker Houlihan	
		E.G. Steele	'no'
		Houlihan	
		Huff	asks to be verified
		Speaker Houlihan	
		Yourell	
		Speaker Houlihan	CCR lost
		Geo-Karis	SB 1861 CCR
207		Speaker Houlihan	House adopts
		Recess	
208		Speaker Redmond	House to order
		T. Ohler	picks banjo
		Speaker Redmond	
		Tipsword	
		T. Ohler	banjo again
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Clerk O'Brien	Reading of the Journal
		Speaker Redmond	
		Robinson	dispense with reading Journal
		Speaker Redmond	Messages from the Senate
		Clerk O'Brien	Reads Messages
209		Speaker Redmond	HJRCA 55
		Steczo	leave to use Attendance Roll Call
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk O'Brien	reads Resolution
		Speaker Redmond	
		Vitek	speaks Polish
		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	speaks Greek?
		Speaker Redmond	
		Robinson	speaks Jewish?
		Speaker Redmond	
		Maragos	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Daniels	
210		Speaker Redmond	TOOR
			HJRCA 22
		Simms	leave for Attendance Roll Call
		Speaker Redmond	HJRCA 22 adopted
		Vitek	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Margulas	Polish
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Kozubowski	mentions 3392
		Speaker Redmond	
		Daniels	
		Speaker Redmond	
211		Deuster	woman's voice
		Peggy Martin	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Deuster	
		Speaker Redmond	
212		Simms	talks about quiz
		Speaker Redmond	
		Wolf	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Deuster	reason for fountains
		Speaker Redmond	
213		Geo-Karis	quiz
		Speaker Redmond	answers to quiz
	8:05	Daniels	
		Speaker Redmond	
214		Geo-Karis	
		Tipsword	
215		Speaker Redmond	
		Vitek	Polish
		Speaker Redmond	
		Lechowicz	what time home?
		Speaker Redmond	
216		Mann	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kempiners	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Lechowicz	
217		Speaker Redmond	
		Flinn	
		Speaker Redmond	
218		Mann	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Flinn	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Robinson	
		Speaker Redmond	
219		Totten	HJRCA 44 - jokes
		Speaker Redmond	
		Dyer	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Deuster	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Lucco	mentions Pages and Doorkeepers
		Speaker Redmond	
		Huff	French
		Speaker Redmond	
220		Cunningham	speaks French
		Speaker Redmond	
		Toten	
221		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Friedrich	
		Speaker Redmond	
222		Winchester	imitates C.L. McCormick
		Speaker Redmond	
		Friedrich	
		Speaker Redmond	
		J. Taylor	
		Speaker Redmond	
223		Tipsword	
		Speaker Redmond	
224		Wolf	imitates C.L. McCormick
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kelly	
		Speaker Redmond	HB 1264 CCR
		Garmisa	accept CCR #1
		Speaker Redmond	
225		Geo-Karis	question, in favor
		Garmisa	discussion
		Speaker Redmond	
226, 227		Collins	opposes
		Speaker Redmond	
228		J. Houlihan	yield?
		Garmisa	discussion
		Speaker Redmond	
		J. Houlihan	question
		Speaker Redmond	
229, 230		Garmisa	discussion



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
231		Huskey	
		Speaker Redmond	
		J. Houlihan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Garmisa	answers
		J. Houlihan	discussion, addresses Bill
		Speaker Redmond	
		Huskey	
		Speaker Redmond	
232		Bradley	supports
		Speaker Redmond	
233		Bluthardt	supports
		Speaker Redmond	
		Garmisa	to close
234		Speaker Redmond	
		Lucco	votes 'aye'
		Speaker Redmond	H.B. 1264 CCR adopted
		Polk	SB 82, concur
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kosinski	
		Speaker Redmond	
235		Kosinski	continues
		Speaker Redmond	
		Houlihan	questions
236		Kosinski	discussion
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
237		Kosinski	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mann	
		Kosinski	discussion
		Speaker Redmond	
239		Kelly	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Polk	to close
240		Speaker Redmond	
		Huff	voting green
241		Speaker Redmond	House adopts SB 82
		Ewell	impersonations
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ewell	
		Dan Ryan (Tomato)	'Muhammed Ali'
		Speaker Redmond	
		Geo-Karis	votes 'aye' on SB 82
		Speaker Redmond	
242		Wikoff	SB 1595 Amendment #2
		Speaker Redmond	House refuses to recede
		Bowman	impersonations
		Speaker Redmond	
243		J. Davis	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Adams	
		Speaker Redmond	
244		Mann	impersonation



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		Harris	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Marovitz	
		Speaker Redmond	
245		Houlihan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leinenweber	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Deuster	
		Speaker Redmond	
		E. Jones	
246	9:19	Matijevich	
		Speaker Redmond	
247		J. Davis	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Thompson	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Levin	point of order
248		Speaker Redmond	
		Kempiners	HB 3394 CCR #1
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	question
		Kempiners	discussion
		Speaker Redmond	
		J. Houlihan	
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Kempiners	
		Speaker Redmond	
249		Levin	Parliamentary inquiry
		Speaker Redmond	
		Stuffle	motion on Rule 68(d)
		Speaker Redmond	
		Walsh	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Stuffle	persist in motio
		Speaker Redmond	
250		Totten	speaks on motion
		Speaker Redmond	
		Stuffle	
		Speaker Redmond	
251	9:29	W. Walsh	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	
252		Darrow	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Stuffle	withdraw motion, amended motion
		Speaker Redmond	
253		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kempiners	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madison	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
254		Barnes, E.M.	
		Speaker Redmond	
255	9:35	J. Houlihan	
		Speaker Redmond	
256		Stuffle	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	
257		Deuster	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mudd	
258		Wm. Walsh	
		1. Speaker Redmond	
		Friedrich	MPQ
		Speaker Redmond	
		Stuffle	persists in motion
		Speaker Redmond	
		Holewinski	verification
		Speaker Redmond	
		Stuffle	withdraws motion
259		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	
260		Daniels	
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
261	9:51	Porter	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk Hall	Agreed Resolutions
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Redmond	
262		Terzich	
		Matijevich	
		Speaker Redmond	Resolutions adopted
		Matiejvich	Death Resolutions
		Speaker Redmond	
		Clerk Hall	further Resolutions
263		Speaker Redmond	Committee on Assignment
		C. Davis	
		Speaker Redmond	
264		Schlickman	wants announcements
265		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Marovitz	
		Speaker Redmond	
266		Bianco	point of personal satisfaction
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matula	personal privilege
		Speaker Redmond	
267		Schlickman	wants HJRCA 44
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Yourell	
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Bowman	
		Speaker Redmond	
	10:14	Schlickman	persists in motion on HJRCA 44
		Speaker Redmond	
		Katz	Parliamentary Inquiry
268	10:15	Speaker Redmond	Supplemental #5
		Schlickman	HJRCA 44
		Speaker Redmond	SB 736
		Capparelli	CCR
		Speaker Redmond	
269		Schlickman	yield?
270, 271		Capparelli	discussion
		Speaker Redmond	
272		Ewing	
		Speaker Redmond	
273		Terzich	
		Speaker Redmond	
274		Totten	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mugalian	votes 'no'
		Speaker Redmond	
275		Speaker Redmond	
		Capparelli	
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Ebbesen	MPQ
		Spekaer Redmond	
		Capparelli	to close
		Speaker Redmond	House adopts CCR SB 736
			HB 2987 CCR
		Macdonald	'aye' on SB 736
276		Speaker Redmond	
		D. Jones	HB 2987, Sponsor
		Speaker Redmond	
277		Totten	yield
		Winchester	discussion
		Speaker Redmond	
		Darrow	yield
		Winchester	discussion
		Speaker Redmond	
		Skinner	
		Winchester	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Winchester	moves adoption CCR #1 HB 2987
278		Speaker Redmond	CCR #1 adopted
		McClain	CCR SB 1555, Sponsor
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	yield
279		McClain	discussion
280		Speaker Redmond	
		Edgar	
281		Speaker Redmond	CCR SB 1555 adopted



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
	10:45	Houlihan	question
		Speaker Redmond	
282		Kozubowski	HB 3392, Sponsor
		Speaker Redmond	
283		Schneider	
284		Kozubowski	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kozubowski	answers Schneider
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schneider	
		Speaker Redmond	
285		Gene Barnes	
		Schneider	
		Speaker Redmond	
286		Schneider	
		Speaker Redmond	
287		Bluthardt	yield
288, 289		Gene Barnes	discussion
		Speaker Redmond	
290		Stuffle	speaks on Bill
		Speaker Redmond	
		Emil Jones	
		Speaker Redmond	
291		McAuliffe	question
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kozubowski	
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Gaines	
		Speaker Redmond	
292		Jaffe	question
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kozubowski	
		Jaffe	discussion
		Speaker Redmond	
		Kozubowski	
		Jaffe	questions
293	11:14	Tipsword	
294, 295		Speaker Redmond	
296		Williams	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Simms	
		Speaker Redmond	
297		G. Barnes	
		Speaker Redmond	
298		Schlickman	yield
299, 300		Kozubowski	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ewell	Point of order
		Speaker Redmond	
301		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Deavers	MPQ
		Speaker Redmond	
302		Kozubowski	to close



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	
		J. Houlihan	explains vote
		Speaker Redmond	motion fails
		Kozubowski	moves House not adopt 1st CCR
		Speaker Redmond	
303	11:30	Simms	point of order
		Speaker Redmond	responds
304		Mautino	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schuneman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	
		Speaker Remdond	
305		Schuneman	proceeds
		Speaker Redmond	
		Mudd	
		Speaker Redmond	
		McMasters	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	moves to suspend rule
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	yield
306		Ryan	responds
		Speaker Redmond	
		J. Houlihan	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Redmond	Ryan's motion carries
308		Ryan	HB 3237 CCR
	11:40	Speaker Redmond	
		Satterthwaite	
309		Ryan	discussion
		Speaker Redmond	House adopts 1st CCR
		Madigan	move to suspend rule
		Speaker Redmond	
		Ryan	argues
		Speaker Redmond	
310		Walsh	objects
		Madigan	responds
		Speaker Redmond	motion prevails
		Madison	inquiry of Chair
		Speaker Redmond	
311		Kempiners	HB 3394 CCR
		Speaker Redmond	
		Matijeovich	supports
		Speaker Redmond	motion carries
312		Leverenz	HB 2851 CCR
		Speaker Redmond	House adopts 1st CCR
		Edgar	HB 337 CCR
		Speaker Redmond	
313		G. Barnes	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Peters	
	11:59	Speaker Redmond	House adopts 1st CCR



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Ebbessen	HB 1523 CCR
		Speaker Redmond	
		McClain	
		Ebbessen	
314		Speaker Redmond	House adopts 1st CCR
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Telcser	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Madigan	TOOR
		Speaker Redmond	Out of the record
315		Giglio	SJR 55 CCR
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Leverenz	question
316		Giglio	discussion
		Deuster	
317		Speaker Redmond	
		Holewinski	MPQ
		Speaker Redmond	
		Giglio	to close
		Speaker Redmond	
318	12:12	Conti	
		Speaker Redmond	Resolution adopted
		Schlickman	point of order
		Speaker Redmond	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Collins	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Schlickman	withdraws motion
319		Speaker Redmond	
		Doyle	moves to suspend rule
		Speaker Redmond	motion carries
320		Doyle	HR 988
		Speaker Redmond	
321		Collins	
		Speaker Redmond	
		E. Jones	yield
		Doyle	discussion
		Speaker Redmond	
		L. Martin	
		Speaker Redmond	
322		Gene Barnes	
		Speaker Redmond	
		Hudson	MPQ
		Speaker Redmond	previous question moved
		Doyle	to close
		Speaker Redmond	Resolution adopted
323	12:22	Kucharski	HR:150
		Speaker Redmond	
324		J. Dunn	votes 'no'
		Speaker Lechowicz in Chair	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
325		Telcser	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Leverenz	MPQ
		Speaker Lechowicz	
326		Kucharski	to close
		Speaker Lechowicz	
327		Winchester	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Skinner	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Mann	
328		Speaker Lechowicz	Resolution adopted
		Yourell	move to table HR 11
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Barnes	HR 62
329	1:38	Speaker Lechowicz	Resolution adopted
		Mautino	HB 3177 CCR
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Farley	asks for order
330		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Conti	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
331, 332		Mautino	
333		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Simms	opposes
334		Speaker Lechowicz	
335		Tuerk	opposes



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
336		Schuneman	
337		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Huff	
338		Speaker Lechowicz	
339		McPike	yield
		Mautino	
340		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Stuffle	
341		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Mahar	MPQ
	1:10	Mautino	to close
342		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Griesheimer	explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	
343		Ebbessen	question of Chair
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Schlickman	question
		Speaker Lechowicz	
344		Madison	question
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Madigan	explains vote
345		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Katz	explains vote
346		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Stiehl	
		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Telcser	
347		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Jacobs	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Cunningham	
348		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Mautino	
		Speaker Lechowicz	House does not accept CCR #1
		Wolf	
349		Barnes, J	H.B. 2981
		Speaker Lechowicz	
350	1:32	Madison	yield
351		Barnes, J	discussion
		Speaker Lechowicz	
352		Collins	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Madison	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
353		Collins	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Bradley	yield
354		Barnes, J	discussion
		Speaker Lechowicz	
355		Barnes, J	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Barnes	Explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
356		Deuster	explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Huff	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Friedrich	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
357		Mann	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Ewell	
358		Speaker Lechowicz	House adopts 2nd CCR
		Wikoff	SB 1595
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Terzich	question
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Terzich	
359		Wikoff	discussion
		Speaker Lechowicz	CC #1 SB 1595 passed
		Kosinski	SB 82
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Satterthwaite	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
360		Kosinski	explains CC #2
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Johnson	questions Sponsor
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Johnson	
361		Kosinski	discussion



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Kosinski	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
362, 363		Johnson	concludes
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Mann	yield to D. Houlihan
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		D. Houlihan	speaks on Bill
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Mann	questions Sponsor
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Mann	discussion
364		Kosinski	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Mann	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
365		Mugalian	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Daniels	MPQ
		Speaker Lechowicz	moved
		Houlihan	Parliamentary inquiry
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Polk	to close
366		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Kelly	favours
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Kosinski	close



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Mann	point of order
		Speaker Lechowicz	
367		Kosinski	continues
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Martin	explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	polls absentees
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Martin	questions affirmative
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Martin	
368		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Polk	PPC
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Mann	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Barnes	point of order on PPC
		Speaker Lechowicz	
369		Polk	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Barnes	question
		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Barnes	
370		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Barnes	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Mann	
		Lechowicz	
		Bradley	HJR 97
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	reads HJR 97
371		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Bradley	
		Speaker Lechowicz	Amt. #1 HJR 97 adopted
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Beatty	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Bradley	asks adoption of HJR 97
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Beatty	yield
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Beatty	question
372		Bradley	discussion
373		Beatty	
374		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Kelly	MPQ
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Bradley	close



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Tuerk	Opposes
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
375		Mautino	explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Emil Jones	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Speaker Bradley	explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	
376		Kent	explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Tipsword	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
377		Beatty	explains vote
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Totten	
		Speaker Lechowicz	HJR 97 fails
378		Speaker Bradley	
		Speaker Lechowicz	SB 1672 and CC appointed
		Ease	
379		Speaker Madigan	
		Daniels	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Porter	
		Speaker Lechowicz	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Doorkeeper	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
380		Clerk O'Brien	Introduction and First Reading
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Clerk O'Brien	HJR 103
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Madigan	moves adoption
		Speaker Lechowicz	adopted
381		Kempiners	HB 3394 CCR
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Houlihan	question
		Kempiners	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Geo-Karis	
		Speaker Lechowicz	2nd CCR HB 3394 passed
		Telcser	SB 1672
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Madigan	corrected version
		Speaker Lechowicz	
382		Telcser	
		Clerk O'Brien	
		Speaker Lechowicz	TOOR
		Ryan	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Ryan	HB 3276
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Holewinski	question



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
383		Ryan	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Mann	explains vote
384		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Mann	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Mann	
		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 3276 passed
385		Houlihan	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Telcser	SB 1672
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Telcser	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Geo-Karis	amend on face
		Speaker Lechowicz	leave
386		Clerk O'Brien	Reads corrected SB 1672 CCR
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Telcser	
		Bowman	discussion
		Speaker Lechowicz	
387		Mann	question
		Telcser	discussion
		Speaker Lechowicz	
388		Mann	
		Speaker Lechowicz	2nd CCR SB 1672 passed
		Doorkeeper	



<u>Page</u>	<u>Time</u>	<u>Speaker</u>	<u>Information</u>
		Speaker Lechowicz	HB 3392
		Kozubowski	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Totten	question
		Kozubowski	discussion
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Mann	
		Christensen	
390		Mann	discussion
		Speaker Lechowicz	
391		Barnes	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Caldwell	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
392		Mann	
		Speaker Lechowicz	2nd CCR HB 3392 passed
		Mautino	
		Speaker Lechowicz	
		Madigan	moves adjournment till Nov. 14
		Ryan	
		Speaker Lechowicz	House adjourns

