

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

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order. Members, please be in their seats. Be led in prayer by the Reverend Krueger, the House Chaplain."

Reverend Krueger: "In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, Amen. Bless, Oh Lord, this House to Thy service this day. Amen. We are privileged to have a guest Chaplain this day that will be introduced by Representative Woodyard of Chrisman."

Woodyard: "Thank you. It is my pleasure to introduce to you this morning for this morning's prayer, my Minister, Reverend Chrisman from my home town of Chrisman."

Reverend Chrisman: "Thank you. Let us pray. O God, creator and Lord of all before whom the Nations rise and fall, we thank you for this nation, in which we claim citizenship and for the rights and freedoms which have been entrusted to us. We ask your devine guidance for our elected Representatives as they struggle with the many issues before them, the myriad voices clam or to be heard with many different understandings of what is good and bad, just and unjust, helpful and not helpful. Give them wisdom to discern that which is your will. Give them courage to do what is right. Forgive them their mistakes and help them to lead us all into more responsible citizenship. We pray especially for your presence during this Session, O God, as these Representatives strive to carry out their responsibilities. Guide, we pray, the leaders of the Nation in these trying and difficult times, that they make those decisions which are most helpful. These things we pray in Thy Holy Name, Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Pledge of Allegiance, Representative Williams. Williams, Pledge of Allegiance."

Members: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Speaker Redmond: "Roll Call for attendance. Your switch only. Take...Wait a minute now. Take the record.request for change of vote."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Sandquist requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 1490."

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, yeah, Mr. Clerk, yeah."

Clerk O'Brien: "Requests for a change of vote. Representative Sandquist asks leave to vote 'aye' on House Bill 1490. Does he have leave? Representative Johnson requests to vote 'aye' on House Bills 1534, 2863 and 3091. Does he have leave? Representative Balanoff requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 2863. Does she have leave? Representative Leverenz requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 2976. Does he have leave? Representative Winchester requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 2976. Does he have leave? Representative Marovitz requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3079. Does he have leave? Representative Daniels requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3079. Does he have leave? Representative Hudson requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3092. Does he have leave? Representative Satterthwaite requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3092. Does she have leave? Representative Matula requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3129. Does he have leave? Representative Sumner requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3190. Does she have leave? Representative Murphy requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3192. Does he have leave? Representative Donovan requests to vote 'aye' on Amendment 6 to House Bill 3200. Does he have leave? Representative

Johnson requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3205. Does he have leave? Representative Sumner requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 3290. Does she have leave? Representative Hanahan requests to vote 'present' on House Bills 3292 and 3293. Does he have leave? Representative McPike requests to vote 'present' on House Bills 3292 and 3293. Does he have leave? Representative Giorgi requests to vote 'present' on House Bills 3292 and 3293. Does he have leave? Representative Dyer requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3296. Does she have leave? Representative Ropp requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 3330. Does he have leave? Representative Catania requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3385. Does she have leave? Representative Schneider requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3369. Does he have leave? Representative Winchester requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3456. Does he have leave? Representative Matula requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 3456. Does he have leave? Representative Harris requests to vote 'aye' on Amendment 39 to House Bill 3580. Does he have leave?"

Speaker Redmond: "Is Giorgi ready? Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 774, Giorgi-Redmond. 775, Ralph Dunn. 776, Schisler. 777, Johnson. 778, Catania. and 779, Lechowicz."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Representatives. House Resolution 774 by myself and Redmond, honor Paul Carey, the son of Dave Carey. 775 by Dunn, honors a William H. Freeberg for services at Southern Illinois University. 776 by Schisler, honors J. C. Helfrich for 27 years with the Department of Conservation. Johnson, 777, notes about a Truman scholar. 778 by Catania, thanks Elizabeth Casimir for her extraordinary public service, and 779 by Lechowicz, notes the Bresler Ice Cream Company, was founded in 1930 and I move for the adoption of the

Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Schneider: "Moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye', any opposed? There are none, the Resolutions are adopted. Senate Bill, First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1980, Ewing. A Bill for An Act making appropriations for the Department of Corrections. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1982, Vinson. A Bill for An Act making appropriations to the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1985, Polk. A Bill for An Act making appropriations to the Department of Labor. First Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "House Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate Calendar. On page 5, appears House Bill 2967. Representative McGrew on the floor? Out of the record. 3359, Representative Burnidge. Burnidge on the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3359. A Bill for An Act to authorize the Department of Conservation to convey certain lands to the Sanitary District of Elgin. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Burnidge."

Burnidge: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill simply allows the Conservation Department to transfer a parcel of property approximately 60 feet by 70 feet to the Sanitary District of Elgin. They are currently leasing the property from them. They have a structure on the property. The reason they need title to the property, they're involved in getting a grant from the Federal Government and in order to pursue this grant any further, they need to have title to the property. The Conservation Department is not opposed to the Bill. I have not run into anybody that is opposed to it."

Speaker Redmond: "Anyone in opposition? Question is, shall...Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, if there's nobody in opposition, I'd at least like to get into the record, if there has been an appraisal on this property and what the value of it is and why we should permit it to be conveyed for \$1."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Burnidge."

Burnidge: "There has not been an appraisal of the property. The Conservation Department will still be using it after the Sanitary District alters their structure."

Speaker Redmond: "Can't hear you, please. Please give the Gentleman order."

Burnidge: "There has not been an appraisal on the property. The property will be...continued to be used for its present use, after they alter the structure that is on there now."

Speaker Redmond: "Question is, shall this Bill pass? Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "You think we ought to have a verification with regard to this?"

Speaker Redmond: "Well, we'll get to that when we find out what the Roll Call is. Think Representative Burnidge, maybe we'd better take this one out of the record."

Burnidge: "Could I take that out of the record."

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, out of the record. 3382. Is Representative Flinn on the floor? Out of the record. Glenn, do you want to come up here?"

Speaker Schneider: "Will the individuals not entitled to the floor, please remove themselves, and to the areas that they are entitled to be in. Al Manning, stumbles up the steps again. House Bills, Second Reading, page 2. We'll take them right in order. House Bill 1295, Representative Flinn. Not on the floor. Take that Bill out of the record. House Bill 2220,

Representative Taylor. Not on the floor? Take that out of the record. House Bill 2520, Representative Christensen. Representative McClain."

McClain: "Speaker, there are two Amendments on that Bill that Mr. Christensen said that we could go ahead and put on if he was not on the floor."

Speaker Schneider: "You have two Amendments for Christensen's Bill?"

McClain: "Well, I'm Co-Sponsor of those Amendments with him."

Speaker Schneider: "Oh, you want to advance with that then? You want to go ahead with them? Alright House Bill 22...2520, Representative McClain."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2520. A Bill for An Act establishing the moratorium on the construction of new nuclear power plants. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

McClain: "Mr. Speaker, we'd like to move to table Amendment #1. It was written improperly and it was adopted in Committee and the second Amendment will clear up the language for Amendment #1."

Speaker Schneider: "Alright. Representative McClain moves to table Amendment #1. Is that correct?"

McClain: "That's correct."

Speaker Schneider: "Alright, all in favor say 'aye', any opposed? There are none. The Amendment is tabled. Amendment #2."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Christensen-Meyer-McClain. Amends House Bill 2520 on page 1, by deleting line 1 and 2 and so forth."

McClain: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 is the work of a subcommittee of nuclear safety put together by the House Environment Energy and Natural Resources Committee. The concept of the Amendment was passed unanimously by the House Environment Committee. What it basically

does, is provide for two components. That is if the Governor...or if the President of the United States designates any nuclear site in the State of Illinois as a nuclear national dumping site for nuclear waste and spent fuel rods, that the Illinois General Assembly may, within a 60 day period after that designation by the President, move by Joint Resolution passed by the House and the Senate, move to veto that designation by the President of the United States and then the Governor must approve that Joint Resolution within a reasonable period of time after the House and Senate have moved. We've been informed that that way, it takes care of the checks and balances. We also know that it's in a...basically a Bill of Rights and Amendment #10 Amendment, and we move for the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 2520."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative McClain has moved the adoption of Amendment #2. Any discussion on that? There being none, all in favor say 'aye', any opposed? There are none. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, Christensen. Amends House Bill 2520, as amended, by deleting the title and so forth."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. One of the problems that we solved constitutionally in the Sub-Committee chaired by Representative Dan Pierce, was the possibility of Amendment #2, which we've now adopted and might have some constitutional problems without some standards. So, Amendment #3, basically, puts some standards on any radioactive by-products being dumped in a site in Illinois or spent fuel rods, and the standards are basically those standards that we adopted in our hazardous waste proposal, passed by the General

Assembly last year, under the Sponsorship of Representative John Sharp. Those...those standards are ones that basically pretty much prohibit the national dumping site at Morris, Illinois, because those standards are written such that Morris, Illinois would not qualify under these standards...and I would move for the adoption of Amendment #3 to House Bill 2520, as amended."

Speaker Schneider: "Any discussion on Amendment #3? There being none, the Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #3. All in favor say 'aye', any oppose? There are none. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Schneider: "Mike. Representative McClain."

McClain: "For the record, please, Mr. Speaker. I have agreed with Representative Ted Meyer to move this on Third Reading, but Representative Meyer might have an additional problem with this, so if Representative Meyer comes back with a specific Amendment agreed to by Representative Christensen, we'll move it back to Second, for further Amendments. But, at this time, we'd like to go to Third Reading."

Speaker Schneider: "Alright. Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Schneider: "Third Reading. House Bill 2705, Representative McPike. Is the Gentleman on the Floor? Out of the record. House Bill 2762, Representative Yourell. Yourell. Out of the record. House Bill 2824, Lechowicz. Not on the floor. Take that Bill out of the record. House Bill 2845, Representative Henry. Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. 2846. Also out. Representative Henry. Also out of the record. Let's see, House Bill 2918, Representative Yourell. He'll proceed with that. House Bill 2918, Representative Yourell."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2918. A Bill for An Act to effect the revision of several laws in relation to the election of local public officials in conformity with the statutory consolidation of elections. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments # 1, 2 and 4 were adopted in Committee...or adopted previously."

Speaker Schneider: "Any motions in regard to those three Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Schneider: "Alright. Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "None."

Speaker Schneider: "Third Reading. 2932, Representative Griesheimer. Gentleman is not on the floor. Remove...take that out of the record. House Bill 2960. Representative Simms. Repre...Representative Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Representative Simms and I discussed this and we agreed that we would table Amendment #1. It is technically defective. The purpose of Amendment #1 is incorporated in a subsequent Amendment #2, which we have filed. At this time, I will move to Table Amendment #1."

Speaker Schneider: "Gentleman has offered to table Amendment #1. All in favor, say 'aye'. Amendment is tabled. We're on Simms, handled by Getty, which is 2960."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2960. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of the Mental Health and Developmental Disability Confidentiality Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Getty: "Alright, again for the record, that is tabled."

Speaker Schneider: "Right. Now, where are we? Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Looks like there should be."

Speaker Schneider: "You got one? You circulate an Amendment, Mike? Alright, we're looking for it."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2, Simms-Getty. Amends House

Bill 2960 on page 1, by changing and amends Section 11 of and so forth."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Getty, on Amendment #2."

Getty: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. As we indicated before, Amendment #2 replaces Amendment #1. It is technical in nature. It cleans it up to make it clearly constitutional and proper and I would move for adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Schneider: "Any discussion? Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "As I understand it, we have tabled #1."

Speaker Schneider: "That's been tabled, correct."

Brummer: "Adopted #2, which is technical in nature and I think I've stated everything I know about this. I wonder if the Sponsor....."

Speaker Schneider: "We're on Amendment #2. We haven't adopted it yet."

Brummer "Well, the, the Sponsor indicated it was technical in nature and cleared up some of the language. I don't think I have Amendment #2 on my desk. I would like some detail as to what Amendment #2 does exactly."

Speaker Schneider: "I think we distri...It's been distributed, to my understanding. You're just asking for an explanation from the Sponsor?"

Brummer: "Yes."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Getty."

Getty: "I'd be more than happy to explain it. What Amendment..."

Speaker Schneider: "Let's give the Gentleman some order and some attention, please. Representative Getty."

Getty: "What Amendment #2 provides, is the exact same thing that Amendment #1 would have provided, except in proper form. When a person either commits a crime in a facility as defined under the Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Code, or when he is lodged

in there and a warrant has been issued for his arrest, the Director of the Department may disclose his name and his location."

Brummer: "Thank you."

Speaker Schneider: "Further discussion? None. The Sponsor has moved the adoption of Amendment #...Amendment #2. All in favor say 'aye', any opposed? There are none. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Schneider: "Third Reading. House Bill 2994, Representative Rea or Winchester."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2994. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of An Act to license and regulate grain dealers engaged in the business of purchasing grain."

Speaker Schneider: "Is the Sponsor on the floor? Take it out of the record. House Bill 3019, Representative Flinn. Sponsor's not on the floor. Out of the record. House Bill 3025...3024, 3024, Representative Winchester. Is the Gentleman on the floor? Take that out of the record. House Bill 3026, Hallock. Representative Hallock, are you in a..in view anywhere? Take that out of the record. Rep...Representative Reed on House Bill 3027. Out of the record, at the request of the Sponsor. House Bill 3035, Hoxsey. Out of the record. House Bill 303..3038, Representative Ryan. Not on the floor. Out of the record on that Bill. House Bill 3043, Reilly. The Gentleman in sight? Not on the floor, also. Take that one out of the record. Representative Oblinger, 3045. The Lady is not on the floor. Take that Bill out of the record. House Bill 3049, Representative Bower. Oh, you broke the streak. Representative Bower on 3049."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3049. A Bill for An Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Veteran's Affairs."

Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Schneider: "Any motion in regard to that Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A motion to table Amendment #1, by Representatives Bower and DiPrima."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Bower on the motion to table."

Bower: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative DiPrima and I are both Sponsors of the motion to table this Amendment. In the Appropriations Committee, there was some misunderstanding on several positions at the Soldiers and Sailors, at the Veterans' Home in Quincy. There was some misunderstanding on the number of vacancies that were there. It ends up that there are 17 positions. It was believed that all of them were vacant...I believe that the staffs of both Parties have gotten together and realized that there was a mistake made and that the \$218,000 should be restored to the budget that was originally there."

Speaker Schneider: "On the motion to table, Representative Schlickman, for discussion."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Schneider: "He will."

Schlickman: "I noticed that the Sponsor of Amendment #1, Representative Chapman, is not on the floor. What is her disposition with respect to this Amendment? I would also call to the attention of the House, that this is an Amendment that apparently is controversial, having been adopted by a vote of 13 to 11. I would suggest that we pull this from the record until Mrs. Chapman is here, to defend the Amendment, or her honor."

Speaker Schneider: "Let's stick with the Amendment."

Schlickman: "Oh, stick with the Amendment. Okay. How did the Cubs do last night?"

Speaker Schneider: "They won. Kingman had a homerun, #8."

Schlickman: "Beautiful. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You're okay."

Speaker Schneider: "Gentleman from..."

Bower: "Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the Republican and Democratic staffs have worked this out and that there is no controversy at this time."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Getty, on the controversy."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, I am advised that the Democratic staff has reviewed it and that there is no problem with it and I think that we'd be perfectly willing to have it go forward and when Mrs. Chapman does come back on the floor, if there is any problem, why then, we could move it back, but I'm 99% sure there's not."

Speaker Schneider: "Alright, let's try Representative Mulcahey. He has some insight, Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Chairman, the ah, the ah, Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of the Appropriation II Committee and the Vice-Chairman, neither one of which are here right now, but as a member of that Committee, I can verify that, that..."

Speaker Schneider: "You affirm that Representative Chapman would be content to..."

Mulcahey: "Well, I can't speak for Representative Chapman, but I think that things have been worked out and there's no problem with this Amendment now."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Schlickman, do you have any further concerns on that?"

Schlickman: "It seems like they're okay."

Speaker Schneider: "Okay. Now, on the motion, Representative Bower has explained the motion to table Amendment #1. All in favor, say 'aye'. Any opposed? There are none. Amendment #1 is tabled. Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Schneider: "Third Reading. Representative Hallstrom, on 3051. Out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. House Bill 3066, Representative Dunn, Braun, or Breslin. Representative Dunn."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3066. A Bill for An Act making appropriations to the State Board of Education for the disbursement of certain monies. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Schneider: "Any motion in regard to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motion filed."

Speaker Schneider: "Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2. Peters."

Speaker Schneider: "Hold on. You taking it out of the record? What are we doing? Whose Amendment is this? Representative Peters?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Peters."

Speaker Schneider: "He's not here, so we want to just move it along. Right? Do you want to move it to Third Reading, Representative Dunn? Any...is there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3. Peters."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Peters. Not on the floor."

Dunn, J: "Move it."

Speaker Schneider: "Move it along, says the Sponsor. Further Amendments? Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "...I would like to take this Bill out of the record for now."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Dunn."

Dunn, J: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, it's, it's my Bill and whether the record, whether the Bill comes out of the

record or not is up to the Sponsor. I asked the Bill be moved to Third Reading."

Speaker Schneider: "That's correct. We have been operating, I think, on that procedure..."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, that's fine. There is, as I understand it, a couple of Amendments offered to this Bill. The Sponsor's not here right now. He will be here just shortly. He's tied up on some other business. If this Sponsor doesn't want to accommodate members on that situation then that will have to be the way it goes. That's all. That's up to him if he doesn't want to do this."

Speaker Schneider: "Alright now, Representative Dunn on that matter."

Dunn, J: "We certainly, as Sponsor, I certainly wanted to be accommodating, but this Bill has already been held for two or three days. We need to move along the legislative process. Let's move it to Third and if there is a need to move it back to Second, we can talk about that."

Speaker Schneider: "Alright. The Sponsor appearson that matter. Any...there are no further Amendments? Third Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Schneider: "3083. Representative Ryan."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3083. A Bill for An Act to make certain reappropriations to Department of Transportation. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Schneider: "Any motion in regard to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motion filed."

Speaker Schneider: "Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Schneider: "Third Reading. House Bill 3084. Representative Ryan."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3084. A Bill for An Act making

appropriation to the Department of Transportation. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Schneider: "Any motion in regard to Amendments 1 thru 7?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Schneider: "Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8. Daniels, Redmond, Hoffman. Amends House Bill 3084, as amended, by inserting after the last sentence in Section 6 the following..."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Floor Amendment #8 provides for a sum a money to purchase the Elmhurst-Chicago Stone Quarry, which is the key to the Flood Management Control Problems in the northern part of Illinois and that area and I would ask for a favorable support of this Amendment."

Speaker Schneider: "The Sponsor has indicated the adoption of Amendment #8. Any discussion on that? Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield? What is being acquired, or what would be acquired?"

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "The portion, the west portion of the Elmhurst-Chicago Stone Quarry, which is in the Department of Water Resources long range plans for Flood Management Control in the, that part of the northern part of Illinois, which affects your District, plus the woods all the way down Route 83. It's an essential part of that Flood Management Control."

Schlickman: "Did you say that this acquisition is a part of a State plan, which respect to drainage?"

Daniels: "It is a part of a State plan with respect to drainage."

Schlickman: "How much money are we appropriating?"

Daniels: "We are appropriating \$10,000,000 for that purpose, which would be purchased in accordance with an appraisal."

Schlickman: "From which Fund is the \$10,000,000 being appropriated?"

Daniels: "In this particular one, it would be from the General Revenue. In the Amendment #10, we would then go into the Capital Development Board."

Speaker Schneider: "We're having trouble with the various members hearing Representative Daniels' explanation about about the Quarry and would you go through that one more time, Representative Daniels?"

Daniels: "As I was saying, Amendment #8 appropriates \$10,000,000 for the purchase of the western portion of the Elmhurst-Chicago Stone Quarry, which is in accordance, that's known as Structure Site 15 and is in accordance with the Flood Water Management Plan for the DesPlaines River flood control problems in that area."

Schlickman: "Now you say, this is founded on an appraisal. Who conducted the appraisal and what's the date of the appraisal?"

Daniels: "It will be based upon an appraisal. All we have now is an informal appraisal, which indicates Nine Million and some odd Hundred Thousand."

Schlickman: "There is no formal appraisal then?"

Daniels: "The formal appraisal has not yet been done."

Schlickman: "Why is this money from the General Revenue Fund?"

Daniels: "We felt that it was the best way to go at this point. Amendment #10 would go on the Capital Development Fund to the Department of Transportation and what we're going to do is just put this, hopefully, on the Bill and let the decision be made at a higher level."

Schlickman: "Where is this in the Governor's Budget, if at all?"

Daniels: "It is not in the Governor's Budget."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Leverenz. Further discussion."

Leverenz: "Would the Sponsor yield, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Schneider: "He will."

Leverenz: "Representative, I understood from prior conversation about the purchase of the Quarry and I understand it is in a long term program of flood relief, but why 10,000,000? That's about double what had been talked about earlier. It was only supposed to be a \$5,000,000 program and now, enter the fact that we're talking now about General Revenue money, it appears that we're trying to burn up the tremendous surplus of cash that the State has, but don't we normally bond this and is Federal money available?"

Daniels: "We will be..."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Daniels. Okay."

Daniels: "We will be on Amendment #10 asking it go to the Capital Development Fund."

Leverenz: "Mr. Speaker, I can't hear him. I'm sorry."

Speaker Schneider: "Once again, we ask the Speaker to enunciate and speak more loudly."

Daniels: "Enunciation is no problem."

Speaker Schneider: "How about loudly?"

Daniels: "Turn up the microphone."

Speaker Schneider: "It's been turned up."

Daniels: "Okay, are we ready now? Okay. Take Two. Once again, Structure 15 is in the long range purchase plan. The sum of money, I think you are in error, Representative. I have been informed that the amount that they are talking about is \$9,000,000. This is through a summary of the Flood Water Management Plan, of which I have a copy in my hand, and on the front

page of that Management Plan is the Elmhurst-Chicago Stone Quarry. The Western Division. This will affect your District, Representative, in the Flood Management Control in your District, as well as many others on this House floor and is in the Department of Water Resources' Master Plan. As far as the funding mechanism, I would support the allocation under the Capital Development Fund, but I would suggest to you that the route that we're taking is the two-fold approach and we'll let the Governor make the final decision as to what Fund he would like to take it out of."

Leverenz: "Well, I can agree in part. It does sound like a two-fold approach. One, we take General Revenue money and two, we take it away from the ability to provide that money for tax relief, I would assume. Perhaps you could explain how that would help the, the a flooding situation in my District. I understand that, is this the Quarry that they intend to dig retention basin 106 and 102 and utilize this as a depository for the stone they take out of those two basins?"

Daniels: "That coupled with the drainage system as well."

Leverenz: "I understand it was only supposed to be a \$5,000,000 program. Do you have a, any formal appraisal?"

Daniels: "I answered that question previously that the formal appraisal has not yet been completed. If we can purchase it for \$5,000,000, I'd be more than pleased for that amount, but the \$10,000,000 figure is based upon the approximate estimate as of this date, that the purchase price would be in this area of 9,000,000."

Leverenz: "Well, if that's true, perhaps they could purchase the Hillside Quarry."

Daniels: "Well, that's another matter and I would be certainly happy to discuss that with you if you were

to present an Amendment to effect that too. If that's in the Master Plan of Flood Management Control, that's something that we could certainly look into."

Leverenz: "How could it be in the Flood Management Control Program and not have made a part of the Governor's Budget? I don't understand how that would happen?"

Daniels: "I answered that question earlier too. This is not part of the Budget at the present time. It has been the long-range plan for purchase."

Leverenz: "I don't understand why we're doing it now if it's not in his Budget. In all due respect, Representative, we have had difficulty hearing you before and at least with the volume level now, I can understand your explanation and I just don't agree with doing something that isn't in the Governor's Budget."

Daniels: "Well, we'll be happy to remember that on other matters too."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Griesheimer."

Leverenz: "It sounds like a threat."

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

Speaker Schneider: "Indeed, he will."

Griesheimer: "Representative Daniels, are they still taking stone or gravel or crushed rock out of this Quarry?"

Daniels: "They are. Yes."

Griesheimer: "What is the anticipated continued terminal life of the Quarry at the present time for more stone in there or how close are they to having quarried it out?"

Daniels: "There's two parts to the Quarry. There's what they call the eastern part and the western part, and what we're referring to, in this case, is the western part, which for a common definition, is west of West Avenue. The eastern part is actively being excavated at the present time and with the permit that's been, as I understand, recently granted by the EPA, they may experience some additional 100 years of activity. As

far as the western plant...part is concerned, it is my understanding that, although they are undergoing, presently, some of the stone activity that their future depends upon the Flood Management Control Program, but they could too, as well, have substantial years in the future, particularly if they would use it as a landfill site."

Griesheimer: "Are we buying both half of it, or, I mean both halves of it, or just..."

Daniels: "No, just the western."

Griesheimer: "The area that's been quarried out, that would be used as the landfill site?"

Daniels: "Well, both, both of them can be active sites. Present time, it is my understanding that it's just the eastern portion that's being actively pursued."

Griesheimer: "Alright, thank you."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative VanDuyne."

VanDuyne: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question."

Speaker Schneider: "He'll yield."

VanDuyne: "Ah, Lee, where is the exact location of this Elmhurst Stone Quarry? There is one just on the Will-DuPage line. Is that the one you're talking about?"

Daniels: "No, Sir. This one is located in Elmhurst. It is south of North Avenue and on Route 83."

VanDuyne: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Schneider: "No further discussion? The Sponsor has moved Amendment #8 be adopted. All in favor say 'aye'. Any opposed? The Amendment is adopted. Let's establish a quorum. Roll Call for attendance. Please vote your own switches. This is a Roll Call for attendance. If you're voting 'green', you're absent, and of course, it carries a heavy penalty of no per diem. Johnson and Hoffman, let's get them yellow, so that we get everybody in conformity. Someone hit, hit Johnson's switch, will you? Well...The Clerk will

take the record, but please remove Representative Hanahan because he is not here. Now, we're back to Amendment #8 on House Bill 3084. Representative Daniels has moved the adoption of Amendment #8. All in favor, vote 'aye', any opposed vote 'nay'. Schneider 'aye'. Aaron, vote me 'green' will you? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 58 'ayes', 29 'nays', 2 voting 'present'. This Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #9, Anderson. Amends House Bill 3084, as amended, by inserting before the effective date, Section of the following Sections, so forth."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Anderson."

Anderson: "Mr. Speaker. Amendment #9 is for an improvement of a road at Starved Rock State Park. Now, the Department of Conservation had \$117,000 in their FY81 capital budget for this improvement and they found that this road was really under the control of the Department of Transportation, even though it was in the Park. Therefore, this is the reason for the Amendment."

Speaker Schneider: "Any discussion on Amendment #9? There being no discussion, the Sponsor has moved that the House adopt Amendment #9 to House Bill 3084. All in favor say 'aye', any opposed? There are none. Amendment #9 is adopted. Further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #10, Daniels, Redmond, Hoffman. Amends House Bill 3084, as amended, by inserting after the last line in Section 6, the following."

Speaker Schneider: "Alright. This one empties the Quarry. Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "As discussed earlier, this is the alternative funding mechanism, which is through the Capital Development Fund for the purchase of the west branch of the Elmhurst-Chicago Stone Quarry. I think this is

possibly the one that would be the one accepted, if any of them. This would be in alternative purchase form and I would ask for the Amendment be adopted."

Speaker Schneider: "Any discussion on Amendment #10? Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Schneider: "He will."

Leverenz: "Well, what is the dollar amount of this baby?"

Daniels: "The same as Amendment #8."

Leverenz: "How much is that? I didn't hear the numbers. I want to hear the numbers."

Daniels: "10,000,000."

Leverenz: "How many?"

Daniels: "10,000,000."

Leverenz: "\$10,000,000. And you said...yeah, turn down the mike...the alternative?..."

Daniels: "Yes, this is a..."

Leverenz: "Are you putting it in both ways?"

Daniels: "No, this is Speaker Redmond's idea."

Leverenz: "Oh, then I agree."

Speaker Schneider: "Further discussion? There being none, the Sponsor has asked that Amendment #10...Brummer are you up? No lights? Representative Brummer, please acknowledge him on Amendment #10, I presume."

Brummer: "I guess I wasn't paying close attention here. This now makes \$20,000,000 for this stone quarry? 10,000,000 in the other Amendment and 10,000,000 in this Amendment?"

Daniels: "We expect that one of them will be line itemed out and we expect that 10 is probably the funding mechanism that will be utilized through the Capital Development Fund."

Brummer: "Well, have you, have you discussed with the Bureau of the Budget the best way to proceed with this and how they desire to proceed?"

Daniels: "No."

Brummer: "Did they have this in the Governor's Budget?"

Danields: "You asked two questions, I'll answer them both with 'no'."

Speaker Schneider: "Further discussion. Are you done, Rich?"

Brummer: "Well, I just don't understand why we put \$20,000,000 that's not in the Governor's Budget for one project which admittedly at a maximum by the Sponsor is going to cost \$10,000,000 or less. You know, I...it's no small secret why the Governor at times labels us as 'big spenders' when we put all this Republican sponsored Amendments on for \$20,000,000 for a \$10,000,000 project or less that's not in the Governor's Budget in the first place."

Danields: "The nice thing about this Amendment is that it's bi-partisan."

Brummer: "Is this stated in the form of an alternative? Is the first Amendment that we adopted says that this will only become effective if the subsequent Amendment is deleted or vice versa, so we make sure that \$20,000,000 isn't spent since we are adding \$10,000,000 in two different areas? I mean in theory, it would be possible to spend \$20,000,000."

Danields: "No, because you're only purchasing Structure 15, which is the site that we're talking about."

Brummer: "Well, we don't have the appraisal on it. Maybe it will be appraised for \$20,000,000 and we'll have \$20,000,000 available from two different sources to do so."

Danields: "I certainly hope that it is not. I wouldn't anticipate that it is and the intent of the Amendment is as stated."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Hoffman, further discussion."

Hoffman: "No, I was merely rising, Mr. Speaker, to point out that this is not a partisan effort. This is an effort

for the people. For all of the people. Not just in Elmhurst. There's a misapprehension here."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Hoffman has clarified the Amendment and now Representative Daniels moves that Amendment #10 be adopted to House Bill 3084. All in favor say 'aye', opposed? There are none. Roll Call. Those in favor of Amendment #10 on 3084 vote 'aye', any opposed vote 'nay'. Schneider 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this matter, there are 68 'ayes', 32 'nays', 2 voting 'present' and Amendment #10 to House Bill 3084 is adopted. Before we do the next Amendment, Representative Polk for the purposes of an introduction."

Polk: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I am privileged this morning, in the 81st General Assembly, to have some friends of our from Cambridge in the gallery. Sitting up in the right hand side, represented by Neff, McMasters and McGrew is Vince Brimley and his family from Cambridge. If they'd stand and be recognized, we'd appreciate it please. Thank you."

Speaker Schneider: "Welcome to Springfield. Now, further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Schneider: "No further Amendments. Third Reading. Representative Ryan has asked to go back to 3038 and as a courtesy to the Minority Leader, I ask leave of the House to grant, grant that. Now, he's out of the record. Ping Pong. We're back to the regular order. We are now on 3126, Representative Daniels. Judicial Inquiry Board."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3126. A Bill for An Act making appropriations to the Judicial Inquiry Board. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Schneider: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Schneider: "Third Reading. 3127, Representative McCourt."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3127. A Bill for An Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Schneider: "Any motions filed in regard to Amendment #1?"

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Schneider: "Further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2. McCourt. Amends House Bill 3127, as amended, and so forth."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like leave to table Amendment #1 and have it replaced by Amendment #2, which is a clarifying Amendment."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative McCourt has moved to table Committee Amendment #1. All in favor, say 'aye'. Any opposed? None. The Amendment is tabled. Now...Alright, now we're on Amendment #2."

McCourt: "Amendment #2 is mainly a clarification Amendment, suggested by the Reference Bureau and members of the Committee and I would like adoption of Amendment #2."

Speaker Schneider: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2. Any discussion on that? Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Will he explain the Amendment, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Schneider: "Explanation, please, Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "Alright, Amendment #2, basically says that if you have a dual school district and the dual school district would like to...is coterminous and they would like to combine into a unit school district, they would not lose their existing tax levies as a dual school district and so it tries...the Bill itself, is

trying to encourage the combination of dual school districts, but at the same time, they do not want to lose some of their existing tax levies."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Schneider: "Yes."

McGrew: "Representative McCourt, how are you handling this when they have a different tax levy. The high school district has one rate that's higher than the elementary district and when they're consolidated, do they take the low figure, the high figure or strike the middle?"

McCourt: "Well, right, right now, in a dual district, the elementary levy for education is \$3.00 and for the high school districts it's \$3.00, so basically, they have a total tax levy of \$6.00 for educational purposes. Now, in a unit district, the tax levy for educational purpose is just \$4.00. So, under the existing legislation, there is no incentive for a dual district that happens to be coterminous and possibly would like to cut some costs, administrative costs and the like, there is no incentive ah, to have them combine into a unit district, as basically, their tax levies would be reduced from \$6.00 to \$4.00. And basically, this is, this is just to encourage the coterminous school districts such as in Evanston, to combine into a unit district."

Speaker Schneider: "I ask the membership to give your attention to that...Repres...have you completed it? Representative McCourt is finished. Mr. McGrew."

McGrew: "Well, I understand what you're saying, Sir, but, evidently you didn't understand my question. My question is, as they have a differing rate, one higher than the other, in the School Code currently, how, what, what figure did you decide to settle on what would be the maximum tax levy? You can't, you just

adding the two maximums together?"

McCourt: "That is correct. That would be their maximum tax levy. Now, for them to reach their maximum tax levy, it only could be done by referendum. So, they wouldn't have anything under this Bill that they, that they don't have at present. They would have to, they would have to get that by a referendum."

McGrew: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Schneider: "Any further discussion? There being none, the Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #2 to 3127. All in favor say 'aye'. Any opposed? There are none. Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3, Bullock-Catania. Amends House Bill 3127, as amended, in the title and so forth."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #3 is basically a technical, clarifying Amendment. It merely puts into conformity the residency requirements for board of education and it ties it into a person's address in which they are a registered voter. I know of no opposition to this Amendment and I have spoken to the Sponsor and I would move for it's adoption."

Speaker Schneider: "Any discussion? There being none, the Gentleman has moved that Amendment #, Representative Lechowicz, on Amendment #3. Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield to a few questions?"

Speaker Schneider: "The Sponsor will yield."

Lechowicz: "Is this Amendment dealing with residency?"

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Bullock. Put on Bullock."

Bullock: "Representative Lechowicz. This Amendment deals with the requirement for residency and it merely makes it consistent with the residency where other persons

throughout the State of Illinois are, in fact, registered in the county or the district in which they serve."

Speaker Schneider: "Further questions? Yes, yeah."

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I believe that this Amendment says residency shall be determined by the precinct in which the person is registered to vote. This would be a new change in as far as the definition of residency is in the State of Illinois. I think it may, I really don't know the purpose of the Gentleman's Amendment, but as I read it, I notice that there has been some problems currently in the Press in reference to some of the members of the school board and they question their residency within the City of Chicago. I would hope that that is not the purpose of this Amendment, but if the Amendment is adopted, and passed and signed into law, it would be rather specific as far as where the person...his residency is, based upon his ability to vote. I don't believe that's presently within the Statutes. I think it is a rather narrow interpretation of residency and I know that it would affect adversely a number of people, and for this reason, I stand in opposition to Amendment #3."

Speaker Schneider: "Further discussion? Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker. I'd like to withdraw the Amendment and discuss this with Representative Lechowicz. I'm sure that would could work out his objection. I'd like to withdraw the Amendment."

Speaker Schneider: "Further discussion? Oh, he withdraws it, I'm sorry. Further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #4. McCourt-Hallstrom. Amends House Bill 3127, as amended, by deleting the title and inserting in lieu thereof, the following."

Speaker Schneider: "Mr. McCourt looks puzzled. Amendment #4

has not been distributed. That's a McCourt-Hallstrom Amendment. Are you going to proceed with that, or do you want to withdraw it, Jim?"

McCourt: "Hold it on Second, then."

Speaker Schneider: "Hold it. Alright. House Bill 3140, Representative Pierce-McPike-Madigan. Either of those Gentlemen on the floor? Pierce, McPike, Madigan. Not being present, take the Bill out of the record. Representative Stuffle. House Bill 3173. Out of the...out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. House Bill 3184, Bowman-Currie and Braun. Representative Bowman."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3184. A Bill for An Act to accelerate payments of real property taxes. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Schneider: "Any motion in regard to Amendment #1?"

Clerk Leone: "No motion filed."

Speaker Schneider: "Further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Skinner. Amends House Bill 3184 in Section 1 by deleting Sections 224 and so forth."

Speaker Schneider: "Whose Amendment is it? Bowman? Representative Skinner. Gentleman not here? Sponsor requests to proceed. Further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3, Skinner. Amends House Bill 3184."

Speaker Schneider: "Is Representative Skinner on the floor? The Sponsor requests to proceed. Further Amendments. Further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #4, Schuneman. Amends House Bill 3184 in Section 1 by deleting Section 224 and inserting in lieu thereof the following."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Schuneman on Amendment #4. Not present. Proceed. Further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Schneider: "Third Reading. 3196, Representative

Beatty. Representative Beatty. 3196."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3196. A Bill for An Act to Amend the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Beatty. Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1. Beatty. Amends House Bill 3196 on page 1, line 1, and so forth."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Beatty."

Beatty: "Mr. Speaker, I have another Amendment that's being prepared. I'd just as soon have this Bill passed...ah kept out of the record. We'll get to it next week."

Speaker Schneider: "Out of the record. Representative Yourell. 3201."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3201. A Bill for An Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent and distributive expenses of the State Board of Elections. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Schneider: "Any motion in regard to Amendment #1?"

Clerk Leone: "No motion filed."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Yourell. No motion filed. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2. Yourell. Amends House Bill 3201 on page 3, line 10 and so forth."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Mr. Speaker. I didn't file a motion on Amendment #1, but I want to table Amendment #1, because I have other Amendments to follow that will take care of that."

Speaker Schneider: "Well, let's back up to 1 and see if...where's the motion, Tony? Alright, he had filed it...the Gentleman has moved to table Amendment #1. All in favor say 'aye', any opposed? None. Table 1 is...Number 1 is tabled. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2. Yourell. Amends House Bill

3201."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "I move, Mr. Speaker, Amendment #2 adds \$925,000 for the State reimbursement of \$10 to election authorities for election judges, mandated by the one hour poll...ah polling hour extension law that we passed last year. So, I move for the adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 3201."

Speaker Schneider: "Any discussion on Amendment #2? There is none. The Sponsor's moved the adoption of Amendment 2. All in favor, say 'aye'. Any opposed? There are none. Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3. Yourell. Amends House Bill 3201, as amended, in Section 1 and so forth."

Yourell: "Mr. Speaker, I have another Amendment that will take care of this and I move now to withdraw Amendment #3."

Speaker Schneider: "Gentleman moves to withdraw Amendment #3. Further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #4. Yourell. Amends House Bill 3201, as amended, in Section 1 and so forth."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #4 is an Amendment that reduces by \$19,800, the State Board of Elections' Budget in four categories. Now, it was determined that some of the areas that were cut were not in the best interest of the Commission, and so, we decided to make further cuts in other areas where we could afford them, so that we could restore the monies where we really needed them. And I move for the adoption of Amendment #4 to House Bill 3201."

Speaker Schneider: "The Sponsor has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4. Representative Schlickman on the question. Hold on."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Schneider: "Hold it, Gene. Buz, he has a question on 4 to begin with."

Yourell: "Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry. I had the wrong advice when I started out. I don't want to table Amendment...withdraw Amendment #1. I want that to remain on, so having voted on the prevailing side, I now move that we reconsider the vote by which Amendment #1 was withdrawn."

Speaker Schneider: "Inadvertently, Amendment #1 was tabled. The Sponsor has moved to reconsider the vote by which that took place. All in favor say 'aye'. Any opposed. There are none. We are now back on Amendment #1. Now, he moves the adoption of Amendment #1. Alright, he restores Amendment #1. All in favor say 'aye', any opposed? There are none. Amendment #1 is back in place and now we are on #4. Sponsor on 4."

Yourell: "Now this is the Amendment that restores the amount that we did in Amendment #1 and I move the adoption of Amendment #4 to House Bill 3201."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Yourell: "Yes."

Schlickman: "What is the relationship between Amendments #1 and #4? Are you cutting by 1 and returning or restoring by 4?"

Yourell: "Yes, that's correct."

Schlickman: "Well, why didn't you just stay with the tabling of 1?"

Yourell: "Well, they didn't want to do that because there were certain line items that Amendment #1 took care of where we reduced in Amendment #4 other line items that would make up the difference and it's for a total reduction in the Budget of \$19,800."

Speaker Schneider: "Further comments?"

Schlickman: "Well, what you're doing is redistributing the

cuts?"

Yourell: "We're restoring some equipment money that was in a line item, back to the General Counsel item for law libraries."

Schlickman: "But the net effect is the reduction of \$19,800?"

Yourell: "Yes."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Schneider: "Further discussion? There being none, the Sponsor has moved the adoption of Amendment #4 to House Bill 3201. All in favor, say 'aye', any opposed? There are none. Amendment #4 is adopted. Further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Schneider: "Third Reading. We'd like to take time right now to acknowledge the arrival of the Benton Rangerettes. The Class A Champion Basketball Team in the State of Illinois. Representatives Rea and Company, I think would like to advance to the Speaker's rostrum for this moment. Representative Darrow wishes to be acknowledged."

Darrow: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Representative Harris was called back for an important conference in the Speaker's Office. I'm sure he'd like to be here, so if he's within hearing my voice, he should come out here, since his constituents are here."

Speaker Schneider: "Tiger Harris."

Darrow: "Here comes the Tiger now."

Speaker Schneider: "Where is he?"

Rea: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. We're very pleased to have as our guests here today, the Benton Rangerettes Class A Girls Basketball Champion Team from Franklin County in the 59th District, represented by Representatives Harris, Winchester and Rea. I would ask that the resolution be read at this time."

Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 689. Whereas, the Benton

Rangerettes of Benton, Illinois, capped an outstanding season by winning the Illinois High School Association's Class A Girls Basketball Championship on March 29, 1980; and, Whereas, the Rangerettes posted an impressive record this season of 25 to 6 and clearly demonstrated that formidable basketball skills and sportsmanship are the key ingredients to a championship team. And, Whereas, Coach Sally Niemeyer, and Assistant Coach Brad Hunt provided the steady leadership and insight required to produce a winning team. And, Whereas, the honor for high scoring in the championship game goes to Cheri Nagreski, who poured in a record of 31 points. And, Whereas, the State of Illinois is proud of the fine athletic ability and competitive spirit shown by the Rangerettes. Therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the 81st General Assembly of the State of Illinois that we extend our heartiest congratulations to Coach Sally Niemeyer, her staff and members of the Benton Rangerettes on their First Place win in the Illinois High School Association Class A Girls Basketball Tournament that we commend these young athletes for their outstanding ability and sportsmanship and that we wish them great success for the future. And, Be it further resolved that a suitable copy of this Preamble and Resolution be presented to Coach Sally Niemeyer and to every member of her team as a formal indication of our admiration for their great success."

Rea: "At this time, I would like to introduce to you the Coach who has led this team to a great victory and to the championship here in the State of Illinois, who in turn, will introduce members of the team. At this time, Sally Niemeyer."

Sally Niemeyer: "First of all, just let me say thank you very much for having us here today and honoring us."

I'm sure the hard work that these girls put in is being paid off now by your recognition that you're giving us. At this time, I'd like to introduce them. I'll go from my right to left. Senior, Linda Sourheag. Raise your hand or something. Claudette Barnfield. Sharon Summers. Lisa Bell. Michelle Melvin, Senior. Becky Carney. Karen Hunsinger. Suzy Chaplin. Senior also. Tracy Smith, Senior. Valerie Bower, Senior. Linda Gazelle. Cheri Nagreski. Our Manager, Lisa Frolinni and now, this is my Assistant Coach, Brad Hunt, and our sports co-ordinator Joe Meeler."

Harris: "I'd like to announce that these girls' gym is not air conditioned and Jim Rea will have a Bill for that purpose in the very near future and I know that my colleague and our friend Mr. McCourt will be a Co-Sponsor of that piece of legislation. Let's give these girls a big hand. This Team and these coaches."

Winchester: "Well, for a minority comment, I'd like to say that this is Southern Illinois' finest and we really do appreciate your coming up here with us today. We're proud of your accomplishments and we all, we welcome from all of us, welcome all of you down to the great State of Southern Illinois and to Benton and to come down and to play a little basketball with us."

Rea: "Thank you very much. The real Speaker will now return."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative McCourt."

McCourt: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It seems to me that this is a wonderful illustration of what a group of dedicated young people can do without alot of mechanical equipment interfering with their physical desire to be #1 and I congratulate them."

Speaker Schneider: "Thank you. Representative Jones."

Jones: "I wonder if this is the team my seatmate, Bill

Harris, coached before he came to Springfield?"

Rea: "Let me take just one other second and present a copy of the Resolution to the Coach and we do have additional copies for each one of the players. Congratulations."

Speaker Schneider: "After that slam dunk performance, House Bill 3211. Representative Pierce. Representative Pierce."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill.."

Speaker Schneider: "3211."

Clerk Leone: "3211. A Bill for An Act to amend the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Schneider: "Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1, Skinner. Amends House Bill 3211 on page 1, in line 30 and so forth."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Skinner, on Amendment #1. The Gentleman is not in the chamber. Mr. Pierce. Do you want to keep moving along?"

Pierce: "Move it to Third and I'll bring it back for him if he really cares about it."

Speaker Schneider: "Further Amendments. Okay."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, Pierce-Skinner. Amends House Bill 3211 on page 1.."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Maybe we'd better hold this on Second."

Speaker Schneider: "Hold the Bill on Second. House Bill 3214. Representative Chapman or Frederick. Dwight. Oh, Virginia Frederick."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3214. A Bill for An Act to establish a State program for the planning, development, administrative of support services for adolescent parents. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Schneider: "Any motions in regard to Amendment #1?"

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Schneider: "Further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2."

Speaker Schneider: "Hold on. Darrow, are you?...Okay.
Further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2. Piel-Boucek. Amends House Bill
3214 on page 3, line 10 and so forth."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Piel."

Piel: "With leave of the House, I would like to take
Amendment #2 out, please."

Speaker Schneider: "The Sponsor has requested withdraw
Amendment #2. Further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3. Piel-Boucek. Amends House Bill
3214 on page 3, line 10 and so forth."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Piel."

Piel: "Basically, what Amendment #3 is, is basically
clarifying the language of the Bill and it's put in
there that it's not going to be used for abortion
performance, counseling, or referral services."

Speaker Schneider: "Further discuss...any discussion on
Amendment #3? Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker. This is one of six Bills proposed by
the Conference of Leg...of Women Legislators to
respond to the needs of pregnant teenagers. This Bill
designates one State agency to plan and co-ordinate
all State programs and establishes a task force on
adolescent parents support. It is not the intention
of any of these, of this legislation, to be involved
with abortion at all. Our goal is to help young women
who are about to become mothers and who are mothers,
in dealing with the problems that they face.
Therefore, I have no problem with this Amendment
whatsoever."

Speaker Schneider: "C.O.W.L. has not opposition to Amendment
#3. Further discussion? There being none, the
Sponsor of the Amendment has moved the adoption of
Amendment #3 to 3214. All in favor, say 'aye'.

Anybody opposed? None. Amendment #3 is adopted.
Further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Schneider: "Third Reading. Hold on. Representative Darrow."

Darrow: "I believe there was a fiscal note requested. Has it been filed?"

Speaker Schneider: "Yes, it has been filed. Third Reading. 3215. Representative Satterthwaite."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3215. A Bill for An Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Satterthwaite on Amendment #1, first of all."

Satterthwaite: "Now, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee, I believe."

Speaker Schneider: "That's right."

Satterthwaite: "But, at this point, I'm requesting that the Bill be sent back to Committee and placed on interim study."

Speaker Schneider: "Lady, Lady has requested that the Bill be recommitted to the Interim Study Committee of the appropriate Committee which was what?"

Satterthwaite: "Human Resources."

Speaker Schneider: "Human Resources. Leave to recommit is granted. That Bill will now be placed on the Interim Study Calendar for of the Human Resources Committee. 3216."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3216. A Bill for An Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Willer. Willer-MacDonald. She's flailing away. What are your flailing? Out of the record. Hold on. We'd better

hold it then. There's consultation by Collins. Now, the Sponsor's are, alright, Representative Currie is a Chief Sponsor also. Miss Currie."

Currie: "There has been an Amendment filed, I believe."

Speaker Schneider: "Yes, hold on. Alright. We got...any motion in regard to Amendment #1?"

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Schneider: "Further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2. Piel-Boucek. Amends House Bill 3216 on page 1, line 17 and so forth."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Piel."

Piel: "First, a comment, Mr. Speaker. The Sponsors of the Bill, there's many Co-Sponsors. The two main Sponsors are MacDonald and Willer on the Bill. I would ask leave of the House to withdraw Amendment #2."

Speaker Schneider: "The Gentleman has asked leave to withdraw Amendment #2. Leave is granted. Further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3. Piel-Boucek. Amends House Bill 3216 on page 1, line 17 and so forth."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Piel on 3."

Piel: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have discussed this with Representative MacDonald. She has no problem with my Amendment, but she introduced Amendment #4 and I told her if Amendment #4, if she introduced that, I would withdraw Amendment #3."

Speaker Schneider: "Gentleman has asked leave to withdraw Amendment #3. Leave is granted. Now, Amendment #4."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #4. MacDonald. Amends House Bill 3216 on page 1, by deleting lines 12 thru 31 and so forth."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative MacDonald are you here? Can one of the Chief Co-Sponsors of the Amendment, Representative Currie."

Currie: "On behalf of Representative MacDonald and the other

Co-Sponsors of the Bill, I would like to ask leave to table Amendment #4. Amendment #5 does what Amendment #4 did and we're, I'm going to ask that we accept Amendment #5, Bob."

Piel: "I would ask that you hold it until I discuss this with you, please."

Currie: "Amendment #5 says exactly the same thing, Representative Piel, but it's in correct form. Amendment 4 was not properly drawn, but the language is the same."

Piel: "Fine. I see. Thank you."

Speaker Schneider: "Withdrawing #4, Representative Currie?"

Currie: "Yes."

Speaker Schneider: "Leave is granted with withdrawal of that Amendment. Amendment #...further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #5. MacDonald. Amends House Bill 3216, as amended."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Amendment #5 turns this Bill into authority for the Department of Public Health to do a feasibility study on the issue of establishing pilot programs and demonstration projects involving teen pregnancies."

Speaker Schneider: "Any discussion on Amendment #5? There being none, the Sponsor moves the adoption of Amendment #5 to House Bill 3216. All in favor say 'aye', any opposed? There are none. Amendment #5 is adopted. Further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Schneider: "Third Reading. House Bill 3230. Representative Yourell, in the absence of the Chairman of Elections."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3230. A Bill for An Act to amend the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee. Amendment #3 failed."

Speaker Schneider: "Any motion in regards to Amendments #1

and 2?"

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Schneider: "Further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #4, Grossi. Amends House Bill 3230 on page 1, line 5 and so forth."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Grossi on Amendment #4. Grossi. Pechous, get out of the way. Let's go. Amendment #4, Pat. Gentleman withdraws Amendment #4. Leave is granted. He also asks that Amendment #5 be withdrawn. Further Amendments. Yes, 4 and 5 are withdrawn. Amendment #, further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #6. Bowman-Braun. Amends House Bill 3230 on page 1 and so forth."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Let me ask the Clerk. Does he have an Amendment #7 as well, filed by us?"

Clerk Leone: "7 by Bowman, yes."

Bowman: "I believe that #6 should be withdrawn, because of a drafting error..."

Speaker Schneider: "Gentleman moves to withdraw...withdraw Amendment #6. Leave is granted. Further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #7. Bowman. Amends House Bill 3230 on page 1, by deleting lines 1 and 2 and inserting thereof the following."

Speaker Schneider: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Okay, let me further check with the Clerk. The first Section amended a Section 2A-1? Is that correct? I just wanted to make sure I knew which Amendment we were going with now."

Clerk Leone: "To read further, in lieu, inserting in lieu thereof the following, An Act relating to elections and in line 5 by inserting 2A-1, 2A-1.2."

Bowman: "Okay. Thank You. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment to House Bill 3230 is the same as an Amendment we had adopted in Representative Yourell's Bill 2917. I promised

Representative Yourell that I would table my Amendment to that Bill if I could get this Amendment adopted, the same Amendment adopted to this Bill. He kindly consented. We've already adopted the Amendment. I ask for, that we adopt it at this time to this Bill."

Speaker Schneider: "Motion to adopt?"

Bowman: "Yes."

Speaker Schneider: "The Sponsor has asked that Amendment #7 to 3230 be adopted. Any discussion? No discussion. The, all in favor say 'aye', any oppose say 'no'. Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #8. Grossi. Amends House Bill 3230 on page 1, line 5 and so forth. Representative Lechowicz in the Chair."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Grossi."

Grossi: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I believe Amendment #8 will be agreed upon by the Sponsor. Basically, it provides for seven day's notice of the lottery be given to all authorized persons."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall Amendment #8 be adopted. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed. Amendment #8 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #9. Bowman. Amends House Bill..."

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

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #9 was worked out in cooperation with the State Board of Elections. After having some discussions with the county clerks, it attempts to respond to some of the problems the county clerks have with the Election Bill we passed last year, under my sponsorship..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall Amendment #9 be...I look at the Sponsor. Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn, J: "Yeah, there's discussion. All I want to know is

what the Amendment does. You interrupted him. He was explaining it. Let's hear what the Amendment says."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Oh, I thought he was finished, I'm sorry."

Bowman: "Okay, the legislation that was adopted last year, provided for a special supervision of casting absentee ballots in nursing homes. The clerks had some problems with it and one of the main things that this Amendment does is, I know Representative Dunn is interested in the, in the problems of having the ballots cast the day before the election. This provides a mechanism whereby the ballots may be cast on election day with a special team of judges, which would be appointed separate from the panel, regular panel of judges. So it could all be taken care of on election day with a couple of extra judges to go out and collect the ballots and that is the main thing it does. It provides further that residents of nursing homes may use the five year incapacitated voter certificates, so they don't have to get medical affidavits every time. Those are the, those are the main features of the Amendment."

Dunn, J: "Are the county clerks in support of this Amendment?"

Bowman: "Well, the...we worked it out with representatives of the County Clerks Association. Their legislative committee is meeting today. In fact, they probably just adjourned and I expect to have word back from them as to whether they are officially supporting this. I did, I think a letter has been sent out to all members of the House over the signature of the head of the Clerks and Recorders Association supporting this concept at least, and if there are additional problems, I would be happy to, you know, if the Sponsor will bring the Bill back to Third Reading, I would be happy to work them out. It's our intention

to work with the county clerks and I think this addresses their concern."

Dunn, J: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The question is, shall Amendment #9 be adopted? All in favor signify by saying 'aye', oppose. Amendment #9 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #10. Collins. Amends House Bill 3230 on page 1, line 5."

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

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #10 was filed at the request of the County Clerks Association and this Amendment would provide that the list of voters to whom absentee ballots were issued, which is already required to be delivered to each polling place by 6 a.m. on election day. This list would include only those voters who received absentee ballots by mail. Of course, the ballots of voters who vote absentee in person are sent to the precinct polling place before the close of the polls anyway, so there really is no reason for them, their inclusion on this list and there is no practical possibility of all of them being included before 6 a.m. and I would ask for a favorable consideration of this Amendment."

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

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemn of the House. I have no objection to Amendment #10 and I ask that you support Representative Collins' motion."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? Question is, shall Amendment #10 be adopted? All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', oppose. Amendment #10 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. Yes, Sir. The Gentleman

from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

Yourell: "Would, could we go back now, Mr. Speaker, to House Bill 29 is that 18 or 17 Woody, you put that Amendment on? 18."

Speaker Lechowicz: "House Bill 2918?"

Yourell: "Yeah."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That was moved to Third Reading?"

Yourell: "Yes, we want to move that back to Second Reading."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman asks leave to bring House Bill 2918 from Third to Second, for the purpose of Amendment. Hearing no objection, it's on Second Reading. Are there any Amendments? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I move to table the Amendment in which I successfully had adopted to that Bill. I believe it was Amendment #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman moves to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #4 was adopted."

Bowman: "Yes, I so move."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All in favor vote 'aye'. You got to have a Roll Call on this. All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. Dawson, vote me 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there's 109 'ayes', no 'nays', none recorded as present and the Gentleman's motion to reconsider the vote by which Amendment was adopted prevails. Now, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman, moves to table Amendment #4. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed? Amendment #4 is tabled. Any further Amendments? Third Reading. House Bill 3237."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3237. A Bill for An Act to provide for the reimbursement of mass transportation carriers, which provide reduced transit fares for students. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the Floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1. Williamson-Skinner. Amends House Bill 3237 on page 1, line 24 and so forth."

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

Williamson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to withdraw Amendment 1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Alright. On that question, hearing no objections, withdraw Amendment #1. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2. Skinner. Amends House Bill 3237 on ..."

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

Skinner: "The current law allows reimbursement, or at least under this Bill only during the five days in which school is normally in operation. There are numerous classes that are held at night and on the weekends, according to the Representative from Nortran and it was at her request that I've introduced this Amendment. It seems logical to me that if one is going to get half-fares when kids are going to school, if kids go to school at night or on the weekends, that they ought to get half-fares then, as well as during the normal five day week, so I ask for support of this Amendment."

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

Winchester: "Well, I'm curious Mr. Speaker. Has there been a fiscal note ah, filed with the Clerk on this particular Bill?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "We're in the process of considering an Amendment, as the Bill, as it has been introduced, the fiscal note has been filed."

Winchester: "Well, what about on the Amendment, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, it has to be either considered up or down and after..."

Winchester: "Well, would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Winchester: "Do you have any idea what the fiscal impact would be, Cal, if this Amendment is adopted to the Bill?"

Skinner: "I would assume it would be fairly marginal. There are not many people that go to school at night and on Sundays or Saturdays."

Winchester: "Well, this applies ..."

Skinner: "The next Amendment that I offer will be substantial, however."

Winchester: "Well, I, I rise in opposition to the Amendment, Mr. Speaker and I would ask the other members of the House to do the same thing."

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

Garmisa: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. The, while I'm sympathetic with what my colleague on the other side of the aisle is trying to do with this Amendment, the cost would be prohibitive. DOT tells me that the cost would run somewhere around close to 35 millions of dollars and I think that this would be weighing this Bill down too much. The Bill, in its original form, is a good Bill and I would not like to see it weakened at this time and I would ask that we oppose the adoption of this Amendment."

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

Skinner: "Yes, unfortunately, the Sponsor of the Bill has the fiscal impact of the wrong Amendment before you. Think about how much it's going to, how many kids you know who go to high school or to grade school at night or on Saturdays. For example, for a special enrichment program on a Saturday morning, which occurred when I went to school in New York State. There must be, you know, maybe 30 people per school. How many would take a bus? It couldn't possibly cost

35 million. There is an Amendment, which we consider next, which might cost that much. It would allow college students to get half fares. Now, I'd be perfectly happy to hear the argument used against that Amendment, but not against this Amendment. This Amendment will have a very small additional cost. It is desired by the largest suburban bus carrier, Nortran, and I don't think it is going to cost that much. It seems to me that it ought to be adopted without any controversy."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? Question is shall Amendment #2 be adopted. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed? The 'Nos' have it. This Amendment is lost. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3. Williamson. Amends House Bill 3237 on page 1, line 23 and so forth."

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

Williamson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Due to the fiscal impact of the Amendment, I withdraw Amendment #3."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let the Gentleman conclude. Any discussion? The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would ask leave to be substituted as Sponsor of the Amendment. I was supposed to be a hyphenated Sponsor and apparently was inadvertently left off."

Speaker Lechowicz: "There's no objection to that."

Williamson: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to answer Mr. Skinner. We were hyphenated on Amendment #1 and I think you submitted Amendment #2. Right now, we're talking about Amendment #3."

Skinner: "If this is the Amendment which allows college students half fares, the agreement was that when it was rewritten, we would both jointly sponsor it as we jointly sponsored the first Amendment. Now, if you want to kill the Amendment, that's fine, but it

deserves a hearing on this House Floor."

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

Garnisa: "Well, Mr. Speaker. I have no objection to Cal offering this Amendment, but I would ask for its defeat as we have defeated Amendment #2. If he feels that he should have been on as a hyphenated sponsor and he may be correct about that, I have no objection to him substituting as the Sponsor of Amendment #3, but I would ask for the defeat of this Amendment for the same reasons that we defeated Amendment #2."

Skinner: "Assuming I'm the Sponsor now, may I speak to the issue?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Now, wait a minute. Mr. Williamson, I believe the Gentleman's originally requesting is a matter of a point of information. Initially, he thought that he was the co, chief co-sponsor and with you on Amendment #3. Is that your understanding, Sir?"

Williamson: "Yes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "With no objections, then, the name of Mr. Williamson and Mr. Skinner will appear on Amendment #3. Now on the, now on the Amendment, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "This may be a perfectly horrible Bill that shouldn't be passed, but those of us in the suburbs ought to get our heads screwed on straight and figure out that we do not benefit from half fares for high school students and grade school students on public transportation. The only people in McHenry County who are benefiting go to the only Catholic high school in McHenry County, which is located in Woodstock. Now, if you think in your District, how many people commute into Chicago to a, to a university or college and how many people that go to junior college by bus. For example, in Lake County, I know that the buses going to and from the junior colleges are packed at certain

times during the day. You'll realize that if we, in the suburbs, are to benefit from student half fares, we'd better cut in college students. 'Cause if we don't cut in college students, 96% of the money under this Act or this proposed Act, will end up going to the Chicago Transit Authority. Now, either we end up trying to get our fair share, or we don't. In either event, we may still want to kill the Bill. But, the only way to make, to get any amount of money in the suburbs, it seems to me, is to adopt this Amendment and I ask for the approval of the Amendment, knowing that the administration spokesman and the spokesman for the City of Chicago's position will point out that it will cost, well, what did he say, \$35,000,000, well that's fine. Nobody is saying this isn't a ripoff of the General Fund. It is a ripoff of the General Fund, whether or not it's amended."

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

Winchester: "Well, I think in the last few comments of Representative Skinner. He's pretty well summarized my feelings on the issue that it probably is a ripoff and I don't think that we should be considering the Amendment. It's a bad Amendment and I would ask for its defeat."

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

Getty: "Will the Sponsor of the Amendment yield?"

Skinner: "I certainly will."

Getty: "Cal, what is this going to cost?"

Skinner: "I haven't an idea in the world. All I know is what the Representative from Chicago and the Gentleman from the Southern part of the State who likes to speak on behalf of local interests projects down there, has mentioned previously in this debate."

Getty: "In other words, it's going to be astronomical and fiscally irresponsible."

Skinner: "Certainly no more astronomical than the original Bill."

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

Williamson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As we have received the fiscal note."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Who is the Sponsor of the Amendment now? Is Mr. Skinner the principal Sponsor?"

Williamson: "I'll yield to Mr. Skinner."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, if the Representative wants to explain why he's against the Bill, or the Amendment, that's fine, but I really think that I ought to be allowed to close."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry. I initially thought that it was Williamson-Skinner, but I know that Mr. Williamson has better, better intentions and he adequately withdrew and opposed the Amendment. Please proceed, Sir."

Skinner: "I thank you for your continuing neutrality. It is really a pleasure to watch during this Session. This Amendment, excuse me, I didn't hear you Sir."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I said, I'll miss you. Please proceed."

Skinner: "Who's going to keep you honest. I just don't understand."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Don't worry about me."

Skinner: "Maybe the people in his District? Well, perhaps. The, this Amendment is an attempt to cut in college students in the half fare program. Now, it is certainly going to be a costly diversion from the General Fund, but so is the original Bill. The question is whether the Chicago Transit Authority is to receive 96% of the benefits of this Bill, or whether maybe some of the benefits will be spread elsewhere in the State. Now, I would remind the downstate college communities which have public

transportation entities, that their college students will also benefit. The students in Champaign will benefit from the half fares, which they do not now receive. College students have to, have to pay full fares at the present time. It seems to me that people are going to college are generally very, very low on money and I believe that this, if we are going to allow subsidies for students, that we should include college students and ask for your support on that basis."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Amendment #3 be adopted."

Skinner: "And may we have a Roll Call, so that we can give it to the university students."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. He closed, Ma'am. Now, Mrs. Braun."

Braun: "Speaker, I had a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ask him while you're explaining your vote."

Braun: "Alright. Question is, what is the fiscal impact of this Amendment?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, my answer is 'I don't know.' All I know is what Rep., the Representative from Chicago has said. He said it's \$35,000,000. Beats me."

Braun: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 37 'ayes', 50 'nos'. The Amendment is defeated. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. 3320."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3320. A Bill for An Act making appropriations for certain continuing boards and commissions. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments 1, 2, 3..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is Mr. Peters on the floor? Take it out of the record. He wants to take it out of the record. Request of the Sponsor. House Bill 3324."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3324. A Bill for An Act making appropriations to the Department of Conservation. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 3331."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3331. A Bill for An Act making appropriations to the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2. Representative Karpiel. Amends House Bill 3331, as amended, by adding on page 1, immediately after Section 1 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Karpiel."

Karpiel: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment will appropriate \$550,000, or as much thereof as may be necessary, to the Capital Development Board to develop a therapeutic and recreational swimming facility at the centerized court of the Ray Graham Association."

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

Kelly: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Representative Karpiel did come over and discuss this Amendment with me. I don't know her area as well as I should. I do know there is a great need in the South and Southwest suburban area...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Why don't we take the Bill out of the record then, and we will, you'll be able to talk. Well, what do you want to do?"

Kelly: "I'm not opposing her Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Alright, fine. Is there any further discussion? Question is, shall Amendment #2 be adopted? All in favor, signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed. Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3. Skinner-Burnidge-Hanahan. Amends House Bill 3331, as amended, by adding on page 1, immediately after Section 2, the following, \$300,000 or so much as may be necessary..."

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

Skinner: "The Campbell Cartoon Service recently had an editorial cartoon, which had shoddy construction, a black wolf, blowing at the Illinois Community Colleges, in which there was a little pig in a wooden, in a wooden house. And, the house was falling down. The house was built by the Capital Development Board. According to the Capital Development Board's specifications and according to an article in the Chicago, in the Sunday's Chicago Sun-Times, within the last two months, there are problems throughout the State with shoddy construction of junior colleges that were supervised by the Capital Development Board. My junior college is one of them. McHenry County College has a heating and cooling system with, with units which are on the roof of that heating and cooling syst...the roof of the junior college. They have not worked since the college went into operation. It will cost approximately \$300,000 to put these in working condition and this Amendment is intended to catch the attention of the Capital Development Board, which has not been voluntarily offered and to fix the situation.

And, I ask for support of the Amendment."

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

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I understand there is a need for this, I don't object to the Amendment, so, we can proceed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? All in favor, signify by saying 'aye', oppose. Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 3358."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3358. A Bill for An Act providing for loans to certain corporations. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1. Leinenweber. Amends House Bill 3358 on page 1, line 22, and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Will, Mr. Leinenweber. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Mr. Leinenweber is off the Floor, Mr. Speaker, but his Amendment is acceptable to the Sponsors and we move for it's adoption."

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

McClain: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman explain the Amendment?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Collins."

Collins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. The Bill, as introduced, establishes a 9% rate on the loan. The Amendment would change it to the going rate for commercial loans, or for industrial loans, pardon me."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis."

Davis: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry that Harry's not on the floor, Phil. We had a series of Amendments filed to the Bill. This particular Amendment was supposed to be withdrawn in favor of another Amendment

that I was going to introduce and if that did not succeed to the Bill, then this Amendment should have followed it. Now, I don't know whether we're out of sequence or what. Maybe the Clerk can advise me as to the Amendment numbers, since I don't have...I have my Amendments and I know Harry has filed a..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Amendment #1 states that amends House Bill 3358 on page 1, line 22 by deleting the interest rate of 9% per year and inserting in lieu thereof the annual interest rate at the prevailing commercial loan interest rate."

Davis: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. May I speak to the Amendment then? Or may I object? Because I know Representative Leinenweber did not want this Amendment called prior to mine and I think there is an identical Amendment subsequent to my Amendment #3 that addresses the same topic."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, since the Sponsor of the Amendment is not here, unless he specifically asked that you handle it for him, Mr. Collins."

Collins: "No. No, he didn't. I talked with Representative Dawson, a hyphenated principal Sponsor of the Bill and we both indicated that this Amendment was acceptable to us. If it's not to be offered, well then we would ask that it be withdrawn and move on to the next Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman withdraws the Amendment. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2. Skinner. Amends House Bill 3358 on page 1, by inserting between lines 22..."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 attempts to require full collateral of, from any company to which a loan is made. It is the same language which we put in the Chrysler Bail Out Bill. It seems to me that it is appropriate that any company that's going to attempt

to get money from the State as a loan, have some collateral and that's why I ask acceptance for this Amendment."

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

Collins: "Well, obviously, Mr. Speaker, we have to object to this Amendment. If collateral were available, we could go to any industrial bank or any bank for this loan. The difference between this Bill, I think, and the Chrysler Bill is obvious. The problem in the Chrysler situation is that apparently Chrysler has a product that nobody wants to buy. In the case of Wisconsin Steel, quite the opposite is true. We have a product that is saleable, however, the principal customer of the company, who has been engaged in a six month strike that was just, was just concluded, and if allowed to go back into business, Wisconsin Steel could immediately start supplying their customers, as they have in the past. Collateral would be desirable, but is not available. If collateral of the company's assets in a second position were acceptable, that would be acceptable to the Sponsors of the Bill, but we cannot collateralize what is not available and I would ask for the rejection of this Amendment."

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

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Wisconsin Steel's a little bit different than Chrysler Corporation for the fact that Wisconsin Steel is shut down right now. There are not in business. It is not such a thing as being a threat of going out of business. They are out of business right now, trying to get back into it with 3,500 employees. I oppose this Amendment."

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

Friedrich: "Well, I'd like to ask the Sponsor of the Bill,

of Amendment 1, isn't it true that Wisconsin Steel's been losing money for years? This isn't anything that happened right now."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr., Mr. Dawson."

Dawson: "Representative Friedrich, they've been paying 3,500 employees for 43 years over there, so, evidently they've been paying their taxes and paying their employees for that many years, so whatever they've been doing, they've been able to take care of the people of the District there."

Friedrich: "Well, isn't it true, since their shutdown, that those furnaces will now have to be rebuilt."

Dawson: "They have been maintaining them up until this week, with a standby crew. There is so much money been allocated, the last allocation was \$750,000 for maintenance of the plant until they can get it back together."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, the story I've got is that the, there's already been substantial damage in the shut down. They will have to completely rebuild the furnaces."

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

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker. The Sponsors of this Bill have grossly misrepresented it. It is not, excuse me..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from Effingham, Mr. Brummer. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Brummer: "I was wondering if I could either close the door or turn off the lights. I can't even see up to the rostrum. The door is now closed. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, I was a little thankful for the assistance of shedding some light on this Bill from the light that was coming in the door. The, this Bill needs a lot of light shed on it. Representative Giorgi was

relatively straight forward with his presentation of the Chrysler Bail Out Bill in comparison with the presentation we've heard so far on this one. This Bill is not just for a Wisconsin Steel bail out. I would ask you to open the Digest and read what it says. It says new Act providing for loans to Illinois corporations that have ceased operations or are about to because of financial hardships. That's any corporation. Mr. Dawson apparently wishes to put a parentheses in and I would be happy to let him do so."

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

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker. This legislation says for any company with 3,000 employees or more. It's not anyone and it's at the discretion of the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs if the loan shall be made."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Thank you. This Bill applies to any of over 30 companies in the State of Illinois that hire more than 3,000 employees, and yet, we're talking about only Wisconsin Steel on the House Floor. Well, let's look at Wisconsin Steel, where it is, although this Bill does not just affect Wisconsin Steel. Wisconsin Steel now is virtually owned by the Federal Government, because it has defaulted on the loan guarantee that the Federal Government has made. The problem is, the Federal Government does not want the title. The Federal Government, although it's dumb enough to sponsor, loan guarantees for companies like Chrysler or Wisconsin Steel, it's smart enough to know it can't operate a steel plan. Well, I guess we should be thankful for small favors, but this Bill is not a small favor. This Bill is a direct loan with no collateral whatsoever to any company that is determined to have a financial hardship by the Director of the Department of Commerce. No collateral. Now, if the company has no collateral and

it's in bankruptcy court, what chance whatsoever do you think we'll get the money back, unless perhaps we adopt this Amendment. Now, the Sponsor of the Bill has suggested that the loan cannot be made if Amendment #2 is adopted. Well, if Wisconsin Steel cannot offer any collateral whatsoever, that's a worse deal than Chrysler. At least, Chrysler has offered us a proving grounds, God knows what we're going to do with a proving grounds in the State of Michigan, but at least they've offered us a proving grounds. Couldn't Wisconsin Steel offer us Wisconsin Steel property? Wouldn't that make a good prison site, close to a lot of, close to a source of a lot of the prisoners in the State of Illinois' prison system? Your constituents, Representatives. I think that this is a minimum Amendment that has to be adopted. The loan is, it's like, it's like flushing stuff down a toilet, if we don't have collateral and that's why I would ask for a Roll Call on this Amendment. I think it is the most significant Amendment to be adopted and I, I hope for the hysteria on the part of the Sponsors of the Bill if we get close to passage of this Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Amendment #2 be adopted? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. No. Come on, wake up over there. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 59 'ayes', 61 'nos'. The Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, I really think with 57 people not voting on this extremely important Amendment that I certainly want a poll of the absentees and I certainly want a verification of the Affirmative Roll Call, if the proponents happen to get enough, excuse me, it's a Negative Roll Call, if we don't gain enough positive

votes in the poll of the absentees."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Coles, Mr. Stuffle. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. It appears to me a number of people are confused as to which way to vote on this thing. I think we ought to dump the Roll Call and be fair to everyone and save the time of this House."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Fine. Dump the Roll Call. Question is, shall Amendment #2 be adopted? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis."

Davis: "Well, thank you Mr. Speaker. I can't imagine why anybody would vote against this for, except perhaps the Sponsors, since my God, Wisconsin Steel is in Chapter XI bankruptcy right now and we at least afforded this consideration to the Chrysler Bill and I can't imagine why anybody would vote against a similar provision here. It may indeed give the Bill the kiss of death, which it righteously belongs, we'll debate that on Third, I'm sure, but everybody should be for this Amendment."

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

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker, in explaining my vote. My colleague on the other side mentioned what kind of collateral we have. Maybe if he didn't come from such an affluent area and he had 3,500 people that were out of work, I feel that those people's lives and their jobs are worth the collateral to put this kind of money into a District."

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

Skinner: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if the workers at the plant wish to pledge their homes as collateral, I would be willing to accept an Amendment that would make that, make that legal. Certainly, we should not turn the spigot of the taxpayers' dollars on without a bucket

underneath to catch it and I would suggest that if we don't adopt this Amendment, there's not going to be a bucket. So, I would ask for more affirmative votes so that the negatives won't try to have a verification."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 83 'ayes', 57 'nos', 1 recorded as 'present'. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3. Davis. Amends House Bill 3358..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis."

Davis: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment #3 addresses the issue of interest rates. In the Bill it says that 9% annual interest, if this loan should be made with Wisconsin Steel. In this one, it takes..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, Sir, it's my mistake. Please continue."

Davis: "Maybe that was an indication of the Amendment's worth. This Bill, this Amendment would simply identify what this loan would be if it was made. The Amendment calls for the Department of Commerce, before any issuance of money to Wisconsin Steel, and I wish this were on the Chrysler Bill, as a matter of fact, which is a poor credit risk, but Wisconsin Steel is a horrible credit risk, it simply would require the Department of Commerce to determine what the annualized high risk loan rate is at the time of issuance of money. And for those of you who have never been in the business, in the business world and have had to borrow money from the high risk discount loan people, and they are people like Walter Heller, Acceptance Corporation, National Acceptance Corporation, some of the large banks are now involved in that particular business. What it usually means

is they take the so called prime rate, which is the lowest rate at that time granted to the supplying commercial borrowers and add 7 to 8% on top of that. These people are in the business of financing high risk credit situations where they can't get money any place else. And, if Wisconsin Steel doesn't fit that particular description, then I can't think of any, anything that does. Now, it's a floating rate, so if the prime rate, let's say, went down by the time this Bill should succeed, and God forbid that should happen, if that should occur, let's say at the end of the year, the prime rate were 10%, the rate charged by the State of Illinois to Wisconsin Steel for the issuance of money would be roughly 17%, which would be my guess, or roughly 7% higher than prime. I think the taxpayers of this State, if you're going to loan money to a failing corporation, certainly deserve the same kind of credit risk interest rate that the high risk borrowers do and I would urge adoption of the Amendment."

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

Collins: "Well, Mr. Speaker. If I understand the Sponsor of this Amendment right, he's proposing that the State of Illinois get into the juice, the juice loan racket, and I think it's unconscienable to offer this type of Amendment to strangle a company that's already on their knees. We indicated, as Sponsors of this Bill, that we were certainly willing to take any interest rate that is reasonable and certainly the going rate would be reasonable. But, for us to extract juice from a company that is already in trouble, I think it is a conscious effort to destroy this Bill and ought to exposed as such."

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

Skinner: "The Sponsor of this Amendment has suggested that

Wisconsin, a loan to Wisconsin Steel would be a high risk loan. It's not going to be a high risk loan, it's a no risk loan. We know we're never going to get it back. Never going to come back. This company's not on its knees, it's on its back. The flowers are growing on its stomach. Now, we have a choice. We could either charge the commercial going rate and maybe get our money back in four years, if, in interest, if the company lasts four years, which I think is in great doubt, in fact, I think there's great doubt whether it will last four months, or, we can just give them the money. And, that's basically what we're doing without this Amendment. We're just giving them the money. It seems to me that we might want to give away money to the Community Action Agencies or public aid recipients or senior citizens, but we don't want to give them away to stockholders. And, that's who we're giving it to here. We're giving it to the stockholders of Wisconsin Steel, a teeny-tiny little company, that probably never should have owned Wisconsin Steel in the first place. You know what the financial pages are saying? The financial pages are saying is after Wisconsin Steel goes belly up, that they turn all the furnaces off, International Harvester's going to buy it back. They're going to grab it for a very small amount of money, and basically what we're doing maybe, is not giving money to Wisconsin Steel, maybe we're not giving money to the, to the steel workers, whose jobs are in jeopardy, maybe we're just writing a check of \$20,000,000 that will end up in the till of International Harvester. There are all sorts of reasons why there ought to be great collateral and a high interest rate. Maybe 25% interest rate in today's market isn't enough. Maybe it ought to be 50% interest rate. It certainly ought, should not be

charity, and that's what the original Bill is, just charity."

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

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker. It specifies in this Bill that this money will be distributed by the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs and I believe that that is a very qualified agency who could disburse this money and I am quite sure that they would make sure that it will not be wasted. As far as anything coming back, maybe there's a few other things you may not like to see come back also."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis."

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I certainly am in sympathy with the Sponsors of this Bill and the distinguished Minority Whip from my side's interest in the Bill and I sympathy with the plight of Wisconsin Steel, but that is indeed was a classic case of undercapitalization when it was bought on its own assets from International Harvester with a captive that turned its back on them through a labor negotiation, which has nothing to do with what we're talking about here. I think the fine companies that I mentioned earlier that are in the high risk loan business would take exception to the word juice, although privately, I've used it, since I in the business world was in the steel business and it's a very common practice to finance high risk loans, which my company was in its early days, through this mechanism. I did business with Commercial Discount and National Acceptance Corporation for many years and found no problem if you have a marketable product and that's what we're being told here. If you have a marketable product and a market for it, you have no problem with this kind of interest rate financing. Absolutely no problem. I think we owe it to the taxpayers of Illinois. Representative Skinner was

absolutely right. If they do succeed, if they get this money, within four to five years, the taxpayers would have their money back and that's what it's all about folks. If we're in the loan business, you'd better secure your loan and get the best rate you can, and yes, Representative Collins, if we're in the juice business, we're in the loan business, then let's get the juice and get the money back. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Amendment #3 be adopted. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 64 'ayes', 58 'nos', 2 recorded as 'present'. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4. Leinenweber. Amends House Bill 3358, on page..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Withdraw the Amendment. I think it's almost the same as Amendment #3, which was adopted. Any further Amendments? Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #5. Davis. Amends House Bill 3358 on...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis."

Davis: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. There's some question on my side of the aisle if the Amendment's been distributed. Can the Clerk tell me that?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, it has."

Davis: "Alright. Amendment #5 simply says if the corporation applying for a loan under this Act is a party in a proceeding under the Chapter XI Bankruptcy Act in a Federal Court, the Director of the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs must approve the credit plan submitted in that action before a loan may be made under the Act. It simply puts us on the Credit Board of the Chapter XI Bankruptcy proceeding

to approve the disbursement of funds to bring them out of Chapter XI under reorganization. Now, I'm not a Chapter XI bankruptcy lawyer, but I know a great deal about that particular action, having been there once with a business that I own. And, I can guarantee you that the State of Illinois should certainly approve the credit plan before issuing the \$20,000,000 in question here. It's a very good Amendment. The Sponsor should have absolutely no problem with this one."

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

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker. I am glad to see they finally came up with something good on that side and I agree with them."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Amendment #5 be adopted? All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed? Amendment #5 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 3469."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3469. A Bill for An Act in relation to contracts with dance studio services. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3. Kelly. Amends House Bill 3469 on page 4..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentlemen from Cook, Mr. Kelly. Kelly, please."

Kelly: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would like to table Amendment #3."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman withdraws Amendment #3. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4. Jaffe-Daniels..."

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

Jaffe: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #4 is in agreement with the Attorney General. It's an agreed Amendment and it amends the dance studio physical fitness center Bill and it requires the contract mentioning statutory ceilings on dollar amounts and time limits and also makes violations of either of these Acts violations of the Consumer Fraud Act and gives the Attorney General the investigatory and enforcement power. It changes the effective date to January 1, 1981 and there's also some technical corrections and I would move its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall Amendment #4 be adopted? All in favor say 'aye', 'aye', oppose? Amendment #4 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House 3474. Mr. Daniels."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 34..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take it out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. 3513. Mr. Ewing."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3513. The fiscal note isn't filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Fiscal Note has not been filed. Leave the Bill on Second Reading. House Bill 34...I'm sorry, House Bill 3514."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3514. A Bill for An Act creating an advisory board to the Industrial Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2. Farley. Amends House Bill 3514 on page 1 by inserting after a period at the end

of line 19, instead of the comma and so forth."

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

Farley: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 removes all references to employees of the proposed Workmen's Compensation Advisory Board. It is not contemplated that the Sponsors, by the Sponsors that the Advisory Board would have any employees. It also deletes the requirement that in the unamended Bill that one of the Advisory Board's public members must represent municipal or local governments. This Amendment, if adopted, would give the Governor, with the approval of the Senate, the latitude of appointing strictly three public members and I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall the Amendment be adopted? All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed? Amendment's adopted. Do you want a Roll Call, George? Question is, shall Amendment #2 be adopted? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Marco, give me an 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 72 'ayes', 37 'nos', none recorded as 'present'. The Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 3539."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3539. A Bill for An Act to amend the Illinois Housing Development Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1. Piel. Amends House Bill 3539 on page 1, line 1 and so forth."

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

Piel: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Yesterday, there was a question that was brought up. I took the Bill, the Amendment out of the

record. It did clear up the question with Representative Bullock and this basically, the amended version, this Amendment is now the Bill. We struck everything after the enacting clause. The Amendment requires that IHDA has got to put their unencumbered funds into the purchase of mortgage and secondary mortgage market and requires savings institutions who IHDA has helped in their portfolio to give loans at 2% over IHDA's bond rate in their own geographical area. So cannot make mortgages throughout the State and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

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

Brummer: "Yes, will the Gentleman yield? Does IHDA not currently make loans in various areas of the State?"

Piel: "Pardon me. I didn't hear you."

Brummer: "IHDA is in existence currently, right?"

Piel: "Yes."

Brummer: "Do they not make loans all over the State of Illinois now?"

Piel: "Okay, IHDA would not be making loans under this Bill. It would not. They would be buying mortgages at what their bond rate is, they would be buying them from the institutions. The institutions would then be reinvesting these at low interest rate mortgages to low and moderate income families in their geographical area."

Brummer: "Well, wasn't the substance of the original Bill to increase the rate at which IHDA could pay interest."

Piel: "I'm sorry, I didn't catch the first part of what you said."

Brummer: "Wasn't the original thrust of this Bill to increase the interest rate of IHDA bonds?"

Piel: "No, No, IHDA, you know, will go at the bond market. It's not to increase their bond rate at all. No."

Brummer: "Well, wasn't the last part of your comment, that something to the effect that this would restrict the

application of the Bill to certain areas of the State?"

Piel: "No, not at all. It would be going onto....."

Brunner: "Explain what the Amendment does."

Piel: "Okay, basically what the Amendment does. To give you an idea right now, Rich. IHDA is sitting on approximately \$150,000,000 in unencumbered funds. These are not funds that are set for any specific purpose. They are not lending these out. They are not using these funds for anything. This is so it mandates, stimulate the mortgage market, mandates IHDA to buy up these low interest mortgages and in turn, the financial institutions in the State have got to give mortgages out, at today's rate, it would probably equal out to about 10, 10 1/4, maybe 10 1/2% mortgages. The problems we have today, are that people cannot afford the payments and this is to lower their monthly payment on mortgages and to stimulate the mortgage market throughout the State."

Brunner: "And that would apply all over the State?"

Piel: "Yes, yes, wherever there is a financial institution."

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

Huff: "Thank you Mr., thank you Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Huff: "Mr. Piel. You mentioned something about geographical areas. Can you clarify that for me please?"

Piel: "That would be set down by IHDA. Now what they're classifying as geographical area. I would say, Doug, you probably talking about like the county. The county where they're located."

Huff: "Yeah, but you don't, you don't state that."

Piel: "When we were talking to you yesterday, we felt, like I mentioned to you yesterday, we felt that we were willing to accept an Amendment if you wanted to define geographical area, but we're leaving it under the

Director of IHDA to set the guidelines on this and geographical area, obviously you wouldn't because you have certain situations where you might not have a savings and loan for, you know, maybe a mile, or 2 miles, 3 miles, 5 miles, something like that. So, it would have to be their general geographical area."

Huff: "I can't hear you, Mr. Piel. I can't hear your explanation."

Piel: "Well, the Director of IHDA is going to setting down the guidelines on exactly how the geographical area is going to be defined. More than likely, it would be defined as the county, or the working area of that specific institution. The reason we're just saying geographical area, we do not first of all, want them going to making mortgages across the State line, like in my District, you know, where you'd have say like Calumet City or Lansing or this type of a thing where they're right next to the State line, going across the State line, or you don't want the situation to where they're going like down to Cairo, Illinois, either."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "To the Amendment, Sir."

Huff: "To the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Huff: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I realize this is a new Act and because of IHDA's previous predilection for building where they wish, to the exclusion of building any housing in my area and several other areas around the State, that I think that it would be a poor, mandate to leave the discretion to IHDA, where they would put this type of mortgages in effect. IHDA, heretofore, has acted on its own in total disrefute to the General Assembly. I think that this is one agency that really needs to be tightened up and I think that this Amendment won't do

it. I would ask that we hold this Amendment."

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

Piel: "Yeah, Doug, I explained this to you yesterday. What we are saying to IHDA, you know, you say that they will go all over the State. That's the reason we have, it has to be in the same geographical area. They cannot go all over the State. IHDA cannot, you know, say that you can go anywhere in the State and do this. It states specifically in the Act that the savings and loan, the bank, the mortgage company, whoever the lender is, have got to put out those loans in their same geographical area. And, I would be more than willing, you know, we get it out of Third Reading and bring it back to Second, if you want to specify a ten mile radius from the lending institution or something like that. I mentioned that to you yesterday and you said, go ahead with the Amendment the way it is. Now, I don't know why, why you're changing your...in the middle of the stream here."

Huff: "It sounds, it sounds a little different now, Mr. Piel. And then, too, I'm, I'm not unmindful of the fact that IHDA has not built any housing in my area and several other areas. Whether they be Section 8 housing or conventional financing."

Piel: "This is the reason we have geographical areas, so IHDA cannot discriminate on one area in the State over the other."

Huff: "Well, I think that what, since IHDA..."

Piel: "IHDA's to put those funds back in the area where they were held initially..."

Huff: "But, you're going to leave it to the direction of the, discretion of the Director to determine what geographical area he's going to put housing in, whether he..."

Piel: "No, no, no, Doug. You misunderstand. You misunderstand. The geographical area, as far as

dimensions of the geographical area. They've got to be done in the same geographical area, so the Director could not come out and say that this was, that this would be done in a 500 mile radius. An average geographical area for a..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I think...is there any further discussion? The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge."

Younge: "Yes, Mr. Piel, would you take this out of the record in order to draft the Amendment much more specifically. Isn't the question, who defines the geographical area? Are you talking about the area of financial institution?"

Piel: "Yes."

Younge: "Is your effort to make sure that low and moderate income homes are financed with the proceeds, and if so, shouldn't that be more specifically written into this..."

Piel: "If you read it, Representative Younge, it is stated in there that they have got to re-lend those funds at no more than 2% over the rate in their geographical area. The institution's geographical area. In reference to your first question, no, I will not take it out of the record."

Younge: "But the problem is, that just doesn't say it so far as low and moderate income families are concerned. Just to say that it is..."

Piel: "That's what IHDA's in the business for low and moderate income. They don't go to high income."

Younge: "...in geographical area does not pin it down specifically and you had said a moment ago that you would permit further drafting. Would you take it out, so that it could be drafted more specifically?"

Piel: "No, I will not. I will be willing to see an Amendment, if you've got an Amendment, I will bring it back from Third if I agree with the Amendment, but I'm not going to sit here and dilly-dally around. We've

sat here and talked about it for two hours yesterday. There were no questions on the thing and, you know, all of a sudden, I was just talking to Representative Bullock and a couple of other Representatives over and I thought everything was fine and all of a sudden, now, everybody's raising questions on exactly what we covered yesterday."

Younge: "I'd like to speak to the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "To the Amendment, Ma'am?"

Younge: "To the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Ma'am."

Younge: "The problem, right now, is that although that it's written in the IHDA statutes, is clearly direction from the General Assembly that they shall build housing for low and moderate income people. It doesn't do that. It builds housing only in various affluent suburban areas and it doesn't build it where the housing is most needed. Therefore, it is incumbent that this Amendment be defeated and that it be written more specifically to put in some regulation that will ensure that the purposes of the statutes are followed out, so that they won't, once again, circumvent the will of this General Assembly by not building housing where housing is needed. The only agency that has the authority in this State to help to build low and moderate income housing is IHDA and if we permit them through a vague Amendment, once again, to circumvent our will, I think we will be defeating our purposes for being here. Therefore, this Amendment ought to be defeated and the writer of it ought to be called upon to write specifically, guidelines that will help follow the statutes so low and moderate income housing can be benefited."

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

Huff: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Piel's Bill is good, as far as it goes, but it leaves no direction

as to the housing that is most important in an area such as mine, which deals with Section 8 housing, which is a subsidized housing."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mr. Huff. What point do...what's your problem, Mr. Piel?"

Piel: "He already spoke on the Amendment. How many times can a person speak on it?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, first of all, I believe, I thought he was concluded on with his remarks, but he was not. I inadvertently shut him off and recognized Mrs. Younge. So, now in fairness, I will ask Mr. Huff to conclude his re...if he's got any more questions or he wants to address himself to the Amendment, he may proceed in that vein. Please Mr. Huff."

Huff: "I'll clear it up in just a second. Mr. Piel, I think now that we, you know, we talked yesterday, like you said, but I think now that after Mrs. Younge spoke, that we can come up with an Amendment that would tighten up your Amendment with regards to our geographical area, if you will."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Are you concluded, Mr. Huff?"

Huff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker."

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

Piel: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, I'm sorry. There was Mr. Kane, seeking recognition."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Kane: "Your definition of housing emergency period. It seems to be a very high standard. It's not much of an emergency if you have three months in a row that's below a three year average. That could happen very easily, couldn't it? If we just had bad weather during a winter or if we had rainy weather during a summer. Why is that standard so loose?"

Piel: "Not necessarily, Doug, because we're talking about, you know, taking a three year average, which would cover in this period of where you would have a low time and a high time, but the housing starts I would say in the three years have not been exorbitantly high, so this, you know, as far as a three month average, it is not exorbitant."

Kane: "Right, but all you're saying is in a housing emergency period is any three consecutive months, in which those months fall below that three year quarterly average, and you could do that in a three month period very easily, and then the emergency period would continue until there were three consecutive months, over the average. It seems to me that we would, under this definition, we could almost be in a housing emergency almost continually."

Piel: "No, Doug, not really. The way, the way it's stated and the way it would work out, you would find that the emergency would probably kick in when the interest rates started going higher. And this is basically what the whole Bill is for."

Kane: "Well, higher than what?"

Piel: "Alright. Higher than your average. Like you're saying higher than 7, higher than 9, but right now, we have high interest rates where people cannot afford the payments. And, so this is basically to lower the rates, you know, to establish an emergency where we can give lower rates and give more, you know, residential loans to the people at affordable rates. People, today, cannot afford the payments."

Kane: "What this would mean then though that IHDA would be almost continually in the regular housing mortgage market."

Piel: "No, they're not in the regular housing mortgage market."

Kane: "Well, if this Bill passed, they would be, right?"

Piel: "No, no they would not."

Kane: "Well, they would be buying up secondary, all of their present programs, there would not be enough money to fund. Isn't that correct?"

Piel: "No, this is unencumbered. 67% of the unencumbered. Unencumbered, Doug."

Kane: "Yeah, but how would they...they wouldn't get...once they committed that money to buying secondary mortgages, they wouldn't have it to use for their regular programs later. Is that not correct?"

Piel: "Put, if it's unencumbered, it sitting there. Like I mentioned before, they've got a million and five hundred thousand right now, just sitting there that they're not using. And I'm..."

Kane: "That's true, but if you put it into this program, it's not going to be available ah, in the next two or three years either."

Piel: "Pardon me."

Kane: "It won't be available in the near future, if you use it for secondary mortgages."

Piel: "If they're not using it, they're not, you know, doing what the purpose that they were set out for in the first place. If it's just sitting there. This is not encumbered. If it's encumbered, then they can't use it. And it's still leaving a 33%, or yeah, a 33% gap in there, in case they do have something come up. Okay, unencumbered. 67% of the unencumbered."

Kane: "Yeah, but what we did is we authorized a high level bond issuance, so that they could run a program over a long period of years. What you're saying is that they would have to sell those, those bond immediately."

Piel: "Not necessarily, no."

Kane: "Yes, because it says they shall enter the secondary mortgage market. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself to this Amendment. I think..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed, Sir."

Kane: "I think that this Amendment undermines the existing purposes of IHDA. I think that if we pass this Amendment, we would be, IHDA would be involved almost continually, in a secondary mortgage market, and there would not be sufficient funds left over to continue the kinds of programs that IHDA is presently involved in and the reason why we created IHDA some ten years ago. IHDA may not have performed all that we had expected of it in that ten year period and there are problems as have been indicated by other members on this House, but I don't think that those problems are going to be solved by diverting all of their money and resources into this other program."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Piel. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Piel: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. We're working up an Amendment. We'll have an Amendment ready this afternoon, so I'll take it out of the record for the time being."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take the Bill out of the record. 3540. What about 3540, Mr. Piel? Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3540. A Bill for An Act in relation to State Housing Emergencies. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1. Piel. Amends House Bill 3540..."

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

Piel: "They're companion Bills. I would like to..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Out of the record. Request of the Sponsor. House Bill 3542."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3542. A Bill for An Act to amend certain Acts in relation to tax rate limits of the Chicago Park District. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1. Braun. Amends House Bill 3542

on page 2 and so forth."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun."

Braun: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like everybody to take a close look at what House Bill 3542 does. It might be characterized as a 'sneaky pete tax increase'. It is a tax increase without referendum. I would point out to the members of this House that the Chicago Park District already taxes at a rate three times that of any other park district in the State. That it routinely goes...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me, Mrs. Braun. We're on Amendment #1. Is that Amendment #1?"

Braun: "Yes Sir. Amendment #1 requires a referendum for the passage of a tax increase by the park district. All this Amendment does is require that the Chicago Park District go to the voters of the City of Chicago, in its attempt to raise taxes. It's as simple as that. It doesn't ask for anything more than is already required in most of the park districts throughout this State. I think it is only fair. I think it is only proper and it is consistent with the message that we send out of this House regularly that the voters should have something to say about the level of their taxes and the services that are provided. Therefore, I would encourage...all of you are familiar with the other problems associated with the other problems associated with the Chicago Park District, the scandals, associated with that operation. I would encourage that we not raise taxes on the people of the City of Chicago for maintenance of the parks without referendum. I want to further say that I am an advocate of and supporter of the parks. Chicago should have some of the finest parks in this State. Our parks are designed by Frederick Law Homestead. They have the potentials of being great parks. But, we cannot go about having great parks that without the

support of the Park District, without the activity by the Park District to see to it that our tax dollars are spent wisely. This Amendment would only require that before they get a tax increase as is proposed in this legislation, that the voters have the right to say yes or no, and I encourage your 'aye' vote on Amendment #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Cook, Miss Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The tax rate for the Chicago Park District has nearly doubled in the last fifteen years by repeated actions of this General Assembly and of the Park District's authorities in Chicago. The people in Chicago have never had the opportunity to vote on whether they should continue to be soaked and soaked and soaked with higher taxes and I strongly support the adoption of this Amendment."

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

Farley: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to this Amendment. It's never been the practice of the Chicago Park District or the people of the City of Chicago to vote by referendum for such tax increases. I think it's within reason that we ask for this particular tax increase. I think it's within reason that we defeat this Amendment and let us proceed with the normal operation of the Chicago Park District by levying a tax that is fair and equitable. This Referendum-Amendment would, in fact, submit to the voters whether they wanted a increase or not. This is not the practice in the City of Chicago, by the Park District, by the Sanitary District, by the City itself. So, I would certainly urge a 'no' vote on this Amendment."

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

Bullock: "Thank you. Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and

Gentlemen of the House. I would certainly respectfully urge that my colleagues on the floor of the House pay particular attention to Representative Braun's Amendment. Representative Braun's Amendment, while it may be the first time that the citizens of Chicago would have an opportunity to speak in government, I think that they would speak quite clearly on the subject of the Chicago Park District's tax increase. I have a personal interest in Representative Braun's Amendment and there's not too many pieces of legislation that comes through the House that I have a personal interest in. In my District, the Chicago Park District spent a quarter of a million dollars to buy a junkyard and it has remained a junkyard to this day. Chicago Park District's property. It was a coal yard. It was located outside of a housing project and it is Chicago Park District property and today, with the public tax dollars, it is still a junkyard owned by the Chicago Park District, with no improvement. Concomitantly, the Chicago Park District has spent in excess of a million dollars in other areas of the City of Chicago, making them quite attractive for recreation and appreciation to Chicago citizens. The Representative previous to me made some remarks that it is not the policy of the Chicago Park District or the City of Chicago to let the voters make a choice about what to do with their money. Well, I think, perhaps, the Gentleman might take note of the last election and realize that the citizens of Chicago have spoke quite clearly in terms of what it is they want for government and how they wish for government to operate. I respectfully urge an 'aye' vote on Representative Braun's Amendment and I think that Representative Pullen's remarks were quite cogent and should be taken into consideration."

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

Ewell: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I, too, rise in support of this Amendment. What we have here is the Chicago Park District, which has in the past, as has been alluded to, raised the taxes on the citizens of the City of Chicago with impunity. They simply said we want it, give it to us and they have not been responsive. The people of the City of Chicago have a number of bones to pick with the Park District. The Park District has not been run in the best interest of the people of the City of Chicago. We're simply asking, the same issue, that all of you have asked before, please allow us the same right to at least submit this to the voters. Submit it to the people and let them decide whether the Park District should get this increase. We could go into the various abuses of the Park District and perhaps tomorrow sometime, we might be through. But, that's not the point. All we simply want is the right of the people to vote for their tax increase. The Chicago Park District, like the King of England, used to tax the colonists without representation and at will. The Chicago Park District has taxed the people of the City of Chicago at will. The increase in real estate taxes has not been due to the fact that the City of Chicago's expenditures have gone up, but the fact that the component part of the Chicago Park District has risen consistently out of proportion over the years, causing all of us to pay more taxes. Ladies and Gentlemen, this Amendment is reasonable. It's fair and there can be no reason why any right thinking person would not join us and support the right of the people to control their own taxes. Thank you."

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

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Too long, our State has been divided between Chicago and

downstate. Too long have we tailored legislation specifically to one part of the State and to another. All of the park districts outside the City of Chicago have elected boards. And, in order to get tax rate increases, they have to go to the taxpayers and to pass a referendum. So far, up until now, we have exempted the City of Chicago Park District from that. Their Park District is run by appointed trustees and they get tax increases from us and downstaters, too often have said, well, if Chicago wants it, then we'll give it to them. But, I think that we now have a new day and I think that we ought to be treating all of the citizens of the state alike and we shouldn't be treating one park differently from another and I would urge an 'aye' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Iechowicz: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ronan."

Ronan: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I find it really ironic to listen to some of the speeches from my colleagues from the City of Chicago. We've got one issue here and one issue that's very important. That's services for the people of the City of Chicago. The only way we're going to be able to provide decent parks, decent services, the kind of staff we need, is to pay for it and the mechanism to pay for it right now is to get this type of tax increase for the Chicago Park District. The only way we're going to improve the parks on the west side and the south side, and I'm in favor of improving all the parks in the City of Chicago, is to give the money to the Chicago Park District. And, I have to stand here and listen to this type of irony where if we put a tax referendum to the people, we know what's going to happen to that referendum. The mood of the people right now is to vote out services. The mood of the people, they want to cut the Legislature. So, let's stop kidding ourselves and let's stop kidding the people. Let's

provide the services that the people of the City of Chicago deserve. The services that the people of the City of Chicago are paying for and let's go about the business of improving the Chicago Park District. And the way you do that, is you give them the money that they need to provide those services. I urge my friends from downstate and my friends on the other side of the aisle to join with me to kill this needless Amendment. Thank you very much."

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

Gaines: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

I rise in support of this Amendment. I make a particular appeal to my colleagues on this side of the aisle. They have criticized me over the year because I voted to support Chicago, getting money without referendum. When I'm in Committee, they worship referendum. So, I'm calling upon all the persons who understand that the citizens need to have a say so. That when the persons who are running the park district have not been kind or responsive to the needs of the citizens, then the citizens ought to have some type of control. Therefore, I am asking that all of the Republicans, join in this Republican type legislation, and show that they mean it when they say we don't believe in any taxation without referendum. So, I'm asking all my colleagues on this side of the aisle to join those of us in Chicago who finally seen the light to make us like you. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady from Cook, Mrs. Alexander."

Alexander: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I too rise in support of this Amendment. I feel that if the Chicago Park District do indeed need additional taxation to improve the services of the Chicago Park District, then it should go to a referendum vote. I do not feel that the citizens of Chicago should be forced to pay any taxes that they have not agreed upon to pay. I

support this Amendment whole heartedly."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The previous question has been moved.

All in favor, signify by saying 'aye', opposed. The motion prevails. Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun, Mrs. Braun to speak to the issue."

Braun: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It seems to me no answer to say we've done it before to the people of the City of Chicago, let's do it again. It seems to me no answer to say the park needs money, let's stick it to them and not give the people a chance to have some say about the amount of money they're paying for the park. The waste in the Chicago Park District is an abomination. The corruption in the Chicago Park District is an abomination. The misuse of State and Federal and local money by the Chicago Park District is an abomination. All that this Amendment would do, is require that the citizens of the City be given an opportunity to vote on whether or not they want to pour money into the Park District, more money into the Park District without, without any control over how that money is spent, over whether or not services are actually being delivered. Again, I want to say and make perfectly clear. I am an advocate of the parks. A friend of the parks. I believe that the parks of the City of Chicago can be improved and the services should be improved, but I think that the people of Chicago deserve the right that is given across the State to vote on such a tax increase and I encourage your 'aye' vote for Amendment #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Amendment #1 be adopted? All in favor, vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 75 'ayes', 47 'nos'. The Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain, wants to be recorded as 'no'. Request for verification by Mr. Ronan. Request by Mrs. Braun to poll the absentees. Kindly record Mr. Reilly as 'no'. Mr. McGrew as 'no'. Mr. Simms as 'aye'. Mr. Molloy as 'no'. Sam Wolf 'no'. Terry Steczo 'aye'. Mr. Preston as 'no'. Mr. Ronan. We'll poll the absentees first."

Ronan: "What's the count at this point?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "We'll get it for you in a second. Mr. Katz wants to be verified as 'aye'. Leave is granted."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the absentees. Barnes. Bianco. Bircbler. Breslin. Brummer. Chapman. Christensen. Davis. Donovan...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Mr. Ebbesen. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "I'm sorry, change it to 'aye'? Change Mr. Ebbesen from 'no' to 'aye'. The same request is by Mr. McMaster and Mr. Schuneman wants to be recorded as 'aye'. Mr. Griesheimer."

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, change my vote to 'aye', please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Griesheimer as 'aye'. Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Jones. Kindly record Mr. Jones from 'aye' to 'present'. Christensen. Record Mr. Christensen as 'aye'. Anyone else? Proceed to poll the absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the poll of absentees. Breslin. Brummer. Chapman. Davis. Donovan. John Dunn. Ewing. Flinn. Greiman. Grossi. Hoffman. Huff. Huskey. Klosak. Laurino. Mugalian. Piel. Pierce."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Piel, for what purpose do you seek

recognition? Record Mr. Piel as 'aye'."

Clerk Leone: "Pierce. Rea. Reed. Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Slape. Stanley. Stearney. Telcser. VanDuyne. Watson. Wikoff. Williams. Yourell. and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Yourell as 'no'. Kindly change Mr. Leon from 'aye' to 'no'. Mr. Borchers. Kindly record Mr. Borchers as 'present'. What's the count, Tony? Mr. Ronan, the count is 79 'ayes' and 62 'nos'. And he persists in the verification request? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kelly. For what purpose do you seek recognition? Kelly, please."

Kelly: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to switch my 'yes' vote to a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Kelly as 'no'. Proceed to verify the affirmative. Mr. Birchler, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is not recorded as voting."

Birchler: "Vote me 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Record Mr. Birchler as 'no'. Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Younge: "May I be verified?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leave is granted. Gentleman from Will, Mr. Davis, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Davis: "Record me as 'no', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Davis as 'no'. Mr. Robbins, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Robbins: "Leave to be verified."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman asks leave to be verified. Leave is granted. Mr. Totten. Proceed to verify the affirmative vote."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the affirmative. Alexander."

Balanoff. Birkinbine. Bluthardt. Boucek. Braun.
 Bullock. Burnidge. Casey. Catania. Christensen.
 Collins. Currie. Daniels. Darrow. Dawson.
 DiPrima. Ralph Dunn. Dyer. Ebbesen. Epton. Ewell.
 Virginia Frederick. Dwight Friedrich. Gaines.
 Goodwin. Griesheimer. Hallock. Hallstrom. Harris.
 Henry. Hudson. Jaffe. Johnson. Jones, Emil Jones.
 Kane. Karpziel. Katz. Kent. Kornowicz. Kosinski.
 Pardon me, Kornowicz and Kosinski are voting 'no'.
 Leinenweber. MacDonald. Mahar. Matula. McCourt.
 McMaster. Mulcahey. Murphy."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Gent...Mr. Griesheimer, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Griesheimer: "Mr. Speaker, I've had a change of heart. Switch me back to the way I was, please. That would be a 'no' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Griesheimer as 'no'. Kindly record Mr. Steele as 'no'. Kindly record Mr. Casey as 'no'. Kindly record Mr. McCourt as 'no'. Mr. Reilly, oh, I'm sorry. Where's Totten? What about you? Please proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the poll of the affirmative. Mulcahey."

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

Bluthardt: "Change my vote from 'yes' to 'no', please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record Mr. Bluthardt as 'no'. Kindly record Mr. Huff as 'aye'. Totten. Mr. Collins. Kindly record Mr. Collins as 'no'. Kindly record Mr. Totten as 'no'. Totten 'no'. Mrs. Braun, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, I'm also going to want to verify the negative vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You're entitled to that Ma'am. Please proceed with the verification."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the poll of the affirmative.

Mulcahey. Murphy. Neff. Oblinger. Patrick. Piel.
Preston. Pullen. Rigney. Robbins."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from Lake, Mr.
Pierce. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman is not recorded as voting."

Pierce: "Please vote me 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record him as 'no'. Please
proceed with the verification."

Clerk Leone: "Sandquist. Satterthwaite. Schneider."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Change Dawson from 'aye' to 'no'.
Please proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Schneider. Schraeder. Schuneman. Simms.
Skinner. Stecz. C. M. Stiehl."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Vote me 'no', please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Change the Lady from 'aye' to 'no'.
Mrs. Kent. Change the Lady from 'aye' to 'no'.
Please proceed, Sir."

Clerk Leone: "Stuffle. Sumner. Swanstrom. Taylor. Tuerk.
Walsh. Willer. Williamson. Winchester. J. J. Wolf.
Woodyard. and Younge."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Piel: "Change that to 'no', please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record him as 'no'. What are we
starting off with Tony? Give us the count. 68 'ayes'
and 70 what? Starting off with 68 'ayes' and 77
'nos'. No, you better go through with it because the
Lady is going to go through with the negative vote.
Mr. Ronan."

Ronan: "Boucek."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Boucek. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Remove him."

Ronan: "Birkinbine."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Birkinbine's here."

Ronan: "Burnidge."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Burnidge is here."

Ronan: "Dwight Friedrich."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Ronan: "Harris."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him. Excuse me. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Ewell: "Point of parliamentary inquiry. As I understand the Rules, you're supposed to go with the prevailing side first, for verification. Is that correct?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "That's true."

Ewell: "Alright, which is the prevailing side in this issue?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, at the time when the issue was called, it was the affirmative. At the present time, it's the negative."

Ewell: "Well, then do we go?...The question would be of the Chair, at what point in time do we go? I thought it was customarily at the time you find..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady requested a verification of the negative and I told her we would get to that order and at the time when the matter was called, the affirmative was in the lead. So, we'll just continue

with this and then we'll get to the Lady's request.
Please continue, Mr. Ronan."

Ronan: "Jaffe."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Ronan: "Katz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Katz. He was...he had leave to be verified."

Ronan: "Daniels."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Daniels. How is the Gentleman recorded?
Tony, how is Mr. Daniels recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Ronan: "Ralph Dunn."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ralph Dunn's in his chair."

Ronan: "Epton."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Ronan: "Leinenweber."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leinenweber? He's here."

Ronan: "Hallock."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Who was that?"

Ronan: "Hallock."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him. Lady from DuPage, Mrs.
Dyer, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is the Lady recorded?"

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

Dyer: "Please change that to 'no'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kindly record the Lady as 'no'. Mr. Ronan, any further ah...?"

Ronan: "Matula."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Matula. The Gentleman is there."

Ronan: "Murphy."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Ronan: "Neff."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Ronan: "Hudson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Hudson is here."

Ronan: "Oblinger."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Oblinger is here."

Ronan: "Simms."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Ronan: "Sandquist."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Ronan: "Stuffle."

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

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

Ronan: "Swanstrom."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Ronan: "Winchester."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Ronan: "Jake Wolf."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him. Excuse me. The Lady from Cook, Miss Pullen. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "How is Miss Pullen recorded?"

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

Pullen: "Fine. Please leave it that way."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any other, any other verification?"

Ronan: "Is Mr. Williams recorded?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Williams? I don't know, no it's not the procedure in verification, Sir. Are there, do you have any ah..."

Ronan: "I, I just want to verify Boucek. I just want to make sure we knocked him off."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We did. Boucek was taken off. What's the, what's our count now, before the Lady goes through with the negative vote? On this question, there are 52 'aye' and 70...52...78 'no'. Now, the Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun, requested a verification of the negative vote. Please proceed to verify...Lady from Cook, Mrs. Braun."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, first I'd like to thank those individuals that held with their 'yes' votes for the principles of the people of the City of Chicago should be given an opportunity to vote on whether or not, yet another tax increase should be given to the City of

Chicago. I think we've seen this afternoon, the very evident concern about the operation...."

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

Farley: "Is she verifying the Roll Call or giving another speech, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I don't know what the Lady's doing."

Farley: "Well, I would ask that she persist with the, her verification, but let's leave the speeches on the side."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Braun."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, as I understand the Rules of this House, I'm entitled to make a speech. That's what we do all day, Mr. Farley. But, in any event, I'd like to thank those individuals who persisted in their 'yes' vote. We will be back again with regard to this issue of the Chicago Park District unless and until it cleans up its act and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I will not persist in my verification of the Negative Roll Call."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman...the Lady withdraws her request for verification of the negative vote and the Amendment fails. On this question, there are 52 'ayes', 78 'nos' and Amendment #1 fails. Any further Amendments? Before we get to that, Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Conti, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies of the House. I rise with the deepest regret to inform, inform the members of this House and the friends of Hayes Robertson, who is a former State Senator, and a former GOP Committeeman from the County of Cook, and a former candidate for Governor of this great State. Hayes Robertson passed away this morning. There's not going to be any memorial, there's only going to be memorial services at the Floomor Community Church. There is

no wake. For, the friends of Hayes Robertson, he passed away this morning."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Thank you Mr. Conti. Back to House Bill 3542. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2. Braun. Amends House Bill 3542 on page 1, so forth."

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

Braun: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the Amendment I was originally intending to withdraw. It abolishes the Chicago Park District altogether and merges that operation with the City of Chicago."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Farley. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Farley: "Mr. Speaker. I would question the germaness of Amendment #2."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Would the Parliamentarian come back to the Speaker's rostrum, please? Tony, would you pass up the Bill and the Amendment. Mr. Epstein. The Amendment is not limited to the tax rate limits, and so it is not germane. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 3544."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3544. A Bill for An Act to amend An Act to revise the law in relation to Clerks of the Court. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any motions?"

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2. Getty. Amends House Bill 3544, as amended, by deleting Section 2 and replacing it with the following."

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

Getty: "Mr. Speaker, Amendment #2 would make an effective date of October 1, 1980. I would move for adoption of

the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall the Amendment be adopted? All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed. Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. 3550. I'm sorry, 3600."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3600. A Bill for An Act to amend the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any Amendments from the floor?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1. Bowman. Amends House Bill 3600...."

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

Bowman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to ask if the Clerk could further identify the Amendment. I don't seem to have it in my file here."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Read the Amendment, please."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1. Amends House Bill 3600, as amended, in the first sentence of Section 7b7, by changing November of each even numbered year..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Excuse me. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ewell at Mr. Emil Jones' desk. For what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Ewell: "For the purpose of an introduction. We have with us the class, Eighth Grade Class of the Hookway School from Chicago, represented by Representative Williamson, Representative Gaines and Representative Ewell, in the balcony to the South. Hookway School, Eighth Grade Class."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Welcome to Springfield. Mr. Bowman on Amendment #1."

Bowman: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Well, for the benefit of those people who haven't been following the Calendar, very closely,

House Bill 3600 which this Amendment, is addressed to...is the primary lockout Bill, which requires enrollment of one's Party affiliation before one can vote in a Primary. Now, Amendment, the Amendments that I'm offering, Amendment #1, permits the person to, to take the opportunity of enrolling at, at any election that, that may take place. In other words, you walk into a polling place, say this November, or during municipal elections or school board elections, or whatever and, at that time, it seems to me that, you should have the opportunity to enroll your Party affiliation of the Party of your choice. The way the Bill is in its unamended form, is much more restrictive than that and would only permit enrollments at the polling place in Novem...in November elections. I think we really ought to open it up and allow enrollments at any elections and that's why I'm offering Amendment 1. I urge its adoption."

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

Totten: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to Amendment #1. First of all, the Amendment has some serious drafting problems and I really don't think the Sponsor's accomplishing what he says he'd like to accomplish. But, secondly, let me point out to you that under the Bill, enrollment is opened at any time up to 28 days prior to the election and if we get into allowing enrollment at some of these special elections, under the new Bill, you're going to have problems with jurisdictions that no...normally don't do registration, being involved in it, it would be very cumbersome and would not work and for these reasons, I oppose Amendment #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman

from Cook, Mr. Bowman, to close."

Bowman: "Well, I find it odd that the, the Gentleman who opposed the blind primary so much would want to now to have an elite primary, where only a select few can vote. All the Amendment really does, is to permit a person, when they walk into a polling place at any election, to vote for purposes of voting, they may also, at that time, take that opportunity to enroll other Party affiliations for the upcoming primary, to change their Party affiliation if they wish, to terminate their Party affiliation, ah, but to take the advantage of what is a very convenient opportunity, namely, having the polls open to...in their own neighborhood, to walk in and do whatever you want to do with the status of their Party affiliation. It's all the Amendment does and I think it's, it should be a very simple one for the House to adopt. I urge its adoption."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Amendment #1 be adopted? All in favor, signify by saying 'aye', oppose. The 'nos' have it. Amendment #1 is defeated. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment, Amendment #2. Bowman. Amends House Bill 3600, as amended, in Section 70...in Section 7B-5, by inserting immediately after the final period, the following: Any registered voter who has not changed his residence, shall be able to enroll, or terminate his enrollment..."

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

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Basically, what this Amendment does is to permit persons to change their Party enrollment, ah or to enroll or terminate their enrollment, by filling out a postcard or sending a letter to the election authority in their area. Very much the same way that people can, at the present time, indicate to that

election authority that they changed their address, as long as they don't move out of the jurisdiction of the election authority. So, it seems to me that if we permit people to change their addresses, if they move within the same neighborhood, by the simple expedient of a postcard, we ought to permit them to change their Party enrollment if they don't move at all. So, all this would do is to permit people to use the postcard method of changing their Party enrollment if they so choose, as long as they don't move outside the jurisdiction of the election authority. I urge its adoption."

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

Totten: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to Amendment #2. I really don't think in this case the Amendment has any effect. Number one, there is no such thing as an election jurisdiction. Refer to a precinct, yes. But the language in the Bill, or the Amendment, refers to election jurisdiction and the Amendment that is really rendered useless. There are many means in the Bill to do what the Sponsor wants to do, but this does not do it, so I am in opposition to Amendment #2."

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

Bowman: "Well, thank you Mr. Speaker, once again, it seems to me that the Sponsor of the Bill is simply raising a red herring to attempt to make the primary participation much more restrictive than needs to be. It seems to me that if a person would like to change their Party affiliation, at any time, as long as they're already a registered voter, I see no reason why they shouldn't be permitted to use a postcard to affect that chance. He is raising a red herring by saying that election jurisdiction isn't defined in the statutes. Well, who, what person here doesn't know

what an election jurisdiction is? We all know what jurisdictions are and, and I think that that's totally a silly kind of objection to this kind of Amendment. He really didn't address the, the Amendment on its merits and I think for good reason. Because he wanted to keep the primary participation as restrictive as possible and he realizes that the Amendment has much merit in opening up and making it less restrictive and I submit that that's really why he was opposing the Amendment and I think that's precisely the reason why everybody here should support the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Amendment #2 be adopted? All in favor, signify by saying 'aye', opposed. 'Nos'...all in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Marco, vote me 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 36.38 'yes', 73 'no'. Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3. Bowman. Amends House Bill 3600...."

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

Clerk Leone: "...In the first sentence of Section 7B-1, by changing no to except as otherwise provided..."

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

Bowman: "Yes, I'm going to withdraw that Amendment as there's another one offered by Representative Kane that does it better."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman withdraws Amendment #3. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #4. Currie-Stanley. Amends House Bill 3600 on page 1, line 1 and 2 by deleting Sections 7-10, 7-43, 7-...."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady from Cook, Mrs., Mrs. Currie."

Currie: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Amendment #4 to House Bill 3600 would change, rather drastically, the scope of the legislation that

Representative Totten has introduced. I was surprised to see that he, the person who fought most violently against the Blind Primary Bill would introduce primary lockout legislation this Session. Amendment #4 would change the way in which we operate primary elections for public officials, by permitting voters to participate in either Party primary without having to disclose their partisan affiliation at that time. The values of the Bill are two. First of all, voters would have a secret ballot in the primary elections, which now, they only enjoy in this State during the general election. Secondly at a time when voters less and less are identifying themselves with any political party at all. Less and less willing to participate electorally, this kind of change would give us an opportunity to see an increase in political participation. We'd find ourselves as elected officials less open to charges of elitism, less open to charges of attempts to try to keep the voters from having a say in what happens to them in State, Federal and local elections. I would urge this House to change the direction of House Bill 3600 by opening it up to participation by encouraging people to participate in the political process. I urge adoption of Amendment 4."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates she will."

Flinn: "If this Amendment was adopted, would you have the privilege of going in and saying, I am a Republican or I am a Democrat, or I don't want to say?"

Speaker Bradley: "Mrs. Currie, please."

Currie: "Thank you. Yes, Representative Flinn, you could ask for the Party ballot by designation, in which case, you would eligible to vote for Party office as

well as public officials. You could ask, if you don't want to participate in the election for Party officials, you could ask for an undesignated ballot that would permit you only to vote for public officials. So, this Amendment wouldn't change the way we select ward committeemen, precinct committeemen and so forth. It would only change the way we select public officials."

Flinn: "Alright, one more last question. Would under any circumstance, you be allowed to vote for one Party...one particular office and another Party of another office?"

Currie: "Not under the terms of this Amendment. You would be restricted either to voting in the Republican primary or the Democratic primary. You would not be able to vote for a Republican for one office and a Democrat for another."

Flinn: "Thank you Barbara Flinn Currie."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Deuster."

Deuster: "If the Sponsor would yield for a question. I understand on election day, you would walk in and you would approach the judge and they would say, you would say give me a ballot. And, they would give you a ballot that would include both Republican and Democratic candidates for public office. Is that right?"

Currie: "Yes. You would only be permitted, however, to cast your votes on one or the other of the Party ballots."

Deuster: "You would spoil your ballots if you punched on both sides."

Currie: "Yes, indeed."

Deuster: "Alright, and at the same time, the judges would then say to you. Would you also like to participate in the Republican or Democratic primary for electing precinct committeemen and Party officials?"

Currie: "If you wish to participate in the Party balloting,

you would have to declare your partisan affiliation. You would have to say I want a Republican ballot, as we do now to elect every kind of officials. The value of this Amendment is that when people are choosing those who will be on the public official ballot in the general election, they would not need to disclose Party affiliation. They would, in fact, be able to have a secret ballot when it comes to nomination for public office, not for Party office."

Deuster: "Do you anticipate more people would be voting for taking one ballot and a smaller, a much smaller group would elect Party officials?"

Currie: "Yes. I do expect that. I think many people are not happy to disclose Party affiliation to make it a matter of public record that they are or not members of a particular political party. They consider it an intrusion on the privacy of the polling place. They are not comfortable designating themselves publicly as members of one Party or the other. They may, in fact, not even be interested in the Party offices."

Deuster: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates she will."

Kane: "Did you say that you felt that this would reduce participation in Party politics?"

Currie: "It might reduce participation in the purely private Party part of the election process. I think it would significantly increase participation in the nomination of pattern process for public office."

Kane: "It would have the effect then, of limiting Party participation? Would that not be accurate?"

Currie: "Limiting Party participation in what? Pardon me."

Kane: "It would have the effect of limiting activity within the two Parties?"

Currie: "To the extent that the Parties are not providing arenas where people want to participate, yes. If the Parties are opposing interesting, challenging races for Party office, then I think a lot of people will participate. But, if they don't, people won't. And a lot of people don't want to declare their partisan affiliation as a matter of public record. They would like a secret ballot in the primary, as they have in the general election. The actual affect in terms of what happens with the purely private Party issue, the Committeemen's races and so forth is very hard to predict. It could indeed depress participation in, in elections for those offices."

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

Bluthardt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Cut me off. Anyhow, some years ago, I chaired a Commission Meeting that held hearings on the proposed Open Primary Bill or idea. We made a study of it and we issued a report. And our conclusion was that those States that had adopted this form of open primary had increased participation in those primaries, not significantly, but it did increase to some extent. I, personally am in favor and I've been a party man you know, for about fifty years. But, I am personally in favor of trying an open primary such as this one proposes. I think we ought to try it for a few years. See if it doesn't increase participation. I don't think it's going to affect adversely the Parties, the Republican and Democratic parties. I know why the politicians are opposed to it because they're afraid they'll lose control of primary elections. I don't think that will happen at all, but I do think that it will bring in some additional participation in the primary election and I think that's what we should strive for. We shouldn't go for the main thrust of this Bill, which is to discourage participation in primaries. We

should go the opposite direction. We should adopt Amendment #4 and I would urge you to vote yes on that Amendment."

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

Yourell: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to Amendment #4 to House Bill 3600. Because, I believe that in spite of the suggestions made by other speakers, that this would do things that it would not do. All it is really, is a repeat of the open primaries legislation of the last several years. And the problem with it, it does not permit persons who request a combined ballot to vote for Party committeemen or delegates. So, you either have to do one or the other. And, if this Amendment goes on the Bill, then you will be precluded from doing that. It allows the voter to vote in either Party primary without declaring affiliation. Of course, that's the open primary situation. Representative Deuster, I believe, suggested that a voter who takes the combined ballot and then attempts to vote for candidates of more than one Party, which is very apt to happen, will have a spoiled ballot. Now, in spite of the Sponsor's intent, and I have every regard and respect for her knowledge in this area, but I think she's damaging the independent posture and those candidates by giving more control to the parties, in spite of what other speakers have said. So, because of the Amendment's provisions, we will have, I think, a lot of spoiled ballots. We will preclude people who ask for a combined Party...a combined ballot where they can vote for candidates of either Party to then not be able to vote for committeemen and delegates and I think that's wrong. I think that would should have the option to do exactly that. They'll go into the polls and ask for a Democratic or Republican ballot and then vote

accordingly. Not skip around. The intent of 3600 is to preclude and to prevent that kind of nonsense. We'd all have problems with that in the future and so I would ask you to consider the points that have been raised and to do something constructive to it, not to have so many spoiled ballots and preclude people from voting for Party candidates, if they ask for a combined ballot."

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

Anderson: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates she will."

Anderson: "Representative Currie, I believe, is this what you call the open optional primary?"

Currie: "Thank you Representative Anderson. It is just that. The optional open primary, which means you would not have an opportunity to vote in the same election for both Republican and Democratic candidates. You would be restricted to voting in one Party primary or the other. If you want to declare your Party affiliation, you may vote for convention delegates, for ward committeemen, for Party officials. My view is that the voters of the State of Illinois are very intelligent people. They were able even to cope with the exigencies of the blind primary, which this House forced upon them last year. It is not difficult to understand that if you ask for a Party, that ballot, you may vote for Party officials. If you ask for the consolidated ballot, you may vote either in the one Party primary or the other, but not both, and you will not, at that time, be able to vote for Party officials."

Anderson: "Alright. I, Representative Mulcahey and myself had a Bill similar to this two years, and we couldn't even get it out on the House Floor. I congratulate you for getting it out as far as you have. The Amendment was not printed and it wasn't timely and

everything else, so I'm certainly going to support your Amendment. I think it's a fine Amendment. It allows the people the option."

Currie: "Thank you very much, Representative."

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

Totten: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to the Amendment for a number of reasons. Some of which have been cited, but I think the Sponsor and some of the supporters have lost sight of precisely what a primary election is. And that is, that it is a private election by the Party to determine its nominees. It is not necessarily a public election, any more than you would like the members of the Knights of Columbus from voting in the VFW election, do you want who at least don't pay their dues to either Party to go and nominate their officers in the election. And, this, this Bill, House Bill 3600, attempts to provide some reason to our two party system. It is similar to legislation that is the law in a number of other States and for those who argue that we must increase the turnout in a primary, let me point out that the only thing that really increases turnout in a primary is a contest within the Party and we saw that in the last March primary, where record numbers turned out. They did so because there was a legitimate contest. If you don't have a contest, people are not going to vote and to provide enrollment, in no way will diminish the interest in a Party's primary. It will only increase costs, increase spoiled ballots, and increase confusion over and beyond even what the blind primary may have created. And, for these reasons, I am opposed to Amendment #4 and would ask that we move the Bill, in its present form, to Third Reading without any Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady from Cook, Mrs. Currie, to close."

Currie: "Would Representative Stanley, my principal co-sponsor like to close?"

Stanley: "Surely. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Stanley, to close."

Stanley: "Thank you very much, Representative Currie. I think we're talking about enlarging the number of voters that participate in the process. We're talking about opening the process up, not locking people out of the process. I think any polls you'll see today, whether we're talking about Gallop or Harris, they're looking for an alternative. They're looking more and more toward being independent voters and they're looking for the option and I think the option to vote in either Primary is a good one. I think the course is so ruled that here in Illinois, and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on this important Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall Amendment #4 be adopted? All in favor, say 'aye', opposed? Roll Call's requested. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there are 48 'ayes', 57 'nos'. The Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #5. Bowman. Amends House Bill 3600..."

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

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The intention of Amendment #5 is to void the Grandfather clause that is in the present Bill. The present time, under House Bill 3600, depending on how you voted in the last primary, that is how you automatically be enrolled for the next primary. So, for example, the people who voted in the Republican primary because they happened to like John Anderson, but normally don't vote Republican primaries would be

locked in. The purpose of Amendment #5 is to avoid that problem. However, the, several people have raised questions with me about the language of Amendment #5 and precisely whether it does precisely what I intend it to do. So, for that reason, I'm going to withdraw Amendment #5, with leave of the House."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman withdraws Amendment #5. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #6. Kane. Amends House Bill 3600 on..."

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

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #6 simply includes the provisions for people who will be absentee to be handled in the same way as disabled persons and just trying to help everybody along here."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Totten: "Representative Kane. Is it my interpretation of this Amendment, that you are adding language to provide that persons entitled to absentee voter be entitled to the same provisions for enrollment, as others are made under special provisions? Why? What persons entitled to absentee voters? Are you talking about overseas or what?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Kane."

Kane: "Anybody who would otherwise be entitled to a absentee ballot."

Totten: "How would you envision it working?"

Kane: "That a person who is absent from the jurisdiction would be able to register as the, as they otherwise would as an absentee or both."

Totten: "What about enrollment? Are you referring to enrollment?"

Kane: "Yes."

Totten: "What you're saying is that they could enroll in the period, are you making..."

Kane: "If they were going to be absent during the period of enrollment, they could enroll under the same provisions as an absentee voter can now vote absentee. They could enroll absentee."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Are you concluded, Mr. Totten? Is there any further discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Yourell: "Doug, I've read the Amendment and I'm not clear as to what the Amendment requires the County Clerk to do. I think with the Amendment, we're asking the County Clerk to treat certain people differently than they treat all other persons. Now, it's my understanding that, it's true that with the absentee ballot, it's required that the Clerk send a Party enrollment form with the ballot, but that will not be processed at any rate until after the election. So, I think we have to give some direction to the County Clerks and I don't see that in the Amendment."

Kane: "No. I think that as far as persons, disabled persons, can now vote in a certain way and under those same kinds of provisions, that person can enroll that way. This would allow a person who is absent from the jurisdiction, during the period of enrollment, to request by application, for an enrollment form in the same way that that person can now ask for an absentee ballot, if that person is going to be absent on the day of election."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Grundy, Mr. Christensen. Oh, I'm sorry, Guz, I thought you were done. Mr.

Yourell."

Yourell: "Yes, I understand that Doug, but my problem again is, what happens with the party enrollment form from the time that it is received by the voter from the County Clerk until after the election? There can be no processing of that and this...."

Kane: "No, what this would do, is apply to the person who is absent from the jurisdiction during the period of enrollment. I, what that person would do is apply to the County Clerk, as an absentee person to enroll."

Yourell: "Right."

Kane: "The Clerk would send an application to that person, to enroll. The person would fill out that application and would then be enrolled as a Party member, which would then make that person eligible for a absentee ballot, for the, for the primaries."

Yourell: "Yes, there's one other problem. I understand that part, but there seems to me that there are other provisions in the Amendment that does not provide for that, that to take place. And unless you have instruct, or direct the County Clerk to make those decisions..."

Kane: "No, I think, I'm not talking about the enrollment that is sent along with the ballot. If, for example, I am going to be absent during the period of enrollment, okay, so that I cannot enroll, but I am going to be back, say on primary day, but if I'm back on primary day, but I'm going to be absent during the whole period of time that I could enroll, then, in effect, I'm precluded from voting during the primaries. What this says, is that I can enroll as an absentee. That in the same way that a person applies for an absentee ballot, that person, during the period of enrollment, if they're going to be absent during the period of enrollment, can also enroll absentee."

Yourell: "So, what you're talking about, Doug, is simply a

kind of a postcard arrangement for enrolling in the, in the party primaries, during the open period of that primary and nothing more."

Kane: "In the event that the person is going to be absent..."

Yourell: "During that time."

Kane: "Or, in the event that the person is away during the enrollment period and could be back during the primary..."

Yourell: "Fine. I have no further objections."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? The Lady from Sangamon, Mrs. Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Sponsor a question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he'll yield."

Oblinger: "I would like to follow-up with what Representative Yourell said. As a former County Clerk, I would like to know how this would work, but my first question is what is enrollment? Is that the period of registration or what is enrollment?"

Kane: "You'd have to ask Mr. Totten, the Sponsor of the Bill, as to what enrollment is?"

Oblinger: "Well, that's that period, 28 days that ends 28 days before the election."

Kane: "Yes. I assume, if I read the Bill correctly."

Oblinger: "Alright. The reason we have absentee balloting is because it comes on one single solitary day and people may be absent, but with the period of enrollment, you can register anytime during the year. That gives you eleven months to register to vote. I don't see why you would have to have this kind of exception for people like that."

Kane: "Well, there could be people that are out of the Country for a period of a year or two, that would still want to vote and they would be entitled to vote, but they would not, they couldn't register, ah, there could be people that were down in the Armed Services

and stationed and not back during a period of a year or so, I can think of a lot of occasions in which people may not be in the election jurisdiction, for a period of a year or two."

Oblinger: "To, before whom would they swear for the accuracy of their registration?"

Kane: "It would be handled the same way that they now ask for an absentee ballot."

Oblinger: "That has to be notarized."

Kane: "Well, I assume that there would be notaries wherever the person was."

Clerk Leone: "Representative Flinn in the Chair."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Christensen."

Christensen: "Mr. Speaker, for purpose of an introduction. Up in the balcony, to the right, we have the Herscher Grade School children, with their instructor, Mr. Jim Pibbs and they are represented in the 43rd District by Representative Ryan, Representative McBroom and myself. Up to the right."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion. If not, the question is, shall Amendment #6 be adopted to House Bill 3600. All those in favor, say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #7. Kane. Amends House Bill 3600 on page 21, so forth."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Kane, is recognized."

Kane: "I would, I would withdraw Amendment #7."

Speaker Flinn: "Gentleman has asked to withdraw the Amendment. No objection, objection being heard, the Amendment is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Flinn: "Third Reading. House Bill 2824. Representative Lechowicz. Representative Lechowicz, you're recognized for House Bill 2824."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2824. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of the Unemployment Insurance Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Flinn: "Any motions pertaining to Amendment #1?"

Clerk Leone: "No motions filed."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2. Simms-Schuneman. Amends House Bill 2824 in Section 402, Subsection C and so forth."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker. I wish to withdraw Amendment #2."

Speaker Flinn: "Gentleman requests to withdraw Amendment #2. No objections. No objections being heard the Amendment is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3. Simms-Schuneman. Amends House Bill 2824, as amended."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, I wish to also withdraw Amendment #3 because of the problems that Representative Lechowicz and Representative Schuneman and others have been able to work out in a subsequent Amendment. So, for this reason, I withdraw Amendment #3."

Speaker Flinn: "Gentleman withdraws Amendment #3. Any objection? No objection being heard, the Amendment's withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #4. Schuneman-Simms. Amends House Bill 2824, as amended, in Subsection 1501, so forth."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Cal Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd ask leave to withdraw Amendment #4."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has asked leave to withdraw Amendment #4. No objections? No objection being heard, Amendment #4 is withdrawn. Further Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #5. Schuneman, Lechowicz, Mautino, Simms. Amends House Bill 2824, as amended, with

reference to page and line numbers and so forth."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Cal Schuneman."

Schuneman: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We've withdrawn some Amendments here this morning, this afternoon, rather, in an effort to reach a compromise agreement with the Sponsor of this legislation. Amendment #5 accomplishes what we think is a very important change in unemployment compensation, in that it would affect the present charge-back provision that has been causing employers so much trouble in Illinois. During the hearings on this Bill, we had many employers who came before us and complained of the present situation under which an employer may have never laid anyone off, but still has unemployment claims charged against his experience. The way that has happened in many cases, is that an employee may have quit his job to take a better job with employer #2. Within a few weeks, he's laid off by employer #2 and the charge for that unemployment claim is charged back to the original employer, rather to the employer...than to the employer who laid him off. Employers throughout the State have complained of this and we have tried all during the hearings on this Bill to get acceptance of a provision which would place the charge on the employer that was responsible for the layoff. Amendment #5 accomplishes that, to this extent. If an employee is laid off by employer #2, and if that employee has earned six times his weekly benefit amount, or more, then the claim will be charged to employer #2. It does not accomplish, perhaps, what everybody would like. On the other hand, it is, it is a very important step in the right direction, and I want to publicly thank Representative Lechowicz and Mautino and Simms and others that have worked on this to come up with an agreement, which I think is a very

positive step. So, I would urge adoption of Amendment #1, or #5."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't rise in opposition to this. I just want to emphasize what Representative Schuneman said. I don't believe this Amendment corrects the problem that has been brought to our attention. This Amendment addresses itself to the situation where an individual leaves his job and is found disqualified for UI, then goes to work for an employer. Earns six times his weekly wage and is laid off. The original employer is not charged in this situation. This is a very rare situation. This does not deal with the problem where an individual quits on Friday and goes to work for another employer on Monday. Works for six weeks and is laid off. This does not cover that situation. That is the one that we have been trying to correct. This does not cover it. This is a good Amendment, but it simply does not fully cover the problem that we've had."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? Representative Lechowicz."

Lechowicz: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Very briefly, I stand in full support of Amendment #5. I concur with Representative McPike that it doesn't cover the situation totally, but in working with the Department, in working with the Labor representatives and in working with the small business people, they thought that this was a step in the right direction and this is one way that the Department can administer the wishes of the General Assembly, and hopefully, Mrs. Miller told us that they will review the entire workload of the Department during the course of the Summer and if it can be further

restricted, they will make that recommendation at that time. I move for the adoption of Amendment #5."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Amendment #5 be adopted to House Bill 2824. All those in favor say 'aye', those oppose say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Flinn: "Third Reading. We're going to Page 5. House Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate. First one up is Representative McGrew. I see him bustling around back there, trying to find House Bill 2967. Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2967 is very simple and basic in its concept. It passed out of Committee 23 to 0. In essence, what it does is to extend the \$3,000 general homestead exemption to those people that have..."

Speaker Flinn: "Just a minute. I should have had the Clerk read the Bill. Then, we'll get started again. Sorry about that Sam."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2967. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you. The Bill still reads the same. It amends the Revenue Act, it allows the general homestead for those that are on long term leases. What we had was some general corporations that sold lots, you'd have shares in the corporation, but not the individual lots. This Bill would allow for you to get that exemption. They can get it under the homestead exemption for the aged, but not under the general. I'd ask for its adoption."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the

question is, shall House Bill 2967 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Burnidge is on deck next. Mark Flinn 'aye' back there Sam, while you're punching all those buttons. Have all voted who wish? J. J. Wolf 'aye'. Would somebody punch J. J. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there's 147 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3359. Representative Burnidge. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3359. A Bill for An Act to authorize the Department of Conservation to convey certain lands in the Sanitary District of Elgin. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Burnidge."

Burnidge: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill was put in at the request of the Sanitary District of Elgin which resides in, partially in my District, the 33rd and part of the 2nd District. They are in the process of receiving a federal grant to expand a lift station. The property that the present lift station sits on is leased from the sani...the Conservation Department. They need title to the property at this time in order to receive the federal monies. The use of the property will be by the Conservation District, will be continued. There was no objection in Committee and the Conservation Department has no objection."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any, anyone in opposition? Question is, shall House Bill 3359 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there's 133 'ayes', no 'nays', 7 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed."

House Bill 3382."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3382. A Bill for An Act to amend the Administrative Review Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3382, all it does is add in the permission to have certified mail and notification under the Administrative Service Act. Right now, it calls for registered mail, which is considerably higher in cost and this gives the privilege in such cases where we can use certified mail, that it would make it cheaper on those doing the mailing, and I would move for the adoption of this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Anyone in opposition? Question is, shall House Bill 3382 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all 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 'ayes', no 'nays', none recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 24."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 24. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act...a marriage and dissolution of marriage Act to provide for the direct payment of support payments to the Clerk of the Court. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Huskey: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the alarming extent of disregard for court-ordered support obligations to children and former spouses deserves the prompt attention of the General Assembly. Now, every Illinois citizen shares in the cost of allowing the widespread nonpayment of obligations to go unchecked. Information from the Illinois' Legislative Studies Center Analysis of Support

Delinquencies indicate that after the first year there were only 43% compliances with the court-ordered support in divorces granted, and the full compliances dropped only 19% after six years. It's a sad commentary that within after one year, after the court's order for support, 57% of the payers were delinquent with the delinquencies growing to 81% of the payers within another five years. Most indicated alarming ineffectiveness of our present system of support enforcement is the fact that the same study shows that only 1% of the 81% of the payers who were in noncompliance were the subjects of any legal enforcement action. The Legislative Studies Center continues to gather data of 80...800 divorced families in Illinois in comparable figures for the recent period being available within the next few months. House Bill 24 will help solve a problem of long standing. How to insure that child support payments which are ordered by the Court will actually be made by the spouse ordered to them to pay them and will actually get into the hands of the person entitled to receive them and to prevent the 57% of default that now exists after the first year. Well, far too long...yes, yes, far too long, ex-spouses with children have had to choose between one of the following options: Hire an attorney over and over again to try to collect delinquent support payments or go without. The mother of a child should not have to spend her scarce resources to have an order enforced. She should not have to repeat this process again and again..."

Speaker Flinn: "One moment...one moment, please. For what purpose does Representative Mulcahey, arise?"

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Are we not following the Priority of Call?"

Speaker Flinn: "Well, we're going to the...somehow or some

way the Speaker promised Representative Huskey that we would call this one. Then, we're going to 3004 and go right down the line from there, but I'm carrying out a promise that the Speaker...the real Speaker made to Mr...Representative Huskey. Representative Huskey, proceed."

Huskey: "Yes, my apologies for today, but this Bill was supposed to have been called two days ago, and it was overlooked by error. So, it was put in today. Thank you very much. This...House Bill 24 will take the burden from the shoulders and place it in the courts, for which the Supreme Court has endorsed, of which the Circuit Courts have endorsed and which every lady...every lady Legislator of this House of Representatives are either the hyphenated Sponsors or the Cosponsors of this good Bill. Some of the highlights of this proposal are: all child support orders entered after October 1, 1981 are to provide for direct payment to the Clerk of the Court for distribution to the recipients entitled to them. In case of default, enforcement is to be automatically sought by the Clerk and pursued by the State's Attorney. To cover the enforcement costs there is to be a mandatory 2% penalty on arrearages. When the payer is two months in default and such payment is without cost, but the court is not limited to the 2%. It may assess even further charges or expense incurred and enforcement. The basic fee and provision is that all persons making payments under this system must pay at the rate of a dollar and a half per month payable semi-annual for the supervision of this Bill. A division of child support enforcement is created in the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts with the following major duties: to monitor the program, to encourage enforcement where local enforcement is lacking in enthusiasm, to assist the counties and

courts in setting up the program of enforcement. Now, 75% of all costs, including start up costs, will be borne by the '4-D' program of the Federal Government. The start up costs will be borne by the states...the provisions of the Bill...the dollar and a half per month collection. The cost to be paid by the payer...spouse, which will support the remaining costs. Also, the court has the authority to charge the 2% or more if it so desires. Mr. Speaker, I move for a favorable vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? Representative Bob Piel. Representative Piel. Bob Piel, you asked for the floor? Your light's on, Robert. Representative Braun. Carol Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this excellent Bill by Representative Huskey. The fact of the matter is, if this legislation is passed, it will establish a sensible mechanism for the collection of child support payments. It would get around...it would avoid...it would end the bizarre and some...and almost always counter-productive process whereby people who are under court orders for child support payments find themselves going back and forth and back and forth into the courts seeking enforcement of the court order. This Bill will have far-reaching ramifications. It can only anear to the benefit of the women, the children, and the families who are affected here...affected by this issue, and I encourage a positive vote...a favorable vote on House Bill 24."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative MacDonald."

MacDonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker...go ahead, Carol."

Speaker Flinn: "I...I didn't...I'm sorry. I thought you were done, Carol. Will you turn Carol Braun back on? I'm very...very sorry."

Braun: "I actually was, Mr. Speaker, but it was...one of the Members on the floor asked the question whether I was supporting the legislation. I'm very vigorously supporting the legislation. I just wanted to make that clear. Thank you for turning my mike back on."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, I apologize again. I thought you were finished. Representative MacDonald."

MacDonald: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in strong support of this very important Bill. For far too long, Illinois has been neglectful of this particular issue. More than half a million children in Illinois live on public aid and legally their fathers are supposed to pay the state for, at least, part of their care. There has been a haphazard collection of these payments, and certainly, I think that this Bill will go a long way toward saving this State millions and millions of dollars. Unfortunately, 75% of the default are nonpublic aid cases, and those are the women that we have talked about before who have to go continually and fight for the right to have the money to maintain their families that they were justly due. I ask for your support of this Bill, because I think it is a Bill that is long, long overdue. There have been several years of hard work put on this particular piece of legislation, and while I had a Bill quite similar to this Bill, I tabled it in favor of this Bill, because I think a lot of legal problems have been worked out with the Bill, and I urge your support of this particular Bill. Thank you. To House Bill 24...will go a long way toward helping Illinois collect support payments."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Slape. Michael Slape."

Slape: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Huskey: "...Representative Slape. Yes, Sir."

Slape: "Herbert, is it true that to implement this Bill correctly, it's going to take a direct tie up to

Public Aid's computer system?"

Huskey: "Yes, that's right, and these systems are being worked out by the Governor's Office, by many, many parties. It's a very complicated Bill, and we have to pass it to show that the General Assembly is interested in it. The funding is being worked out...the 75% of the '4-D' program which will share the...I mean, the '4-D' program and the public aid would share 75% of the costs..."

Slape: "All right."

Huskey: "Plus, start up money from the state which...we've met with the Governor. We met with Morgan Finley, George Dunn. We met with all the people...everyone is favorable."

Slape: "Okay. Isn't it also true that this Bill would really apply to about four large counties in the State of Illinois. About...it could include four counties in this Bill, and we'd be taking care of about 85 or 90% of the problem?"

Huskey: "Those things we've agreed with the Clerk that we would talk about it when it goes to the Senate. We will be agreeable."

Slape: "That's my next question. If the Bill passes the House, would you be amendable to talking about Amendment...amending the Bill in the Senate?"

Huskey: "Mike, I can't say definitely Amendment, but by all parties concerned that have worked so hard with the Bill...with the Circuit Courts of the State and the Supreme Court. We'd be happy to work with Amendments that will..."

Slape: "Oh, I see. You will be willing to consider Amendments."

Huskey: "...be happy to."

Slape: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative John Dunn."

Dunn: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question or two?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Dunn: "If...in the present form as amended, does this Bill require that all child support payments be made through the Clerk of the Court and that none can be made direct from payer to payee?"

Huskey: "No, that isn't quite right, Representative Dunn. In agreement with Representative Getty and some of the Members of the Judiciary Committee, we agreed that we would bring it to the House floor and amend it, so if there was an agreement worked out between the two parties, that they could pay each other rather than be mandatory on the court on every case. In case, in that particular case or if the person gets into default, then the person that's the payee could go to court and ask that the payer be put under the court system..."

Dunn: "Is it...?"

Huskey: "...but right now, they're exempt from the..."

Dunn: "As amended then is it possible for the interested parties, the payer and the payee, to agree to make both child support and maintenance payments direct instead of through the Clerk of the Court?"

Huskey: "That's what I answered. Yes. Yes, if it's agreeable between the two parties, it's payable that way. Maintenance has been taken out of the mandatory provisions of the Bill, though."

Dunn: "I understand you're saying maintenance is, but what about child support?"

Huskey: "Child support, also. Yes."

Dunn: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Margalus."

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

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed...the 'ayes' have it. The main question's

put. Representative Huskey, to close."

Huskey: "Well, Mr. Speaker, we had a very emotional issue yesterday about equal rights. Talk about equal rights, this is an equal rights Bill in the highest degree. It's an equal rights Bill for children to keep children right here in Illinois from going to bed hungry. This Bill...voting on this Bill will justify your being in this General Assembly...in the 81st General Assembly. Just your 'yes' vote on this Bill will justify that. For mothers to tell their children whom Santa Claus did not leave...leave a present. Why weren't they as good as the child next door who got a nice present? These things I know, because I came from one...from a home like this. I ask for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, shall House Bill 24 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Daniels, to explain his vote."

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have some concern about this legislation in the form that it's in right now. My concern is that I might bring out to your attention at this time is that we're going to undergo a request by the State's Attorneys of this State for additional funds to enact the enforcement of it. However, I know the Sponsor is sincere in his desire to provide the necessary legislation and I'm aware of the fact that the Sponsor has represented to all of us that there are federal funds available for the enforcement of this legislation. Now, based upon those representations and based upon the Sponsor's statement that it will not incur the additional State's Attorneys throughout the State of Illinois to enforce it, many of us are supporting this legislation after the action in Committee. I know that he's sincere in his desire, and I think that it's a good piece of legislation

based upon the representations that he made to us in Committee."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Borchers, to explain his vote. One minute."

Borchers: "Actually, I wanted to ask another question. He can nod 'yes'. Does it...will this help collect outside from a man that leaves the State of Illinois? Would that help? I just wanted to know. Okay."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Satterthwaite, to explain her vote. One minute."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I just would like to have the record set straight. It was my intention to be a Cosponsor of this Bill, but I noticed in the Digest that my name was omitted and in order to set that record straight along with Representative Huskey's remark, I ask that we have permission also for the Clerk to add my name as a Cosponsor."

Speaker Flinn: "I think you could do that by signing a slip down here. You have to do that now. I'm sorry. The Parliamentarian corrects me. Is there leave to add her on as one of the chief hyphenated Cosponsors? No objections. Leave is granted. Representative Polk, to explain his vote. One minute."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, take the record."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Go ahead and take the record, but I wanted to explain to Representative Satterthwaite there was a slip turned in with Representative Satterthwaite's name on it. I don't know how it was averted. Every woman in this House had her name on the slip..."

Speaker Flinn: "We've already..."

Huskey: "...and I'm very sorry, Representative, but you certainly...it wasn't anything of my doing."

Speaker Flinn: "We've taken care of that. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will

take the record. On this question, there are 138 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'nay', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. In order to try to keep on schedule we need to do 40 Bills yet today. That don't mean we will or we won't, but for your benefit, if we could do some sort of modified debate on the Bills that are coming up on the Priority Calendar, we can move right along. The first one where we left off yesterday...started yesterday, I'm sorry, is House Bill 3004. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3004. A Bill for An Act making appropriations to the Capital Development Board for reimbursement grants to public community college districts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Steczo."

Steczko: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 3004 appropriates \$33,297,000 to the Capital Development Board from the General Revenue Fund for distribution to designated community colleges, who have used their own funds for building purposes. Public Act 80-1200, which we passed, authorized the CDB to make these payments for 75% of the costs, provided that the monies had come from the building fund of those community colleges and provided that the construction commenced after July 1st, 1972. There are approximately 27 districts affected by this Bill. These buildings and this construction was done on the basis that there would be reimbursement and I would ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Flinn: "Is there any question of the Sponsor? Any opposition? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 3004 pass? All those in favor, vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Peters. For what purpose do you arise?"

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not...are we allowed now...are we on Short Debate or something....to explain our vote?"

Speaker Flinn: "No, we're just trying to keep the debate down. If there's any reason for you to ask a question, ask."

Peters: "Just in terms of the record, Mr. Speaker, to indicate that this Bill is not in the appropriation, or the budget of the Governor and I have not received any word from the Community College Board, in terms of their stand on it, and just for those reasons, I will cast a 'no' vote and ask other members to do likewise."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 91 voting 'aye', 47 voting 'no'. Representative Peters."

Peters: "I really don't want to do it, Mr. Speaker, but it's part of my job. So, I ask for a verification."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Steczko would like to have the absentees called. Call the...Representative...wait a minute, let's call the absentees. Representative Steczko requests that the absentees be called. We have to wait on the machine to put the paper out."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Anderson. Bianco. Burnidge. Collins. Deuster. Donovan. Ewell. Greiman. Hanahan. Hannig. Harris."

Speaker Flinn: "Hannig, 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Harris."

Speaker Flinn: "Preston 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Who?"

Speaker Flinn: "Preston 'aye'. Dwight 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing with the poll of the absentees. Harris. Henry. Huff. Dave Jones. Emil Jones. Kane. Katz."

Speaker Flinn: "Kane 'aye'. Vinson, 'no'. Daniels 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Vinson from 'aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "Vinson from 'aye' to 'no' and Daniels now 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Daniels from 'aye' to 'no'. Katz. Continuing the poll of the absentees. Klosak. Laurino. Leinenweber. Leverenz. Margalus. Marovitz. Mugalian. Schlickman. Schoeberlein. Stearney. Willer. J. J. Wolf. No further."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further changes before we get into polling the affirmative votes? J. J. Wolf 'aye', Greiman...no, I'm sorry, J. J. Wolf 'no'. Greiman 'aye'. Alan Greiman 'aye'. Ropp 'no'. Henry 'aye'...too fast...just a minute. Hold on, you're going too fast. Ropp 'no'. Willer 'aye'. Willer 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Ropp, 'aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "The Clerk's caught up? Marovitz 'aye'. We're still too fast for the Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Henry 'aye', then Willer. Who after that? Marovitz."

Speaker Flinn: "Bell 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bell 'aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed with the poll of the affirmative at the request of Representative Peters. Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker. If I may check with the Clerk. We started with 91. We added 7 to 98 and we changed 4 to 94."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, we've got a couple more here. Doug Huff 'aye', Getty 'aye'. I'm sorry, Representative Getty, for what purpose do you rise?"

Getty: "I'd like leave to be verified."

Speaker Flinn: "Gentleman asks leave to be verified. It's granted. Any further changes before we find out what the total is before we go onto the affirmative? Representative Katz 'aye'. No? For what purpose does Representative Katz arise?"

Katz: "To be recorded as voting 'aye' and for leave to be verified."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman asks leave to be verified as voting 'aye'. Leave is granted. Repre...Representative Keane asks to be verified. Granted. Representative Skinner votes 'aye'. You guys caught up? Representative Sandquist 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "'Aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "From 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Abramson 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "'Aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "From 'aye' to 'no'. Any further changes? Representative Anderson 'no'. Proceed with the Affirmative Roll Call. How many do we have right now, affirmative?"

Clerk O'Brien: "We've picked up 11 'ayes', we've taken off 6 'ayes'. We've picked up 8 'nos'."

Peters: "Where are we at, Mr. Clerk? How many 'yeses'?"

Speaker Flinn: "There's 96 'ayes' to begin with."

Peters: "We've got a difference of 2, Mr. Speaker. I don't want to..."

Speaker Flinn: "Virgil Wikoff changed from 'no' to 'aye'. Wikoff. Wikoff. Representative Sumner votes 'aye'. Any further changes before we go with the poll of the absen...affirmative. Proceed with the poll of the Affirmative Roll Call. We're starting now, I guess, with 98. Right?"

Clerk O'Brien: "We've picked up 13 'ayes', taking off 6. Gives us 98 'ayes'."

Speaker Flinn: "98 'ayes', Pete."

Peters: "Okay."

Speaker Flinn: "McMasters votes 'aye'."

Peters: "No, I'm going to verify."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed with the Affirmative Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander. Balanoff. Barnes. Beatty. Birchler. Borchers. Bower. Bowman. Bradley.

Braun."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Carol Braun wants to be verified. Verification. You're verified. Representative Collins. Collins 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the poll of the affirmative. Brummer. Bullock. Campbell. Capparelli. Catania. Chapman. Christensen. Cullerton. Currie. Darrow. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. Dyer. Farley. Flinn. Dwight Friedrich. Gaines."

Speaker Flinn: "Friedrich changed from 'aye' to 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Garmisa. Getty. Giorgi. Goodwin. Greiman. Hannig. Henry. Hoffman."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ray Ewell. What purpose do you arise?"

Ewell: "...as 'aye', please."

Speaker Flinn: "Ray Ewell as 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Huff. Huskey. Jaffe. Johnson. Kane. Katz. Keane. Kelly. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kulas. Lechowicz. Leon."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Lechowicz would like to be verified. You're verified, Representative Lechowicz."

Clerk O'Brien: "Madigan. Marovitz. Matijevich. Mautino. McClain. McGrew. McMaster. McPike. Mulcahey. Murphy. O'Brien. Patrick. Pechous. Pierce. Pouncey. Preston. Rea. Richmond. Rigney. Robbins. Ronan. Satterthwaite. Schisler. Schneider. Schraeder. Sharp. Skinner. Slape. Steczo. Stuffle. Sumner."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Tim Johnson."

Johnson: "Vote me with the Governor. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "Tim Johnson 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "'Aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Yea, vote me 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "Leinenweber 'no'. Representative Breslin wants to vote 'aye'. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing with the affirmative. Sumner. Swanstrom. Taylor. Terzich. VanDuyne. Vitek. VonBoeckman. White. Wikoff. Willer. Williams. Williamson. Winchester. Sam Wolf. Woodyard. Younge. Yourell. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Hoffman from 'aye' to 'no'. Gene Hoffman, 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Winchester."

Winchester: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Could I be recorded as voting 'no'?"

Speaker Flinn: "You sure could. That's your request..."

Clerk O'Brien: "'Aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "'Aye' to 'no'. Questions of the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Peters."

Peters: "Yes, Mr. Clerk, are we starting with 96?"

Speaker Flinn: "97, the Clerk has."

Clerk O'Brien: "Got 16 on and 10 off."

Peters: "Somewhere we lost, we lost 2 someplace, Jack."

Speaker Flinn: "We're juggling the books up here."

Peters: "I'll take your last figure, 98, minus Friedrich, minus Johnson, minus Hoffman, minus Winchester. That's 94. Add Breslin, add Ewell. That's 96."

Clerk O'Brien: "I can't tell what I did last."

Speaker Flinn: "Let's proceed with it. Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker. How am I recorded?"

Speaker Flinn: "How is the Lady recorded?"

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

Dyer: "Please change that to 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "Change her from 'aye' to 'no'. Questions of the Affirmative Roll Call."

Peters: "It's 96 now, Jack?"

Speaker Flinn: "98 now."

Peters: "96, fine."

Speaker Flinn: "Oh, 96."

Peters: "Alexander. I see her. Balanoff."

Speaker Flinn: "Balanoff's in her seat."

Peters: "Okay. Representative Beatty."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Beatty. The Gentleman is not in his seat. Representative...wasn't he verified?"

Peters: "Pardon."

Speaker Flinn: "Wasn't Beatty verified?"

Peters: "No."

Speaker Flinn: "He was not? I thought he was. The Gentleman is not in his seat. Is he on the floor? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll."

Peters: "Representative Bower."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Bower. The Gentleman is not in his seat. There he is. He is in his seat."

Peters: "He is in his seat?"

Speaker Flinn: "Yea."

Peters: "That's a surprise."

Speaker Flinn: "He's sitting right there."

Peters: "Representative Bowman."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Bowman is in his seat."

Peters: "Representative Capparelli."

Speaker Flinn: "Capparelli is in his seat, on the phone."

Peters: "Representative Catania. I see her. Okay. Representative Darrow."

Speaker Flinn: "Darrow is in his seat."

Peters: "Representative Dawson."

Speaker Flinn: "Dawson's in his seat."

Peters: "Representative Cullerton."

Speaker Flinn: "Cullerton."

Peters: "Oh, he's in his seat. I see him."

Speaker Flinn: "That's Pouncey. No, that's Cullerton."

Peters: "I got them mixed up with Robbins. Representative Domico. Oh, I see him. Representative Doyle."

Speaker Flinn: "Doyle. The Gentleman is not in his seat. Is he on the floor? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll."

Peters: "Representative Vitek."

Speaker Flinn: "Vitek. John Vitek. I don't...John Vitek
was verified."

Peters: "He was? Representative Farley."

Speaker Flinn: "Beatty is back on the floor. Put him back
on the Roll."

Peters: "Who?"

Speaker Flinn: "Beatty."

Peters: "Oh, Beatty, okay. Farley."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Farley. I can't see back
there. Is Representative Farley back there? He's not
in his seat. Is he on the floor? How's the Gentleman
recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll."

Peters: "Representative Jaffe."

Speaker Flinn: "Jaffe is not in his seat. Somebody pointing
towards Jaffe? Oh, Doyle is back. Replace...put
Doyle back on the Roll. Representative Jaffe is not
in his seat. Is he on the floor? How is he
recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll."

Peters: "Representative Huskey."

Speaker Flinn: "Huskey. Representative Huskey back there?
I don't see him. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll."

Peters: "Kulas, Myron. I see the hand. Representative
Leon."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative John Leon is not in his seat.
How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Rolls."

Peters: "Representative Marovitz. I see him."

Representative McGrew."

Speaker Flinn: "McGrew. Representative Sam McGrew. The Gentleman is not in his seat. Is he on the floor? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Rolls."

Peters: "Representative McMaster."

Speaker Flinn: "McMaster. Tom McMaster. Not in his seat. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Rolls."

Peters: "Representative Murphy. I see Murphy. Representative O'Brien. I see him. Representative Patrick."

Speaker Flinn: "Patrick is in his seat."

Peters: "Representative Pechous."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman is not in his seat. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll."

Peters: "Representative Donovan."

Speaker Flinn: "Who?"

Peters: "I see him."

Speaker Flinn: "You got him."

Peters: "Representative Richmond."

Speaker Flinn: "Bruce Richmond is not in his seat. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll."

Peters: "Representative Schisler."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Schisler. Are you back there? Gale? I don't see him in his seat. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Roll."

Peters: "Representative Slape."

Speaker Flinn: "Mike Slape is in his seat."

Peters: "Representative Sumner."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Sumner."

Peters: "I see her."

Speaker Flinn: "She's here."

Peters: "Representative...Telcser is voting no...Taylor."

Speaker Flinn: "Jim Taylor is in his seat."

Peters: "Representative Robbins."

Speaker Flinn: "Robbins. The Gentleman is not in his seat.

How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Remove him from the Rolls. Representative
Dave Jones wants to be recorded as voting 'no'."

Peters: "Representative Woodyard."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Woodyard. He...Sam McGrew is
back. Put him back on the Roll. Is Representative
Woodyard on the floor? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him, remove him from the Roll."

Peters: "Representative VonBoeckman."

Speaker Flinn: "VonBoeckman is back there, next to, across
the aisle from his regular seat."

Peters: "That's all I have, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "I see Representative Robbins is back on the
floor. Put him back on the Roll. Representative
Huskey is back. Put him back on the Roll.
Representative John Dunn. Representative John Dunn.
For what purpose do you arise? Dunn wants to vote
'aye'."

Dunn: "Please record me as 'aye', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Mahar. Representative Mahar votes 'aye'.
On this question, there are 90 'aye' votes and 60
voting 'no' and this Bill, having received the
Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.
Now, before we go on any further, I've learned my
lesson. Appropriation Bills have another week and

we're going to skip those on the Priority of Call and go on to those non-appropriation Bills, which must be heard in the next two weeks. Therefore, we will skip the next one 3007. Take it out of the record and we'll go to 3118. Representative Collins. Is he on the floor? Take that out of the record. 3122. Representative Yourell."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3122. A Bill for An Act to amend An Act relating to the composition of elections of county boards in certain counties. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Yourell."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3122 would require that members of the county board be residents of the district they represent for a period of one year preceding election or appointment. As I originally introduced the Bill, it was for a period of two years and with consultation with county board members and others, with the Illinois Association of County Board Members, they thought it best to amend the Bill by going to one year. It also provides that in the General Election, following redistricting, a member of the board may be elected from the district which contains a part of the candidate's former district in which he resided at the time of the redistricting and it also made one other change, significant change. That reelected if a resident of the new district...originally was for eighteen months and we reduced that by amendment, to one year. The Bill is sponsored by the Illinois Association of County Board Members. It was brought to my attention by that organization and I solicit a favorable vote on House Bill 3122."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? Representative Birkinbine."

Birkinbine: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a

question?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Birkinbine: "Why?"

Yourell: "Well, the reason for it is that they've had problems with the members running from without the district and they thought it better that they should reside within the district for at least one year. That's the reason for the Bill."

Birkinbine: "Why is that a problem?"

Yourell: "Well, I don't know why it's a problem, but they obviously think it was a problem or they wouldn't have asked me to introduce the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further questions? Representative Conti."

Conti: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If this innocuous Bill that Representative Yourell is asking you to pass today doesn't do too much and doesn't seem too much to raise a red flag, but I want to warn the members of Cook County and the General Assembly on this side of aisle, particularly that this is going to be the vehicle for the reapportionment of Cook County and having the county board members run in districts instead of at large and from the suburban area. You pass this Bill and this is going to be the main locomotive that will give you that type of legislation in Cook County."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Yourell, to close."

Yourell: "Yes, thank you Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen. I know that the previous speaker has a problem in that regard. This Bill deals with counties of less than 3,000,000. It does not include Cook County and if what he says is true, if this Bill, when it reaches the Senate, provides the impetus to redistrict the County of Cook, you have my word publicly and on the Floor of this House, that I'll table the Bill in the Senate."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, shall House Bill 3122 pass? All those in favor, vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Question, there are 121 voting 'aye', 10 voting 'nay'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Inadvertently, I skipped House Bill 3007. Read House Bill 3007."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3007. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of An Act in relation to State finance. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Reilly is moving to...asking leave, rather, to move this Bill from Third back to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Is there any objection? No objection. Leave is granted. The Bill's on Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #4. Reilly. Amends House Bill 3007, as amended, and so forth."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Reilly on Amendment #4."

Reilly: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Representative...er, Amendment #4 was brought to me by the Comptroller's Office. It clarifies the problem they've had as to which line item and agency ought to pay for equipment and I believe it's duplicating equipment bought on purchase lease kind of agreement. Their suggested language and I would ask adoption of Amendment #4."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Amendment #4 be adopted to House Bill 3007. All those in favor, say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Flinn: "Third Reading. House Bill 3166. Representative Campbell. Out of the record. Both of them out of the record. 3167. House Bill 3174. Representative Reed. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3174. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of the North Shore Sanitary District Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "I'm sorry. That's an Appropriation Bill. Is that not an Appropriation Bill? It is not? Okay. I've got a misprint here. Representative Reed is recognized."

Reed: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Based on an Illinois Supreme Court decision, the North Shore Sanitary District in Lake County, which is a municipal corporation, finds that they are not covered either by the Municipal Code or the City and Villages Act, to waive bid requirements for emergency repairs. The Bill requires declaration of emergency by four of the five trustees. The declaration must also include the termination date of the emergency and furthermore, a full written account of all of the facts of the emergency, the materials, the labor, costs, must be on display for public perusal for one year following the termination of the emergency."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is...oh, Representative Pierce, I'm sorry. I didn't recognize you. You're recognized now, though."

Pierce: "Will the Lady answer a question?"

Speaker Flinn: "She indicates she'll yield."

Pierce: "Ah, is this, is this Bill authorized in the hiring of a legislative lobbyist, a former State Senator, at \$1,000 a month? Is this that particular Bill?"

Reed: "No, Sir."

Pierce: "But, aren't they, aren't they going to hire a former State Senator and pay him \$1,000 a month, so they can get Legislators down here to act expeditiously on their legislation?"

Reed: "Since we're here handling their business, Danny, I don't think they'll need that lobbyist. Certainly, it is not in this legislation. This has to do with

emergency repair."

Pierce: "Alright, well I agree with you then. I don't think they have to spend \$1,000 a month, even when we're not in session to hire a former State Senator from Waukegan to represent them in this Body, when they have Legislators like the Lady from Lake who's willing to carry the water for them down here with my support and I'll vote 'aye'."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 3174 pass? All those in favor, vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 140 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'nay' and all those...and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Repre...Representative Bob Piel wants to vote 'aye' too. House Bill 3271."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3271. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to the disclosure of beneficiaries of land trust and owners of property allegedly violating building laws. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Will Representative Marovitz...He's not in his seat. Representative Marovitz around? Take it out of the record. House Bill 3346. Representative Simms, you're on deck. Read the Bill. 3346."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3346. A Bill for An Act in relation to the establishment of real estate index number system and map making department of the Office of the Recorder of Deeds. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Timothy Simms."

Simms: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3346 is an extension of House Bill 2040, which was enacted last year by the General Assembly. This gives the county boards the authority to make the recorder of deeds to set up a real estate tax, a real

estate numbering system and map making department within the office of recorder of deeds. It does not mandate. It's an option which the county board can exercise if they so choose. It passed out of Representative Yourell's committee with substantial support. It has been amended to delete Cook County. It only pertains to those downstate counties that are in support or choose to make this type of decision and I would urge the passage of House Bill 3346."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? Representative John Dunn."

Dunn: "Well, Mr. Speaker. Who's going to pay for this? I'd like to ask the Sponsor that question and how much will it cost."

Speaker Flinn: "You're asking me, or do you want to ask the Sponsor?"

Dunn: "Yeah, well, I know you would know the answer, Mr. Speaker, but I will address my question to the Sponsor."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay, he indicates he'll yield."

Dunn: "How much will this cost and who's going to pay for it?"

Simms: "Well, Representative Dunn, it's up to the county board to decide whether or not they wanted to place that responsibility in the county recorder's office. At the present time, they can place this responsibility with the county clerk, the county treasurer, or the supervisor of assessment. This just allows them another option, if they so choose. It's not mandatory, it's an option."

Dunn: "And then it would have to be paid for at the local level?"

Simms: "Yes, it's an option, it's not mandated. It's up to the county board."

Dunn: "And what is a real estate numbering system?"

Simms: "Well, the real estate numbering system is when a

piece of, when property is recorded with the county recorder, that at that time, the parcel of property receives a tax number and a number which will go all the way through the process through the recording and also through the assessment procedure. Some counties have it. And it's an option which some counties place with the county clerks. Some with the county treasurer and some with the supervisor of assessments. It just allows them to place it with the recorder, if they so choose."

Dunn: "Can they, at the present time, can they...in my county, for example, we have a tax plate numbers issued by the county treasurer. Are you saying that those...we need this authorization to enable the county recorder to take advantage of those same parcel identification numbers?"

Simms: "Yes."

Dunn: "And the county recorder cannot do that at the present time?"

Simms: "Not without county board approval. No."

Dunn: "Okay."

Simms: "I mean not without statutory approval giving the county board the right to place it with him. This legislation was drafted with the help from the Chicago Title and Trust and with attorneys with the Cook County Recorder's Office. It's up the county boards to decide where they want to place it."

Dunn: "Thank you. My advisors have indicated I have asked enough questions. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? Representative Mahar."

Mahar: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question."

Speaker Flinn: "Indicates he will."

Mahar: "Why isn't this fine Bill good for Cook County? What's the reason Cook County is not in it?"

Simms: Well, I'll yield to Representative Yourell, who I think could best answer that more than what I could."
 Speaker Flinn: "Turn Yourell on."

Yourell: "A matter of \$17,000,000."

Mahar: "The cost would be \$17,000,000 and no cost downstate?"

Simms: "They have a torrens system in Cook County."

Yourell: "We have a separate system in Cook County."

Mahar: "Alright. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, shall House Bill 3346 pass. All those in favor, vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 146 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'nay'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3383. Representative Polk. Ben Polk. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 334..."

Polk: "Mr. Speaker, before you read the Bill. I understand that there has been a fiscal note, request of a fiscal note, and as far as I know I have not received it, so we'll just take it out of the record, understanding, I'm waiting on a fiscal note."

Speaker Flinn: "It's on Third Reading. Fiscal notes hold them on Second Reading, not here. If you want to run the Bill, run it."

Polk: "Fine. Where's Mr. Steczo?"

Speaker Flinn: "Where's who? Terry Steczo."

Polk: "Yeah. I wouldn't do anything...you know, I wouldn't want to do it. Did you file a fiscal note. Do you mind if I run with it then?"

Speaker Flinn: "Why don't we take this out of the record and you talk to Terry and we'll go on and I'll go back to you."

Polk: "Yeah, I have no reason to move it if there's any

questions about it, so..."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, you and Terry get together and we'll go on to the next Bill. House Bill 3433."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3433. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to the regulation and maintenance of the level of Lake Michigan. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Reed."

Reed: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a fairly complex piece of legislation, but it is of great importance to those of us from the Northeastern section of the State. It legislates the requirements of a compromise reached by all of the Great Lakes States and the United States Supreme Court, in regard the Illinois allocation of Lake Michigan water for domestic and industrial uses within our area. The emphasis of the compromise is not, and I repeat, not on an increased diversion of lake water, but better domestic utilization. The legislation establishes the conditions that the new decree will not be effective until this General Assembly passes legislation that includes the following: limitation of the amount of water used for dilution purposes to the maximum extent of 320 cubic feet per second. That means free up some of the water used by the metropolitan sanitary district in their treatment processes for domestic use within the six county area. Any new allocations of Lake Michigan water must be given top priority for domestic purposes only and to the extent practical any new allocation must be made with the goal of reducing the amount of water, the amount of withdrawal from the aquifer that is peculiar to northern Illinois, Lake County, McHenry County, and into DuPage and Cook. In no way, Ladies and Gentlemen of the this House, is there an increase in the amount of water from Lake Michigan, but rather this is

designed for better utilization of the 3200 cubic feet per second that we currently are allowed by the Supreme Court and the other Great Lakes States."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion. If not, the question is, shall House Bill 3433 pass? All those in favor, vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 142 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3487. Representative McPike."

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

Speaker Flinn: "Out of the record. Request of Sponsor. House Bill 3491. Out of the record. Representative Bradley is next. 3498."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3498. Representative Bradley. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "In order to give the Sponsor a chance, before I recognize Representative Bradley, Mr. McGrew is on deck. If anybody knows where McGrew's at, he's on deck. Okay. Representative Bradley is recognized."

Bradley: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3498 now has been amended. The Amendment, Amendment #1, is the Bill. And what Amendment #1 does, it addresses itself to the lab school situation at Illinois State University. In order to give some stability to the students as well as the faculty, we thought best that we fund the institution directly instead of funding it as we have in the past through the Board of Regency's appropriation fund. The concept, I think, is a good one. We've had from time to time, throughout the years threats of closing the school. Thereby

disrupting the community and the students and the faculty. And this seems to be a way that we can send the dollars directly to the University, based on the number of students they have. We have met the objections with some Amendments, regarding the size, so it cannot grow out of proportion, restricting it county wise, restricting it to the number of students they presently have and then to relieve the tension and anxiety of the superintendents in the immediate area from the different school districts, with the phase out, which spelled out over a three year period in another Amendment to make sure that the phase out procedure was there. I think it's a good concept. It only affects, really we only have two laboratory school districts left in the State. It really affects this one. It's designed for this lab school and I respectfully request your support on the Bill and I would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Gentleman would yield for a question? Representative Bradley, you know we had alot of trouble with this Bill or we started out with some trouble with in in Higher Education. It would create a new school district for the lab school. But, now that you've got it amended like this, it still has some problems. I understand that you're going to double count students. That it will raise the school aid formula in that it will have double counting of students for at least the first three years that it's put in effect. Is that not correct?"

Bradley: "That would happen in any situation because of the phase out of students that happens, if you lose students today, it's still the, they are phased out over a three year period. So, it's already in the School Code. We just spelled it out to make sure to

relieve the anxiety of the superintendents of that problem. If you lose students today, they're phased out over a three year period."

Dunn: "If we leave it like it is now, it wouldn't be any double counting of students because they don't do it now, do they? If we didn't pass this Bill, the lab school would still go ahead and you would have the funding you had before from the Board of Higher Education and from the school district."

Bradley: "Actually, just exactly the opposite of what you're suggesting is really true today. We fund those students through the appropriation for the Board of Regents. Then, we turn around and fund those students again through the local school districts and give those dollars to the local school districts. So, what you're suggesting is just the opposite is true. We are paying twice now with tax dollars. If we adopt this Bill, we will only be paying for those students one time instead of twice. It will no longer be necessary and I happen to be the Sponsor of the Board of Regents Appropriation Bill. It will no longer be necessary to fund this school through the Board of Regents. So, we'll really...it will be a savings to the taxpayers of Illinois."

Dunn: "Representative Bradley. Since you're the Sponsor of the Regents Bill, is it reduced by the amount that this will raise increasing State Aid? I think it isn't is it?"

Bradley: "I don't know. It's still in the Senate."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, if I could address the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed."

Dunn: "I think this is starting a dangerous and different precedent than what we've been doing in the education and in the State Aid formula, in that we're saying that the school districts now can start lab schools or universities and schools can start lab schools and

then the kids will follow them and go to the lab schools and they'll get full funding. I don't object to this if the Legislature wants to do it, but I think you ought to know about it and I think you ought to be aware of it. This Bill was heard in the Higher Education and I had a strong feeling it should have been in Elementary and Secondary Ed, 'cause Higher Education doesn't ordinarily deal with students in the elementary and secondary schools. So, I'd urge a good look at this and possibly not vote for it. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative McGrew. Sam McGrew."

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

Speaker Flinn: "Indicates he will."

McGrew: "Representative Bradley. We have considered some discussion on amending the provisions of the School Code that would specifically give the teachers the rights that they now enjoy under all other systems in which they are full time teachers. Specifically, the Section 2411 and 2412 of the School Code. I would just like it frankly in the record that that is your intent and it would be the intent of the Board of Regents to do so."

Bradley: "Yes, the Board of Regents has indicated that they will take care of that problem by resolution and you and I have discussed that and I visited with Franklin Matchler, the Executive Director of the Board of Regents today. That will be done. That's one of the primary reasons for this legislation, is to give that kind of stability to the faculty at the lab schools."

McGrew: "Okay, then if I may, Mr. Speaker, on the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed."

McGrew: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Frankly, House Bill 2490, I'm sorry, 3498 says simply that the dollars will follow

the students. We find that in this system of more and more tight dollars that the universities are facing very serious cuts for specific programs. They have to look around and try to make those kind of judgmental calls. Illinois State University, in spite of my jealousy for W.I.U., is noted as one of the outstanding teachers training colleges in the Nation, if not in the State of Illinois, and I think that this would greatly enhance the program. If you look at the students there, you will find an inordinate amount of students that are handicapped, that have physical as well as mental disabilities, that they are a larger percent of minorities and so on and so forth than is the surrounding community in which the university lab school is located. In short, really, what they are doing is providing outstanding programs that would be really a hardship on the local district if they had to pick them up themselves. Secondly, I think that, and perhaps most importantly in all, the Legislature has tried to find direct accountability for each and every one of the dollars that we appropriate for the various segments of our government. This would provide that money for educating students grades K through 12 would indeed come from the resource equalizer system for grades K through 12. It would not be funded in a higher education budget, such as it now is. I think it's a good concept. It would affect only I.S.U. and the high school and the University of Illinois, if they so choose to opt into this kind of proposal. So, I think it's a good idea from an educational standpoint. I think it's a good idea for fiscal accountability and I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Sam Vinson. I'm sorry. Gene Hoffman was ahead of you. I take that back and then you're next."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker and Ladies and

Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this legislation in its present form after the Amendments. I want to compliment the Sponsor and the Co-Sponsors on this Bill for the fine work they have done in terms of resolving some of the concerns and some of the differences that not only the local constituents had on the issue, but also some concerns that were mentioned on a much broader and a much more basic perspective. The type of program that is offered in this setting is one in which I think we would find to be an exemplary program and one in which this Bill, I believe, will guarantee its continuation and its support and for that reason, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to add my endorsement to this excellent program."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Sam Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Essentially, what this does is to preserve a laboratory school for the largest teachers college in the State. It provides a way to insure that the funds that the State has normally appropriated for students at that laboratory school and has paid to the laboratory school through an intermediary, the local school districts, will actually go to the laboratory school and by insuring that, we insure that the financial resources for those students, follow those students and pay for the education of those students. It's a good plan. Representative Bradley has worked very hard with people who have problems with it. Have accommodated a number of those problems and in our last discussion with the Superintendent of the Normal School District, he indicated that the Bill would not cause him any problems and that his problems had been resolved. Very much urge...very urgently solicit a 'yes' vote on this."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Everyone has spoke glowingly of the Bill. I have no ambivalence whatsoever about the proposal and that is I'm in opposition. Number one, the lab schools at any university are the function of the university. What is being undertaken at this point is an effort to move dollars out of the elementary and secondary area and applying it to the university. If the university wants a laboratory program, which many universities have had in the past and discontinued for any number of reasons, then I think the university ought to pay for that program as it is done now. That program will not die as you may be lead to believe by the Sponsors and supporters of this legislation. So, what I'm suggesting to you is, that they are coming here to take money through the School Aid Formula funding for their purposes when in reality, it is a function of that system. Secondly, the Superintendent in that District testified very effectively, I think, to the Committee Members that there are certainly sufficient opportunities in schools and classrooms available for student or cadet teachers to participate in whatever the educational program is. That is, teachers who are eventually going to teach have to meet certain observation requirements. That is, they will sit in a classroom and observe possibly the sophmores or juniors two or three hours a week in those classes. The lab schools really offers an artificial setting. An artificial setting in the sense that many of the kids who go to that school are extraordinarily talented and gifted kids. The kids in that school at I.S.U. certainly have minority representation and handicapped representation, but remember a lot of these kids are faculty member kids. They are not, in a sense, the kind of students that the teacher is going to be exposed to in the real world. So, when

the Superintendent testifies, very accurately in my judgment, that there is sufficient room in the schools throughout that District for teachers to observe and to student teach, if necessary, I think that indicates that there's really only a need for the lab school, as it is expressed by the universities. They are not being denied. They being the future teachers, the opportunity to be in that classroom, whether it's a lab school or any other school, particularly at I.S.U. So, I think we have to understand that when a local superintendent delivers the kind of information that we saw in that Committee Hearing that day, there is no hardship faced by that school district, that lab rather, and I think if the university wants to maintain that program, they can still maintain it. Other schools have discontinued it. Northern Illinois University, for example. University of Illinois chooses not to participate in this program. And I think what you have to understand is that this is a special interest proposal by Illinois State University. It's not the first, of course, that we hear from any of the universities, but you ought to be aware of what it is. I solicit a 'no' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Rich Brummer."

Brummer: "If it's not too soon, I'd like to move the previous question."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. The question is, shall the main question be put? All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed. The 'ayes' have it. We'll recognize those of you who had your lights on to explain your votes. Representative Bradley is recognized to close."

Bradley: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to respond to a few of the comments made in opposing the Bill. Number one,

there's a million fifty thousand dollars that comes out of the school formula money now, going to two of the local school districts that keep over 65% or 70% of those dollars to educate students they don't have. So, in balance, we'll probably be better off under this proposal and I'm sure we will in total, when we think about the dollars in the Board of Regents Appropriation Bill that can be deleted. We'll be better off financially, at least the State of Illinois will be. I was questioned by one Member about the type of students we have and how we select them. I'd like to, for the record, say that we have more minority students in the lab schools than we have in the other two local school districts. As far as the teacher training part of the program, the lab schools are used solely to provide the two hours credit for observation time that is necessary for those young men and women who want to become teachers. Their practice teaching can be done any place in the State of Illinois and it's done that way. But, the observation that is required and two hours credit is done in the lab schools. It's a, I think a good solution to a problem of threat of closing those schools that we've had for a good many years and I realize that other lab schools have been closed in other universities. However, Illinois State University is and has been recognized for years as the number two, three or four teacher education university in the United States and surely, number one in the State of Illinois, and I think it is imperative that we give the school the stability it needs and that will happen with this Bill. Thank you very much."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, shall House Bill 3498 pass? All those in favor, vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. The Chair recognizes Representative Stuffle to explain his vote. One minute."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I rise only to say this that I think Representative Bradley has a good Bill here. I think it will be a detriment to many people if we were to allow another lab school to go under for whatever reason and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Kopp, to explain his vote. One minute."

Kopp: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'd just like to correct a couple of statements. This is one of the finest special education schools that is in the Country, dealing with a lot of multiple handicapped young students that would be very difficult for alot of schools to take care of. They're doing an excellent job. They have a higher percentage of minority students. More so than in any other part of our county and they are handling some twelve to twenty foreign students that one of the school districts was in no position to handle at the present time. I urge a favorable vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Satterthwaite, to explain her vote. One minute."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I regret the debate was cut off on this Bill, because I had a number of questions to ask the Sponsor."

Speaker Flinn: "Why don't you ask him and I'll recognize him."

Satterthwaite: "I think there was a mistaken statement on the House Floor that this Bill affects only S.I.U. and I believe Jerry that you told me earlier that it does affect all lab schools. Someone else said that the U. of I. chooses not to participate under this program. I don't know what that means, but I do know that the U. of I. does have a lab school, which will presumably be affected by this program. I don't know whether they are opposed or not, but I know that some of my local school districts have problems with the Bill,

even with the Amendment that went on yesterday. The other question I wanted to have answered was, why in some areas are these students being counted as public school students, if they are not attending there? It's my understanding that in Champaign County they are not counted as public school students and are therefore not getting reimbursement through that program. If that's true, then it seems to me that we end up having less money in the formula for all the school children of the State, if we put these children under the program as well. I'm going to have to vote 'present' because I don't have the answers to those questions."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Dyer, to explain her vote."

Dyer: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. My opposition is similar to that of Representative Schneider. We heard this Bill in Committee and no local taxing effort is required by the lab school districts under this proposal. The State is going to have to pick up the tab on this. You'll notice in your analysis, those of us on the Republican side, that if this Bill does not go through, the I.S.U. would have to continue to fund this school as they have been doing, since it's an educational program for their teachers, and they would have paid \$817,000. If this Bill goes through, their direct support would drop to \$291,000 and you and I, the taxpayers from other parts of the State would be picking up that tab. The maximum multiplier is used, the maximum tax rate, when calculating aid here, even though no local taxing effort is required. This is an elitist school. We heard from superintendent of the public schools in the area that they have declining enrollment. They have vacant school rooms. They could absorb all these children in the normal school system. The prospective teachers could get practice teaching under normal

teaching conditions, not under special hot house conditions of the lab school. If this continues to show more than 89 votes, I'm going to request a verification."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Preston, to explain his vote."

Preston: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I'm rising to explain my 'aye' vote for this good Bill. This Bill will not only allow Southern Illinois University to maintain its laboratory school and provide for the education the students enrolled in that school, but will also permit the training of teachers that will go throughout the State of Illinois to teach students elsewhere and this is not an elitist school. This is a laboratory school where conditions can be controlled for experimentation, for providing experimental programs, to arrive at an education program that is beneficial not only to the children of that laboratory school, but the schools throughout the State of Illinois and I strongly encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Dolly Hallstrom to explain her vote. Hallstrom."

Hallstrom: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this legislation. Not too long ago, I thought I'd be standing up and asking you to vote against it, but I also was in the Higher Education Committee when the Bill was heard. I feel very comfortable with the Amendments that are on there. I have been to the lab school. I know the importance of that lab school for handicapped youngsters. I would urge you to support the legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Change your button. Push your button. It hasn't been turned off yet. Have all voted who wish?"

The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 101 'ayes', 49 'nays'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. For what purpose does Representative Dyer arise?"

Dyer: "Well, I withdraw my request for a verification. I just hope the Senate will kill it."

Speaker Flinn: "Thank you. House Bill 3555. Representative McGrew."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3555. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of the Public Community College Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you...thank you very much Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I ask leave to move House Bill 3555 back to Second Reading for purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has asked leave to move the Bill back to Second Reading. Is there any objection? Representative Keane, do you object? Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Yes, I object to moving this back to Second for an Amendment. When the Bill came out of the Higher Education Committee, it was my impression that there would be no major Amendments and as to oppose the major Amendment, I would ask...and therefore, I object."

Speaker Flinn: "Objections being heard, leave is not granted. Representative Dunn, for what purpose do you arise? Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I was going to rise for the same reason. I, too, think that it ought to leave on Third Reading."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Brummer, for what purpose do you arise?"

Brummer: "Yes, a question of the Chair. I know nothing

about the Amendment. I thought it was routine procedure that Bills requested by the Sponsor could be moved back to Second Reading for an Amendment and I would like..."

Speaker Flinn: "It is if there's no objections."

Brunner: "And if there are objections, what are the alternatives of the Sponsor?"

Speaker Flinn: "The alternative, I assume, would be the Sponsor to make a motion to move it back."

Brunner: "And how many votes does that require?"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Brunner. What was your last remark. I'm sorry, I didn't hear you. Brunner. Turn him off. Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Well, then, Mr. Speaker, I would move that for permission to take this Bill back to Second Reading."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman moves that House Bill 3555 be returned to Second Reading. Any discussion on the motion? No discussion? All those in favor, vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Motion. Motion to return to Second Reading. Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Frankly, what I'm attempting to do here, is to give an alternative funding system for the junior college system. Right now, we have only one Bill and that is in the Senate. I explained in Committee when I asked that this Bill be voted out that it was a vehicle Bill and I would be happy to play the record for anyone who would be interested in hearing it. I was interested in looking at alternatives. Currently, there are major proposals in legislation in changing the funding system to two years prior enrollment. We're talking about a great deal of increase in the disadvantaged student categories. We're talking about a great shift of dollars and as a matter of fact, if we adopt the Amendment, the Bill coming from the Senate, you will

see sixteen junior college districts in the State of Illinois with less dollars than they received last year. I mean fewer dollars and no inflation taken into consideration. To be quite honest, this Amendment would change that so there would only be three school districts instead of sixteen who would receive less and two of those that receive less would receive less than they would have otherwise. In other words, they would receive more dollars under this proposal for all thirty-seven districts out of thirty-eight, if we adopt this Amendment. It's an alternative to what is going. I, frankly, have got the print outs, so we can get into it if you want to. I assume that, frankly, normally we receive leave to amend a Sponsor's Bill the way he would like to and it was inadvertent that we didn't make that decision first. I would ask for the necessary votes to do that."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Dwight Friedrich."

Friedrich: "I think he has the necessary votes. I just was going to say, I think it's a bad precedence when a Sponsor can't take his Bill back to Second Reading for an Amendment. You don't have to vote for the Amendment and I probably won't, but I think he ought to be in control of his Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "We need to get the Parliamentarian to the rostrum please. Parliamentarian. Representative Keane, for what purpose do you arise?"

Keane: "To explain my vote, Mr. Speaker. The Bill Sponsor was quite correct. As the Bill came out of the Higher Education Committee, it was a vehicle and was so noted and it was felt that as Chairman, he would not move the vehicle unless he discussed what he was going to use it for with the Minority Spokesman and with members of his own Party on the Higher Education Committee. This did not occur. It's not to my way of

thinking. I've listened to Representative Friedrich. It's a Committee Bill. It is not an individual's Bill and I'm not at all happy that we voted out the vehicle, which I thought before it was amended, would have some concurrence by the Members and it didn't occur."

Speaker Flinn: "This question takes 89 votes, I'm advised by the Parliamentarian. Any further discussion on the motion? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative McGrew, for what purpose do you arise? Turn him off. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 92 'ayes', 39 'nays' and Representative Keane would like to have a verification of the affirmative votes and Representative McGrew would like to have a poll of the absentees. Am I right? We weren't making much progress forward, so we're going slower backwards. Tim Donovan 'aye', when you get the sheet out. Wikoff. Where's Wikoff? 'Aye' over here. Breslin 'aye'. Braun 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees. Beatty. Bluthardt. Borchers. Bradley. Burnidge. Capparelli. Casey. Chapman. Cullerton. Currie. Davis. DiPrima. Ebbesen. Ewell. Flinn. Gaines. Goodwin. Griesheimer. Hannig. Harris. Emil Jones. Kane. Katz. Klosak. Kornowicz. Laurino. Leverenz. McAuliffe. McPike. Mugalian. Neff. Richmond. Schisler. Schlickman. Slape. Stearney. E. G. Steele. Stuffle. Totten. Vitek. Williams. Younge. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Verify the Affirmative Roll Call. Representative Kelly votes 'aye'. Oh, I recognize Representative Kelly. Wants to vote 'no'. Proceed."

Clerk O'Brien: "From 'aye' to 'no'. Poll of the Affirmative. Abramson. Ackerman. Anderson. Balanoff. Barnes. Bell. Bianco. Birchler. Boucek.

Bower. Bowman. Braun. Breslin. Brunner. Campbell.
 Capuzi. Christensen. Collins. Conti. Daniels.
 Darrow. Deuster. Donovan. John Dunn. Epton.
 Virginia Frederick. Dwight Friedrich. Greiman.
 Hallock. Hallstrom. Hanahan. Henry. Hoffman.
 Hudson. Huff. Huskey. Jaffe. Johnson. Dave Jones.
 Karpziel. Kent. Kucharski. Leinenweber. Leon.
 MacDonald. Mahar. Margalus. Marovitz. Matula.
 Mautino. McBroom. McCourt. McGrew. McMaster.
 Molloy. Mulcahey. Murphy. Oblinger. O'Brien.
 Pechous. Peters. Pierce. Polk. Preston. Pullen.
 Rea. Reed. Reilly. Rigney. Robbins. Ropp. Ryan.
 Satterthwaite. Schneider. Schoeberlein. Schraeder.
 Schuneman. Sharp. Simms. Skinner. Stanley.
 Steczo. C. M. Stiehl. Sumner. Swanstrom. Telcser.
 Tuerk. VanDuynes. Vinson. VonBoeckman. Walsh.
 Watson. Wikoff. Winchester. Sam Wolf. No further."

Speaker Flinn: "We have some changes now. I'm going to try to pick them up. I've got to go slow, because the Clerks have got to have time to change them. Davis 'aye'. Ewing from 'no' to 'aye'. Hoxsey from 'no' to 'aye'. Marovitz 'aye'. Oh, wait a minute. 'Present'? Representative Marovitz."

Marovitz: "There's one left Mr. Speaker. I'd like to go from 'aye' to 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "Oh, from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative okay. I've got a bunch of them. Representative Chapman 'aye'. Representative Younge 'aye'. Representative Neff 'aye'. Representative Everett Steele 'aye'. Am I going too... Neff before Steele. Chapman, Younge, Neff and Steele 'aye'. Richmond 'aye'. Burnidge 'aye'. Doris Karpziel 'aye'. Any further changes? Leon 'aye'. Oh. From 'aye' to 'no', Leone, I'm sorry about that. Leone...yes. Collins 'no'. From 'aye' to 'no'. Williams 'aye', Jack Williams 'aye'. Any further changes before we

have questions to the affirmative? We're starting out, Representative Keane, with 101 'ayes'."

Keane: "Representative Epton."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Epton. The Gentleman is not in his seat. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him from the Roll."

Keane: "Representative Hanahan."

Speaker Flinn: "Hanahan. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him from the Roll."

Keane: "Representative Abramson."

Speaker Flinn: "Abramson. He's back there in the middle aisle."

Keane: "Representative Anderson."

Speaker Flinn: "Anderson. He's in his seat...at his seat..."

Keane: "Representative Daniels."

Speaker Flinn: "Lee Daniels. In his seat."

Keane: "Pardon me."

Speaker Flinn: "He's in his seat, on the phone."

Keane: "Representative Huskey."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Herbert Huskey is not in his seat. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him from the Roll."

Keane: "Representative Jaffe."

Speaker Flinn: "Who was that?"

Keane: "Jaffe."

Speaker Flinn: "Aaron Jaffe is not in his seat. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him from the Roll."

Keane: "Representative Johnson."

Speaker Flinn: "Tim Johnson. I don't see him in his seat. Is the Gentleman on the floor? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him from the Roll."

Keane: "Representative Kucharski."

Speaker Flinn: "Kucharski. He is not in his seat. Yes he is. No he isn't either. I don't see him. Is he on the Floor? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him from the Roll."

Keane: "Representative McCourt."

Speaker Flinn: "Mccourt. Back by his seat. Representative Henry, for what purpose do you arise? Representative Henry."

Henry: "Mr. Speaker. Change my 'yes' to 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "Henry from 'yes' to 'no'."

Keane: "Representative McMaster."

Speaker Flinn: "Tom McMaster is not...yes he is...he is in his seat. There he is, standing up."

Keane: "Representative Molloy."

Speaker Flinn: "Vince Molloy. There he is in the middle aisle."

Keane: "Representative Oblinger."

Speaker Flinn: "Oblinger. She's in her seat. Representative Doug Huff, for what purpose do you arise?"

Huff: "How am I voted, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Flinn: "How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Huff: "Change me to 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "Huff from 'aye' to 'no'."

Keane: "Representative Preston."

Speaker Flinn: "Preston. I don't see him in his seat. Is the Gentleman on the Floor? How's he recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him from the Roll."

Keane: "Representative Rigney."

Speaker Flinn: "Harlan Rigney. In his seat."

Keane: "Representative Ropp."

Speaker Flinn: "Ropp. The Gentleman is not in his seat. Is he on the Floor? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Take him from the Roll."

Keane: "Representative Schoeberlein."

Speaker Flinn: "Schoeberlein. Allan Schoeberlein. Is in his seat."

Keane: "Representative VonBoeckman."

Speaker Flinn: "VonBoeckman. The Gentleman is not in his seat. Herbert Huskey's back. Put Huskey back on. Mr. VonBoeckman. How is he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "VonBoeckman is recorded..."

Speaker Flinn: "Here...Here he is, on the Floor. VonBoeckman just walked in."

Keane: "Representative Winchester."

Speaker Flinn: "Winchester. Bob Winchester's back there in his seat."

Keane: "Representative Steczo."

Speaker Flinn: "Steczko. Terry is back there."

Keane: "Representative Wolf."

Speaker Flinn: "Which one?"

Keane: "J. J."

Speaker Flinn: "J. J. Wolf."

Clerk O'Brien: "Gentleman voted 'no'."

Speaker Flinn: "He voted 'no'. Take him off."

Keane: "That's all I have."

Speaker Flinn: "On this question, there are 92 'ayes' and 42 'nos', and the motion prevails and the Bill is on Second Reading. House Bill 3555 is on Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1. McGrew. Amends House Bill 3555 by deleting everything after the enacting clause and so forth."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative McGrew. Sam McGrew."

McGrew: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Frankly, I've tried to be as

straight forward on the proposal as I can. I will be putting out a memo to each and every member as the Bill reaches Third Reading that will show you precisely the rate categories. It will show you the additional disadvantaged grants credit hours, equalization and so on and so forth in junior college funding. As I said earlier, I have tried to come up with a compromise proposal. Right now, they are making changes that would make this effective on 1977 enrollment, instead of the projected current enrollment, which is a great change, especially for those junior colleges who have had an increase in enrollment. They are really going to lose if we don't have some sort of phase in proposal. The Amendment, now before you, does not hurt any junior college district whatsoever. In fact, the vast majority are helped. I would hope that I could have the Amendment adopted and address the Bill on Third Reading in depth and I assure you, you will have that information on your desk at that time."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is, shall Amendment #1 be adopted? Representative Keane. Representative Keane is recognized."

Keane: "Yes, I'd like to speak to the Amendment, which is in effect the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Proceed."

Keane: "At the present time, in the Senate, the community colleges have worked hard and diligently to bring together to an acceptable formula that all junior college groups could accept. They worked that out. I met with members from downstate junior colleges and Chicago junior colleges and they indicated that they would hope that everyone would get behind the Amendment, or the Bill that is presently in the Senate. This Amendment is totally opposite to the

thing that has been worked out by the junior colleges and I would ask that you vote to kill the Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Representative McGrew, would you yield to a question?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Stuffle: "Sam, have you discussed this Amendment with the trustees of the community college board, the board or any of the downstate community college district presidents or the like?"

McGrew: "Yes, yes and yes. While we met frankly in two separate meetings and I did not restrict the discussion at that point to the proposal that is now before you. As a matter of fact, I had five different proposals which we went into the strengths and weaknesses of each one as an alternative to what has been recommended by the junior college boards. I contacted the presidents from my area of the State and discussed it with them and you know, I have not frankly taken it to the junior college boards themselves, but for, but in front of their delegates and representatives of the Legislature."

Stuffle: "What was the response from the community college presidents that you presented this particular Amendment to?"

McGrew: "Well, the junior college presidents are 100%, that I spoke to, are 100% behind this proposal. They were frankly, quite worried on the phase in going back, oh, I'm sorry, just immediately going back to two years previous enrollment. The Bill in the Senate will have the junior college funding system based on 1977 enrollment and obviously, there has been a great deal of changes since that time. I don't argue with a great deal of their logic in trying to get concrete numbers instead of an abstract guess, as what they

have had in the past. My Bill does still allow for those concrete numbers. What I am attempting to do, frankly, is to phase in the great shift of dollars that would occur if we went to this formula change immediately."

Stuffle: "Mr. Speaker, to the Amendment of Representative McGrew. As a downstater, I find myself in the unique and odd position, because Representative McGrew is trying to shift some money around that would place a bit more money downstate and take a bit more money away from Chicago. But, in the last two or three hours, I have been able to talk with not only representatives of the Chicago City College System, but also downstate presidents. I do not dispute what Representative McGrew says at all because he's a man of his word with regard to what he said about his president. But, I discussed this particular Amendment with the presidents in my area, with others in some other areas, and I can assure you that they have given their word as have I, in the fact that I will be receiving those Bills from the Senate he's talking about, from Senator Bruce that we would go with the proposal of the community college board, as it exists now. Many would like to have more money. I'm sure the City of Chicago would like to have more money as we downstate would, but I reluctantly have to oppose the Amendment, because I and other downstaters, including presidents and local boards have given their word to accept the proposal that is now on the table in the Senate. That is agreed to by, as I understand, most previously, if not all previously, of the groups of trustees. It would be nice to have more money for us downstate. I don't think that much is being shifted. I understand only about four to five million out of a budget of some hundred...one hundred and thirty six million dollars. So, I regretably and

reluctantly rise to oppose the Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Brummer. Mr. Brummer."

Brummer: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Flinn: "Indicates he will."

Brummer: "Apparently, the Illinois Community College Board is not in support of this Amendment?"

McGrew: "I would say that they are not."

Brummer: "Are they in support of the Bill unamended?"

McGrew: "Absolutely not."

Brummer: "So, they're in support of neither proposal."

McGrew: "That is correct. Frankly, as I attempt to explain, we are shifting the entire funding system mechanism, changing categories, adding the basic adult education category, adding the GED program, as a specific line item, we are going back on enrollments that are two years old, so we can get hard numbers and frankly, those are the kinds of changes that we are addressing. As I said, I frankly, have most of those kinds of changes in my Amendment. What I'm attempting to do is a one year phase in that will not see the shift of dollars that make such drastic changes. No school district, under this, is really facing a great deal of difficulty under the types of programs. My Amendment, no school district would receive fewer dollars than they would under the current funding system."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I want to apologize for a while ago, opposing bringing back this Bill, if indeed I need to apologize for it. I really was opposed to the Bill in any form, because it doesn't...it's not the Governor's budget. It is not part of the community college program and I thought probably the easiest way was to go ahead and take the Bill on Third Reading and try to defeat it there as it was. I know that Representative McGrew told us in the Committee that it was a shell Bill. I

thought maybe that it was going to hold it until we found out what happened to the community college formula in the Senate and since the Bill now has been amended, it still makes it a bad Bill in the fact that it is not in accordance with what the Board of the Community College Boards want. It's not the Governor's budget, it's not in his request. The money is not distributed as it will be in the form that it will come over from the Senate. So, I would urge now, I would urge the defeat, if I..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative McGrew. Do you wish to close?"

McGrew: "Well, thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just ask for your support."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is, shall Amendment #1 be adopted to House Bill 3555? All those in favor vote 'aye', those oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Skinner, for what purpose do you arise?"

Skinner: "Well, I thought I might explain my 'yes' vote."

Speaker flinn: "Explain it."

Skinner: "Well, I'll try to Sir. This takes money away from Chicago and gives it to most downstate junior college districts in the formula, and it seems to me for that reason anybody that's outside of Chicago, probably ought to be in favor of this Amendment. Isn't that right, Mr. McGrew? What? Well, that's what McGrew's printout said. So, you know. Take your choice of sources."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 60 voting 'aye' and 76 voting 'no' and the Amendment loses. Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, I want to verify the negative."

Spoker Flinn: "He has that right. No, that's the winning

side. The negative is the winning side. He does have that right. I suppose, Representative McGrew, you would like to have a poll of the absentees. No."

McGrew: "No, not yet."

Speaker Flinn: "Give us a poll of the negative votes."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the negative. Alexander. Balanoff. Beatty. Bianco. Birkinbine. Forchers. Boucek. Braun."

Speaker Flinn: "O'Brien, 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bullock. Burnidge. Capparelli. Catania. Collins. Cullerton. Currie. Darrow. Dawson. DiPrima. Domico. Doyle. Ralph Eunn. Farley. Virginia Frederick. Dwight Friedrich. Gaines. Garmisa. Getty. Goodwin. Greiman. Griesheimer. Grossi. Hallock. Harris. Hudson. Emil Jones. Kent. Keane. Kornowicz. Kosinski. Krska. Kucharski. Kulas. Lechowicz. Leon. Madigan. Mahar. Marovitz. McAuliffe. McBroom. McCourt. Molloy. O'Brien. Patrick. Peters. Piel. Polk. Pouncey. Preston. Richmond. Ronan. Sandquist. Schoeberlein. Simms. Stanley. E. G. Steele. C. M. Stiehl. Stuffle. Swanstrom. Taylor. Telcser. Terzich. Vitek. Walsh. Willer. Williamson. J. J. Wolf. and Yourell."

Speaker Flinn: "I've got some changes. Hallock from 'no' to 'aye'. Simms from 'no' to 'aye'. Richmond from 'no' to 'aye'. Campbell to 'aye'. Birkinbine, 'aye'. Deuster, 'aye'. Satterthwaite, 'aye'. Everett Steele, 'aye'. Ed McBroom, 'aye'. Doris Karpel, 'aye'. Burnidge, 'aye'. Hudson, 'aye'. Am I going too fast? Schoeberlein from 'no' to 'aye'. Griesheimer, 'aye'. Polk. For what purpose do you rise, Representative Polk?"

Polk: "Would it be any easier to dump it and take a new one? You've got quite a change and apparently, there's a lot of changes."

Speaker Flinn: "No, I don't have very many more requests. I think we're pretty well along, if they don't keep jumping up. Representative Reed, 'aye'. Pierce, 'aye'. I got you, Reed. Mary Lou, I got you. Mahar, 'aye'. Swanstrom, 'aye'. Cissy Stiehl, 'aye'. Margalus, 'no'. Margalus, 'no'. Flinn 'aye'. Tim Bell, 'no'. Giorgi, 'no'. Yourell, 'aye'. Garmisa wants to be verified as 'no'. Okay. Mulcahey. Garmisa wants to be verified as 'no'. Okay. Verified. I see no other changes. Give us the count. There are 82 'ayes' and 79 'nos', and Representative Mulcahey, do you want to still check the 'nos'?"

Mulcahey: "If I can. Yes, Sir."

Speaker Flinn: "You sure can. You're first then, Representative Keane is after you, I believe. Representative McGrew."

McGrew: "Mr. Speaker I think the prevailing side has to be verified first and in light of the changes the prevailing side is the 'yes' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, when we started, the prevailing side was the 'nos'. It really doesn't make a lot of difference, because both are going to be challenged. I'm sure Representative Keane doesn't have his light on just to speak to me. Piel from 'no' to 'present'. Pat Grossi from 'no' to 'present'. Bay Christensen wants to be verified. You're verified. Chapman wants to vote 'aye'. Genie Chapman. We're a long way away from getting the count. We have one of the Clerks copying them down, and we have to post them all and count them. So, we'll be at ease for a few minutes. I'd like to point out, while we're moving Bills back to Second...while we're fighting over Amendments, we are not passing anything on Third. Not any. We've had a total of nine Bills so far today. Three of those that were on Short Debate. We're doing just fine folks. Bill Henry. Representative Henry."

Henry: "Will you change my 'yes' to a 'no'?"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Dyer."

Dyer: "We're on 3555? Is it still open. I wanted to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, you'll have to change it, because the button's not open. No."

Dyer: "Okay."

Speaker Flinn: "You can't...we'll change you to 'no'."

Dyer: "No, I would like to vote 'yes'. I'm not..."

Speaker Flinn: "All right. We'll change you from..."

Dyer: "I was not..."

Speaker Flinn: "...not voting to voting 'yes'."

Dyer: "Right. Correct. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "All right."

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

McGrew: "Mr. Speaker, in light of all the changes, you know, if it would be agreeable to the opposition, I'd be more than happy to take another Roll Call, and if everyone would hit their own switch accordingly, just let it fly. Then you can challenge it on Third win or lose."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Mr. Kane, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Kindly record Mr. Kane as 'aye', please. Mrs. Younge. Change Mrs. Younge from 'aye' to 'no'. Mr. Bianco. Mr. Bianco. No, that's all right. He...the Lady from Kane, Mrs. Karpziel, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Shut her off. What's the count, Jack? On this question, there are 85 'ayes', 62 'nos', and Mr. Keane persists in his request for a verification...withdraws his request for a verification, and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. I'm...I'm sorry. There

was a request for a fiscal note as amended, and the Bill remains on Second Reading. What...? Yes, Mr. McGrew."

McGrew: "Is the Bill now on Third Reading?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "No, there was a request for a fiscal note as amended."

McGrew: "Mr. Speaker, this is the rate increase for the ordinary and contingent expenses for junior colleges. The Bill for funding is in the Senate and, as a matter of fact, this Bill is one thousand dollars less than the appropriation Bill now. I suggest that that is a ridiculous request."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, you can put it in writing and file it, I guess. It's on Second Reading."

McGrew: "No."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Where did we...where did we leave off? Were we on Third Readings, Jack? 3568. Mr. Schisler. Oh, I'm...the Gentleman from Henry, Mr. McGrew, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

McGrew: "Mr. Speaker, it's specifically in the House Rules that if there's a companion appropriation, you do not need a fiscal note."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's also in the Rules that if the request for a fiscal note is filed as amended, you've got to comply with the Rule."

McGrew: "Well, then...then you're telling me the Rules contradict each other in that category?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "I guess so."

McGrew: "Oh, come on."

Speaker Lechowicz: "3568."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3568. A Bill for An Act relating to farming by business organizations, family farm corporations, and authorized farm corporations. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Bradley: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 35..House Bill 3568 addresses itself to farm corporations and limiting to those corporations who are involved specifically in farming and it, it bans those corporations who, because this might be a...farming would be a secondary occupation to those corporations, or for an investment of some reason or another, that a corporation buys farm lands and becomes, gets into the farming industry, we are limiting, in fact, we are denying those corporations from continuing to operate or to renew or to initiate farming as a, as a, as a vocation...new corporate enterprise. It is a good piece of legislation that is designed to protect the farming industry of Illinois and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? Gentleman from Perry, Mr. Ralph Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. My Calendar shows that Representative Schisler is the Sponsor of the Bill. Is Representative Bradley a hyphenated Co-Sponsor?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes he is."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker. Thank you. I think that this Bill is the same Bill we've had, or nearly the same Bill we've had for the last eight years. It's a bad Bill. It's a Bill that we ought to look at carefully. It's one that would prevent corporations from owning farm lands. These corporations would include the coal companies as I understand it, unless the...if they use the land for farming while they're waiting to mine coal. It would include a lot of our farm groups that have corporations now. I talked to Representative Schisler about the Bill three or four times and I was of the opinion that he let it pass yesterday, I think he called it yesterday, and it wasn't heard. And I didn't think he was going to move it today. So, that's the reason I asked about the Sponsorship. If

it's going to be moved, I'd urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

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

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. There is a feeling on behalf of this Bill that it is going to protect and perpetuate the family farm in the State of Illinois. If you vote for this Bill on that premise, let me correct your thinking to the degree that it will not perpetuate and advance the family farm. If you're wanting to perpetuate the family farm, the thing that is in question as this point is the fact that the price of corn is only about \$2.40 a bushel. That the price of soy beans at this present time is about \$5.70 a bushel. The fact that interest rates are nearly 17 to 18% to purchase land or to purchase equipment. The thing that's going to hurt the family farm is, in fact, national administration policies which are in the position of causing those businesses to purchase equipment, fertilizer, and supplies at 17 to 25% increased costs over last year. With a projected income by the Federal Government's statistics in the area of a reduction this year, of all the way from 25 to 35% reduction in income this year over last year. That's the thing that's going to hurt family farms. There has been no evidence whatsoever that states, that corporations are discouraging family farms. Many of the corporations right now are the result of two brothers, or a father and son going together to become incorporated. We have not, at this time, enough evidence to indicate that foreign corporations are in the position to drive away or to put out of business family farms. They are having just as much trouble making an income on \$2.30 to 40 cents bushel corn when the costs are in the area of \$3.25. I urge your strong consideration on this to vote 'no' if you want to protect the family farm as

certainly this is not the procedure to go through if you want to give some support for rural Illinois."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Randolph, Mr. Birchler."

Birchler: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I have looked at this Bill, not through the eyes of an attorney, but through the eyes of a person that has worked with farm corporations in my particular area as a business consultant in helping them with their work, and I have had nothing but negative calls from the farmers in the area that have these corporations. Particularly, in our area we have a lot of coal mine strip land. We have families that claim the ground back after it's been stripped, have the father, son, or grandchildren involved in their corporations, and those people have been calling and asking that we defeat this particular Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. Ackerman."

Ackerman: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Ackerman: "Does the Farm Bureau support this Bill, Mr. Bradley?"

Bradley: "I'm not aware of their position."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Thank you. Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Robbins."

Robbins: "I talked with Mr. Schisler earlier this afternoon. The Farm Bureau does support this Bill. He did intend to call it. Why don't we take it out of the record for now until he gets back?"

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

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just like to point out what I consider to be two relatively serious shortcomings of this well-intentioned piece of legislation. Those of us who live in downstate Illinois are certainly well aware of the concern of our farmer friends for the

protection of the family farms and their concern about alien ownership. However, this concept has been worked upon for two or three years now and every time we work on this Bill, there are a number of us who feel that, in spite of the well-intentioned efforts of the proponents, loopholes always remain. I'd just like to point out that one of the exemptions as I read the Bill is agricultural land which is pledged as security to a business corporation, and if you take out a mortgage to a bank which is a corporation State of Illinois or to a savings and loan or to anyone else who is incorporated, you may thereby exempt that particular tract of land from the scope of this Act. And if you can exempt it that easily, you have a serious loophole which would be available to alien owners to dodge this particular legislation. In addition, if you are one of the farmers who'll be required to comply with the reporting provisions of this legislation, you had better beware because the penalties are very severe for failure to...for failure to comply with the provisions about ownership of foreign farm land a penalty can run from 10,000 to 50,000 dollars. For failure to comply with the reporting provisions contained in this particular piece of legislation the penalty can run from 1,000 to 5,000 dollars if there is a failure contained in the report as originally filed. If, however, the report is late, if the farmer overlooks the report and is as much as a year late in filing the report, a farmer can be subjected to a 50,000 dollar fine for failure to file the report required by this legislation. This is someone who owns the family farm. This is someone who is a natural citizen. This is someone who is on the land maybe for 100 years. This is not someone we're trying to attack. This is not someone we're trying to get off the ground. This is a person who is intended

to be protected by this legislation. This person can be subject to a 50,000 dollar fine as a result of this legislation just for failure to comply with the requirement to complete a form. I think those of you who represent farmers ought to take a long, hard look at this particular piece of legislation. It is well-meaning, but it may create a monster."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Bradley, do you want to persist in calling this Bill?"

Bradley: "Yes, Mr. Schisler indicated that because of the priority of call we may never get back to the Bill again. He wanted to go ahead with the Bill. I'd just like to say to the Members..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, before you close, I just want to know if you want to still continue with the Bill."

Bradley: "Alright."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Vinson: "Representative Bradley, I'm trying to read the Bill and get the scheme of it. As I understand the Bill from a quick reading, it prohibits certain kinds of ownership of farm land and it allows some entities to own farm land. Is that correct?"

Bradley: "That's correct."

Vinson: "Now, among the entities that can own farm land in some cases a corporation can own farm land?"

Bradley: "Correct."

Vinson: "Now, under what circumstances can a corporation not own farm land?"

Bradley: "There are specific exemption...or specific restrictions on...in the Bill it spells it out. I'm trying to see..."

Vinson: "Let me ask a more specific question that might get to the heart of my concern. If a corporation, if a farmer formed a corporation and that corporation had

two purposes: One was to own his farming operation and the second was to own, let's say, a gasohol production still. Would that be impermissible under this Bill?"

Bradley: "You're asking if he would be restricted to just doing one or the other and he couldn't do both."

Vinson: "Yeah. A corporation that did both things. Would it be prohibited?"

Bradley: "The Bill, as I read it, if it's related...if they are related one to the other within the corporation I think that they can actually do both. There has to be that relation. Whether that would come under the definition, I'm assuming that it will. It's farming practices whether it be the production of corn or beans or timber, feeding livestock, whatever it might be. If it comes under that definition. I'm assuming that they could also be in the gasohol business."

Vinson: "My second question, in the case of a secret land trust, in the case of a secret land trust, do I read the Bill correctly that in effect the prohibition for a land trust to hold farm land depends on the nature of the beneficiaries of the trust?"

Bradley: "Yes. Yes."

Vinson: "Okay, now, let's assume that I'm a farmer and I have farm land and I'm in business...I buy some more farm land through a trust, a land trust, and one of the beneficiaries who comes into this to buy the farm land with me has a business downtown that's in the automobile business, a car dealer. In that case, and it's a fifty-fifty deal, in that case, is that land trust prohibited because of the nature of the beneficiary?"

Bradley: "I think that you're correct that they would be restricted. I think he would be prohibited under the language in the Bill. It provides that if you were engaged in that type of an operation prior to January

of '81, you may continue but not to expand that business, and so I'm assuming that, in the Bill after 1931, that yes he would be restricted from taking in a partner that was solely in another business."

Vinson: "Like to speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Please proceed."

Vinson: "I would like to associate myself in this case with Representative Robbins' request, Representative Bradley. I think that...I know you've been involved in this effort for a long time and in the past on a number of occasions I've voted for legislation like this, but I think Representative Robbins and Representative Dunn have raised important points. We're going at an awfully delicate thing. We're, I think, naturally concerned and you're naturally concerned about the threat of large corporations who are out of the agriculture business entirely coming in and tying up huge amounts farm land as they have in some parts of the country. But, there's another side to the issue when you can get into an issue this complex. And you may end up prohibiting a number of arrangements that are totally normal, totally consistent with the concept of small family farms which I don't think in your heart you would want to...you would want to prohibit. And I think it might be a mistake for us to move ahead with the Bill at this time and I want to say that I understand your long-standing concern and involvement in this and your entirely beneficial motivation, but I'm concerned about it."

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

Bradley: "Mr. Speaker, this...I share the concern of the previous speaker on some of the issues. However, this Bill, in exactly the same form, House Bill 1357, of the 80th General Assembly was adopted by the Illinois

House and was passed. I think if you look in Section 4 of the Bill, regarding the definition of the restriction on no business organization or non-resident alien may acquire agricultural land or engage in farming or have any interest in real estate suitable for farming in this State, and a business organization which holds or has acquired agricultural land or is engaged in farming may continue to farm takes care, I think, of some of your concern. And on...under Section 1 under...on page 1 defining business organization means any trust, corporation, partnership, limited partnership, persons, or organization serving a fiduciary capacity or business arrangement other than authorized farm business. I think it pretty well spells out who this applies to. I don't think it has anything to do with...as one Gentleman said whether corn is \$2.50 or \$3.50, we're not addressing ourselves to that problem. We're addressing ourselves to corporations other than...are in business other than in farming and aliens who are purchasing farm land. We're restricting them and we're trying to protect Illinois farm lands to continue to be in the hands of Illinois farmers and I ask for the support as was given before in the House of Representatives. I simply ask on behalf of Representative Schisler for that same kind of support. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall House Bill 3568 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'no'. Leave me out Mike. Vote me 'no'. Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Borchers, to explain his vote."

Borchers: "Mr. Speaker and fellow Members of the House. We're really farmers and I'm thoroughly in support of the idea of what's trying to be done but there are some unanswered questions here that just leaves enough doubt in my mind. I think we should vote 'no' 'til we

have them all cleared up. The idea's good, but I think there's some dangerous angles as my fellow Representative from Macon County pointed out as to possible serious consequences. So, I think we should vote 'no' 'til we know more about it."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 28 'ayes', 93 'nos', 7 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having re...failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. 3577."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3577. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3577..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "It's me. I'm sorry."

Terzich: "One more time. Okay. House Bill 3577 exempts vehicles operated by or for any county, township or municipal corporation from the \$8 registration fee and requires that vehicles as well as state vehicles display externally identification number as evidence of ownership. We amended the Bill to replace exterior decals with permanent plates. This will aid in the identification of state and local vehicles for law enforcement purposes and also will solve municipality problems in regard to reducing the paperwork which is necessary for this annual registration. This was worked out with the Secretary of State, it will also provide that over 38,000 vehicle...or state plates to have to be issued for fire vehicles, ambulances, squadrols and all municipal vehicles will only be required to purchase one plate and will be registered and they will not have to continuously annually renew that and it will save a tremendous amount of time and expense for all of the municipalities in the State of

Illinois."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 3577 pass? All in favor, vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'no'. Jack, vote me 'aye'. Have...Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Getty."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker. I was trying to get your attention. I wanted to ask the Sponsor, if in the Senate, it is his intention in accordance with the conversation that I had with Secretary of State, to clean it up so that counties and townships are, indeed, included, and not merely municipalities, in accord with the question we raised yesterday."

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

Terzich: "It's my understanding that you did speak with the Secretary of State's Office, who, you know, I cooperated with in writing this Bill and there's no problem on that end, Mike. I always like a clean Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question, there's 135 'ayes', 4 'nos', 2 recorded as 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Calendar, appears House Bill 3271. Mr. Marovitz. Is he on the Floor?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3271. A Bill for An..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to bring the Bill back from Third to Second for the purpose of Amendment. Any objection? Hearing none, the Bill's on Second Reading. Amendments from the Floor."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3. Katz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Katz. I'm sorry, it's Amendment #2."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #2. Katz."

Katz: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, what I desire to do with the consent of the Sponsor, is to table Amendment #1, to

withdraw Amendment #2 and to move to adopt Amendment #3, that's been distributed."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? Question is, shall Amendment #2 be adopted? What?"

Katz: "No, Mr. Speaker, we moved to table Amendment 1, to withdraw Amendment 2 and to adopt Amendment 3."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Alright. Gentleman moves that the House reconsiders the votes by which Amendment #1 was adopted. Using the attendance of Roll Call, it's been approved. The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #2. Now, Amendment #3."

Katz: "Alright, now, Mr. Speaker, Amendment #3 is and deals with the problem of arson and what Amendment #3 does is to make it very clear that where a fire has occurred on the property and the fire inspector believe or suspect arson, and the property is owned in a land trust, that the fire inspector will be entitled to the list of the beneficiaries of that trust. That the fire inspector can also obtain the names of other property owned by the beneficiaries where a fire claim has been filed. That is the essence of Amendment #3, in addition to making clear that it applies where property is owned by a nominee, as well as owned in a land trust or where the property is owned by a corporation. In other words, what it does, is to provide important tools to fire inspectors to get at arson without, however, destroying the privacy that attaches to property owned in land trusts by people in which there has been no fire on that property."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Piel. Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Kosinski."

Kosinski: "Mr. Speaker. Arson, certainly in many of our districts, has been a problem. This will assist in the prosecution therein and if a second is in order, I would like to second this Amendment. The Amendment is being put on with the agreement of the Sponsor of the

Bill."

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

Dunn: "Two questions, Mr. Speaker. The first of which is how did we get to this Bill?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Leave of the House. What's your second question?"

Dunn: "That was to bring it back to Second. But, how did we get to this order of business?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Well, we got through with that page and the Gentleman had the request up here for some time."

Dunn: "Well, what order are we on? Are we on the Priority of Call?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "We're on 3271, Amendment #3."

Dunn: "Is that on the regular Calendar, the Priority of Call, or where are we?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "On the Priority of Call."

Dunn: "But, out of order. Did we have leave of the House to take this Bill out of order?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes we did."

Dunn: "I don't know anybody back here who heard that leave. Okay, that's question #1."

Speaker Lechowicz: "We used the attendance of Roll Call."

Dunn: "Alright. Question #2 is, we can't hear the explanation of the Amendment. Amendment #1, which was withdrawn seems to have some teeth in it to get at the ownership of land trust. What does Amendment #3 do?"

Katz: "Amendment #3 has more teeth in it, Mr. Dunn, than Amendment #1. Amendment #3 provides that where there has been a fire and a fire inspector suspects that arson may have been involved, that the legal owner of the land trust must supply the fire inspector a list of all of the beneficiaries of the land trust. And, in addition to that, if any of those beneficiaries has owned property upon which a previous claim for fire damage has been filed, they must supply that information under oath, to the fire inspector."

Similarly, the fire inspector can require this information where the property is held by a nominee or where the property is held by a corporation and so it is much broader in its impact when a fire has occurred on property than the previous Amendment #1. It still, however, leaves in effect, the privacy that has always attached to land trusts when no fire has occurred on the property and where no fire inspector has any suspicion of arson."

Dunn: "Under...what are the ground rules or how does the fire inspector decide when he suspects arson? Does he notify the legal title holder in writing and say, 'I suspect arson, please disclose the beneficiaries'?"

Katz: "He makes a request to the legal title holder."

Dunn: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any further discussion? Question is, shall Amendment #3 be adopted? All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Oppose. The 'ayes' have it. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 536."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 536. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of the Environmental Protection Agency. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Rea."

Rea: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 536 will amend the Environmental Protection Act by lowering the standards of, for sulphur dioxide emissions of the State to those of the Federal Air Quality Standards. As you know, we have had quite a problem in terms of the marketing of coal, the burning of Illinois coal and I would ask for a favorable vote on this Bill and would ask also that Representative Winchester closes."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Rea. There is an Amendment over here. Amendment #1. Is there any discussion?"

Gentleman from Adams, Mr. McClain."

McClain: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. With all due respect to the Sponsor, I stand in opposition to House Bill 536. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a very complicated issue and I'd like to try to explain the best I can, what this issue is about. We have in the State of Illinois, except for East St. Louis, Peoria and the metropolitan area of Chicago, a State law, saying the ambient quality standard for the rest of the State cannot be any more stringent than the federal. So, what we're faced with really is whether or not this Bill will lower the ambient quality standards of the metropolitan areas of East St. Louis, Peoria and the metropolitan area of Chicago, so that Illinois coal can be used. Actually, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill will not do that. It will not do what the Sponsor said. In fact, if you will talk to Coal Associations or others, in fact what it might do is restrict the mining of Illinois Coal in the State of Illinois. In fact, when the Bill was heard before the House Environmental Energy and Natural Resources Committee, the United Auto. and United Mine Workers would not even come and testify in support of the Bill and the Coal Association did not actively support the Bill when it came before us. They did testify in favor of it, but they did not apply pressure like you and I know that they can apply pressure when they want to. This Bill actually does not even go as far as we did last year. The Gentleman from the 59th District last year, had a Resolution in which the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency must report to us by July 1, 1980 on what we can do to help the areas of East St. Louis, Peoria and the Chicago metropolitan area, to lower the ambient quality standards without harming the air quality of those

three metropolitan areas. The Illinois Environmental Protection Agency is now preparing that study, which will get to us by July 1, 1980. In fact, I think Mr. Rea and Mr. Harris and Mr. Winchester were Sponsors of that piece of legislation. So, what we're faced with here is a Bill which sounds good, but which will not do what the Sponsors really want it to do. In fact, the general consensus is that it will restrict the mining of Illinois coal. It will not put coal miners back to work. The United Mine Workers did not sign a witness form in support of this piece of legislation and in fact, what we're faced with here is a piece of legislation that could be damaging to Illinois coal."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Schuneman."

McClain: "Excuse me? Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In no way is this impugning the integrity of the Sponsorship, which tried arduously for their coal miners to go back to work. Likewise, the House Environment Energy and Natural Resources Committee has passed numerous Bills that will indeed help the mining of Illinois coal. For instance, Representative Firchler passed a Bill with Representative Harris' Amendment on it. Mr. Rea and Mr. Winchester were Sponsors of that Bill, which took the transporting of out of state coal off the fuel adjustment clause. Now, that's a significant thing positively and it puts Illinois coal on an equal footing and in fact an economic advantage to western coal. This Bill will not do what the Sponsors want and, in fact, if it gets to the Governor's desk, the Governor will be forced to veto it which ends up being a political thing rather than anything else and if the Governor, under pressure, or unknowingly signs this piece of legislation, it could very much harm the mining of Illinois coal. I respect the Sponsors, but I ask you to hold off. Vote 'present' or 'no' on this piece of

legislation."

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

Tuerk: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Tuerk: "Well, I'm, I'm interested in the Bill. Now, to what extent will this Bill allow industrial plants or utility companies and so forth, the use of Illinois coal without use of scrubbers? Will that have any impact on that particular phase of the concept?"

Rea: "We feel that this..."

Tuerk: "Beg your pardon."

Rea: "We feel that this is a part of the overall program. This is, by the way, does exclude East St. Louis, Chicago, and Peoria, in the more metropolitan areas, there may be some more stringent regulations that should be imposed than what's imposed by the Federal. In terms of burning more coal, this would only be a part and perhaps would help some of the small power plants and it could even in terms of the blending. This will not solve the problem by itself, but we do feel that this will help in terms of being able to burn more of the Illinois coal. This will not replace the scrubbers or other cleaning devices that will be needed. And, I might also mention, that the Coal Association was there, Illinois Coal Association was in Committee and did testify on the Bill. U.M.W.A. took a neutral position. The person representing U.M.W.A., however, in talking to many of the presidents of the local unions throughout the area, and to the miners themselves, they feel that this will be very helpful. And, I might also mention, in regards to that, that there is a report that has been provided by the Legislative Council, in fact it's 509-130, where they say that information contained in this report shows a wide range of emission standards

for particularly sulfur dioxide. It also states that Illinois sulfur dioxide standards for both pre 1971 and small generating facilities are more stringent than the surveyed States. And they did survey a number of States."

Tuerk: "Well, I understand, I understand the fact that the Illinois regulations are stricter than federal, but I'm a bit confused relative the relationship of burning high sulfur coal as it relates to the use of scrubbers. Now you say it's going to encourage the use of Illinois coal and yet in order to meet the Environmental Standards, many of the companies and utilities do have to install the scrubbers, so how in effect, will this encourage the use of Illinois coal?"

Rea: "Probably, mainly through the blending effect. To blend low sulfur coal with of course the higher sulfur."

Tuerk: "Well, in other words, it would be the mixture of the low and the high. Therefore, you could meet the standards and therefore, burn more Illinois coal."

Rea: "Right."

Tuerk: "But, I'm also interested in the previous speaker's comments in opposition. I hope you will address yourself to that in your closing remarks."

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

Bullock: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I was wondering if the Sponsor would yield to a question."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Bullock: "Representative, has a piece of legislation similar to this, reached the Governor's desk before?"

Rea: "Yes, there was a Bill identical to this, I believe, two years ago and it failed to be overridden on the veto by, I believe one vote in the House. And, that was sponsored by, I believe Representative Hart and I believe Senator Donnewald."

Bullock: "In relationship to this particular piece of legislation in terms of sulfur dioxide emission standards, is it your intention that the federal standards would some way supersede these? Or, would this particular legislation any way run counter to existing federal regulations regarding the prescribed and determined type of sulfur dioxide emission standards?"

Rea: "The State standards, of course, would never be any lower than the federal."

Bullock: "I can't hear you."

Rea: "The State standards would at no time be any lower than the federal standards and there would be the, well, abiding by the federal air quality standards."

Bullock: "So, you're saying that this piece of legislation would in no way jeopardize Illinois' State rights in terms of setting the standards, in the event that these standards were considered to be too much in variance with federal standards that we could have possible court litigations? That's not your intent at this point."

Rea: "No it is not."

Bullock: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Schneider."

Schneider: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

I know this legislation probably is going to fly out of here, but we ought to be aware of the notion that we're dealing with. It's simply stated, if I understand the synopsis, we're simply going to lower the quality of air in Illinois to the federal standards. The problem with that, of course, is that it might be beneficial in some other State, but we're not a rural State. We have large metropolitan areas both around St. Louis and in Chicago, of course. The air level does not stop at the boundaries. So, what is very obviously clear, is that once again, what

we're trying to do is to lower the quality of air, and create the hazards to health that many people have clearly found evident in their own experience and certainly by medical data. There have been other ways that the industry has avoided, I think, its obligation to clean up the Illinois coal. I've been in this House for ten years and I think one of the first Committees I served on without much distinction obviously, was the Agricultural Committee. We dealt with this issue before. At that time, the power companies were all indicating that some day they would find that the scrubbers would be available to them. Well, even at that time, many countries, including England and Japan and others, had had great success with scrubbers. Now, what we're saying is ten years later, when we have had an opportunity to have seen the experience of many other countries as well as other scrubbers throughout the State, not the State, rather but throughout the country, Illinois is still reluctant to make that investment to clean the coal in Illinois. I don't see any reason why we ought to be responsible for the ineptness or the unwillingness of the various groups that need and use that coal by lowering our air standards. So, if you vote for this, remember you've got to be prepared to tell the people in the metropolitan area that they are going to allow lower air standards, quality air standards and it's going to affect us negatively. If you live in the Chicago area, if you live in the St. Louis area, they are going to be highly impacted areas and I believe you will do your citizens and your constituents an injustice by supporting such legislation. I solicit a 'no' vote."

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

Meyer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I couldn't concur more with Representative

McClain's statement. He said it well and he said it eloquently. This Bill should be defeated."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Rea, to close."

Rea: "I would call on Representative Winchester to close, please."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Surely. Gentleman from Hardin, Mr. Winchester, to close."

Winchester: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There have been some fairly decent arguments, I suppose, against the Bill. Representative McClain had quite a few very good remarks that he said. But, one of the things that I think that the Membership should understand, is this is an issue that's not going to go away, Mr. Speaker. It's an issue that's going to be with us until something is done. We have the greatest coal reserve in the free world right here in Illinois and we've got to do something to start promoting more and more use of Illinois coal. This may not be the answer, but it's something that we need to keep hanging around the General Assembly, to continue sending messages to the Illinois Department of...the Illinois EPA and the Federal EPA, but some of the biggest problems that I think that metropolitan areas are having, Mr. Speaker, is with the Federal, in the Federal Government, as far as their standards on sulfur emissions and that's through catalytic converters. Most of the sulfur problems that metropolitan areas are having is through catalytic converters which is emitting a tremendous amount of sulfur, which was not intended, but it is doing it. That's where the great problem is coming, not through the use of coal. And I think that we should give this piece of legislation real serious consideration. Perhaps Representative McClain is correct. I think he's a very knowledgeable person on

this particular subject. He probably has some good points. But, let us send it to the Governor. Let us send another message to the Governor, to the Illinois Department of Environmental Protection and to the Federal Government, that we want something done and we want it done soon. Because if we don't do things like this, eventually they're going to forget about us and nothing is ever going to be done. So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask, those who may not support this Bill or feel that it's a good Bill, to support it so that we can continue sending messages to the Federal Government and the State Environmental Protection Agency."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall House Bill 536 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'no'. Danny, get me. Have all voted who wish? Gentleman from Wayne, Mr. Robbins, to explain his vote. Timer's on."

Robbins: "Basically, all this Bill does, it says that Illinois' standards shall be no stricter than the federal standards. Why should Illinois have to have stricter standards than the federal standards? We can ship our coal to Indiana. We can ship it to Florida and burn it. Illinois should be able to burn its own coal."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Franklin, Mr. Rea."

Rea: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. In explaining my vote, I feel that this is very important that we do look at what's happening as far as the air quality standards. As I said earlier, this will not affect Chicago, Peoria and East St. Louis. I also might say, that in terms of Chicago, I have an article here from the Sun Times that sulfur dioxide, the highest twenty-four hour average was 60 micrograms per cubic meter of air. So, even at the present time, you're sulfur dioxide emissions, and that's what we are speaking to in terms of this Bill here today. I feel that Illinois coal is very important to our economy,

I'm for clean air, for clean water. But the same time, I feel that we are too stringent in terms of the burning of coal here in this State. This is not the total solution, but this is part of the overall solution to help..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman from Perry, Mr. Ralph Dunn. Timer's on."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. As my friend from down South said a while ago, it just merely says that...not have any more strict requirement than the Federal ambient air standards, the Federal ones. And this does not affect Chicago, Peoria or the St. Louis Metropolitan areas for the rest of downstate. I would have to concur with some of the Members. It probably doesn't really do much. It's the same Bill as the Governor vetoed in the 80th General Assembly, Senate Bill 281. And all that it really does is point up the very darn need that we have to burn Illinois coal, and to encourage the Pollution Control Board and the EPA to not relax...not to give up on the burning of Illinois coal. I would urge enough votes so that we can at least keep it on Postponed Consideration. Maybe consider again before the end of the term. Thank you."

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

Borchers: "This is perfectly amazing to me to see so many of you so care less about our own people in the southern part of the State of Illinois. I cannot understand it. Why should you be so damn clean that you have to be ultra clean along with some of the radical nuts that we have in charge of our Environmental Protection Agency. Use a little common sense for once. Make it easy, at least equal for our own people. I can't understand it."

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

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a great paradox, but everyday the 'C and E&I' Railroad run by my farm in Will County. A hundred fifty car loads of Illinois coal go by my house everyday from the Southern Illinois Waltonville Mines heading for Northern Indiana Public Service and for the mills in Lake County Indiana that burn that coal and the same air comes right back over Cook County."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Jackson, Mr. Richmond, to explain his vote. The timer's on."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's, it is kind of amazing to me too...it seems like we're addressing the serious problem of unemployment quite a bit in this Session, talking about \$20,000,000 loans to keep several hundred or few thousand people employed. I want you to know that we have hundreds of unemployed miners in Southern Illinois, and this is a very serious situation. I think that you should give serious consideration to this issue, because we are not asking that we really do play any havoc with our EPA rules or clean air standards as has been pointed out. We can ship our coal out of the State, but in some cases can't burn it here."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 73 'ayes' and 66 'nays'. The Gentleman asks leave to have this put on Postponed Consideration. Leave is granted. House Bill 1525."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1525..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Take it out of the record, request of the Sponsor. 2051. Take it out of the record. The Sponsor, I don't see him. 2768, take it out of the record, request of the Sponsor. 2917."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2917. A Bill for an Act to effect the revision of the several laws in relation to

referended conform of the statutory consolidation of elections. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the, the synopsis is accurate relative to House Bill 2917. What it does is amend numerous Acts, deletes obsolete provisions governing conduct and timing of referenda which have been superseded by the three consolidated election laws that we have presently. It does nothing but amend the various provisions to conform to procedures in and to and refer to the General Election Law of the State. What we've done is codify really all of the election laws that relate to referendum that appear in other Statutes and put them where they belong in the Election Code. This Bill was reported out of the Election Laws Committee with the Attendance Roll Call, and I move for a favorable Roll Call on House Bill 2917."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? The question is shall House Bill 2917 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all 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 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 2941."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2941. A Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to blood tests. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from Champaign, Mrs. Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 2941 was introduced at the request of people working in the Attorney General's Office in Champaign as an instrument to help in pursuing cases of

paternity for collection of funds to go to split families, so that we could reduce the Public Aid Rolls and also help to keep other people off the Public Aid Rolls. The Bill will change the law in regard to submission of evidence in contested cases of paternity and will allow the newer, better tests that are now available to be submitted as court evidence as part of what is available in the decision in the court. For those of you who may not be aware, the Bill was amended yesterday on Second Reading, and it's Amendment #2 that now becomes the Bill. I'll be happy to answer any questions that you might have."

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

Leinenweber: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Lady answer a couple of questions?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates she will."

Leinenweber: "As I understand the Bill, you are opening up paternity suits for medical evidence which a court might consider relevant as to the issue of paternity. Is that correct?"

Satterthwaite: "Yes."

Leinenweber: "Alright, currently, as I understand it, the law excludes medical evidence unless the evidence excludes paternity. Is that right?"

Satterthwaite: "Yes, the current law was put into effect, I believe, in 1957 when the types of tests were considerably different and far less conclusive in their evidence. There are instances in the courts where they feel that perhaps laws, such as the State of Illinois currently has, are unconstitutional, because the Federal Rules of Evidence should have us include as much information as is possible for the decision of the court."

Leinenweber: "Alright, what is meant on page 2 of the Amendment, the sentence, 'if the evidence based upon

the tests indicates a clear and convincing probability that the alleged father is or is not the father of the child, where the experts disagree in their findings, such findings shall be admissible as evidence in the question of paternity' etc. What is meant...by that?"

Satterthwaite: "Well...that language was put into Amendment #2, because some of the people on Judiciary I Committee felt that we wanted to make sure that we were not just having superficial kind of evidence. The HLA Tests and some of the other blood tests that are now available can give you statistics up to almost 100% certainty but never 100% certainty. We did not want, however, simply to introduce as evidence something that had maybe only a fifty-fifty definition...50% definition of the probability."

Leinenweber: "Alright...what is meant by clear and convincing probability? It seems to me, if I might suggest an answer to that question, that there you have combined two different tests. First of all, probability is a distinct test and clear and convincing is another distinct test, as I understand the Civil Law. You've seemed to combine the two, and what was the reason for doing that?"

Satterthwaite: "Well, it was the suggestion of the Staff that we used that wording in order to exclude something that was just a minor probability and have only that evidence which had some weight and validity."

Leinenweber: "Must they judge, is it up to the judge to determine then when the evidence is the so called 'clear and convincing'?"

Satterthwaite: "Well, I would presume that the court would have some discretion in that regard, yes."

Leinenweber: "Well, let me ask you this. You have relevant medical tests, including, but not limited to, blood grouping tests and human leukocyte antigen tests.

What other kinds of tests are you...are you including in the term, 'but not limited to'?"

Satterthwaite: "There was some indication that there may be other kinds of tissue tests aside from blood tests that might be indicative of the inherited characteristics of the child."

Leinenweber: "Alright, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I'd like to address..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Proceed."

Leinenweber: "...myself to the Bill. As the Lady points out, Amendment 2 is the...is now the Bill. And I would hope everybody is paying attention, because this is a major change in the law for regarding the procedures to be used in paternity suits. Paternity suits, as most of you probably know, are suits usually brought by the State's Attorney upon complaint against a man who has alleged to have been the father of a...of a child born out of wedlock. Currently, the law excludes medical tests that do not exclude...exclude all tests unless they tend to exclude paternity. Now that is based upon the fact that these tests are not absolutely certain, however, there are certain tests which are certain and that is the exclusionary tests. The Bill seeks to reverse that completely and omit all tests which tend to show that the person could possibly be the father. And I think that's...this is...even though they use the words, 'clear and convincing probability', I really don't know what that means, because under Civil Law we have two different tests. There's a clear and convincing test which is a much higher degree of a burden for the prosecution to show than probability which means generally that is more probably true than not true. I think that we should consider a long time before we make this very revolutionary change in our law. The tests which they...which are proposed do

tend to indicate paternity, but they are not, as pointed out, the type of tests which are of an absolute certainty. I think before we move into this area, we should think quite carefully, and I personally intend to vote 'no' against this Bill."

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

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for two quick questions?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates she will."

Leverenz: "Is this limited to Champaign or Champaign County only?"

Satterthwaite: "No. I simply stated that the Bill was introduced at the suggestion of someone in Champaign County, but it covers anybody in the State."

Leverenz: "It would be state-wide then..."

Satterthwaite: "Yes."

Leverenz: "and not just limited to Champaign, because that's the way you made it..."

Satterthwaite: "No, I'm sorry if I gave that impression."

Leverenz: "I thought there was a particular problem in Champaign or Urbana area or Champaign County."

Satterthwaite: "It is a problem state-wide that the Attorney General's Offices and the State Attorney's Offices have problems of establishing paternity in some of these cases. And I simply indicated that it was at the request of someone from Champaign County that I introduced the Bill."

Leverenz: "Does this have anything to do with rabbit husbandry?"

Satterthwaite: "With what?"

Leverenz: "Rabbit husbandry."

Satterthwaite: "No."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

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

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I just wanted to add to some of the comments of the

previous speakers. And that is that this Bill, I think, is well intended but at the present time, it would require, I think, both sides to attempt to present experts to submit the issue of the...of the expert evidence on the question of paternity, because the Bill has provided, as it now stands amended, provides that all results of medical tests shall be admissible. And I think this will just clutter up the evidenciary process, and I think that we should hold off on this Legislation until we better understand in a more positive manner what the results of tests mean and stick with the standard that we now have."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mrs. Satterthwaite to close."

Satterthwaite: "Now Mr. Speaker, I did not think this was really a controversial measure, but since it appears to be and since attendance looks slight, I wonder if I could have it withdrawn from the record for now."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady takes the Bill out of the record. House Bill 2824. The Gentleman asks leave to bring the Bill back from Third to Second for a purpose of an Amendment. Hearing no objections, the Bill's on Second Reading. We made a mistake on Amendment #5. Technical error. The Gentleman from...any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #6."

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

Schuneman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Earlier this afternoon, the House adopted Amendment #..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman moves that the House reconsider the vote by which Amendment #5 was adopted. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed. Amendment #5 is reconsidered. The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #5. Any objections? Hearing none, Amendment #5 is tabled. Any further Amendments? 6."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment 6, Schuneman."

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

Schuneman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #6 simply constitutes a technical correction in Amendment #5 which was adopted earlier this afternoon and solved some of the questions that were raised at that time by Representative McPike. And at this time, I would move the adoption of Amendment #6."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make mention of the fact that there's also a technical error in this Amendment. We should probably be changing it on its face. On line 12, there's two periods before the term, 'wages'. I don't know if it will be cleaned up by Enrolling & Engrossing, but if you'll look at the Amendment, Cal, I think you'll see that there's a mistake in the drafting."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Alright, we'll amend it on its face. Any further discussion? The question is shall Amendment #6 be adopted? All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed. Amendment #6 adopted. Third Reading. House Bill 2962 is taken out of the record at the request of the Sponsor. House Bill 2985, Mr. Richmond? Out of the record, request of the Sponsor. 3013, Mrs. Stiehl? Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3013. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Stiehl."

Stiehl: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3013 is a very simple Bill. As the Statute presently reads, newspapers are entitled to a fee of thirty cents per column line for the printing of assessment lists. This is both the maximum and the minimum. All House Bill 3013 does is remove the minimum. It simply says that newspapers shall be

entitled to a fee of not more than thirty cents a column line. The reason for this is that in many instances the thirty cents is...a column line is excessive. And when a publisher charges less, he is in essence circumventing the law. All we're trying to do is leave the maximum and take out the minimum. I would like to be very clear on this though. Originally, the Bill provided that the fee would be no more than the classified commercial rate. However, some publishers expressed a concern over the manner of computing this, so I have amended this language out and all the Bill says is, newspapers shall be entitled to a fee of not more than thirty cents a column line. It's in the best interest of the people, of the counties and also of the publishers. And I would ask for an affirmative vote."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Williamson, Mr. Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates she will."

Stiehl: "I guess I will."

Harris: "I have a question Miss Representative. Will this be a maximum that the newspapers could charge, thirty cents per column?"

Stiehl: "Representative Harris, that's what's in the Statute now. I don't change that. All I did was put in three words, 'not more than'. That is the maximum in the Statute right now."

Harris: "What would we do if inflation kept going and how would we allow for more money for the newspapers under this piece of Legislation?"

Stiehl: "This doesn't change that part of the Statute. All it says is if the newspaper wants to charge less, they may do so without circumventing the law."

Harris: "What's the purpose of this Bill?"

Stiehl: "Pardon?"

Harris: "What's the purpose for this piece of Legislation?"

Stiehl: "Oh, well, because in certain instances the thirty cents a column line is excessive. And if a publisher wants to charge less, if the county can get a better deal in negotiating with the newspapers, no newspaper could charge less than thirty cents a column line according to the present Statute. And all we're saying is, 'if it's fair for you to charge less, you may do so without breaking the law'."

Harris: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield for one question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates she will."

Mautino: "Representative Stiehl, what is the lowest published rate charged on a classified contract? Do you know?"

Stiehl: "That's not in my Bill."

Mautino: "It's..."

Stiehl: "The Bill has been amended so that all it says is, I can...it just adds three words, 'not more than'."

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

Yourell: "Yes, thank you. Would the Lady yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates she will."

Yourell: "Representative Stiehl, can you tell me how the IPA feels about this Legislation?"

Stiehl: "Well, they would rather not have any change."

Yourell: "They don't endorse it then."

Stiehl: "No."

Yourell: "Thank you."

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

Kane: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates she will."

Kane: "Do you think that we ought to require bidding for legal advertising?"

Stiehl: "Well, I think that perhaps in this instance, rather than to require bidding, it's probably better to allow the Supervisor of Assessments or the County Assessors whoever is letting the publication of these assessment lists to negotiate, because there are...there is quite a bit of difference in the circulation of newspapers in the county and of course, often, the price is effected by the circulation, and so I think that if we leave that to the...just as it is now in the present Statutes, if we leave that up to the local counties, I think that they are the ones best to address that. They can negotiate right now. But under the Bill, under the present Statute, there is no minimum. This just simply says if a newspaper can do it cheaper and they're willing and they want to, then let's save the taxpayer some money."

Kane: "Will this..."

Stiehl: "And if they want to do that, then they're not breaking the law by doing it."

Kane: "Would this increase competition?"

Stiehl: "I would think it would, yes."

Kane: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady from Cook, Mrs. Hallstrom."

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Lady moves the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed. The previous question has been moved. Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Stiehl to close."

Stiehl: "Well, thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. I think enough has been said on this Bill. It is very fair. It's fair to the newspaper and it's fair to the taxpayer. We're not asking any more than you and I are expected to do, and that's just to insure that the taxpayer gets the best service for their money."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is shall House Bill 3013 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 101 'ayes', 103 'ayes', 26 'nos', 3 recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3154. Gentleman asks leave to bring the Bill back from Third to Second for the purpose of an Amendment. Hearing no objections, the Bill is on Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Stuffle, amends House Bill 3154 on page 1 in line 7 and so forth."

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

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. Amendment #1 to House Bill 3154 deals with the Farm Land Tax Study Commission. In the Bill, it reduces the size of the Commission in the Bill, provides for more Legislative Members than we originally had, will reduce the cost of the Study Commission, the...with the Amendment, the Commission will be made up of thirteen members rather than the original fifteen, ten of those will be Legislators. This is a compromise between Legislative Members who have discussed this with me and the various farm groups, and I would urge and move adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Randolph, Mr. Birchler."

Birchler: "Larry, does the Farm Bureau support this Amendment, Larry?"

Stuffle: "They have agreed to the Amendment today."

Speaker Lechowicz: "All in favor of the Amendment signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed. Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Third Reading. House Bill 3198. Out of

the record, request of the Sponsor. It's the intent of the Chair to work til seven o'clock tonight, so don't order any food. And we'll be back at tomorrow morning at nine. House Bill 3200."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3200. A Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Income Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill which has caused quite a bit of discussion...controversy, and I'd like to simplify and try to explain what the issues involved are. What the Bill does is to allow manufacturers...the Bill as introduced allowed manufacturers to claim an investment tax credit of 1% until 1984 and 2% thereafter of the value of new improvements in real estate and equipment that they invest in Illinois. The purpose in allowing that credit is to encourage them to make more investments in Illinois. It's an attempt to stem the flow of manufacturing jobs from the state. If you look at the charts which many groups have made available, you can see that Illinois has continued to grow in jobs in many categories of the economy. The category of the economy where we have been hurt and hurt badly since the middle 1970's has been in manufacturing jobs, so we are attempting to provide an incentive for new jobs, for new productivity for Illinois manufacturers. Now, an Amendment was added to the Bill on Second Reading which makes that investment incentive available to retailers. I believe it's accurate to characterize the intent of the Sponsors of that Amendment, and I believe that they would concur in this that that Amendment was designed to be available to retailers, not to utilities, not to the construction of condominiums and things like that. A fiscal impact

note has been filed by the Department of Revenue, and I'm sure many people who oppose the entire concept and who voted for the Amendment that made this Bill more costly will make much of that...that fiscal impact note. The fiscal impact note suggests that the Bill will cost in excess of a \$100,000,000. That's because of very bad calculations by the Illinois Department of Revenue. They have included utilities in the Bill, in the calculation of the fiscal impact. And it's clear if you read the Amendment or if you ask the Sponsors of the Amendment, that they had no intention to include utilities. And if you check back in the records, you'll find that after...just after that Amendment, an Amendment was offered which would have availed utilities of this investment tax credit. And that Amendment was defeated by the same House which adopted the previous Amendment. I think it's clear from the record that there's no intent to include utilities. There is an intent to provide an incentive in this Bill to manufacturing and to retail business. That's what we're trying to do. We're trying to do it to make this a more productive and growing economy. An economy with the jobs necessary to offset the increase in population in this state and the rising unemployment rate. It's a Bill that could make an enormous difference in getting this state moving again. It's a Bill that would offset some of the increase that was written into the Personal Property Replacement Tax. It's a Bill sponsored...supported now by every manufacturer in the state and every manufacturing organization, and it's a Bill supported by the retailers in the state. It's a good Bill. I'd be glad to answer any questions on it. I think it's the most important thing we can do in this Session to get the Illinois economy moving and to improve the Illinois business climate."

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

Kane: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Kane: "Did you say that there was...that an investment tax credit on purchase of real estate was also included?"

Vinson: "Not on the purchase price of the real estate but on improvements...on real estate improvements. The construction of a new plant, for instance."

Kane: "Okay. I understood from what you said earlier that...that it would've included the purchase of the real estate, but it does not."

Vinson: "No, it's the construction of improvements to real estate that would be credited."

Kane: "How about machinery?"

Vinson: "When the machinery is a fixture and is attached to the real estate."

Kane: "This is 1% for each year?"

Vinson: "It's..."

Kane: "Over what period of time?"

Vinson: "It is a 1% investment tax credit from the date of enactment until 1984. Subsequently, it's a 2% credit. You get, and I want to be clear about this, because it's a...it's a fact that's occasionally misunderstood in discussions on this. If a manufacturer puts in a new plant, he can claim 1% of the allowable costs in that plant on his state income...on his State Replacement Tax Bill that year. The next year he has no claim from that investment from the year before, but if he made a new improvement in the second year, he would have a 1% claim of that new improvement in the second year on his second year's Tax Bill. Do you understand the point I'm trying to make, Representative?"

Kane: "If I have an investment of a \$100,000, I would have a credit of \$1,000 that I could claim for that one

year?"

Vinson: "Yes, Sir."

Kane: "And that would not be carried forwardable?"

Vinson: "After you claimed it in the first year you would never claim that again."

Kane: "Say your taxable income or your tax liability that year was only \$500, and you had a hundred...\$1,000 credit. Would that...?"

Vinson: "There's not a refund."

Kane: "Would it carry over to the second year?"

Vinson: "No, I don't believe there's a carry-over. Let me check that to be positive, but I don't believe there's a carry-over."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Let's have a little decorum on the floor. Mr. Giorgi, back to your office."

Vinson: "There's not a carry-over, Representative."

Kane: "And it's only a one-time credit?"

Vinson: "Yes, Sir."

Kane: "For the year that the investment took place?"

Vinson: "Yes, Sir."

Kane: "On what page is there a forbidden of the...of the credit...of the carry-over?"

Vinson: "Well, you have to understand the structure of the statute, and credits or deductions are only allowed where they're authorized. It takes specific language to authorize a carry-over, a credit, or a deduction, and because there's no language authorizing a carry-over, there's no carry-over."

Kane: "And at what date would you have to date the credit? Say, for example, I invested a \$100,000 and my business went into...it started up on September 1. Which taxable year would I be able to claim that credit, or could I choose?"

Vinson: "Give me that one more time."

Kane: "Well, say I invested a \$100,000 in a new business, and I opened for business on September 1. What year

would that credit...which tax year would the credit be allowed?"

Vinson: "In whatever year...tax year you pay taxes on for September 1. In other words, if your tax year began on July 1, you would claim your credit in that tax year."

Kane: "Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Yes, will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Mautino: "Okay. Included in this legislation is tangible personal property. Does that include rolling stock that could be used as an investment credit vehicles included in that provision?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Did you hear the question, Mr. Vinson? Mr. Vinson, please."

Vinson: "No."

Mautino: "Where is that exempted from, the legislation?"

Vinson: "Well, the definition of what is permitted as claimable under this is taken from the Federal Tax Law and from the particular Federal Tax Law provision that this comes from...it's not allowed in that tax provision. It's handled in the Federal Tax Code in a different tax provision."

Mautino: "Okay, thank you."

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

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. When this Bill was on Second Reading, I tried to point out the problem that we would have with this if we took the credit against the Corporate Personal Property Tax Replacement. But, let me address myself to those Legislators that come from rural areas. There are 102 counties in Illinois. It is estimated that the growth in manufacturing investment...manufacturing jobs will be in approximately 20 to 25 counties. Those counties will

get increased investment, increased real property, and increased real estate taxes. The other 80 counties in this state will not share in that growth. Now, that is an estimate by the business...by the business people in this state, and we know that's approximately true. The growth is going to occur only in certain counties. It's not going to occur in approximately 75 to 80 counties. Now, what we are doing by this Bill, and the Department of Revenue estimates the impact at 150,000,000, and the Sponsors estimate it at sixty or seventy million. We could just say that...a compromise, let's say, a \$100,000,000. We will deplete the Corporate Personal Property Tax Fund, which is that \$500,000,000, we will deplete it by \$100,000,000. Now, those 20 or 25 counties that get increased real estate taxes will not be hurt by that. Their school districts will not be hurt, because the amount of money that they lose will be replaced by local real estate taxes. But, how about the other 80 counties? There is no way, short of a referendum, that that money can be...that those lost revenues can be replaced. There is no way that these rural areas, the 80 counties where there will be no investment, there is no possible way that you can replace that without a referendum for your school districts. If you come from a...an industrial county, fine, support the Bill. If you don't, I would suggest you consider how you're voting, because there's no doubt what you're doing. You're destroying the Replacement Tax Base by about 20%, and you're giving your local counties no way to replace it. What we have tried to say is that if there is a philosophy behind this Bill, that it increases investments, that it increases jobs, that it increases income which leads to a growth in the State Income Tax. Fine. Let's take this credit against the State Income Tax. Let's see that growth

in the overall base of the income tax, and the state will never be hurt. But, you didn't want to do that on Second Reading. You insisted on taking it away from the replacement fund, so this is what we're stuck with. Vote for this, you decrease the replacement fund by 20%, and you leave 80 counties and all the school districts in this state with no possible way to replace that revenue. I think it's a bad concept. I think you should really think before voting for it."

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

Greiman: "Just to add a few thoughts. I guess it's exemption time, and I just wanted to list the exemptions. We voted thousand dollars in interest on income tax. We voted an exemption of farm machinery, and now we're doing this, and...right, a renter's Bill. We're going to start exemption time. This Bill doesn't even come close to doing any of the things that we usually say will be brought in by...will bring business and will...will bring jobs. It just is so obscure. No business based on this Bill is going to run to Illinois or leave Illinois, and it's just an absurd exemption for a very narrow, specialized classification. It makes no sense at all. I'm going to vote 'no'."

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

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Currie: "Two years ago this General Assembly adopted an exemption on the...the sales taxes on machinery used for production. The argument, as I understand it, was made that it would increase business investment and capital investment in the State of Illinois. Can the Sponsor give me any indication how much that sales tax exemption, in fact, increased business activity and new jobs in the State of Illinois?"

Vinson: "No, I can't. I wasn't a Sponsor of that or a...or a supporter of it, Representative, and I have not tracked what's happened as a result of it."

Currie: "I think it would be a serious mistake for this Assembly to jump on the bandwagon of increased exemptions...increased tax rip-offs for businesses and corporations on the un...unattested premise that these kinds of exemptions, in fact, will increase business at all. As I understand it, businesses make decisions based on many kinds of concerns. The kind of investment tax credit we are looking at today may not, in fact, increase one single business activity that is not already planned...may not bring one single new job into the State of Illinois. I think this General Assembly ought to look very carefully at the evidence, if there is any evidence, about what our exemptions, what our activities in this area in the past have been before we blithely go down the road of taking monies away, monies that local districts, local governments need in order to perform their services. That's what this Bill does. It takes away school district money. It takes away park district money. It takes away library money...municipalities' monies. Even though I come from an industrial area of the state and my seatmate suggested that it's alright for us to vote for this Bill, I'm not going to vote for this Bill. It is not clear to me and it cannot be clear to the Members of this Assembly that, in fact, this Bill will increase any investment at all. It is clear that it will substantially destroy the Corporate Personal Property Tax Replacement Fund upon which all of our local governments depend. I urge my colleagues from industrial areas, as well as from rural areas, to vote 'no'."

Vinson: "Thank you, Representative. I appreciate your question."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Indicates he will."

Bowman: "Do you really have any idea what the...a guess even as to what the impact on the rate of capital formation would be? Would it double, perhaps?"

Vinson: "Well, it's very difficult to factor in all of the factors that will...that will affect that. My guess is that where the primary effect will be, Representative, is, not as one of your colleagues suggested, that it will cause new businesses to move into the state or that it will prevent businesses from moving out of the state. Where I think the impact will come will be that it will invite businesses in the state to expand within the state."

Bowman: "Well, my question simply was about the rate of capital formation. I don't...I don't care whether they plan to come in or..."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Will all unauthorized personnel remove themselves from the floor? All unauthorized personnel remove themselves from the floor. Please continue."

Bowman: "Well, so I'm just asking, do you have, you know, a guess...a ball park guess as to what you think the rate of capital formation would be affected by this?"

Vinson: "No."

Bowman: "Okay. Well, Mr. Speaker, then addressing myself to the Bill. It seems to me that we're really flying this one blind. I mean totally blind. The Sponsor of the Bill doesn't even have a guess as to what the impact on capital formation would be. If you were just to pull some numbers out of the air for yourself, try some numbers that you would think to be reasonable. Surely, the rate of capital formation wouldn't double. Perhaps, it would increase by 10%. I don't know. Does 10% sound reasonable to you?"

Well, if 10% sounds reasonable, what that means is that 90% would be waste. Ninety percent of the tax benefits under this would be waste. We would be simply showering dollars on industries that would be expanding anyway. After all we have had expansion over the last several years. Maybe it's not as much as the Sponsor of this measure would like to see, but we have had it. And, we will have expansion in the future. If you think the impact on the capital formation of this state would be by...maybe 10%, then you have to contend with the fact that 90% or perhaps \$90,000,000, if you use Representative McPike's figure or \$55,000,000, if you use Representative Vinson's figure, will be right down the drain. I urge you to vote 'no' on this."

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

Bradley: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as this Bill is...now as it stands before us as amended, it certainly is going to affect more than just 20 counties in the State of Illinois. As one speaker said, only 20 counties are going to benefit. That's not true at all, and it's going to help rural counties dramatically. DeWitt County, for instance, under this Bill as amended, the utilities would be affected, and they built a power plant in DeWitt County, in a small rural county, that adds dramatically to the real estate taxes of that county. Not only that, it affects the county surrounding...DeWitt insofar as supplying or creating a demand for skilled workers. They've been working down there for a couple of years, and it's going to take a few more years to complete that plant, and they've employed thousands of people in our particular area. The same could happen to any county in the State of Illinois. Also, if we develop more business

in the State of Illinois, in that particular area, it's going to create sales tax, which locally they'll receive 1% of the sales tax locally. What does it do to the local real estate picture? If more industry is built, the total assessed valuation in that particular area is increased and creates more money for the local taxing districts. We hear a great deal about improving the business climate in Illinois, and my goodness, we certainly should be doing that. Something has got to be done, because we see time after time after time, businesses leaving Illinois, investing in plants in other states. We will never be able to get those plants to come back to Illinois once they've left. We won't get that employment back. We won't get the income tax state-wide. We won't get the income tax at the local level. We won't get the real estate tax at the local level. And the loss of jobs would be dramatic. The question was asked, I believe, about what the total amount of dollars in investments we might be able to expect and what the cost would be. In 1979, a three...\$3,000,000,000 estimate; 1980, 4,000,000,000; 1981; \$4,400,000,000 of construction. Such a revenue impact in '81 would be \$44,000,000. That is not the figure as amended. It was a figure prior to the Amendment that was put on including the...to allow real estate...the local businesses to be included in the...in the Bill. I think it's...may not be the...all the answers to everything, but it's a good start. The legislation we pass here does not treat every county and every city equally. For instance, in the City of Chicago, we send 32% of our school dollars from the school formula to that particular county that only has 22% of the students, and I support that concept. If that's what it takes to educate those students up there, that's fine. And, I think, it's a good piece of legislation for the

business community of the State of Illinois, and I urge an 'aye' vote on this very, very important piece of legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3200 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote 'no'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan, to explain his vote."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I wish to explain my 'no' vote on this Bill. The purpose or the objective of providing incentives for business location and business expansion is certainly laudible. And, certainly, this General Assembly should address itself to that particular question. My objection to this Bill is that it does not treat tax recipients equally. The Bill is drafted so that it impacts solely upon local governments and school districts. All of the tax relief...the entire credit goes against local government and school districts through the replacement fund. There is no impact upon the regular corporate income tax collected by the State of Illinois. If we are to address this problem intelligently and equitable, then we must provide that the credit would be applied against both taxes, not just one of those taxes. And, for that reason, I stand in opposition to the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson, to explain his vote."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. A question was asked in the course of debate, which I didn't have time to calculate, but I think makes for an interesting thought. Mr. Bowman hypothesized that there might be a ten percent increase in capital expansion in the state as a result of this Bill. If that were true, that would mean there'd be 600 million dollars of increased capital formation in Illinois. If that's true, calculating a relatively low property

tax rate of five dollars, the result would be a thirty million dollar gain in property taxes in the first year. That's a recurring gain that occurs every year, and in two years you would offset the total at fiscal impact of the Bill. I think that alone speaks well for the ability of local government itself to profit from the Bill, and because they derive the real estate taxes is why, in response to the Majority Leader's question, the Bill is aimed at the replacement tax. Again, I would urge an 'aye' vote and earnestly solicit that."

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

Griesheimer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Having heard the comments of the Majority Leader, it brings to mind the situation of two doctors in an emergency room each arguing which form of surgery should be necessary to save the life of the patient, and while he's arguing the patient is dying. I think that what we should say right now is that what we need to do is do something for business, and if he feels this isn't the only way of doing it, let him introduce something effectively on his own and pursue it as the Representative from Bloomington has done. I think this is an absolute must. I think we should all vote for this, and I think any school district that would complain about this would be very shortsighted. As business develops, they will get more of a tax base, and this will all help everyone of our schools and local governments throughout the state."

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

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I...I'm very confused now. I hear on one side that the business is dying and the Bill is really aimed at hurting the money that goes to local governments and schools. The business

is leaving the state, and then I read an article which quotes the President of the Manufacturers' News out of Chicago that since 1975 there has been losses in business, and the fact is that the person that puts out the directory of business in the State of Illinois has now been quoted as the state this year has a net gain of two and a half percent in the number of industrial firms. So, I'm really confused. I don't think we're losing. It might be one or two that are close to certain people."

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

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if you've driven through Arkansas, and Mississippi, and Alabama and those states lately, you know where all the new industry is locating. That's where the industry is going and that's where the jobs are going. And, they're...because they are giving some incentives for business to locate here. Now, it's fun to say just tax business, but the truth of it is that the consumer's the only one that ever pays for anything, and this tax that you put on business ends up on the consumer, because that's part of the cost of doing business. If you want new industry in Illinois, then you'd better start giving them a few breaks here, too."

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

Wikoff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explaining my vote, I think we have a good concept in front of us, and I think we need a few more green votes up there. We're...we're very close to it. There have been many good comments made on this. We've lost a lot of business in the State of Illinois over the last several years, and there's no question about that. One of the reasons we've lost business is because

Kansas, and Colorado, and many of the other states have come in here and raided our area simply by handing out and holding in front of people things such as we have right here, and there's only one way we're going to be able to compete with them and that's be able to compete with them on an open basis such as offering some incentives like this, and I'd urge a few more green votes up there."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 95 'ayes' and 45 'nos'. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan. Mr. Madigan requests a verification. Mr. Bradley asks for a poll of the absentees. Mr. Totten, you're excused, not verified. Please proceed to poll the absentees, please."

Clerk Leone: "Bluthardt. Capparelli. Capuzi. Casey. Deuster. Epton. Ewell. Farley. Giorgi. Hanahan. Jaffe. Emil Jones. Keane. Kelly. Klosak. Kornowicz."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kornowicz is 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Kosinski. I'm sorry. Kosinski is voting 'no'. Kraska."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Kraska, 'no'."

Clerk Leone: "Kucharski. Laurino. Marovitz. Matijeovich. McAuliffe. McClain. Mugalian. Pierce. Preston. Schisler. Schlickman. Schneider. Sharp. Stearney. Terzich. And, Sam Wolf."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Proceed to verify the affirmative vote."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the affirmative. Abramson. Ackerman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Right here. Glasses."

Clerk Leone: "Anderson. Barnes. Beatty. Bell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Excuse me. Mr. Richmond wants to be verified, and Mr. Hannig, and Harris, and Williams. Please proceed."

Clerk Leone: "Bianco. Birchler. Birkinbine. Borchers. Boucek. Bower. Brummer. Burnidge. Campbell. Christensen. Collins. Conti. Daniels. Darrow. Davis. Donovan. John Dunn. Ralph Dunn. Ebbesen. Ewing. Flinn. Virginia Frederick. Dwight Friedrich. Griesheimer. Grossi. Hallock. Hallstrom. Hannig. Harris. Hoffman. Hoxsey. Hudson. Huskey. Johnson. Dave Jones. Karpiel. Katz. Kent. Leinenweber. MacDonald. Mahar. Margalus. Matula. Mautino. McBroom. McCourt. McGrew. McMaster. Meyer. Mulcahey. Neff. Oblinger. O'Brien. Peters. Piel. Polk. Pullen. Rea. Reed. Reilly. Richmond. Rigney. Robbins. Ropp. Ryan. Schoeberlein. Schraeder. Schuneman. Simms. Stanley. E.G. Steele. C.M. Stiehl. Stuffle. Sumner. Swanstrom. Totten. Tuerk. Van Duynes. Vinson. VonBoeckman. Walsh. Watson. Wikoff. Williams. Winchester. J.J. Wolf. Woodyard. And, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any questions of the affirmative vote?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, could you give us the count?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the count? Ninety-five 'ayes' we're starting with. The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Van Duynes, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Van Duynes: "May I have leave to be verified, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman asks leave to be verified. He and Mr. Christensen and Totten. Leave is granted. I'm sorry. What? Mr. Madigan, do you have any questions of the affirmative vote?"

Madigan: "Mr. Abramson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Abramson is here. No, wait. Mr. Abramson? There he is. Yeah. He's here."

Madigan: "He's here?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He's here."

Madigan: "Anderson."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Anderson. He's here."

Madigan: "Beatty."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Beatty. How is Mr. Beatty recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Madigan: "Ackerman."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Ackerman. How's Mr. Ackerman recorded?"

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Madigan: "Bianco."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Bianco is there."

Madigan: "Campbell."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Campbell is there."

Madigan: "Collins."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Collins is here."

Madigan: "Conti."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Madigan: "Ebbesen."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Madigan: "Harris."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Mr. Harris, I believe, was granted leave to be verified, Sir."

Madigan: "Johnson."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Madigan: "Was Mr. Williams verified?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Yes, he was."

Madigan: "Leinenweber."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Madigan: "Margalus."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Margalus is there."

Madigan: "Matula."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Matula is there."

Madigan: "McGrew."

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

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Madigan: "McMaster."

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman is there."

Madigan: "Ropp."

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

Clerk Leone: "Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Remove him."

Madigan: "That's all."

Speaker Lechowicz: "What's the count? On this question there are 87 'ayes', 47 'nos'. This matter having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority. The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "Postponed Consideration."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Gentleman asks leave to put it on Postponed Consideration. Matter is on Postponed Consideration. House Bill 3207. Mrs. Younge. Clerk read the Bill. 3207."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3207. A Bill for An Act to add Sections to An Act in relation to Natural Resources Research and Data Collection. Third Reading of the Bill."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill will establish a minority resource center within the Institute of Natural Resources. A minority resource center is a focus of activity that fosters greater participation in the institutes projects by economically and

socially disadvantaged business enterprises and small business enterprises. At this time, there is no activity in the Institute of Natural Resources that has this focus. Therefore, there is no systematic cohesive agency plan for minority businesses and for businesses predominantly owned by women or small business constituents to gain increased access to the institutes programs. I have reviewed this Bill with Director Beal and he said that he thought that the Bill had a good intent, and was a sound idea. He said that he felt that it ought to be universal or generic and applied to all the departments. What the center would do, would be to serve as an information clearing house for the small businesses and the economically deprived businesses. It would design programs and conduct programs that would secure contracts for these businesses and it would enter contracts with these businesses. The Institute of Natural Resources has as its focus, the energy projects for the State of Illinois. This is a new and expanding field. In Illinois, as in the rest of the country, about three-fourths of the new jobs are made available through small businesses. And, if the institute had a focus of including small businesses in its programs this would lead to a great deal of more job development and an increase in jobs for the people of Illinois. There is a companion Appropriation Bill for fifty thousand dollars and I believe that most of these funds will be able to come from federal funds, under a project that the institute now has, the Federal Energy Expansive Service Program, which is a nine hundred thousand dollar project. And, that is being investigated as to whether or not they will be able to use some of these funds in order to pay for this focus of activity. And, I ask for the approval of this Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any discussion? The Lady from Lake, Mrs. Reed."

Reed: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "She indicates she will."

Reed: "Representative Younger, what is the amount of money on this?"

Younger: "The amount of money is a...fifty thousand dollar allocation and I've said that I think that this can possibly come from federal funds. The institute now, is looking into the possibility of that being included in the funding under the Federal Energy Extensive Service Program, which is a new source of federal funds within the institute."

Reed: "It is my understanding Representative Younger, that that fifty thousand that the...Director Beal advised that that fifty thousand is not going to come from federal funds."

Younger: "I talked with him either today or yesterday and he said that he was going to look into that. He has not advised me that it cannot come from these federal funds. The institute is funded basically and to a great extent through federal funds. And with most federal programs there can be made available funds to make sure that minorities participate in these programs adequately. This is by Presidential Order and generally they just have to be applied for, Representative Reed."

Reed: "As the Sponsor of that particular appropriation for that particular department, it is my understanding that though the Director supports the intent, federal...this particular project does not qualify for federal funding, Representative Younger."

Younger: "Well...thank you, but most federal money can make available the mandate of the Federal Government that there be an effort to promote minority participation in the federal programs. So, I think, that with a

very careful search, it is quite possible that this could be funded federally."

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

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise reluctantly to oppose the Lady's Bill. It seems to me what this Bill do...does is open up an entirely new and foreign area to the Institute of Natural Resources. The institute now, is pretty much a flow-through for energy development. Interesting also, that we had a Bill earlier today which provided for the expanded use of Illinois coal. Well, some twenty-five million dollars of the institutes coal bond funds are used for the purposes of developing a clean Illinois coal. Now, I submit also Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that this Bill provides for a new Director of the center for whatever they call it, Minority Resource, the Minority Resource Center, this new Director shall serve with and at the appointment of the Director of the Institute of Natural Resources, but the Bill does not provide that he shall be responsible to the Director of the Institute of Natural Resources, but shall be the chief executive officer of the center. Now, I submit to you, Mr. Speaker that that is administratively impossible. You cannot have an agency with two equal Directors. One must be the boss. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is certainly not the time, not the agency for a group like this and I would urge you to vote 'no'."

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

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

Speaker Lechowicz: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye', opposed. The previous question's been moved. Please, let's give the Lady your attention. The Lady from St. Clair, Mrs. Younge."

Younge: "Yes, the Secretary of Transporta...the Secretary would have the responsibility...the Executive Director of the Institute of Natural Resources would have the responsibility of appointing the Director of the institute and this would merely be a focus within the institute. The problem is, at this time the institute has not awarded any contracts at all to...to the...to the small businesses in this state or to minority businesses or businesses which are predominantly developed by women. Mr. Speaker, may I take this matter out of the record?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "Lady asks leave to take the Bill out of the record. Leave is granted. House Bill 3229. Last Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3229. A Bill for An Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "You read the wrong Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Yes, I'm sorry."

Speaker Lechowicz: "3229."

Clerk Leone: "3229. A Bill for An Act to amend An Act to provide for the transaction of consolidation of elections and to make certain changes in the administration of consolidation of elections. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Lechowicz: "That sounds more like it. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Yourell. That's alright, that happens."

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3229 was discussed at some length on Second Reading and a number of Amendments were attached to the Bill. What it does, it makes changes relating to the transition to the consolidation of elections that will take place on December 1st, 1980. It makes changes in the Election Code, the School Code and the Public Community College Code, so that the transition from those three codes

will be in the new consolidation of elections schedule and the Act itself. Most of the debate on this Bill took place in the Elections Committee, it came out of that Committee unanimously at 20 to nothing vote and I ask for a favorable Roll Call on House Bill 3229."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Is there any discussion? Question is, shall House Bill 3229 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Vote me 'aye', please. Buzz. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 123 'ayes', 11 'nays', one recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 3255, we'll go one more. For Swanstrom not for Skinner."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3255. A Bill for An Act to amend the Election Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Swanstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3255 would require that the State Board of Elections maintain a research library, which would include but not...be not limited to copies of current precinct poll lists, precinct maps and abstracts of votes by precinct from all election jurisdictions within the State of Illinois. It would provide that the precinct maps and abstracts be kept permanently and that abstracts must include results of the statewide, state legislative and congressional races. At present, we have 111 separate election jurisdictions in the state. We have 11,655 precincts and there is no central location in the state where this information can be examined or copied. A person doing any type of election research must travel around to the 111 different jurisdictions to find the information that he needs. The State Board of Elections has been very cooperative in researching

this Bill. They have most of the equipment that would be needed for microfilming. They have the space to set up this document center. I think now in the...as we approach the General Election and then with reapportionment coming, it's a Bill that could help all of us. It passed out of the Election Committee on a 20 to nothing Roll Call and I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call tonight. Thank you."

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

Yourell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have checked with the State Board of Elections and I think that this is a good legislation. It will cost a little money, about thirty-three thousand dollars, but, I think we can work it out with the State Board. It doesn't require any new personnel and the idea is an excellent idea. Amendment #1, that was put to the Bill, is a cleanup Amendment and it makes the Bill a very excellent Bill in my judgment and I too urge a favorable Roll Call on House Bill 3255."

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

Cullerton: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Lechowicz: "He indicates he will."

Cullerton: "Representative Swanstrom, does this mean that the individual election...strike that. Where they have the records right now, will they be, will they still maintain those records? For example, if I wanted to get a polling sheet in Chicago, would I have to go to the State Board of Elections or would I still go to the city of Chicago?"

Swanstrom: "Yes, you could get them in Chicago."

Cullerton: "So, it's not going to replace these, it's going to be a consolidation, throughout all...throughout the state?"

Swanstrom: "That's correct."

Cullerton: "One central location. Thank you."

- Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, shall House Bill 3255 pass? All in favor vote 'aye', all oppose vote 'no'. Timmy give me an 'aye' over there. Simms, give me an 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 140 'ayes', no 'nays', one recorded as 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Vote changes."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Beatty, requests to vote 'aye'. Beatty and Hudson request to vote 'aye' on House Bill 24."
- Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objection? Hearing none."
- Clerk O'Brien: "And, Representative Keane on 24."
- Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Hearing none, request granted."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Satterthwaite, requests to vote 'aye' on House Bill 2921."
- Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Hearing none, request granted."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Balanoff, requests to vote 'aye' on 3013. Who's that."
- Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Hearing none, request granted."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Representative McClain, requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 20...3433."
- Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Hearing none, request granted."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Johnson, requests to vote 'no' on House Bill 3013."
- Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Hearing none, request granted."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Harris, requests to vote 'aye' on Amendment 38 to House Bill 3580."
- Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Hearing none, request granted."
- Clerk O'Brien: "And, Representative Pechous, Campbell and

Vinson request to vote 'no' on House Bill 3600, Amendment 4."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Any objections? Hearing none, requests granted. Any announcements? You got that Roll Call? Let's clear the board. Any announcements? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "Providing a 5 minute Perfunctory Session, I move that we adjourn to 9 a.m. tomorrow morning."

Speaker Lechowicz: "Question is, is whether the House stands adjourned till 9 a.m. tomorrow morning, after 5 minutes perfunct? All in favor signify by saying 'aye', 'aye'. 9:00 o'clock tomorrow morning. Opposed, the House stands adjourned till 9 a.m. tomorrow morning, giving the Clerk 5 minutes perfunctory. Please be here promptly at 9:00 o'clock, we'll be doing Third Readings at nine. Thank you."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bills, First Reading. Senate Bill 1841, Emil Jones. A Bill for An Act to amend Sections of An Act making an appropriation to the Illinois State Scholarship Commission, First Reading of the Bill. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution, the adoption of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit: Senate Joint Resolution #102, adopted by the Senate May 15, 1980, Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills of the following titles, passage of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit: Senate Bills number 569, 934, 1506, 1510, 1521, 1524, 1557, 1569, 1583, 1588, 1616, 1617, 1620, 1623, 1624, 1625, 1627, 1628, 1630, 1634, 1642, 1658, 1663, 1667, 1705, 1707, 1710, 1713,

1726, 1728, 1741, 1750, 1760, 1762, 1793 and 1799, passed by the Senate May 15, 1980, Kenneth Wright, Secretary. No further business. The House now stands adjourned."

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
MAY 15, 1980

PAGE 1

HB-0024	3RD READING	PAGE	121
HB-0536	3RD READING	PAGE	190
HB-2520	2ND READING	PAGE	6
HB-2824	2ND READING	PAGE	116
	2ND READING	PAGE	206
HB-2917	3RD READING	PAGE	200
HB-2918	2ND READING	PAGE	9
	2ND READING	PAGE	46
HB-2941	3RD READING	PAGE	201
HB-2960	2ND READING	PAGE	9
HB-2967	3RD READING	PAGE	119
HB-3004	3RD READING	PAGE	130
HB-3007	2ND READING	PAGE	142
HB-3013	3RD READING	PAGE	207
HB-3049	2ND READING	PAGE	11
HB-3066	2ND READING	PAGE	14
HB-3083	2ND READING	PAGE	15
HB-3084	2ND READING	PAGE	15
HB-3122	3RD READING	PAGE	140
HB-3126	2ND READING	PAGE	25
HB-3127	2ND READING	PAGE	26
HB-3154	2ND READING	PAGE	211
HB-3174	3RD READING	PAGE	143
HB-3184	2ND READING	PAGE	30
HB-3200	3RD READING	PAGE	212
HB-3201	2ND READING	PAGE	31
HB-3207	3RD READING	PAGE	229
HB-3211	2ND READING	PAGE	37
HB-3214	2ND READING	PAGE	37
HB-3215	2ND READING	PAGE	39
	MOTIONS	PAGE	39
HB-3216	2ND READING	PAGE	39
HB-3229	3RD READING	PAGE	233
HB-3230	2ND READING	PAGE	41
HB-3237	2ND READING	PAGE	46
HB-3255	3RD READING	PAGE	234
HB-3271	2ND READING	PAGE	187
HB-3324	2ND READING	PAGE	54
HB-3331	2ND READING	PAGE	54
HB-3346	3RD READING	PAGE	144
HB-3358	2ND READING	PAGE	56
HB-3359	3RD READING	PAGE	4
	3RD READING	PAGE	120

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
MAY 15, 1980

PAGE 2

HB-3382	3RD READING	PAGE	121
HB-3433	3RD READING	PAGE	148
HB-3469	2ND READING	PAGE	68
HB-3498	3RD READING	PAGE	149
HB-3514	2ND READING	PAGE	69
HB-3539	2ND READING	PAGE	70
HB-3542	2ND READING	PAGE	80
HB-3544	2ND READING	PAGE	97
HB-3555	2ND READING	PAGE	161
HB-3568	3RD READING	PAGE	177
HB-3577	3RD READING	PAGE	186
HB-3600	2ND READING	PAGE	98
SB-1841	1ST READING	PAGE	237
SB-1980	1ST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1982	1ST READING	PAGE	4
SB-1985	1ST READING	PAGE	4
HR-0689	3RD READING	PAGE	34

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
MAY 15, 1980

PAGE 3

SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDHOND - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REVEREND KRUEGER - PRAYER	PAGE	1
REVEREND CHRISMAN - PRAYER	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	2
MEMBER VOTE CHANGES	PAGE	2
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	3
MEMBER VOTE CHANGE	PAGE	236
PERFUNCT SESSION	PAGE	237
MESSAGES FROM SENATE	PAGE	237
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	238