

Doorkeeper: "Attention Members of the House of Representatives, the House will convene in fifteen minutes."

Speaker Redmond: "The House will come to order, Members please be in their seats. 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. O Lord, bless this House to Thy service this day. Amen. It is written in the 2nd Book of Chronicles, Chapter 7, Verse 14: If my people, which are called by my Name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then I will hear from heaven and will forgive their sin and will heal their land. Let us pray. Almighty God, all glory and praise be to Thy Holy Name; all Thy children do honor Thee and Thy Holy Word and we do worship Thee for Thy great goodness. In particular, we do give our thankfulness to Thee for being able to serve the people of the State of Illinois in this House of Representatives. Help us to seek Thy face, O Father, in all that we may do and all that we may say, and in whatsoever manner we may vote, that this state may surely show forth to all men everywhere that it is through Thee and for Thee alone we do serve through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

Speaker Redmond: "Pledge of Allegiance. 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. Roll Call for attendance. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Let the record show that Representative Macdonald is on the Democratic side. Sit down please. Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, I would just like to raise a question being somewhat agriculturally orientated, I noticed out here on the southwest corner of the Capitol there's....looks like a

tremendous amount of excavation going on and what's happening is, eventually they're putting in a little copper tube under there which is going to sprinkle those lawns. And, it seems to me, I've been more impressed with those two young ladies who are weeding the grass and the flowers out there. It seems to me we could save tremendous amounts of money in the budget if those two young ladies would just hold that hose out there and sprinkle that lawn than to go to all that effort to dig it up right now, put that copper tubing under there which I'm sure which costs lots of money. Do you have any suggestions on how we could save money in that regard."

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, you should have not voted for that line item appropriation the last time we were here."

Ropp: "As long as they have been on that, I think that probably happened before I ever got here."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I noticed the Attendance Roll Call was cut off and the only reason I pushed my light was so, you would mention my name."

Speaker Redmond: "That's the only reason I can think of. Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich, D.: "Mr. Speaker, would you call the Secretary of State and tell him the Legislature is in Session. I think some of the Members are not here this morning because they are climbing the stairs because the Secretary of State is too penurious to furnish an elevator operator when the Legislature is in Session. I think that's something that's pretty elementary. Someone said, well you can't get people to work on Saturday and I said, well, I've been to Las Vegas and they run it twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week. If they can get somebody to do that surely we can get an elevator operator on Saturday morning."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "Are we just sort of messing around a little bit, right now?"

Speaker Redmond: "No, I'm about ready to call some Bills for passage."

Borchers: "Well, you are about ready. So, that means there's a little bit of time. I've said this before but there's not a large crowd here but, I want you to know and I also want you know we can't do a darn thing about it. But, the picture of General George Washington, actually it's a disgrace to the State of Illinois, that we have in the rotunda. He's wearing a British Brigadier General's uniform and it's outrageous that we, of course it's a long time ago, I understand. I looked into it once and I understand that a foreign artist painted a picture, so he took George Washington, give him the horse of course and put on him a British Brigadier General's uniform. So, here in the great State of Illinois, one of the states of the union, our picture of General Washington is in the uniform of the enemy. I'm sure, George Washington has turned over many times in his grave at remorse at the thoughtlessness and carelessness of the great State of Illinois. I thought you might just be able..."

Speaker Redmond: "What can you tell us about the Indians that are on that picture."

Borchers: "Well, I don't believe there are Indians around that picture, however...if Representative Karpel would...if this was serious what you are talking about yesterday, about a prize for her, I really think she should see me. I do know a heck of a lot about the history of the Indians in this country, particularly in this area. We only fought them for a hundred years and my great aunt, who died nearly a hundred years old actually, had a lot to do with the

Indians at that time. And, on the right side I want you to know, she had a very good friend when she was a little girl that actually had been scalped and that would be maybe a hundred and fifty years ago, and lived. Another thing, the...I tell you, my grandfather was the last member of our family that actually scalped an Indian. What was good for you are not a subject for scalping a I don't want any remarks from you. From the scalping angle you're not worth a darn."

Speaker Redmond: "I wonder....I wonder if you would tell us how it was during that winter at Valley Forge?"

Borchers: "Well, I remember it well."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Birchler."

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

Speaker Redmond: "Will you state the question? Representative Kornowicz."

Kornowicz: "Mr. Speaker, when do the story hours begin?"

Speaker Redmond: "As soon as the story tellers get here, I guess."

Kornowicz: "9 o'clock..."

Speaker Redmond: "9 o'clock."

Kornowicz: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Boucek."

Boucek: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I come on my desk this morning and I looked...it looked like a five dollar bill on both sides. But, I opened it up and it wasn't that big and it says. 'This is a fake but the message is real. The wages of sin is death but gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ. He alone has paid the penalty for your sins, rely on Jesus by faith today and be saved.' I thought that was very nice."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, many Members have a hard time sleeping because of

the excitement, they're always waiting to come in this morning and get a report on how this national campaign is going. Representative Matijevich is on the floor and Representative Borchers, they're getting mail and phone calls from all over the nation and I'm sure all of us are....some of us are interested in knowing who's ahead this morning. Is it Matijevich or Borchers?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman spoke about the fake five dollar bill, we've got sinners on our side of the aisle but apparently we don't have as great of sinners because we didn't get any."

Speaker Redmond: "You mean you're not going to die. Representative Boucek."

Boucek: "In answer to that, it's nice to know that you would admit that you are sinners but we are just as big a sinner as you are. So, don't go bragging."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers. On Valley Forge."

Borchers: "No, this is on one of the letters. I am not...I will not read this into the record in any way. This is the filthiest letter that I have received. I would say though, John Matijevich, mentioned the other day that he was carrying all the states, which would include California. But, right now, I don't know what happened in the T.V. of California but I have been getting a lot of mail from California and I would reverse that, John, I think you are losing California by the mail I received unless you want to produce your mail and we'll check it out together. This is a terrible letter."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Boucek."

Boucek: "There's Bills floating all over, I see the Clerk's got some but his looks real. I also happened to get a check at my desk this morning. I don't know why I'm getting picked

at but I checked with my colleague, Ray Hudson and he said he got one too. And, apparently this is for our campaign Committee to make sure that we're reelected and if you care, I can read it off to you. It says, well, it's the bank of riches and Christ Jesus resources unlimited. Paid to the order of bearer on demand, so, I've got to hold this so nobody grabs it. All you need according to his riches."

Speaker Redmond: "Let's have....where were you last night?"

Boucek: "Well, I can answer that. After the orderly House adjourned at quarter till eight, I went back to my office and I stayed there until eleven o'clock and did some work. I got all my homework done and then I retired to the bed and I've got proof of that. Well, I thought...."

Speaker Redmond: "Do you care...do you care to elaborate on the proof?"

Boucek: "I saw a couple of my colleagues coming in a little later but I certainly won't mention their names because...."

Speaker Redmond: "Where were you sleeping, in the lobby?"

Boucek: "I don't know if he's sitting here, one in particular, Speaker. When I got to my door of the motel, I couldn't open the door and we had to get the security there and it so happens, one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle had an adjacent room and he heard all the noise and he looked out, but he being the Gentleman as he always is on the floor and elsewhere, didn't say a word just went right back in his room. But, I don't see him on the floor yet, this morning."

Speaker Redmond: "Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 938, Kosinski. 939, Mahar. 940, Collins and 941, McBroom - Ryan."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Giorgi. Pay attention, please."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, 938 by Kosinski asks the Federal Government to bear the brunt of the Cuban cost. 939 by Mahar, honors

George McNally. 940 by Collins notes the retirement and 941 by McBroom, honors a guy for fifteen years in the biological sciences. And I move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker Redmond: "Any discussion? The question is on the Gentleman's motion for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. In favor say 'aye' 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 943, Ewing, et. al."

Speaker Redmond: "Committee on Assignments. Speaker's Table. Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "A little bit of interest to perhaps some who use this law in Illinois. Two hundred and two years ago today, about twenty-five miles south of Vincennes, Indiana, the British Forts there, George Rogers Clark with one hundred and fifty-seven Virginia Militia and a few Kentuckians was getting ready to attack the fort. Which they took on the morning of July 4, 1778, two hundred and two years ago. And I think it's just of interest to we who are from Illinois to realize that from this act was based our state."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Boucek. In rebutal"

Boucek: "Mr. Speaker, our colleague, Webber Borchers only talks about two hundred and two years ago. The message that I brought earlier this morning was from over two thousand years ago and happened to be brought to our attention this morning through one of our very beautiful pages. It wasn't really coming from me."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Borchers, what can you tell us about the Dickenson (sic) Mounds. Representative Borchers. Representative Borchers. Borchers. What can you tell us about the Dickenson (sic) Mounds."

Borchers: "Oh, the Dickson Mounds."

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah."

Borchers: "Well, they were a tribute to the mound builder people, so called mound builder people, they were highly developed Indian people...probably who gosh...you make me pull out drawers in my mind that I haven't pulled out for a while...they were....they were....the settlement started there about...oh, I suppose fifteen hundred years ago, probably existed up to about a thousand years ago. The reason of their disappearance, I do not know. It was a large settlement, they had power obviously over a great area of territory. Most of that part of Illinois probably extending for a hundred miles in every direction which would be quite a power block. They were a developed culture, their religion was pagan. A burial site has been found attributed to these people where a chief had been buried with a beautiful vestment of shells and they had hundred....bodies of a hundred young girls around him under eighteen years of age, all had been probably strangled because there was no evidence of how they died. The mounds were built for burial purposes, there was probably a very extensive village area around there. They have found records that there were probably....a palisade of...made of timber of logs and I have just also been reminded by the father that the...that tomorrow is the feast of St. Peter and...which has absolutely nothing to with the Cahokia or the...or the mounds...at Dickson Mounds unless it be very greatly indirect some way or other, we have no historical knowledge of."

Speaker Redmond: "How about the Koster diggings., do you know anything about those?" "

Borchers: "The who?"

Speaker Redmond: "The Koster diggings?"

Borchers: "The diggings..."

Speaker Redmond: "At Kampsville."

Borchers: "Oh, Kampville, that's very interesting. Now, that one goes back to the close of the 'pristicene period.' Or, the great ice age was the close of the 'pristicene period.' Now the great ice age began...the final retreat was approximately ten thousand years, fifteen thousand years ago and as the ice retreated of course, inhabitants of North America at that time who were mongoloid in background in culture advanced...following the retreat of the ice age. Now, so the Kampville goes over ten thousand years ago, they've gone down and they found out that they were really a very civilized in many ways...people, they didn't build mounds but they were civilized and had a culture perhaps just little bit less than the people of Dickson Mounds or Cahokia Mounds and if I might say, we should do more in this Legislature to try to protect and enlarge the Cahokia Mound area because that's a center of a great Indian civilization and as old as the pyramids probably...maybe, well anyway any other questions?"

Speaker Redmond: "What do you know about Fort DeCharres."

Borchers: "About who?"

Speaker Redmond: "Fort..."

Borchers: "Fort Chartres?"

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah."

Borchers: "Oh, Fort Chartres, yes... well, pronounce it right. Yeah, that was named after the great town of Chartres in France, let me see... 1718. It was probably... started the building of that Fort Chartres was probably started in the early eight... well, let me think a moment... maybe 1718, 1716 or thereabouts. It was a... at the... it was at the area of the Mississippi where it helped give control of the Mississippi River as a...as the French were very expert

in picking...were very able to, they were expert picking strategic areas and this is one of those areas. It was flooded out many years later and it was made of stone, they had cannon there, was a great trading area. They traded with probably, well of course the Illini, they traded there. In fact, come to think about, the Illini when they were being forced by the combination of tribes against the Illini about 17...1750, 60 or thereabouts, just before the Treaty of Paris in 1763. The Illini were forced out of all of Illinois down to take shelter under the Fort, the guns of the Fort, Fort Chartres. The Illini consisted of... let me think a moment, the Michagomea, the... Maroas, the Peorias, the Kaskaskias and I'm missing one of the tribes, I forget which one at the moment. However, it was abandoned...you want anymore, but it was abandoned by the French after the Treaty of Paris in... in 1763 when France was forced to cede after the French and Indian, so-called French and Indian War, all of North America to the British Empire."

Speaker Redmond: "How about Cave-in-Rock?"

Borchers: "What?"

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I think just to clear up one small point. I was intruiged with this because I'm a buff of history and I'm learning things I never knew. But I think back to the Dickson Mounds and the great Chief who was buried with a hundred young women eighteen years old, we may not know what killed the young women, but I think we can logically assume what killed the Chief, Webber."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Boucek."

Boucek: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Not only do we have Webber Borchers digging in the Dickson Mounds and now we got the Reverend Jack Davis. But I would refer to them that

they're not going to find those young women. All they're going to do is find a lot of rocks. So I would ask them to read the gospel of John, Chapter 5, verse 39 where it said if you search the scriptures, you're going to really find eternal life."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Huskey."

Huskey: "Well, Mr. Speaker, after hearing... hearing Representative Borchers on his point of... that he would bring out so strongly the point of the young women, I'm beginning to wonder now if Representative Hanahan's assessment of the... of the Mike Royko article could refer to Webber Borchers."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, we've been here thirty minutes at your call as to the adjournment resolution. We don't have a quorum. The leadership from neither side of the aisle is here and I move we adjourn till two o'clock on tomorrow."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative... I recognized the other Representative Frederick."

Frederick: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring a message from a civilization that has the oldest written language in the world, going back five thousand years. A very prevalent statement at that time was, 'let not too much sorrow break your heart, but keep the needs of the whole world in your farsighted eyes'. I think that's pretty appropriate today."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Collins, you have an inquiry?"

Collins: "I was just asking Mr. Borchers what he knows about the Decatur Staley's."

Speaker Redmond: "Repeat your question."

Collins: "I was asking you about the Decatur Staley's."

Borchers: "The football team that became the... the Bears. Is that what you're talking about? Well, let me see. They

was organized around... they organized around 1918, 16, 17, 18 by the Staley Company of Decatur and then... I can't remember that fellow's name at the moment. But they were then sold or traded for some... sold or transferred to Chicago where the where... they became the Chicago Bears because the Staley name was no long applicable and then, but the Staley's continued to support with financial contributions the team for some years until they were standing on their own feet. They had some very fine football players attached to them and I can't remember all... their names now. You're asking me too much to go back on that without..."

Speaker Redmond: "Sternamon, was Sternamon on that team?"

Borchers: "Who?"

Speaker Redmond: "Joey Sternamon. Dutch and Joey, there were two of them."

Borchers: "Now there's another man I'm thinking of but I can't remember his name at the moment. George Halas, yes. Now George Halas, that's right. That's right. Correct. What else do you want to know?"

Speaker Redmond: "Who killed Cock Robin?"

Borchers: "Well, Mr. Speaker, that is a murder... that is for the killing of Cock Robin many, many years ago was based upon the... upon the death of, the execution of Charles the First actually. It was a British parody upon, it was a political... like our cartoons today and it was... And Cock Robin was actually Charles the First, and that drew out of... came up out of that. And the blame of that, of course, falls on Cromwell, whose head was finally dug up after his death and thrown somewhere, rolled around somewhere. There was a British family owned his skull for awhile. I don't remember which family, possibly the Dukes of Warwick, Earls of Warwick, not Dukes, Earls of Warwick.

I think they did and then they up and buried it somewhere in England but I don't remember the whole detail about that. Unfortunately, I wasn't there at the time. Anything else about..."

Speaker Redmond: "Yeah, how about Louis Carroll?"

Borchers: "Who?"

Speaker Redmond: "Louis Carroll. Alice in Wonderland."

Borchers: "Oh, Alice in Wonderland, let me see. I ought to know the author of that who was... oh, no, it wasn't Stevenson. Yeah, that's right. It was. Well anyway, I believe firmly in... in the truth of the story of Alice in Wonderland and I've been looking for that glass a long time, but I never found it."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Polk."

Polk: "There is a crying problem somewhat more than who killed Cock Robin and I wonder if Webber would help us out and let us know if he knows exactly who killed J.R."

Borchers: "Have been bribed by the... cinema involved not to divulge that information. The bribe is very high, over a million dollars and I'm going to, after the... after the session is over, I think I'll make a trip around the world and I'm keeping the secret whoever killed J.R."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Catania."

Catania: "Speaker, did he tell the State's Attorney about the bribe? And will we have to have a special appropriation to the Sangamon County State's Attorney for the investigation."

Borchers: "I'm trusting the honesty and the loyalty of all the members of the Legislature to keep me out of trouble again. I get into trouble so easy anyway that I'd just as soon and I will trust you to keep that secret."

Catania: "But the press is always blabbing these things all over."

Borchers: "I'll take you all along with me."

Catania: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take this opportunity to point out that while bribery is not acceptable for members of the General Assembly, it is totally acceptable for judges of the Mr. Wonderful contest. So all the contestants should start bribing the judges in anticipation of winning the contest tomorrow night."

Speaker Redmond: "Are there any nonconcurrences? Mr. Pierce. Representative McPike. Give us the number."

McPike: "Yes, this is House Bill 3487."

Speaker Redmond: "3487, on page 5."

McPike: "3487 was put in at the request of the Comptroller. The Senate Amendment number one, I would move to concur in Senate Amendment number one which the Comptroller's Office is in agreement with. It provides that those agencies that have a permanent improvement line item would be required to continue to make all improvements through this line item. But those without a permanent improvement line item, it would allow them to expend contractual funds for small improvements totalling five thousand dollars or less. So that's a break-out and I would move to concur in Amendment number one and nonconcur in Amendment number two because of a technical error."

Speaker Redmond: "The question's on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3487. Those in favor vote 'aye'... Concurrence. Concur on one, we got to vote on this one. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 107 'aye' and 2 'no' and the House concurs in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3487. And Representative McPike moves that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment 2. Those in favor say 'aye', 'aye', opposed 'no'. The motion carried and the House

nonconcur in Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 3487. 3577, page 5. Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, the House Bill 3577 was the Bill by the Secretary of State which applies permanent license plates for all municipal vehicles. Representative Getty made mention that certain townships and municipality corporations were excluded. Senate Amendment #1, provided that all state vehicles at no charge and county, township and municipal corporation plates are to be permanent for one time fee of eight dollars. And I would move for its concurrence."

Speaker Redmond: "Your motion was to concur, is that correct?"

Terzich: "That's correct, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1, to House Bill 3577. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's a 114 'aye', 3 'no' and the House concurs in Senate Amendment 1, to House Bill 3577. On page 2, House Bill 2823. Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 2823 is the inheritance tax, delayed payment Bill for closely held businesses. The Senate, I understand placed three Amendments on the Bill and I want to concur....they placed four Amendments on the Bill, I want to concur in three of them and nonconcur in one of them. Amendment #....the first one to concur in, Amendment #1 is a same Amendment we put on here on Senator Berning's Bill which ties the....ties the....Illinois inheritance tax to the federal state tax more directly....more direct references in determining who's entitled to the delayed payment for closely held business or farm. Amendment 3, provides for payment to the State Treasurer in the smaller counties but of a county treasurer

in Cook County, this is what the county treasurers want. They'll all get the same money they would have....as they have corrected it. Amendment 4, is the other one I want to concur in has minor technical changes that makes clear the effective date of the Bill, it's for people fortunate enough to die after December 31, 1980. So, on three of the four Amendments, Amendments 1, 3 and 4, I would now like to move to concur and then I'll get to the one I want to nonconcur on."

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

Schlickman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Redmond: "He will."

Schlickman: "Is it by Amendment #4 that we would be increasing the counties share of the inheritance tax receipts?"

Pierce: "No, that's Amendment 6, that I have not concur..."

Schlickman: "You're going to nonconcur in that one?"

Pierce: "Yeah."

Schlickman: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Redmond: "Anything further? The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 3 and 4, to House Bill 2823. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 126 'aye' and 2 'no' and the House concurs in Senate Amendments 1, 3 and 4, to House Bill 2823. Representative Terzich has moved the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment 6. Those in favor say 'aye' 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carries and the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment 6."

Speaker Giorgi: "Concurrence on House Bill 3143. Representative....read the....read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Representative Leverenz on House Bill 3143."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask that we concur in

Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3. The first Amendment makes a reduction of appropriations for....the majority of it is for personal services line item for a hundred and eighty-two thousand dollars. Amendment #2, adds thirteen thousand dollars in contractual services, thirty-seven hundred and for audits, ten thousand. Amendment #3 is an additional fifty-six thousand, four hundred for personal services and it includes the 8% level pay raise. I would move that we concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any request for discussion? Representative Leverenz moves the concurrence of Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 3143. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there's 114 'ayes', 13 'nays', 1 voting 'present' and the House does concur to Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3, to House Bill 3143 and the Bill is declared passed. Any other requests for nonconcurrences or concurrences? Representative Schraeder. What number is it?"

Schraeder: "1009."

Speaker Giorgi: "House Bill 1009. How's that?"

Schraeder: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I move concurrence to Senate Amendment 9...1...excuse me, Senate Amendment 2, to 1009. It adds some provisions for the pensions for the teachers, for Chicago teachers downstate and for the University employees. It basically adds a dollar per month for service, it increases the survivor benefit. It makes some reforms that have been requested in permanent disability and has effect of long term survivor benefit and it's the....main provision of the Bill was supported and introduced at the behalf of the Illinois Federation of teachers. It has the whole hearted support of the Illinois

Education Association and I would move concurrence in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1009."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Terzich on this concurrence."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, other than this Amendment being technically incorrect. This Amendment is contrary to the Committee that did not approve about three or four items in this....Amendment. What they're doing is, they're increasing the survivors benefit maximum which is adding an additional twelve hundred dollars a year to survivors benefits for each and every survivor. It's 20% increase in one and 30% increase in another. Increases the disability benefit from 35% to 50% and also, these two Amend....portions were not included when the Bill originally appeared before the Pension Committee. In addition the additional cost on this would amount to approximately eight million dollars. Now, we sent the Bill over in good order with a contribution that was approved by the House quite substantially and also the...there're some systems that are also not included, such as the state employee. Originally the Bill set up to help the older retirees off-set the ravages of inflation, I think the Bill should be that way and therefore, I would urge a 'no' vote on the concurrence to House Bill 1009."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Piel on the motion."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I hope that the Members of the House were paying close attention to what Representative Terzich said. This is a bad Bill and the Sponsor of the Bill gave you the impression the I.F.T. is in support of this. I don't know how many of you received a letter yesterday from Robert Healy, but I.F.T. is completely opposed to this Bill and I would go along with Representative Terzich and ask that we do not concur with it."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Friedrich on the Amendment, Dwight."

Friedrich, D.: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, one of the things in this Amendment that we're going to approve here is, the hundred dollars for the widows of retired teachers. I know of some cases and there are only a few of them, where the man was a teacher, he and his wife worked hard, did everything right. He had a long illness, he died, his widow is now trying to get alone on about a hundred dollars a month. Lower than public aid standards. Now, this....these are people who have really worked hard and have made a great contribution to this state and to the people in it. And, unfortunately I had a Bill to correct this in Pensions Committee and it didn't get to first base. Now, I don't know who these people are on this Committee who are willing to put people in that kind of a category in a real situation where they can't even eat. Now, if there is anyone that needs a little attention, it's some of these people. And, I certainly hope that you will go along with the concurrence."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Collin's on the motion."

Collins: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I had hope that the Members of this House were listening to Representative Terzich and Representative Piel and I'm sure that Representative Wolf will join in objection to this concurrence. This Amendment took a very good Bill that would increase benefits for retirees and has turned it into a absolute rip-off. There's no funding in this Bill for the increases that are proposed. As I say, it's an absolute rip-off. I hope that the House will reject this concurrence and I know there's not enough people in this chamber and if this thing should by some wild stretch of imagination gets 89 votes, I'll ask for a

verification."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative J. J. Wolf on the motion."

Wolf, J. J.: "I would just join with the previous speaker. This concurrence should not....this should not be concurred with, it should be sent back to Conference Committee and cleaned up. And I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Satterthwaite on the motion."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I thought I heard Representative Collins indicate there is no additional contribution. And yet, my synopsis indicates that the contribution is increased by a quarter of a percent. Will Representative Collins respond?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Collins."

Collins: "What. Yes, I believe the quarter percent would adequately fund the initial provisions of the Bill. Which would be an increase for retirees. But, it would not where....it would not come anywhere near funding the proposed increases that have been added into the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Well, that clarifies it. There is in fact an increase that would cover part of the benefits. It's your contention however, that would not be sufficient for all of the benefit increases."

Collins: "It would be an increase in unfunded liability of over a hundred million dollars."

Satterthwaite: "Even with the additional employee contribution."

Collins: "Even with the contribution, yes."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Sumner, do you wish recognition?"

Sumner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor answer a question?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Sumner: "Does this Amendment have a provision in it for a paying....how this will be covered, will the younger

teachers have to pay an extra increase in their pension dues?"

Schraeder: "Well, I think you have to understand that if you're going to increase benefits somebody is going to pay for them. And, if those people are going to retire then they ought to pay for them too, yes, they're going to pay for it, they're going to help. Everyone pays for their own retirement."

Sumner: "What is the increase?"

Schraeder: "One quarter percent."

Sumner: "Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "There being no further questions or discussion, the question is, shall the House concur.....Representative Schraeder to close."

Schraeder: "Well, it is interesting to see that the spokesmen are quoting the Federation of Teachers and the major provision for this Bill is a Bill that was profounded by that group and it passed out of the House with one other Bill....let me give you some figures on the vote in these Bills. Somebody is trying to fool somebody and I don't know but I think it might be the Pension Laws Commission in their usual fashion. The one provision major of this Amendment was passed out of the House, 164 to nothing. 164 to nothing. The other major provision was passed out of the House 132 to 23. 132 to 23, out of this House. Now, if that's not enough to know that the people in the House made a right decision, what happened when it got in the Senate. The Senate passed it 57 to nothing and would you believe that most outspoken opponent of Pension Legislation, Senator Berning endorsed this. It came out of the Senate 57 to nothing. Now, let's not be misled by some of these people in the House that are trying to schuddle legislation for people on retirement, survivors benefits and what have

you. This is a blatant attempt if I ever seen one by the...by a few people on this House floor to kill the first significant pension legislation that we've had in years. It's supported by the I.E.A., the major provision of the provision drafted by the I.F.T. and if that isn't sufficient reason to concur, then I don't know what is. I move concurrence to Amendment #2."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman moves that Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1...that we concur to House Bill 1009. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', and those opposed by voting 'no' and Getty to explain his vote for one minute. Representative Getty to explain his vote."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise to explain my 'no' vote. If you will look on page 20, of Amendment #2 you will see there's a very serious error. The Amendment part which provides for the one dollar per month increase, of which I think probably many of us would indeed want to support. Was put erroneously in a Section that self destructs on January 1, 1981. Therefore, it would never have any applicability. It should have been put on page 21, after line 23. This should not be concurred in, if you favor teachers at all."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there's 55 'aye', 70 'nays' and 7 voting 'present'. Representative Schraeder, do you want to move to nonconcur now? Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move nonconcur."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman moves that he nonconcur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1009. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it, we do not concur to Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1009. Representative Mautino for what reason do you arise?"

Mautino: "Mr. Speaker, if you're looking for things to do, I've

got 3180 that I would like to concur in."

Speaker Girogi: "Let's....should we have another attendance Roll Call, Mr. Clerk. Let's have an attendance Roll Call. Attendance Roll Call, hit your switch. What was that number again, Representative Mautino?"

Mautino: "3180."

Speaker Giorgi: "3180, Mr. Clerk. Read 3180. Or, Mr. Mautino on 3180. Mr. Mautino on 3180."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The Senate Amendment, I would like to concur in...."

Speaker Giorgi: "Take the Roll Call."

Mautino: "Reduces the appropriation for the States Attorney Appellate Service Commission by forty-one thousand, three hundred dollars in contractual services. Thirty-one thousand and one hundred dollars S.A.A.S., County funds, nine thousand two hundred dollars for a total of forty-one, three and I'm recommending that we concur in Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Giorgi: "I didn't hear your motion on Senate Amendment #1, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "I move to concur in the Senate Amendment...excuse me, Senate Amendment #1 and Senate Amendment #2 as well. Senate Amendment #1 cut out a total of ninety-three thousand, six hundred dollars and....excuse me, and added seven thousand, nine hundred and fifty....nine hundred dollars in G.R.F. It was a net decrease of eighty-one thousand, six hundred dollars and then there was an increase of forty-one thousand, three hundred, so that there's a net decrease of forty thousand dollars. And I move to concur in both Amendments."

Speaker Giorgi: "There being no request for discussion, Representative Mautino moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2, to House Bill 3180. All in

favor will signify by voting 'aye' and opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. Representative Breslin on the motion. Oh, just to explain you vote. Representative Breslin."

Breslin: "Mr. Speaker, I have a conflict of interest in this legislation and I would to be recorded as not voting. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Let the record show. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there's 129 'ayes', 7 'nays', 2 voting 'present' and the House does concur to Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3180 and the Bill's declared passed. Representative Taylor on House Bill concurrences to 3208. Representative Taylor on 3208. Do you want to clear the board."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. Senate Amendment #1 appropriates six hundred and seventy seven thousand, eight hundred and ninety-three dollars and one cent. These are awards that have been made by the court of claims. Senate Amendment #2 appropriated eight hundred and sixteen thousand eight hundred and twenty dollars and forty-six cents. This is another award that has been made by the court of claims. Senate Amendment #3...Amendment corrects two case number which are in error. And Senate Amendment #4 changes the dollar amount from forty-eight dollars and eighty cents to forty-eight dollars and eighty-eight cents. Senate Amendment #5 changed the dollar amount by thrity-nine cents and Senate Amendment #6 appropriates a hundred and eighty-two thousand, five hundred and eighty-four dollars and eighty-four cents. These awards have not been finalized as of yet and the court will only use the money that is necessary. I move for the adoption of Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6."

Speaker Giorgi: "There be no request for....time out for a moment."

Taylor: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "Yes, Sir, Mr. Taylor."

Taylor: "Representative Roger McAuliffe is not on the floor at this time and I feel that he has some more awards, I've been informed by the staff that he would like to get in there. I would like to move that the House nonconcur with Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 and request a Conference Committee."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Taylor moves that the House does not concur to Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 to House Bill 3208. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the House does nonconcur...this Amendment. Representative Capuzi on 3047."

Capuzi: "Mr. Speaker, I now move to concur with Senate Amendment #1, 4, 5 and 6 on House Bill 3047 and this is on the Commission on Delinquency Prevention. And I so move to concur."

Speaker Giorgi: "Senate Amendment 1, 4, 5 and 6, you said? Representative Capuzi, would you repeat. Senate 1, 4, 5 and 6?"

Capuzi: "Senate Bill....Senate Amendment 1, 4, 5 and 6."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Capuzi has moves that the House does concur to Senate Amendments 1, 4, 5 and 6 to House Bill 3047. Representative Collins on the motion."

Collins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to the motion to concur in these Amendments, and let me tell you why. There has been no stronger supporter of the Commission on Delinquency Prevention than I. I have worked in their legislation for years, and I have worked with the Commission and its

director who I might say is an outstanding representative for the Commission, but this year in the the Senate for the first time they took one provision in this appropriation which is the grant for Community Committee. These Community Committees that work so closely with the young people in our communities, and for the first time rather than a direct grants, they line item certain communities that would receive monies for working within the community. But what is worse, they left out some community committees that have been doing viable work in their neighborhoods, and I can only speak from first-hand experience to one which is in my district in a community known as 'hegwish' which may be unfamiliar to many of you, but it is a very fine, middle-class, working peoples' community in the 30th District. And the 'hegwish' Community Committee has been in existence for many, many years working very closely with the young people of that community. And that community like so many communities, does have problems. It has youth problems. It has delinquency problems. And this Committee has worked, and has worked successfully with the young people in that community. This community like so many other communities has had drug problems, and this Committee has worked with the problems of the young people in facing the threats and menace of drugs in the community. This has been a hard-working, viable, successfully community Committee, and I think it is downright criminal that it would be cut out of this appropriation. I don't know why it was cut out, but I suspect that it was done for a very base political reasons, jealousies within the community, politically motivated and aimed at the destroying a very productive force in this community. I can't stress this strong enough because I feel this very deeply. This goes right to the heart of problems with young people in my

district. And if it can happen in my district, it can happen in yours. The 'hegwish' Community Committee has been working with young people for many, many years, and I've seen the fruits of their work, and think to see this community Committee cut out for political consideration is the rottenest type of attack that I have witnessed in my time in the General Assembly. And I implore you...I beg the Members of this House, do not concur in this Senate Amendment to this Bill. I don't want my remarks in any way to reflect on Representative Capuzi because he and I have worked together in this appropriation and in this Commission. But he is accepting something that the Senate has sent him, and it's evil what the Senate sent him. And I ask you, do not concur. Let's send this back. I'll buy everything that's in this appropriation except this one item. I want this one small item put back in. And I can't....I cannot overemphasize how important this is to the people of my district. So please, please reject this concurrence. Let's put it back in, and let's all get behind this Commission. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Balanoff on the motion."

Balanoff: "Mr. Speaker, this is one time that I want to agree wholeheartedly, completely with my colleague across the aisle. And I wish to echo every single word he had said. The 'hegwish' Community Committee has done excellent work in juvenile delinquency prevention. We've seen reports in the newspaper where thousands of teen-agers is going to be on the streets this summer because they don't have anything to do. More important this year than any previous year we need the funding for this particular Committee, and I urge you to nonconcur."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative White on the motion."

White: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in

support for the motion to concur in House Bill 3047. I'm very familiar with the Juvenile Delinquency Provention Committee...or Commission. I'm also familiar with the Chicago area project which provides funds for those Community Committees. In Representative Collins' district there are four Community Committees. In my district there's one, and it has been alleged that in this particular district, this particular center has not addressed themselves to the problems of youth. They've concerned themselves with other matters, and so I rise in support of Representative Capuzi's motion to concur in House Bill 3047."

Speaker Getty: "Representative Dawson on the motion."

Dawson: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I worked with this Community Committee since it's in Session, and the area that it particular covers in basically more like an island, and there are really not that many activities for the children, and adults, or anything. And I feel that this is worthy organization, and I feel that we need it very much in our neighborhood. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Bowman on the motion."

Bowman: "Well, thank you. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what I object to most is having the Senate tamper with line items for specific communities. Now I don't know how many of you have had a chance to read the...you know, your staff analysis, or have had a chance to read the Amendment, but if they did this to one particular community they may very well have done it to other communities. And I think unless you're pretty sure that your community is provided for, that the proper vote on this would be a 'no' vote or a 'present' vote, send the Bill to Conference, and strip off the very onerous line iteming of specific community programs. I don't think we

want the Senate tampering in our communities. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Capuzi to close."

Capuzi: "Mr. Speaker, I now move that we concur with all Senate Amendments."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Capuzi moves that the House concur to Senate Amendment #1, 4, 5 and 6, to House Bill 3047. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Capuzi. Representative Henry, for what reason do you rise?"

Henry: "Representative....Mr. Speaker, I rise to explain to the House that there's a number of Commissions, agencies throughout the City of Chicago that have already placed programs together, and they are waiting to go for this long hot summer, and I would suggest that more green lights get there to put this on the Governor's desk so the money could be spread through our communities."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Capuzi again."

Capuzi: "Mr. Speaker, I'll now move that we concur with Senate Amendments 1, 4, and 5, and Amendment #6 we will not concur and go into a Conference Committee."

Speaker Giorgi: "Well, let's declare the first motion lost and then allow you to re...to make another motion. Okay. On the first motion to concur to all four Senate Amendments, the motion fails. Now, you want to renew a motion to concur to Senate Amendments 1, 4 and 5, is that correct? Does everybody understand the motion? All in...will you take the roll, Mr. Clerk. Everyone in favor of supporting the motion to concur to Senate Amendment 1, 4 and 5..."

Capuzi: "Right."

Speaker Giorgi: "To House Bill 3047 signify by voting 'aye' and

those opposed by voting 'no'. 1, 4 and 5. Have all voted who wish? 6 is the one that he doesn't want. Representative Hanahan on the motion."

Hanahan: "Yes, I have a parliamentary inquiry. Since when is a Conference Committee going to be restricted to some sort of action by the House....accepting certain Amendments and none other. This typically a gesture of futility for somebody to....to accept some Amendments and not others. You either send a Bill to a Conference Committee or not, this is ridiculous."

Speaker Girogi: "We've been doing that, Tom. We've been doing that, Tom. We have been accepting some Amendments and rejecting others."

Hanahan: "But, it's still a sense of futility when the Conference Committee could write, rewrite this Bill any way they want."

Speaker Giorgi: "Your right but we can't prohibit this action. Representative Pierce on the motion."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, the Gentleman is not right. This doesn't send the Bill to a Conference Committee. It never has. The Senate can recede from the one Amendment we nonconcur, and that's final action. You're right if it goes to a Conference Committee, they're not restricted in any way. They can write that Bill any way they want. The purpose of this is if the Senate Sponsor wants to recede from Amendment 6, that's final action. The Bill is law. The Bill goes over to the Governor, and you don't need a Conference Committee."

Speaker Giorgi: "Okay, have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, 132 'ayes', 3 'nays', 1 voting 'present' and the House does concur to Senate Amendment 1, 4 and 5 to House Bill 3047..."

Unknown: "God Bless Mayor Byrne."

Speaker Giorgi: "Now, what is your motion on Senate Amendment #6, Mr. Capuzi?"

Unknown: "God bless Mayor Byrne."

Capuzi: "To nonconcur on Senate Amendment 6."

Speaker Giorgi: "The motion is to nonconcur to Senate Amendment #6 to House Bill 3047. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the House does not concur to Senate Amendment #6 to House Bill 3047. House Bill 2227, Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "House Bill 2227 is the Emergency Medical Services Bill. It passed the House with something like 120 votes. There was some opposition in the Senate initially from the municipal league but that was resolved and so, they now join the group of people who support the Bill including the Medical Society the Hospital Association, The Illinois Association of Nurses, Illinois Association of Emergency Medical Technicians. I would move for concurrence in Senate Amendments to 2227, Senate Amendments 1, 4 and 6."

Speaker Giorgi: "You're moving to concur to Senate Amendment 1, 4 and 6 to House Bill 2227?"

Reilly: "Yeah."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman moves that the House concurs in Senate Amendments 1, 4 and 6 to House Bill 2227. All in favor signify by voting 'aye'....Representative Schlickman on the motion."

Schlickman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates that he will."

Schlickman: "Could you be more descriptive of Senate Amendment #4. As I understand it, it deletes all references to statewide as it applies to emergency medical service system and then specify the ambulance standards, licensing and inspection shall not apply to any ambulances owned, operated license or regulated by any unit of local

government."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Reilly to answer."

Reilly: "That's correct."

Schlickman: "What is the effect of deleting the reference to statewide?"

Reilly: "In my opinion, it doesn't have any effect because the other language makes it clear that we're talking about a statewide system. The municipal league's lawyer was worried...there was some other court decision, there was some court decision that they seemed to think the word 'statewide' might somehow be read as preemptive homerule and it was not intended to be and so we took the word out. But, in my opinion, if you read all the language taken together it doesn't have any effect."

Schlickman: "In other words, in your opinion, if we were to concur with Senate Amendment #4, we'll still have a statewide emergency medical services system?"

Reilly: "Correct."

Schlickman: "All right. Now, what about exempting ambulances owned by units of local government from standards, licensing and inspection."

Reilly: "Well, obviously, I would rather not have done that and that's the way we passed the Bill out of the House. But, I've worked on this for a year and a half and I think I know the subject pretty well. Two comments. One is, that's not as big exemption as it appears on its face because almost all, I would guess 90% though I can't document that. Almost all...."

Schlickman: "What did you say?"

Reilly: "It's something like 90% of the ambulances owned by municipalities meet the standards. Second of all, the simple, you know this is the half a loaf is better than nothing kind of thing. I would have rather had the

whole...the whole thing, I couldn't get it."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Conti on the motion."

Schlickman: "Mr. Speaker, may I ask for a division....."

Speaker Giorgi: "I'm sorry, Representative Schlickman to continue."

Schlickman: "I would like a division of the question."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Reilly. Would you answer his inquiry about division of the question."

Schlickman: "Well, I have a right to that, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "I know, but I'm asking Mr. Reilly, he may answer this without any....are you going to divide the question for, Mr. Schlickman or do you want the motion put?"

Reilly: "I would hope that he would withdraw that and if you know, if you're going to vote....the Senate is not going to recede from that Amendment. So, if you're going to vote 'no' because of that necessary compromise then what...you know, there's no point in dividing the question. If it's got to go back to the Senate, it would have to go back to the Senate."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Schlickman. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "I do."

Speaker Giorgi: "You move for the division of the question? What division do you want?"

Schlickman: "I want 4, taken out."

Speaker Giorgi: "Let's take....then that, Representative Reilly moves that the House concur to Senate Amendment 1 and Senate Amendment 6 to House Bill 2227 and on that motion, Representative Simms."

Simms: "Would the Sponsor yield? Representative Reilly, with this Bill now, how is this going to...with ambulances, how's this going to effect the ambulance services in downstate Illinois as it pertains to many of the

communities that still have to rely on the funeral home to provide the ambulance service. Will this completely eliminate them?"

Reilly: "No. Two things which I think you and I have discussed before. Number one, non...non emergency vehicles, you know, medi-cars and that sort of thing are not covered at all. So, I'm...."

Simms: "Okay."

Reilly: "Those are covered at all. Second of all, we grandfather in as I think you and I have discussed before...."

Simms: "This is a grandfather in. Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative VanDuyne on the motion to concur to Senate Amendment 1 and 6."

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

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

VanDuyne: "Well, in Amendment #6 I'm not so sure that I like the Department of Public Health having complete control over this statewide because, you know, they say that the further you get away why the less control you have. But, my real worry is, in the last part on the analysis here where it says, it increases the penalty for violations from a petty offense to ten thousand dollars. Does that...is that going to be included on our volunteer fire department also?"

Reilly: "No. That has nothing to do with that, Amendment #6 was an agreement reached between the Hospital Association and Senator Daley. The fine that they're talking about there applies only to hospitals and there's currently a law in the books that says, hospitals must provide emergency....service in the emergency room essentially whether you can pay for or not. For some reason, Senator Daley thought the penalty for not doing that ought to be increased and the Hospital Association agreed. Both sides

agreed, but that fine has nothing whatsoever to do with the rest of the Act."

VanDuyne: "Well...okay, but it doesn't specifically say that..."

Reilly: "Yes, it does. When you read the Amendment and see the Section of that statute being amended, you will see that the penalty they're talking about applies only to that, the Section of the Act...."

VanDuyne: "Okay...okay...I'll accept that."

Reilly: "Okay."

Reilly: "Okay."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Conti on the motion to concur to Senate Amendments 1 and 6."

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think....a good Bill is probably meaningless here because of the ambiguity in the Bill. It requires hospitals to render....a hospital emergency service in case of injury or acute medical condition and to implement emergency hospital. Medical and surgical services on community area basis. I'm afraid this going to open up the door to an awful lot of litigation because of the ambiguity in the Senate Amendment itself. The concept, the Bill is good but I think they should have been more explicit in the Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Reilly to close."

Reilly: "Well, what Representative Conti said, is with all due respect, irrelevant. The language that you quote is already in the law. The only language we're changing is, the penalty. Is the penalty, the language you quoted about...being required to give the service and so on, that's already in the law. We're not changing that at all."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Reilly moves the Senate....but we're not...."

Reilly: "I'm sorry. Okay, so anyway, what we're on is not....everything except the Amendment #4 and so I would move to concur in 1 and 6 and then we can get to the question on 4."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Reilly moves that the House concur to Senate Amendment 1 and 6 to House Bill 2227. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. It's final action. Representative Chapman, do you want to explain your vote?"

Chapman: "I really wanted to ask the Sponsor a question about the shape the Bill was in now, but...."

Speaker Giorgi: "You can do it on 4."

Chapman: "Possibly it isn't..."

Speaker Giorgi: "On 4, you can do it on Amendment #4."

Chapman: "There's no point in it."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there's 123 'ayes', 18 'nays', 5 voting 'present' and the House does concur to Senate Amendment 1 and 6, to House Bill 2227. Now, Representative Reilly renews his motion on Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 2227. Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Yes. Again, the point....this Amendment represents an agreement that was reached, there was some opposition in the House and a great deal in the Senate on the grounds that units of local government and their elected officials ought to be able to allow....ought to be enabled to control their own destiny and that's essentially what this Amendment does. So, I would move concurrence in Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 2227."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Chapman on the motion to concur in Senate Amendment #4."

Chapman: "Mr. Reilly, I'm trying to figure out where once these Amendments would be accepted, where the Bill stands in

terms of new health occupations. Where...what is the issue in relation to the emergency medical professionals? How many new ones do we have?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "One, in my opinion at least. It is not all together accurate to say that we have any new ones, it's just that we now recognizing that there are people with training somewhere between matters and M.T.A. and that of a E.M.P.T. and enormously helpful particularly in rural areas of the state that can't afford the E.M.P.T."

Chapman: "Now, so then, if I understand you correctly, that particular provision of the Bill that some of us had a problem with is still in the Bill. Thanks a lot. I...I would oppose this Bill then."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Deuster on the motion."

Deuster: "The Sponsor will yield for a question?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Deuster: "It is my understanding, Representative Reilly that the purpose of this Bill is to set standards for ambulances and mobile intensive care vehicles and that that purpose is to promote the health and safety of the people. People who may receive this service. Now, what possible rationale can there be for saying that we exempt the local units of government if the purpose is to guarantee the health and safety of people who may have need for an ambulance. Why, other than political reasons, why do we want to exempt local government and put them at a...put private enterprize under the regulations and exempt those local governments that may be running ambulance services which may be competing with the private enterprise ambulances."

Reilly: "There are two answers to that. One is, 89% of all municipally owned ambulances are already in compliance. So, it's not nearly as big a problem in that sense as it

looks like. But, the second answer is, we do this in a lot of areas because we respect the right of locally elected officials to respond to their own people, with their own standards, at their own cost."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, it may...may be a practical answer but I don't think it's a good public policy and I would urge opposition to the motion to concur here. I think that if we are going to set some standards, particularly in a area where government and private enterprise are competing with one another, and that is my understanding of the case here, that private ambulances are out there running their businesses and here we are passing a law that puts a burden or a regulation on private enterprise and exempts government. It's bad enough to have subsidize government in an area even though it is ambulance service, it's one thing to have government subsidizing a service which may be driving a private ambulance company out of business, but it's another thing on top of that...on top of that subsidization to put some regulations on which don't apply to everybody and I think it's unwise and not proper and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Willer on the motion."

Willer: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield? How do you see the relationship between these new E.M.S. regional agencies. How do you think they're going to act with a new medical board, that we have just set up to not just advise the director of the Department of Public Health but have the last word and we do not know what because that Bill was not delineated. How do you see these councils working with that board?"

Reilly: "Well, the regional agencies were taken out in the House in your Committee..."

Willer: "Okay..."

Reilly: "The....the advisory....the advisory board...I happen to agree with you as a matter of policy that we ought not have...have created that absolute veto power of that board but, we did. The board here is purely advisory and would continue to be, I would suppose that the board here's function in terms of the overall scheme of things would be that, on a question dealing specifically with the emergency medicine, their advise would be thought on things that the...this new vetoed board was concerned with. Obviously it would be the final decision making agency."

Willer: "Well, I would point out to you that as far as the other board is concerned, it says, rules that are promulgated without their advice and consent are null and void. So, I...do you not see some trouble down the road?"

Reilly: "But it said...it also says that, they haven't given that within, I think it's 90 days. That the director...the director can act anyway. It's purely advisory, it's true that they....the problem before under Doctor Peterson was, that he wouldn't even consult the council. All we've done here is say that they have to be consulted, if they say yes if, they say no, or if they do nothing. The director can still go ahead and put the rules into effect as he wants to. Subject only to the other board which I agree as a matter of policy, I happen to agree with you on."

Willer: "Well, then once the council does make up its mind and promulgate rules then does the new medical review....the new medical board we set up have to....they could in effect I guess, just say, well, too bad, we don't like it and make them null and void because they have the final word over the director of the Department of Public Health. Is that not correct?"

Reilly: "The....regardless whether we pass this Act, that's

correct."

Willer: "Well, I...."

Reilly: "Passing this Act doesn't change that."

Willer: "I guess I am trying to point out, the mischief we did in creating the other board in other agencies that you're now trying to create and I can see the same thing coming down the road in many areas."

Reilly: "It's already an advisory board in emergency medical services. All we're doing is making sure that this one is consulted."

Willer: "Well, it isn't going to do any good in the final analysis. What I'm trying to say, if the medical board that advises our director decides that they don't like it in the final analysis, they're the ones who are going to have the last say. Is this not true?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Is that....well, she's made that a formal statement. Representative McClain."

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

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

McClain: "Jim, as you know, I mean it's Saturday morning. Does the advisory council have veto power over the director?"

Reilly: "No."

McClain: "Does the advisory council have the right to approve even if the director against it? Approve E.M.S. plan?"

Reilly: "The advisory council....the council is advisory only as I read the language."

McClain: "Okay. We have a staff analysis and it says, the council duties include approval of the statewide E.M.S. plan. I mean, which approval is pretty definite. That means....like a veto proof."

Reilly: "I'm sorry, would you repeat the question."

McClain: "Well, all I'm saying is, our staff says approval, I

mean, which is...which is not advisory. Okay, advisory is recommend and our staff analysis talks about review. We're talking about approval."

Reilly: "The...on the plan, that is correct. That is the language in the Bill. But, the regulation, every every legal Act as opposed to just a planning document, but every legal Act that the department can take in terms of issuing regulations or whatever, it's purely advisory."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Robbins. Representative Reilly to close."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill has been worked on by all of the provider groups in this area. It is supported by, as I said before, the Medical Society, the Hospital Association, the Nurses, the American College of emergency physicans and by the Municipal League. All of the groups that are...have some expertise in this field that have worked on it, support this. It is not all that I wanted, it is not all that I think that the House wanted, it is not all that perhaps some day we must have. But, it is a major advance, don't focus just, by the way, on the ambulance function because there're a great many other functions that will aid rural areas as they struggle to have ambulance service. It will provide a statewide system with a great deal of force and a great deal of ability to help us in our problems when we have emergencies. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on concurence in Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 2227."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Reilly moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 2227. All in favor signify by vote 'aye' and those oppose by voting 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wish? Representative Chapman to explain her vote or....no, she's gone. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr.

Clerk. On this question 102 'ayes', 37 'nays', 2 voting 'present' and the House does concur to Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 2227 and the Bill is declared passed. House Bill 1505, Representative Stanley."

Stanley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to request a Conference Committee for Senate Bill 1505 and refuse to concur with Amendments 1, 2 and 4. We'd like to make sure that it's crystal clear about the preemption of homerule in there that that provision is out and the Senate did have some problems with it. So, with that I'm requesting a Conference Committee."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Stanley moves to nonconcur to House Bill....Senate Bill 1505 in Amendments 1, 2 and 4. Page 6. Representative Stanley, you move to not to recede from House Amendments and request a Conference. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it, the motion prevails. Senate Bill 1632. Mr. Dunn, 1632."

Dunn, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would like to move that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #2 and that we ask that a Conference Committee be appointed."

Speaker Giorgi: "The motion is to refuse to recede from House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1632. All in favor...and request a Conference Committee. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay', the 'ayes' have it, the motion prevails. Back to concurrence. House Bill 3001. House Bill 3014, Representative Ryan. Getty is going to handle House Bill 3001. Read 3001. Representative Getty on House Bill 3001."

Getty: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move to concur in Senate Amendments 1, 3, 4 and 6 to House Bill 3001. Senate Amendment #1 reduces the operations budget of the

Comptrollers Office by a hundred and thrity-five thousand dollars. Amendment #3 increases the state officers salaries and related line items by one hundred and seventy-three thousand, eight hundred and sixty-one dollars. Amendment 4, changes sub totals throughout the Bill and Amendment #6 adds five hundred and two thousand, five hundred and eighty-one dollars for a court ordered payment to community college district #508. I move for concurrence in all of these Senate Amendments."

Speaker Giorgi: "Being no request for discussion. Representative Getty moves that the House concur with Senate Amendments 1, 3, 4 and 6 to House Bill 3001. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye'....Representative Schlickman. Let's get on our buttons if you want the floor. Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "My light has been on for a while, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "And you turned it off."

Schlickman: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Schlickman: "This is a Bill for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Office of Comptroller, is that correct?"

Getty: "That's correct."

Schlickman: "In Senate Amendment #3, we are adding approximately a hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars for the salaries of directors or officials from other agencies, is that correct?"

Getty: "What it is, it covers the salaries for the new director of the nuclear safety and commerce of community affairs which were not included in other Bills."

Schlickman: "Weren't there....ordinary and contingent expenses Bills for the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs and one for the Department of Nuclear Safety."

Getty: "We carry all of the state officers, the constitutional

officers and Members of the General Assembly on our Bill."

Schlickman: "On the Comptrollers Bill."

Getty: "On the Comptrollers Bill. That's correct, Sir."

Schlickman: "I see. What is this regarding Amendment #6, what was the nature of that suit and why is the responsibility imposed upon the state to satisfy judgment?"

Getty: "All right. There was an error in the Comptrollers Office causing two and a half million dollars to be withheld. Delayed two and a half years in payment to the community college district. This is the interest that had accrued during that period of time. The court ordered that this payment be made to the community college district."

Schlickman: "Oh, there's no act of negligence that occurred or breech of contract that occurred at the local level for which we're being responsible?"

Getty: "No, Sir."

Schlickman: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 3, 4 and 6 to House Bill 3001. All in favor signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there's 136 'ayes', 7 'nays', none voting 'present' and the House does concur to Senate Amendments 1, 3, 4 and 6 to House Bill 3001 and the Bill is declared passed. House Bill 3014, Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3014, which was the General Assembly O.C.E. Senate Amendment #1 adds twenty-five thousand dollars of general revenue monies for the Rape Study Commission. And I would ask for concurrence vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "There being no request for discussion. The question is shall the House concur to Senate Amendment #1

to House Bill 3014. All in favor signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there's 119 'ayes', 17 'nays', 4 voting 'present' and the House does concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3014 and the Bill is declared passed. Representative Winchester on House Bill 3024."

Winchester: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move that we concur with Senate Amendments 1, Senate Amendments #2 and Senate Amendments #3, added in the Senate. All total this comes up to about a forty-nine thousand dollar increase but with the way it was introduced or passed out of the House, what is in that reduction as the way it was entered into the General Assembly by the agency. I would move for the concurrence of Amendment #1, 2 and 3."

Speaker Giorgi: "There being no request for discussion, the motion is shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 3024. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there's 132 'ayes', 13 'nays', 2 voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 3024 and the Bill is declared passed. House Bill 3027, Representative Reed."

Reed: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendments 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 9. The appropriation has been increased approximately a million, seven hundred thousand dollars over the original request. However, we have no problem with this, I ask the acceptance of the concurrence motion."

Speaker Giorgi: "There being no discussion....request for

discussion the question is shall the House concur with Senate Amendments 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 9 on House Bill 3027. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye'....Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Reed: "Yes, Sir."

Schlickman: "Senate Amendment #9 would eliminate a reappropriation of a hundred thousand dollars for research and development of alternate energy sources for urban rural or suburban areas. Why are you agreeing to concur with this elimination in a vital area?"

Reed: "Because those dollars have already been expended."

Schlickman: "What is that?"

Reed: "Those dollars have already been expended."

Schlickman: "So, there is nothing to reappropriate?"

Reed: "That's right."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is shall the House concur to Senate Amendments 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 9 to House Bill 3027. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there's 129 'ayes', 15 'nays' and none voting 'present' and the House does concur to Senate Amendments 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 9 to House Bill 3027 and the Bill is declared passed. Representative Vinson on House Bill 3029. Representative Vinson. Out of the record. Representative McAuliffe on House Bill 3036...out of the record. Representative Jane Barnes on House Bill 3037....she's not in the room...out of the record. House Bill 3044, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I'm ready to go."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Peters, House Bill 3044."

Representative Bowman on the motion."

Bowman: "I wonder if he would mind holding for just a minute, in fact, I'm sitting here talking to the staff right now...."

Peters: "Fine."

Bowman: "...over the question we had yesterday."

Peters: "Fine."

Speaker Giorgi: "Out of the record. House Bill 3049, Representative Bowers....out of the record. House Bill 3140, Representative Leverenz. 3143...out of the record. House Bill 3180, Representative Mautino...did that...okay. House Bill 3201, Representative Yourell. 3201. Representative Yourell. Yourell."

Yourell: "All right. Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 3 to House Bill 3201 which is the budget for the State Board of Elections. Amendment #1 to House Bill 3201 makes the following reductions to the appropriations. Seven thousand thirty-five dollars in Personnel Services, in the election division, seventeen thousand, fifty-four dollars in personnel services and in the same election division printing, ten thousand dollars. And the general counsel Division, personnel services, fourteen thousand zero seventy-six. In the campaign finance division in personnel services, five thousand, two hundred and sixty-three dollars for a total reduction of fifty-three thousand, four hundred and twenty-eight dollars. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3201. Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 3201 appropriates four hundred thousand dollars to State Board of Elections for the purpose of training election judges on the administration of the new consolidation of elections law that will take place in January of 1980. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 3201."

Speaker Giorgi: "There be no request for discussion, Representative Yourell moves that the House concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 3, to House Bill 3201. All in favor signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there's 141 'ayes', 12 'nays' and none voting 'present' and the House does concur to Senate Amendments 1 and 3, to House Bill 3201. The Bill is declared passed. Representative Taylor on 3241...I'm sorry, Representative Matijevich for a purpose of an announcement."

Matijevich: "No, I was going to handle this for Jim. He asked me to handle this for him."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on House Bill...did he read the Bill? 3241, Senate Amendment #1, is no dollar change. It's a transfer Amendment involving four hundred and forty dollars which is added to the personal services and deducted from all other ordinary and contingent expenses of FY-80, contingent expense appropriation of the Illinois Commission on Atomic Energy. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3241."

Speaker Giorgi: "Take it out of the record temporarily. Representative Matijevich on House Bill 3301. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 4, to House Bill 3301. Senate Amendment #1 reduces the appropriation by two hundred and four thousand, three hundred dollars in personal services retirement social security. A reduction which all have agreed on. Senate Amendment #2, reduced....reduces the equipment request for the Supreme

Court by three hundred and fifty thousand dollars to eliminate the E.D.P. equipment in which there is now a feasibility study by the L.I.S., on a particular service of E.D.P. Senate Amendment #4 appropriates four hundred and forty thousand dollars to the Supreme Court, four hundred thousand which is for payment of fees of guardians ad litem in proceedings arising under the mental health and developmental disabilities code. And forty thousand dollars is for administration and payment of the fees. I move for the adoption and concurrence of these three Senate Amendments, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Schraeder on the motion."

Schraeder: "I'm going to ask questions in Senate Amendment 3."

Speaker Giorgi: "Pardon me, just a moment, Mr. Schraeder.

Representative Yourell for what reason do you arise?"

Yourell: "Yes, I don't want to interrupt but there is a young man with three cokes and some money and change and he's...he doesn't remember where it's supposed to go. So, if anybody has ordered three cokes...."

Speaker Giorgi: "I would guess it's McClain, but he's not around.

Representative Schraeder on the motion."

Schraeder: "Representative Matijevec, the Amendment on Supreme Court that we put in and there was serious debate about whether or not the Supreme Court would allow audit of their books by the Auditor General. Am I correct, that Amendment is still in this appropriation?"

Matijevec: "That Amendment...that House Amendment, there was in fact, two attempts in the Senate to take away that House Amendment both of those attempts failed. That is still in the Bill, Representative Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Thank you, that's very important."

Matijevec: "Move to concur, Mr..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Matijevec moves his motion to

concur to Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 4, to House Bill 3301. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there's 135 'ayes', 17 'nays', 1 voting 'present' and the House does concur to Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 4, to House Bill 3301 and the Bill is declared passed. Representative Ryan on House Bill 3311...out of the record. Representative Peters on House Bill 3320. House Bill 3320, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3320 is what we have dubbed the continuing Commission appropriation and has made...or in accord with a promise made to the House by Representatives Chapman, Matijevich, Wolf and myself as a Spokesman and Chairman of the Appropriations Committee. That no items would be added to this Bill other than what the House considered. I want to say to you that, our promise has been fulfilled and this Bill contains no items different than that which came out of the House and that the total changes in the Bill are dollar changes between the appropriations for the various Commissions and the changes all added together make for a reduction of one hundred nineteen thousand dollar...one hundred and nineteen thousand, one hundred and twenty-one dollars. But, there are no new Commissions, no new other items of any kind, any sort, anyway, any shape, any form added to this Bill. The Senate has been extremely cooperative with us, I extend to them our thanks for helping us fulfill our commitment and promise to the Members of the House. And I would move concurrence in Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, to House Bill 3320."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any request for discussion? There being no

request for discussion...Schlickman, I'm sorry.
Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "Is my light working, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Giorgi: "It is."

Schlickman: "Okay, thank you. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Schlickman: "By my analysis, Senate Amendment #1 would reduce the appropriation to the the Sun Set Commission by two hundred and fifty thousand, nine dollar. Is that correct?"

Peters: "Yes, Sir. It leaves the Commission with approximately a hundred and...I think eighteen thousand dollars. Their request was in for around three sixty, Representative Schlickman."

Schlickman: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Peters moves that the House concur to Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, to House Bill 3320. All in favor signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there's 108 'ayes'...Representative Collins wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'. 109 'ayes', 40 'nays', 6 voting 'present' and the House does concur to Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, to House Bill 3320 and the Bill is declared passed. Representative Piel, do you want call 22..3241 now? Representative Jane Barnes would you like to call your appropriation Bill....3037? Out of the record. Representative Kane on House Bill 3614. Representative Kane. Representative Kane on House Bill 3614."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move that the House concur in Amendments 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6, on House Bill 3614. House Bill 3614 is the Bill that puts in statutory language the Governor's reorganization order

on the Department of Nuclear Safety. As you recall, the House added a considerable amount of functions to that department, the Senate in its Amendments have...in Amendment #1, added a separate article which would prohibit the importation of spent nuclear fuel into the State of Illinois, except from states that allowed the exportation of spent nuclear fuel from the state. Amendment #2, is a...."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me, Mr. Kane. Representative Schlickman, for what reason do you arise?"

Schlickman: "I would like to ask for a division of the question. These Amendments are not related, each of them raises a separate issue and I think it would be well if we took them one at a time. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "How do you want to divide the question, Representative Schlickman?"

Schlickman: "Well, let's just take each one of them at a time."

Speaker Giorgi: "Okay."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #1 is an Amendment which puts a second article into House Bill 3614 and what it does is, it says that no spent nuclear fuel can be imported into Illinois from any state that does not accept the same kind of fuel from Illinois. I would move that the House concur in Amendment #1."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Leinenweber on the motion."

Leinenweber: "Yes, would the Gentlemen yield to a question?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Leinenweber: "As I read our staff analysis, I don't have a copy of the Amendment. That this would prohibit the storage of spent nuclear fuels from outside the state unless they come from a state with similar storage facilities and then both Houses of the Legislature have agreed to a reciprocity

agreement with that state. Is that what the Amendment does?"

Kane: "No, it doesn't inject the Legislature into that reciprocity agreement."

Leinenweber: "What....what does the Legislature have to do with the Amendment at all?"

Kane: "Well, it was introduced in the Senate and passed by the Senate and is now here on a concurrence."

Leinenweber: "No, no, I understand that, but doesn't the Amendment give the Legislature some activity in regarding to the prohibition of...."

Kane: "Oh, I'm sorry, yes. The reciprocity agreement would have to be approved by majority of Members of both Houses."

Leinenweber: "And, what possible constitutional basis could that be done? Isn't that an executive function?"

Kane: "That could be. There are some constitutional questions with this Amendment."

Leinenweber: "I move....Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in operation....oppositon, excuse me, to Senate Amendment #1. It's clearly unconstitutional, it's an effort by a Senator, presumably in order to curry favor among the voters in his district who have certain problems with nuclear storage facilities. I can certainly understand the fear on the part of the people but that certainly doesn't help by putting in an Amendment to a Bill that is clearly unconstitutional as this. Approval of an agreement reciprocity agreement between the states is very clearly an executive function. There's absolutely no reason at all that we should adopt this Amendment because of its unconstitutionality."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Mugalian on the motion. Ten requests for rule...."

Mugalian: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Kane: "Yes."

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Mugalian: "Representative Kane, the Bill proper establishes a new Department of Nuclear Safety and Senate Amendment 1, reports not to modify the way in which that department operate but would seem to enact the substantive law. Does that seem to you a question of germaneness?"

Kane: "Yes, it does not have the...the Amendment #1 from the Senate does not have any necessary relationship with the rest of the Bill. There would be some question of germaneness."

Mugalian: "As a question of legislative intent, if the court would invalidate this Amendment. And, I think they very well might because of federal preemption which has been ruled upon all ready by the U.S. Supreme Court. I think in the Minnesota case. Is it your intention that the...that this Amendment 1 is important to the Bill or could it survive without it?"

Kane: "The department and the provisions regulating the functions of the department would be completely separate from the policy enunciated in Senate Amendment #1. I think that the policy in Senate Amendment #1 has nothing to do with the creation of the department and the functions given to the Department of Nuclear Safety. That would be my interpretation of what the Legislative intent would be."

Mugalian: "May I speak briefly to the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "Continue."

Mugalian: "I believe that anyone who takes any interest in this field would agree that the U. S. Supreme Court and other...certain Appellate, U. S. Appellate Courts have clearly ruled that this....that the area in which Amendment 1 seeks to operate, have been preempted completely by the United States and by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. I

therefore, think that this Amendment, if challenged and I think it would be, would be ruled unconstitutional. And, I would feel also that the Amendment is not at all an integral part of legislation creating the Nuclear Safety Department."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Stearney on the motion.
Representative Robbins on the motion."

Robbins: "This Amendment or Bill as you would call it has had a thorough hearing over the last two years in the Energy and Environment Committee and if.. it has not come out of Committee, so we get it on House floor on concurrence would it couldn't make it out of Committee. I suggest a 'no' vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Van Dwyne on the motion."

Van Dwyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd to speak....I would like to rise to speak in favor of this. Now, this has been harangued for at least my six years in this House, when I first came down here I was put on the Environment, Energy and Natural Resources Committee and we tried to pass a legislation of this sort in that Committee at that time. We even tried to alleviate the situation in that, if there was a state such as, California that was depositing this waste, had to go through a state that had a dump in that state before it got to Illinois. That it would be prohibited from passing the state in order to come to Illinois. Now, I don't know how the rest of the people in this area feel or in this House feel, and I wish they would pay attention a little bit. This is right outside of my district, it lies right within Ray Christensen's district, we have three nuclear power stations there now. They're in the process of building another one, we have two or three other generating plants in our district and one of the previous speakers told about, curring favor from people in

the district and it's a known fact that he's brought and paid for by Commonwealth Edison and some of the other business entities in our district. So, I don't think he should really make any remarks about, currying favor. We're talking about a dump there in our area that is the only one that I know of in the northern part of the state and possibly even in the state. So, we're very worried about it, all we're trying to do is curb this and try to stop the interstate travel of nuclear waste. And I think it's a very serious problem, especially for the northeastern part of Illinois. And, so I speak very much in favor of the Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Christensen on the Amendment."

Christensen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This isn't so important as to whether it's unconstitutional or not. The important thing about this Bill, is that we have the only storage site in the nation right now. It's all ready half full without any of our waste and all we're trying to do, is stop the importation of waste from other states. We're not anti nukes, we're in favor of nuclear power. But, we want to just store our own. That's the only thing we're asking. We're not asking anything else, just don't let them fill it up with out of state waste. It's a very simple matter, if we don't have a place to store our own, we're going to be in trouble. So, let's pass this Amendment and then get on with it."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Vinson on the motion."

Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like you to consult with the parliamentarian and check the germaneness of Senate Amendment #1. And, while you're doing that I would like to address the Amendment. But, I am challenging the germaneness of the Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kane on the Amendment."

Kane: "Yeah. Mr. Speaker, I think that it has been a long standing policy that the House or the second House does not have the opportunity to question the germaneness of an Amendment that has been put on by the other House. I think that the questions that we were addressing earlier, the question to do with whether there is a constitutional question of whether the Amendment is absolutely necessary for the rest of the Bill. And, I think those are two separate questions."

Speaker Girogi: "Representative Vinson, continue."

Vinson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, on Mr. Kane's point. There has been a break in that tradition that has established an important precedent in regard to class X legislation some years ago, the Speaker ruled. That the Speaker had the right to rule on the germaneness of...on Amendment added in the other House. And, I think this Amendment is clearly non-germane. And, I would like to get that ruling. Now, on the substance of the Amendment, it's clearly unconstitutional on its face. It asks Illinois to regulate interstate commerce with no reasonable basis. It seeks in effect to say, that we want lights but we don't want electricity. And, I would urge that the House reject this troglodytic approach and send it back to the abandon it deserves. It has been considered many times and rejected by the House and it's an effort to legislate improperly in the last few days of the Session. We ought not have it imposed on us, it's time for us to send a message to the Senate, if you will, that if they want something like this they ought to do it properly, which they have not in this case. And, I would urge a 'no' vote, if it is ruled germane which it ought not be."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Pierce on the Amendment."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, in addition to the constitutional point

which was stated so brilliantly by the previous speaker. In which I'm inclined to agree. I would like to ask Representative Kane a question on the merits of the Bill. If, Representative Kane, we're the largest user of nuclear power and therefore, the largest creator of nuclear waste in our state, shouldn't we be the last state that would want to inhibit the interstate transportation of nuclear waste because some day we'll want to get the nuclear waste here in Illinois that is stored at, Zion and Morris and the other locations and ship that to a permanent...to a permanent disposal site, hopefully in another state, hundred of thousands of miles away like New Mexico in a permanent salt basin. So, isn't it kind of ill advised for us, Illinois, that creates more nuclear waste than any state of the fifty, to inhibit in anyway the interstate transportation of that waste because eventually we're going want to get that waste out of Illinois and transport it to a permanent site. Don't you agree with that public policy?"

Kane: "In answer to that question, I would say, categorically not. I just don't think that's the case. Where we have a problem now is, is that this is a temporary storage facility that is presently the only one in the country. We do not have a permanent solution for the disposal of nuclear waste materials. And, until we have some kind of national policy, national plan for the permanent disposal of high level nuclear waste. I think that Illinois must be in the position of protecting itself from being the national dumping ground for temporary storage of nuclear waste. We have to be in the position of being able to negotiate with the other states on both high level waste and low level waste. And, I do not think that simply because General Electric owns a facility in Morris and that

that is the only disposal site that is presently located....presently existing in the country that we should be naturally the dumping ground for all of the nuclear waste from all over the country. I think we have to be in the position of being able to negotiate with other states, being able to force them into at least taking care...temporarily of their waste. And, I don't think that your point is well taken, this is a good Amendment and it should be adopted."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Pierce."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, to finish. I understand the Gentleman's point of view but someday...someday when our temporary waste, which are stored not only at Morris, but at every nuclear plant in the state. Morris is not the only site in Illinois of temporary site for storing nuclear waste. No Illinois waste is going to Morris. I'll tell you where the storage space is, Zion, Illinois. That's where they store all the waste that comes from the Commonwealth Edison Plant there. Morris, at the plant there. At the other plants throughout the state, no Illinois nuclear waste is shipped...not no Illinois nuclear waste from any plant in our state is shipped to Morris, to General Electric. It's all staying right at the temporary site and someday, ten years from now we'll want to ship that to a permanent site in New Mexico and they'll say, well, those smart Legislators ten years ago, the Senate and some of their House colleagues said, no, we're against interstate shipment of nuclear waste and therefore, Illinois, keep it where you have it. Keep it in Zion, keep it in Morris, keep it in that place near Peoria where they're putting it. Because you passed a law that interstate shipments couldn't take place in your state. And, therefore...and, therefore, you have that nuclear waste and you can keep it. And, you

know where you can put it because....because we were so shortsighted as to be the leading state in prohibiting interstate shipment of nuclear waste. So, I'm not sure this is good public policy, besides being unconstitutional. What we're doing is saying to future generations, we're against interstate shipment so we're going to keep the waste in our state and we have more waste produced in this state than any of the fifty states and we're going to say, each state should dispose of its own waste. And, most of our waste....no waste from any plant in Illinois goes to Morris. No waste from any plant in Illinois is shipped to Morris, that waste...that waste, Commonwealth Edison doesn't ship one bit of waste to Morris. All that waste remains right at the plants, right at the plants in Zion and the other locations throughout Illinois. And, therefore, I don't believe this Amendment is such a wonderful thing and we will live to regret it."

Speaker Giorgi: "On the question of Representative Vinson, the germaneness of the Amendment, the parliamentarian has informed me that it is germane. On the issue of constitutionality is not our domain so, let that rest for another day. Representative McClain on the motion."

McClain: "On the motion? Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, all things change in the year. Last year the House Environmental, Engery and Natural Resources Committee...appropriately killed this piece of legislation as Mr. Robbins stated. However, now, after I was on State Governmental Organization Committee also this year, we heard this piece of legislation. I think it is important for the Membership to understand a couple of complexities that maybe, I didn't understand a year ago. As you know, Illinois is being considered one of the three major dumping areas throughout the United States

on spent fuel. One is South Carolina, one's New York and the other one is Illinois. Do you know that President Carter did not place an Illinois person on the advisory panel as a voting member to determine which state was going to be the dumping site. We have a person as an advisory member only, but not as a voting member. One of the reasons that I think this Amendment is important for us to consider and adopt, is that it says to the President of the United States and to that advisory council, that Illinois does not want to be the dumping area for the entire United States. Whether or not it's constitutional or not constitutional, I think it's important for us as a Member of the General Assembly to tell the President of the United States and that advisory panel that the President did not see fit to have a voting member on. I think it is important for our General Assembly to say that we do not want to be that dumping site. The second issue and I think is important, is that this Bill is more important than any one section. For the first time we're going to have a Department of Nuclear Safety, there are a lot of provisions in this Bill that are very important to now get boxed up into a fight between Senate Members and House Members over one particular section. I think it would be inappropriate for us. So, because of that, I talked to the Minority Leader. I would urge you to concur with Mr. Kane's motion at this time."

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

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

Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman moves the previous question, the question is, shall the question be put. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the previous question prevails. Representative Kane to

close."

Kane: "I would yield to Representative Reilly to close."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kane moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1..."

Reilly: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Reilly to close. Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the Minority Spokesman on the Committee, I rise to urge concurrence in Senate Amendment #1. To review how we got to where we are and why I am standing on the floor making this suggestion. It seems to me clear as some others have said that almost certainly the courts are going to strike this provision down. But, I would also point out two things and they lead me to the suggestion that we concur. Number one, there is a severability clause in the law so, that if that happens all the other provisions of law remain intact. We're not threatening here, if we concur the destruction of all else that we've done. But, we would be threatening what we have done here if we send this back to the Senate. The Senate is wrong on this issue, they been wrong all along, I think they know their wrong. But, I also have the strong feeling that they're not going to back up from the wrong headed decision that they have made. If we send this back and we cannot get any kind of agreement from the Senate and I'm morally certain that we cannot get any reasonable agreement from them. Then all the changes the House has made, all the strengthening, all the improvement in the executive order which takes effect anyway will have been lost. So, on balance it seems to me the practical and the policy thing, the good government thing and the simple practical politics thing to do at this point, the only realistic thing to do at this point is to concur in Senate Amendment

#1, if the Governor decides to take this out or if the Courts take it out, so be it. At least we will have done a responsible job in face of some of the things the Senate has insisted on doing and I am afraid, I am very much afraid would never back up from, so I urge concurrence in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3614."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Reilly moves that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3614. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'nay'. Representative Piel to explain his vote for one minute."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to go into a little bit what the previous speaker said before he closed. He says it's a bad Amendment the Senate put on but you know, they're not going to back down so we might as well concur with it. Well, this is sort of a ridiculous attitude to have. Obviously neither of the Sponsors have gone to the Morris facility or else they probably wouldn't even be supporting something like this. I don't know if any of you have received a letter, you know, that explains the unconstitutionality of this but, California law was struck down and district courts substained that all California laws dealing with nuclear waste are unconstitutional. So, all you're doing is saying, fine, we're going to pass a nonconstitutional law and let them fight it out in court. I think it is a ridiculous way to approach a Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 122 'ayes', 29 'nays', 1 voting 'present' and the House does concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3614 and the Bill...Amendment is concurred to. Representative Kane on Amendment #....Senate Amendment #2. Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment

#2 is a technical Amendment and I would ask the House to concur in Amendment 2."

Speaker Giorgi: "There being no question or discussion. The question is, shall the House Concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3614. All in favor will signify....Representative Ropp on the motion."

Ropp: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Ropp: "Yeah, Representative Kane, I see that we have transferred in this Bill originally about five or six inspectors to this agency. Then, this last week we added two more inspectors to the fire marshall office, does this put all of those back to the fire marshall plus the two we had recently approved just last week? Have they got eight now?"

Kane: "No. The analysis that you have there is incorrect. And, the number of individuals transferred doesn't have anything to do with this particular Bill. This particular Bill under the provisions of it and under the provisions of the executive order that will go into effect regardless of what we do. The functions that the state fire marshal has as to whether inspections having to do with whether inspections located at nuclear power plants will be transferred to the Department of Public Safety."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kane moves the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3614. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question 125 'ayes', 15 'nays', none voting 'present' and the House does concur to Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3614. Representative Kane on the Senate Amendment #3. Representative Dave Jones, 'aye' on that Amendment. Representative Grossi,

'aye'. On that last Amendment. Representative Kane on Amendment #3."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #3 puts into the statute the Assistant Director of Nuclear Safety. The effect of that would be to have both the Director and the Assistant Director....the appointments approved by the Senate and I would urge the adoption or concurrence of Amendment #3."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any request for discussion? Representative Vinson on this motion."

Vinson: "Will the Gentlemen yield for a question, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Vinson: "Did you say that this particular Senate Amendment creates an Assistant Director for this new bureaucracy?"

Kane: "No, it doesn't create the Assistant Director because an Assistant Director would be appointed anyway. What this would do is, say that whatever....that the position of a Assistant Director would have to be concurred in or the appointment would have to be concurred in by the Senate."

Vinson: "Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kane moves his motion that the House concur to Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 3614. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question 118 'ayes', 27 'nays', 2 voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 3614 and Representative Kane on Amendment #4...5."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #5 simply says, that some of the studies that the new Department of Nuclear Safety will be asked to do, will be done in cooperation with the Illinois Institute of Natural Resources. You will recall that when we created the

Institute of Natural Resources several years ago, that it was our intent that the research capabilities of the state and the area of energy be located in one place. There's no need to duplicate that in the Department of Nuclear Safety and so some of these studies technical in nature would be done in cooperation with the Illinois Institute of Natural Resources. I think that this would cut down on whatever danger there might be in duplication. And, I would urge the adoption of Amendment #5."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Schlickman on the motion."

Schlickman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Schlickman: "Our analysis says that, this Amendment would make the Institute of Natural Resources an equal co-partner in overseeing nuclear safety regulations. And, concludes by saying, the institute opposes this and that cosponsorship would be unworkable."

Kane: "I think that...that was a early analysis that has subsequently been withdrawn. I think that that is an incorrect analysis."

Schlickman: "Would the institute simply be advisory with respect to nuclear safety regulations or would it have...."

Kane: "No, no, there're.."

Schlickman: "Substantive authority."

Kane: "There are a number of studies that the 3614, gives the Department of Nuclear Safety to do, to perform. And, these studies having to do with costs and things like that as to the use of nuclear power would be done in conjunction or cooperation with the Illinois Institute of Natural Resources. The institute would have nothing at all to do with the regulation of nuclear safety. That would be done in the new department. This only has to do with certain studies and there's no point in having the same technical

expertise located in two departments."

Schlickman: "Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Reed on the motion."

Reed: "Question of the Sponsor, please."

Speaker Giorgi: "Continue."

Reed: "Representative Kane, is there adequate funding. I happen to handle the Fy-81 appropriation for the institute. Is there funding any place to reimburse the institute for any of the technical work that they may do?"

Kane: "I think there is sufficient funds in the department for this to be done, yes."

Reed: "And those arrangements have been made or are in position to be made?"

Kane: "I don't think that they have been made but, this was...this Amendment was put on in cooperation...conjunction with the Governor's Office and I think that those arrangements will be made. Yes."

Reed: "And, we do then have your word that the institute has removed its opposition to Senate Amendment #5?"

Kane: "I was never aware of the institute's opposition."

Reed: "Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kane renews his motion the concur to Senate Amendment #5 to House Bill 3614. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Borchers, we're taking a Roll Call. Do you want to explain your vote?"

Borchers: "Yeah."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Borchers to explain his vote for one minute."

Borchers: "I would like to point out, this is a division of power. You never every have two generals, that's a fatal mistake. Only one general and this is division of powers,

therefore, you should vote 'no', so we only have one general."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there's 114 'ayes', 28 'nays', 2 voting 'present' and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #5 to House Bill 3614. Representative Kane on the last Amendment, #6."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #6 is a rewriting of Section 25-A, of the EPA Act. This particular Section was ruled unconstitutional ten years ago when the EPA Act was originally passed. Subsequent to that there have been changes in the Federal Statute and what the rewriting of this does is to make this Section constitutional and this is one of the powers, one of the Sections that will be transferred to the new department. It's been agreed to and I would ask for the House to concur."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any request for discussion? Representative Van Dyne on the motion."

Van Dyne: "Just a quick remark, Mr. Speaker. I wonder how the Senate gets along with all chiefs and no indians in reference to what Representative Borchers said."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kane renews his motion that the House concur to Senate Amendment #6 to House Bill 3614. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'nay'. Final action on all the Amendments. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there's 125 'ayes', 22 'nays', 1 voting 'present' and the House does concur to Senate Amendment #6 to House Bill 3614. Representative Matijevich on 3311."

Matijevich: "No, that's George Ryan's."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Ryan. Out of the record then?"

Representative Terzich on a nonconcurrency....he's off the floor. Representative Macdonald on 3385."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3385. House Bill 3385, if you remember is the Bill that would allow inter governmental corporation and form joint action agencies. This Bill was proposed by the Northwest Municipal Conference, specifically for water purchase and piping Lake Michigan water to the Venture Communities. Our original Bill was just related to generally joint action agencies simply because the financial market said, that we would have to have this legislation before we could issue bonds. It was felt that, since the questions were asked in both the House and the Senate as to why this Bill was necessary. That it would be better to relate the Bill merely to water joint action agencies, that is really the reason why the Bill was introduced. It is a Bill that has no taxing power for the water joint action agency, the powers of the eminent domain have been limited so that they are only the powers that are vested in the municipalities that participate. Therefore, I would ask your concurrence on this Amendment #2 from Senator Regner. It changes the Bill by merely making it a water joint action agency."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Mahar on the motion."

Mahar: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Giorgi: "She indicates she will."

Mahar: "Did this apply not only to Venture but applies to any forming water district in the state. Is this correct?"

Macdonald: "That's absolutely correct."

Mahar: "Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Macdonald moves that the House

concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3385. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye' those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there's 152 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present' and the House does concur to Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3385 and the Bill is declared passed. Representative Daniels on 2723. Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 2723 as amended in the Senate includes an investment tax credit provision which has been debated at some length by this Body. Amendment #1 provides that one-half of the credit be applied to the corporate personal property tax and one-half to the corporate state income tax. The arguments on this issue are well known by everybody in this Body and I'm confident that they have been eloquently articulated in the past and will be today. We recognize that there will be a front-end revenue loss to the state and a front-end revenue loss to local government and school. But it's important that we realize that such revenue loss is recovered in three years. And, the new investments generate additional revenue thereafter. The Illinois tax base is, in fact, deteriorating as a result of the decline of manufacturing and protecting that tax base is absolutely essential to support the very programs which the opponents claim this Bill will jeopardize. The supply side of the basic revenue equation has not kept up with the tremendous increase in the demand side. We simply cannot continue spending unless we are willing to increase the supply side of the tax base. An investment credit is a step in the direction of restoring and ultimately expanding the tax base. Business cannot claim the tax credit unless they actually invest. So we are guaranteeing that the tax

base will be expanded. I am concerned about the amount of excessive spending that this Body has authorized and I share our Governor's concern..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me. Excuse me, Representative Daniels. Representative McPike, for what reason do you arise? Mr. McPike?"

McPike: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor would take this out of the record for a few minutes?"

Daniels: "No, I would like to go ahead with it now."

Speaker Giorgi: "Continue."

Daniels: "I am concerned about the amount of excessive spending that this Body has authorized in the past. And I am concerned as..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me, Mr. Daniels. Mr. Kane, for what reason do you arise?"

Kane: "How many Amendments are we considering?"

Daniels: "Five."

Kane: "You didn't indicate. All five on the same motion?"

Daniels: "We are... No."

Kane: "I would ask for a division of the question."

Daniels: "That's fine. If the Gentleman would let me finish, he can have his division. I'm going to ask for a concurrence in 1,2,3, and 4. And I'm going to nonconcur on number five. Now, can I go again? I am concerned as all of you are with the excessive spending that this Body has authorized in the past. The Governor is right when he issues his concern and when he states to all of us that we must view very carefully the economy of this state and be careful on the appropriations that this Body authorizes. I do think that it's extremely important however, that the Members of this House distinguish between revenue expenditures, such as appropriations, and tax expenditures, such as the investment tax credit. The former takes from

the tax base, but the latter, the investment tax credit, contributes to the tax base. We are literally investing in the future of Illinois. With prudent spending, we can accommodate a period of renewed investment in Illinois and I urge you to vote for a concurrence, first of all, on Amendment #1 and that's the Amendment we're addressing at the present time. I urge your favorable support and I suggest to you, to all of you that have looked at the issues of worker's compensation, that have looked at the issues of the business climate in this state, that realize we must, in fact, do something to spur the economy of this state and to help our manufacturing base in the state, that this is a Bill that you can support to assist in the business climate, one that you could take home to your people and say, 'We are doing something for the business in the state.' I urge your favorable consideration for the investment tax credit. This provision has been debated at length by Representative Vinson, Representative Stuffle, and I would suggest that it's a good time to enact this into law."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Mugalian on the motion."

Mugalian: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a GE proposal.

It's conceived and drafted and pushed by the registered lobbyists for General Electric. And this is a rather sophisticated scam. It will do only one thing, believe me. It will reduce the revenues in the general revenue fund and in the personal property tax replacement fund. It will not, I repeat, it will not stimulate new construction. There is not a shred of evidence that it would do so, not one shred. But it will do one other thing. One-half of the loss to our state and local revenues will be the amount of the gain to federal tax receipts. That is because these taxes are fully deductible and most of these corporations

that will be involved, affected, will be in the 48% bracket. So this is really a self-destructive proposal. I resent legislation by lobbyists. I don't dislike the lobbyist himself or the corporation he represents. What I do dislike is that this is at least the third time this Bill is before us in the last month. It has twice been rejected already. Now, how many times must the small taxpayer, the homeowners, defend themselves? One lobbyist gets three shots at the public till. I'm serious. This Bill is just a tax reduction by fiat and only for a favored group. What I resent is that it is flying under false colors. It presents itself as a means to stimulate the economy. That claim is ludicrous. There is no economist, no economist anywhere, anywhere in the world, who could testify that this tax credit proposal will, if enacted, trigger decisions to build commercial or industrial buildings or buy personal property used in the business. I'm still not used to the hypocrisy of those who bleed for the senior citizens, who bleed for the home owners, and who bleed for the small businessman. This Bill puts another heavy load on these classes of our constituents. By the amount that we open the public till to the General Electrics of this state, we are adding another burden on all other taxpayers. This is a terrible Bill and I move...urge you to nonconcur."

Speaker Giorgi: "There are about half a dozen lights on. But I want to indicate that the camera man wants to take some pictures. Representative Slape on the motion."

Slape: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Daniels: "Yes."

Slape: "Representative Daniels, could you give us an estimation on what the loss to the state revenue would be for the Calendar Year 1981?"

Daniels: "It's very difficult to determine because it depends upon the amount of investment that is made. There is a division in this between state and local. There's a fifty-fifty split which is the first time."

Slape: "Would you say that... For both of them combined, would you say that 96 million dollars would probably be out of line..."

Daniels: "I think... I think that's a high figure. I think it's more like the potentially high end of some..."

Slape: "By what percentage do you think it's high? In your own mind, what do you think we're talking about? 50 million?"

Daniels: "Was your question on..for next year? Was that your question?"

Slape: "Yes."

Daniels: "Alright. I'm sorry. I didn't hear that part of it. It was just pointed out to me that you asked that part. It's not going to affect next year. It won't kick in until 1983, is when the impact will be felt. We have a lead time on that. That's Amendment #2."

Slape: "Okay. When it goes into effect, what will be the cost the first year?"

Daniels: "It's estimated by us between 40 and 60, but nobody knows for sure."

Slape: "Okay. And doesn't it, two or three years later, when it goes up to 2%, wouldn't that also double? That loss of the revenue, wouldn't it double at that time?"

Daniels: "We calculate that most of the investments would come in the early period. So we don't expect a doubling feature..."

Slape: "Okay..."

Daniels: "The beauty of this Bill is that we have the lead time till 1983 in order to view very carefully the economy of the state before actually any investments will be credited

and the beauty of this legislation, which for the first time, you have before you now, is the split between local and state, the fifty-fifty provision. The prior speaker was in error because this actual split has not been before the Body previously. It's the first time it's come up."

Slape: "Okay. If it's your understanding and your belief that the initial investments are going to come in the first part of this Bill, what's the rationale for changing it to two percent from one percent then?"

Daniels: "Well, because we want to stimulate investments beyond the initial ones that are brought in. And the one thing I also ought to point out to you too, is that the prior speaker referred for instance to the fact it's going to cost the state all this money, and he's concerned about that, and he's concerned with the hypocrisy. But the fact of that matter is if the businesses do not invest in the investment tax credit through the provisions of it, it won't cost the state anything."

Slape: "Okay. Is there sometime in your mind or is there some...hope in your presenting this Bill that there be a washout in what the state is losing and what the state will be receiving?"

Daniels: "You want to ask that again?"

Slape: "At what point under this Bill do you think the state will be receiving new revenue to equal the lost revenue?"

Daniels: "About three years."

Slape: "That it will equal, right? And how many years before the state will regroup or recover from the loss?"

Daniels: "It's hard to say. But to give you the best figure we can, about three years."

Slape: "I want to understand, you know. You're saying three years before the new money coming because the investments that we're taking, the expanded manufacturer, will equal

what the state's lost?"

Daniels: "The increased taxes paid equal the taxes lost."

Slape: "Okay. And then, how long will it be before it will lose the first two years? You know, we're going to lose money the first two years, I think, even by your own analysis of the Bill. How long will it take the state to recover from that or recoup that?"

Daniels: "Well, the Gentleman here on my left has pointed out that the income tax is around ten percent anyway and it'd just be slower rate of payment. We just won't get as much as we would."

Slape: "Alright. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Stuffle on the motion."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, this particular issue in its current form has not been before this House. It would have been had 1933 come out. The same Amendments would have been offered...Representative Vinson and I, as was pointed out, by Representative Daniels. Throughout this Session there has been seemingly a battle between those who would tie this completely to somehow the argument that we're going to gut the taxing districts if we do this, or the contrary argument that this is something for business. Indeed, General Electric is involved in this thing. We... We admit that. There's no doubt about it. If you have a plant with 800 employees, it's about to shut down, as I do, then you're concerned about General Electric. Or if you have four or five thousand, as another Gentleman does who sits on this floor on this side of the House, you're concerned about General Electric. You're concerned about business in general. I don't think we have to make an apology here, as Representative Daniels said, about the taxing districts. Many people have opposed this proposal and others on the floor here this year...are those people

who have 30 and 40% of their constituents living off the dole, unlike most of us downstaters who don't have hundreds and hundreds of political patronage jobs and a high percentage of other people living off the state or local county and Federal Government one way or another. We've got to live by means of tax incentives as necessary in this period in our economy and this is the type of thing we think is absolutely necessary. We're not talking things away. I think Representative Daniels has indicated that. Money would be plowed back because of the incentives, because of increased spending, because of increased employment, in the local communities. I don't think there's any question about that. I would point this out; still as late as yesterday, some of the groups lobbying against this particular issue were arguing that this would cost 156 million dollars in its first year. They were arguing that 156 million dollars would be attributable to this coming fiscal year. Now that's not the case. The Democratic staff analysis, I think, also is in error because it alludes to a cost figure estimated for this year. Now we're not talking about this year. We're not talking about fiscal '82. We're talking about a first year inception date of impact in 1983 on the taxes payable then. And the estimate that Representative Daniels gave you I think is a firm one, forty-four to sixty million. And only would we reach the sixty million if there's increased and necessary activity in mining, in refining, and in agriculture community activity. And then, and only then, would that occur. And that would also mean increased stimulus locally, increased jobs, increased productions, and increased revenue flow. So hope we'll look at this thing from the viewpoint of what's necessary to stimulate the economy in Illinois. It's not taking anything away

from anyone in labor either. Yesterday, and I know, and continually, certain labor groups have opposed this thing. Now I voted for labor as you know with a 96% record. But, by gosh, I want to know one other thing. Why do some of the labor people support it? Why do the construction people support it? Because they know it's necessary to industry and it's necessary to them. So don't believe that all the people in organized labor are opposed to this either. Because many, many of them support it. Back to the 156 million dollar figure; that is in error. I repeat, that was predicated on false assumptions. That was predicated on the belief, erringly, that other entities other than those covered were brought under the coverage of this Bill and that's not the case. That was predicated on a percentage of national investment and Illinois doesn't fall under the percentage that was used. It was absolutely in error. And every group that's spoken to this issue, spoken to it knowingly, realizes now that the forty-four to sixty million dollar impact figure is correct, virtually so and they know that we're talking about two years at least down the road before the first impact. This is probably as important a Bill, as important an issue, as we can deal with on the House floor or the Senate floor this year and I would certainly urge people to put aside the arguments that we're taking so much away because we're not from the taxing districts, put aside those arguments and stand up and be counted, not only for business, not only for General Electric, but also for the local taxpayers who need jobs, who need tax incentives to develop income and revenue sources in this state. And for those reasons and the others cited here today and in the past, I would urge an affirmative vote on Representative Daniels' motion."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Hanahan on the motion."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I know this may come to somewhat of a surprise to some of my conservative friends that stated they speak in behalf of business, but I'm standing here to tell you that the building and construction industry, the trade unions that have founded the trade union movement of this country, are standing in support of this measure and this motion. Now, that might shock a few of my...my conservative friends and I'm sure Representative Tuerk back there is really interested in this, but sometimes you know, we have to get together and understand our mutual needs. This is one time I'm going to suggest that our mutual needs are in an expansion in the construction industry. If this Bill is proposed and this Amendment in Conference Committee report is...the concurrence is adopted, I am hoping that what has been told to those of us who are concerned about the unemployment, concerned about the move backwards in our employment areas, especially in the expansion in commercial and industrial development, that this money will help spur on an increase in employment. Now I, too, like Representative Stuffle, recognize that there are two different kinds of union movements in this state. Some are the 'tax-eaters' and some of us are the 'tax-providers'. I represent people who provide the tax dollars that pay for this whole economy. My Members, the Members that I represent are not at the trough eating the tax dollar that is provided. The building trades, the carpenters, the electricians, the bricklayers, the cement finishers and painters, the teamsters, and many of the other different trade unions are very much in favor of an expansion in our industrial development in this state. We need the jobs. We're willing to take a gamble and say that if we allow business in this state to expand, and to have a tax break in order

to do it, we're willing to ride along with that hopefully because our Members would like to be tax providers and fully and gainfully employed instead of being at the unemployment lines which some of them are right today because of our economy. So I say to those that are worried about where people stand on an issue as complicated as this, that the unions that I am very involved with have said very vocally and very emphatically that this is a good Bill that we need. We need the expansion in our commercial and industrial development and that we're willing to give an 'aye' vote in order to accomplish that end. So I hope this absolves me with some of my conservative friends in the business community on some of my other viewpoints, but in this issue, I think this is well worth the support that I'm going to offer to it."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative McPike on the motion."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Indicates he will."

McPike: "Lee, just to follow up, a brief question. During the entire time on this debate, I've asked the lobbyists from General Electric one question and I would just ask the same question to you. Earlier you indicated and every economist agrees and it appears that you agree that it takes three to five years to recoup this money. Is that a true statement?"

Daniels: "We estimate approximately three years."

McPike: "Most of us have a minimum of three and a maximum of five. So roughly, it takes you that long to recoup the money. The state has a five hundred million dollar surplus and can afford to wait three years or five years to recoup. My question to General Electric and my question to you is this; every School District in the state is bankrupt. Every School District in the state borrowed money in

September and uses that money throughout the year. Now will you explain to me how the School Districts in this state can wait three to five years to recoup the money that they're going to lose from the corporate tax replacement fund?"

Daniels: "Well, I think that's an interesting point you bring out. Because the point should be returned to you and to say to you that personal property replacement tax that this Body passed is exceeding in revenue expectations by some one hundred million dollars more than the personal property tax showed us in its last year of effectiveness. In fact, we're some five hundred and seventy million dollars more...or will be disbursed, rather, during Calendar year 1980. That's a hundred million more than we have received under the last operation of personal property tax. We are receiving more money by the state. It's expected by the time this kicks in in three years that the replacement tax will distribute even greater sums than we're experiencing right now. And I don't agree with you. All school Districts in this state are not broke."

McPike: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, to the issue then. I haven't the faintest idea where he got those estimates, but most of us received the revenue estimates and economic outlook for FY '81 from the Illinois Economic and Fiscal Commission either yesterday or the day before. And they're estimating that the corporate tax replacement will be 452 million dollars. Four hundred and fifty-two million dollars, not 570. On page 12 of the book if you want to look at it, Lee..."

Daniels: "Does it show the disbursements for the second half of this year? That's where you're in error in quoting that..."

McPike: "Four hundred and fifty-two million for one fiscal year....This is not a question, if you don't mind. You can

answer it...Four hundred and fifty-two million dollars this year and five hundred million dollars for Fy '82. Five hundred and million dollars for Fy '81, I take that back. Four hundred and fifty for this and five hundred...five hundred and...five hundred for next year. And that is not a growth from last year. That is not a surplus at all. We were trying to replace five hundred and eighteen million, and it looks...it turns out it's going to take us two years even to get to five hundred million. The fact is that this takes money away from the local schools, local units of government and they simply do not have any way to recoup those losses. The state does and they do not. And we've offered General Electric and we've offered everybody on this floor an opportunity to provide this investment tax credit against state incomes. We've asked you not to take it away from School Districts, not to take it away from local units of government because they simply can't afford to wait for three years to replace revenues if we give them no way to generate new revenues. For that reason, and for only that reason, I ask that we nonconcur in this motion."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Yes, I move the previous question."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', and opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the previous question is put. Representative Daniels or Bradley to close. Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Spekaer, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we now have before us a piece of legislation that in my opinion and the opinion of many will in fact stimulate growth and assist the economy in Illinois. It will, in fact, provide an incentive for plant expansion which other states already offer. It will, in fact, off-set some of the negative

business climate currently prevailing under Illinois law. And it is a measurable incentive which produces new jobs, yes, new jobs, for Illinois, new construction, new employees, home construction, new vendor and service, business and an increase in business all over the state. Yes, we do have some front-end losses and that's why this splits it half between the state and half with local. And yes, in answer to some of the objections brought up, if it won't work, then the businesses won't invest in Illinois and it won't cost the state or the local government one, single cent. The only time this will work is if business invests. So the objections that are raised that it won't work just don't cut because it won't cost you any money if businesses don't invest in the state. This is an opportunity and a chance to make some meaningful changes in our business climate, to offer some incentive to our existing manufacturing plants throughout the state. I urge you assist us, help this business climate, help us in this economy right now, and vote 'yes'."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2723? All in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. And Representative Schraeder to explain his vote for one minute. Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, we debated this type of subject for quite some time in this Session. But this is the last hour. This is the last time we can possibly do anything to stir the employment in our communities in the State of Illinois. And just yesterday in my local paper and I hate to keep mentioning the name of Caterpillar, but I extremely believe that it's one of the most important issues to my district and my locality that exists today. And let me just read you a couple of things

that were said in that paper and I'll be very brief. July the 7th, 1090 people are going to be laid off at Caterpillar in my district. Now if you think that is not serious, take another look at it. And in same...On the same day, in Decatur on that same day, another 230 people are going to be laid off. In Joliet another 500 are going to be laid off. Now, if you don't think this is serious in your state, it's certainly serious in my district. And as a result of all these lay-offs, there's going to be another 4,000 people affected by switching jobs to lower paid jobs because there's no work available. Ladies and Gentlemen, these people pay taxes. These people are going to have to feed their families. And what my community is going to do, come the defeat of this measure, is be on your back for Public Aid funds to help them live and to feed their families. And, yes, my School District's going to need funds. And these people are paying the property tax that are necessities. And if you don't think that this 89 votes is very critical, come up and visit with my United Automobile workers who work in these Caterpillar plants and who want to feed their families and who want to be responsible citizens. I represent..."

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

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Schisler."

Schisler: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have an unusual situation coming up and I'd like to be verified on at this time in the event that this is..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is there any objection to the Gentleman being verified? There being no objections, the Gentleman is verified."

Schisler: "Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Bowman to explain his vote for one minute. I'm putting the timer on."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I defy the Sponsor of this motion to come up with one cost benefit study that shows that the benefits of investment tax credits of this sort outweigh the costs. They do not. Because the investment tax credit will be going to everybody whether or not they would be making the investment. So it doesn't...while it may induce...some people make an investment, it goes to everybody and so the cost is vastly, vastly greater than the benefits that we would derive either in the state or in any local jurisdiction. I defy him to provide the cost benefit study that justifies his position. He can't because there isn't one. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kane for one minute to explain his vote."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would repeat the statements made by Representative Bowman, is that the only way that this will do any good is if it stimulates investment that otherwise would not take place. There is absolutely nothing to show that it would stimulate investment that otherwise would not take place. If we grant the Gentleman that it would stimulate investment that otherwise would not take place, then there is absolutely no reason to postpone the effective date for two years because you'll remember at the federal level, when there is any change in investment tax credit, it takes...the effective date is always prior to the time that the credit goes into effect. The reason why that is done is not to postpone investment. So what happens is if this tax really is effective. If this income...if this tax credit really is

effective, and is going to generate new investment, the effect of postponing it for three years is to take investments that would take place in the next two years, the people will say, we're going to postpone it for another year in order to take advantage of the tax credit. So what you're going to do is lower investment in the next two years in order to increase anything in the third year. So if it is going to take effect, if this tax credit does have an effect in the real world, the effect in the next two years is going to decrease investment. There is nothing else...no other effect that it could have. I urge a 'no' vote at this time."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Vinson to explain his vote for one minute."

Vinson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If there's one thing I think I know a little bit about in politics, it's how to cut a pie. And it's a lot more fun to cut a big pie than it is a little pie. Now what this Bill does is make the pie bigger for everybody, for education, for Public Aid, for mental health, for everybody. Tommy Hanahan was absolutely right. This is the one that can give us the resources we need to fund government. This is a Bill for the taxpayers, not the tax-eaters and we need to pass this Bill today."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative VonBoeckman to explain his vote."

VonBoeckman: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to explain my vote. I have an unusual situation. I'd like to have permission to be verified. My secretary is getting married."

Speaker Giorgi: "You'd like permission to be verified?"

VonBoeckman: "Yes."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any objections? Does the Gentleman have leave to be verified? No objections. He's verified. Have all voted who wish? Representative William Walsh to explain

his vote for one minute."

Walsh: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise unpopularity to oppose this measure and suggest to you that for 11 years almost now, the income tax in this state has been inviolate, inviolate of credit such as this. Also inviolate of credits such as deductions on the individual income tax for sickness expense and for other very, very trying things that would benefit poor people. This is ill-advised, Mr. Speaker. For example, the corporation gets the benefit of both deductions. An individual would get the benefit of just one of them. How can we possibly justify giving corporations twice as much as we give individuals? This is not the approach. It's 'gerry-built'. It should not be adopted and I urge you to oppose this measure."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there's 94 'ayes', 70 'nays', 2 voting 'present'. Representative McPike, for verification?"

McPike: "Yeah. I'd like to verify the Affirmative Roll."

Speaker Giorgi: "Okay. The Clerk will verify the Affirmative Roll Call. And Representative Daniels has requested a poll of the absentees. Read the absentees first and then verify the Affirmative."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees; Beatty. Dwight Friedrich. Gaines. Emil Jones. Kelly. Klosak. Laurino. Leverenz. Skinner. Slape. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "If there's no request for...Poll the Affirmative."

Clerk O'Brien: "Abramson. Ackerman. Anderson. Barnes..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Mrs. Younge indicates she wants to be recorded as voting 'no'. representative Younge from 'aye' to 'no'. From 'aye' to 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Bell. Bianco. Birchler. Birkinbine. Bluthardt. Borchers. Boucek. Bower. Bradley. Breslin. Brummer. Burnidge. Campbell. Christensen. Daniels. Darrow. Davis. Dawson. Deuster. Donovan. John Dunn. Ralph Dunn. Dyer. Ebbesen. Flinn. Virginia Frederick. Griesheimer. Grossi. Hallock. Hallstrom. Hanahan. Hannig. Harris. Henry. Hoffman. Hoxsey. Hudson. Huskey. Johnson. Dave Jones. Karpel. Kent. Leinenweber. Macdonald. Mahar. Margalus. Matula. Mautino..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Pardon me, Mr. Clerk. Representative McBroom change to 'aye'."

McBroom: "Change me to 'aye', will you, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative McBroom from 'no' to 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "McBroom. McClain. McCourt. McGrew. McMaster. Meyer. Molloy. Mulcahey. Neff. Oblinger. O'Brien. Piel. Polk. Pullen. Rea. Reed. Reilly. Richmond. Rigney. Robbins. Ropp. Schisler. Schraeder. Schuneman. Simms. Stanley. Stearney. E. G. Steele. C. M. Stiehl. Stuffle. Sumner. Swanstrom. Totten. Tuerk. Van Duyne. Vinson. VonBoeckman. Watson. Wikoff. Winchester. J. J. Wolf. Woodyard. No further."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative McPike on the verification of the Affirmative Roll Call."

McPike: "What is the count before we start, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Mr. Clerk, what's the count? 94 'ayes'."

McPike: "Abramson?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Abramson, how...Abramson is along the wall."

McPike: "Anderson."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Anderson is in his chair."

McPike: "Bianco."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Bianco. How is...the Gentleman

in the room? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Bianco. Take him off the Roll Call."

McPike: "Dawson."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Dawson is sitting here."

McPike: "Ralph Dunn."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Ralph Dunn? Ralph Dunn's in the back of the room."

McPike: "Representative Frederick."

Speaker Giorgi: "Frederick. Representative Frederick, Virginia Frederick. How is she recorded? She's in her chair."

McPike: "Representative Hanahan."

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

McPike: "Representative Henry."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Henry. Representative Henry's in the back of the room."

McPike: "Representative...Representative Huskey."

Speaker Giorgi: "Huskey, Representative Huskey, yes, he's in the middle of the aisle."

McPike: "Representative Johnson."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Johnson, Tim Johnson. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Johnson? Take him off the record."

McPike: "Representative Mahar."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Mahar is in his chair."

McPike: "Representative Margalus."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Margalus? Representative...Put Johnson back on the Roll Call. He's back in the room. Representative Margalus. How is Repr...Is Representative Margalus in the room? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Take him off the record."

McPike: "Representative McClain."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative McClain, not... Representative McClain, is he in the room? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative McClain in the room? Take him off the record."

McPike: "Representative Molloy."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative who?"

McPike: "Molloy."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Molloy is in his chair."

McPike: "Representative Rea."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Rea? Representative Rea's along the wall."

McPike: "Representative Reilly."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Reilly? Representative Reilly in the room? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Take him off the record."

McPike: "Representative Ropp."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Ropp. Is Representative Ropp in the room? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Take him off the record."

McPike: "Representative Stearney."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Stearney is in his chair."

McPike: "Representative Watson."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Watson? Representative Watson, how is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Watson in the room? Take him off the record."

McPike: "Representative Wikoff. Wikoff."

Speaker Giorgi: "Wikoff? Representative Wikoff is in his chair."

McPike: "Representative Winchester."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Winchester. He's in the back of the room."

McPike: "Representative Woodyard."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Woodyard? Woodyard's in his same seat."

McPike: "Representative Harris."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Harris. He's in the middle aisle."

McPike: "Representative J. J. Wolf."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Wolf? He's in the aisle near his chair."

McPike: "Representative Hudson."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Hudson's behind his seat."

McPike: "Representative Stuffle."

Speaker Giorgi: "Stuffle. Representative Stuffle's in the room. Put Representative Watson back on the Roll Call. Pardon me. Representative 'Phil' asked to be verified. Is there any objection? There being no objection, he's verified."

McPike: "No further questions."

Speaker Giorgi: "Stuffle's in the room. There he is. Representative Conti, for what reason do you arise?"

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, change my vote from 'aye' to....from 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Conti from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Breslin, for what reason do you arise?"

Breslin: "Change my vote from 'aye' to 'present', please."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Breslin from 'aye' to 'present'. Representative Leverenz to 'no'. Representative Leverenz 'no'. Representative Epton, for what reason do you arise? From 'no' to 'aye'? Representative Epton from 'no' to

'aye'. Representative McPike, continue the verification?"

McPike: "Yes, I have one further. Representative Younge."

Speaker Giorgi: "She did change from 'aye' to 'no'?"

Representative Friedrich wants to be recorded? How do you want to be recorded? From...from nothing to 'aye'.

Representative Friedrich wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Representative...Who's that guy? Burnidge.

Representative Burnidge?"

Burnidge: "Was I removed from the Affirmative?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Burnidge removed from the Affirmative, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Burnidge: "Fine, thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Dawson from 'aye' to 'no'?"

Representative Dawson from 'aye' to 'no'. There are no other questions, no other changes? Representative McClain wants to be back on the Roll Call. The...what's the count, Mr. Clerk? There are 91 'ayes', and 70 'nos', and the House concurs with Amendment #1. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Having voted on the prevailing side, I move that that vote be reconsidered."

Speaker Giorgi: "And Representative Stuffle moves that that lie on the table. All in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion carried. Amendment #2, Representative Daniels?"

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm sure that every Member of this House would want to support the concurrence of Amendment #2 because this is the Amendment that delays the effective date for one year. Therefore, I would urge your consideration and approval of this Amendment to concur in that."

Speaker Giorgi: "There no...Is there no request for discussion? Representative Kane."

Kane: "Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier in my explanation of vote, if this investment tax credit has any effect at all and if it will stimulate new investment by postponing the effective date what it will do is take those industries that would invest now and they will wait until later to make the investment when they can get the credit. So what we will do is by postponing the deadline is to give us a dry spell between now and the effective date of this investment tax credit and we will be driving business out and driving investment down rather than improving it. And I think that this makes a bad Bill even worse and I would urge that we defeat this Amendment."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is there any further request for discussion? Representative Stuffle?"

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. I find it ironic that some of the people who oppose this particular motion, not necessarily Representative Kane, but others have made the same arguments he makes today. All year we've tried to make this applicable in the current situation and now we succumb to the efforts of others who want to push it back a year. That's why this Amendment's on here. And now those same people who came and asked us to push it back a year are now arguing that it ought to be back where it was in the first place. That's ridiculous. I urge concurrence."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Vinson on the Amendment."

Vinson: "Everybody ought to recognize, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that what we are now engaged on in these future concurrences are technical and procedural efforts to kill an idea whose time has come. I urge concurrence. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, shall the House concur to Senate Amendment #2 to House 2723? All in favor signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'."

Representative McPike."

McPike: "Well, I was waiting for Representative Hanahan actually to get up and speak on behalf of the building and construction trades that so desperately need this and if they desperately need this, I would expect that they would need it this year and certainly not next year or the year after. If we're in a recession or if unemployment is getting worse and worse, then let's have this immediately. Let's not wait for two or three years before this investment tax credit applies. Let's put it on the Governor's desk and sign it and let's start taking this income away from the state and the local units of government and put it in these construction trades, back to work tomorrow or yesterday. But certainly not three years from now. I move to nonconcur."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Ewing on the motion...er, to explain his vote."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this probably is an excellent Bill. The last speaker knocked it, but he knocks all business Bills. But I tell you, if it's good, we need it now. And we need to nonconcur in this so that we can have it now. Let's put it in a Conference Committee and then we'll get it now. And I urge a 'no' vote on this."

Speaker Giorgi: "Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. Hanahan to explain his vote for one minute."

Hanahan: "Mr. Speaker, you know, it's one thing to tease and to kid about needs, but, you know, the former Gentleman has mentioned my name in debate...about planning and what happens in the economy. I recall just last year a vote on the road program that somebody said it was needed for the construction trades and we're going to put all the carpenters and cement finishers, operating engineers who

work on the road program. I understand he voted for that at the expense of the sales tax increase. I'm tired of the charade. The fact is representing taxpayers instead of tax-eaters, I think that this Amendment should not be defeated only because I know what the game plan is. The game plan is to get it back in the Conference Committee, screw around with it long enough to kill it by Monday evening. Now let's not kid ourselves. Those that are beating their breasts trying to do something around here and then tongue-in-cheek say things like that, it's just not worth listening to. An 'aye' vote is proper on this."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, you closed the switch. You're sitting up there and you're running your usual business in this House and trying to take an early Roll Call on a very important matter that's been presented to this House on investment tax credit. Now in every good faith the business of this district...of this state has come forward to this General Assembly and said, 'We need to assist the business climate in the State of Illinois.' This General Assembly by its action approved Amendment #1 and now we're following through in what we represented to you in that Amendment, by Amendment #2, in the delay of the effective date. Now some of the speakers, like some of the prior speakers are standing up and saying they favor the immediate effective date of this Bill, then I'm going to hold them to that in the event it comes back from Conference Committee on the immediate effective date. And it's going to be interesting to see the hypocrisy that they bring before this House and misrepresentations to the business climate. Mr. Speaker, yes, you, Mr. Speaker, the one that talks about Chrysler and the need for employment in the State of Illinois, this is a Bill that will do

everything that you asked for, stimulate the economy, stimulate this state. I'm asking that we concur in the first four Amendments and nonconcur in the fifth. Let's not fall around with this legislation. Let's be up front on it. We need some additional 'aye' votes. Some of you people that helped it before pass..."

Speaker Giorgi: "The last person..."

Daniels: "How about opening up the record, Sir?"

Speaker Giorgi: "The last person asked to speak was Representative Campbell. Representative Campbell."

Campbell: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, two minutes ago on a very important Amendment we had 91 votes up there. Now I think everyone in this House knows the whole story of this, that that was an important Amendment and those 91 votes...well, if we don't have those 91 votes now, this is going to go back to Conference Committee and with the Mayor and the Governor both against this particular measure, you know that this isn't coming back in the same form that it is, so I would suggest that each and every one of you that supported the last Amendment, support the move to concur. Because you'll never see this again if you don't. Now I ask you, get a few more votes up there. Let's get at least 89. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Daniels asks a poll of the absentees. Representative Dyer, for what reason do you arise?"

Dyer: "Yes, I would like to vote 'aye', please."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Dyer would like to be recorded as voting 'aye', from 'present' to 'aye'. Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Change my vote to 'aye', please."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Richmond would like to be

recorded as voting 'aye'. Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I...I would rather see this thing implemented this year myself. But, you know, Charlie Campbell is very persuasive so I'm just as frightened as he is so change my...change my vote to 'aye' please."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Leverenz, to 'no'?"

Leverenz: "Record me 'no'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Mahar to 'aye'. You want to poll the absentees first? Let him poll the absentees. Poll the absentees. Just a minute. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, I'd like to explain my vote because I see all these exchanges going on and I'd like to let all of you know that we are not operating under joint rules and we're wasting a lot of time. Because the Sponsor himself is going to nonconcur with the Amendment #5. And the fact of the matter is that it's going to go to Conference Committee and I'm sure you all know that and it can be changed anyway. I don't think the Senate's going to recede. I doubt if they'll recede. There's something that General Electric doesn't like, they're going to persist I'm sure, but if you're thinking they're going to recede, I'm sure your procedural move is alright. But I doubt it."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Molloy? No, proceed with the absentees first. Proceed with the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the absentees; Balanoff. Beatty. Bianco. Gaines. Huskey..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Huskey wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Emil Jones. Kelly. Klosak. Laurino. Margalus. McAuliffe. McBroom. Peters..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Peters, for what reason do you arise? Representative Peters would like to be recorded as voting 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Rea. Schisler. Schlickman..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Rea? For what reas...Record him as voting 'aye'? What's the count, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the poll of the absentees. Schuneman. Skinner. Swanstrom. J. J. Wolf...."

Speaker Giorgi: "J. J. Wolf wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Sam Wolf. Yourell. And, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "What's the count, Mr. Clerk? Representative McBroom wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Representative Epton wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Margalus, 'aye'. Representative Birchler...and Flinn want to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Birchler and Flinn. Representative Stanley wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Molloy wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'. McCourt wants...Stanley, McCourt, and Molloy so far. Stanley, McCourt, and Molloy. Schuneman 'aye'. Karpziel wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Representative Karpziel, for what reason do you arise?"

Karpziel: "Do I have leave to be verified?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Are there any objections to the Lady being verified? No objections, you're verified. Also, Representative Ebbesen, wants leave to be verified. Any objections? Leave is granted. Griesheimer, for what reason do you arise? To be recorded as voting 'aye'. How many? On this question there are 91 'ayes' and 72 'nos. And Representative Hana...Let me declare it passed. The House concurs with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2723. Representative Hanahan."

Hanahan: "Having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #2...What is this...concurrence #2 on House Bill 2723 passed."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Flinn, for what reason do you

arise? Flinn."

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

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is...to lie on the table. All in favor signify by saying 'aye' and oppose 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. And the motion is tabled. Amendment 3, Representative Daniels. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I've been told by some people on the other side of the aisle that Representative Doris Karpziel is up in the gallery, floating around there aimlessly and maybe making points. I don't know what she's doing up there, but I would hope that she would come down here on the floor and do the business of the House like she's...all the rest of us are doing down here."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Daniels on Amendment #3."

Daniels: "Same Roll Call on 3 and 4 and I'll nonconcur on 5."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative...is there leave to grant him the same Roll Call on motion 3 and 4? Leave. And nonconcur to Amendment #5. Alright, you make your motion to nonconcur on Amendment #5. All in favor signify by saying 'aye' and those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. You don't concur with Amendment #5."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Yes, Mr. Daniels."

Daniels: "Alright. Just for the record, we have concurred with Amendment 1, 2, 3 and 4 and not concurred in 5..."

Speaker Giorgi: "1, 2, 3 and 4, and not 5. Right. Representative Piel for what reason do you arise?"

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thought maybe, Representative Karpziel would like to explain what she was doing up in the balancy."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Karpziel, do you wish to address the Body? I'm afraid not."

Karpiel: "Am I supposed to be making some kind of a speech at this point? I just want to tell you that I have it all worked out with the Gentleman in the balcony and we're going to just take care of everything. Thank you very much."

Speaker Giorgi: "On the Order of Concurrence on page 2, House Bill 2710, Representative Hallstrom to nonconcur. Representative Hallstrom. Hallstrom. Is she there?"

Hallstrom: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that the House do not concur with the Senate Amendments on House Bill 2710."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Hallstrom moves that the House does not concur to Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2710. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye' and the opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the House does not concur to House Bill 2710. Representative Pierce on Senate Bill 1457."

Pierce: "Mr. Speaker, Senate Bill 1457 there's a House Amendment on the Bill, House Amendment 3, we find that that has been placed on other legislation of Representative Darrows' in particular and therefore, is not necessary on Senate Bill 1457. And I move that the House do recede from Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1457."

Speaker Giorgi: "The motion is to recede to...from...what is that Amendment, House Amendment or Senate Amendment? Amendment #3?"

Pierce: "It's always a House Amendment when you're on concurrence."

Speaker Giorgi: "Senate Bill 1457. The motion is to recede. All in favor signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action, he's receding. Have all voted who wish? Who is seeking recognition? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this

question 135 'ayes', 3 'nays' and 3 voting 'present' and the House does recede from House Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1457."

Pierce: "Thank you all."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Wolf on 3036. Representative Wolf."

Wolf, J.J.: "Yeah, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was asked to handle this in the absence of Representative McAuliffe whom I believe is out on legislative business. Senate Amendment 1, would move to concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3. Senate Amendment 1 makes a reduction of a hundred and fifteen thousand, nine hundred and seven-five in General Revenue Funds for personal services related line items which will reduce...due to the 8% solution and elimination of four positions and reduces other line items by nine thousand dollars. Senate Amendment #2 restores eighteen thousand, nine hundred and fifty-nine in GRF, to personal services and related line items adds a secretary to a commissioner, that's one position. Which was eliminated in Senate Amendment 1 and allows for a two thousand dollar increase for the commissioners and provides nineteen hundred dollars for incidental expenses of the commissioners. Senate #3 adds fifty-six thousand, three hundred by restoring two positions, commissioner and accompanying secretary which were added in the House but eliminated by Senate Committee Amendment #1. And it does also restore some funds to bring the unbudgeted commissioners added in the FY-80 interrelative salary parity with the existing commissioners. The net effect of the three Amendments is a total deduction of forty thousand, seven hundred and sixteen dollars from the way it left the House. And I would move that the House do concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3, with House Bill 3076."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Pullen on the Amendment."

Pullen: "I would like to ask the Sponsor a question."

Speaker Giorgi: "Continue."

Pullen: "Did you say that this does, in the Amendments, include a pay raise for the commissioners?"

Wolf, J. J.: "Yes, it does."

Pullen: "Thank you."

Wolf, J. J.: "Two thousand dollars. I believe the salary is something like seventeen thousand now. So, it would bring them up to about nineteen...oh, brings them up to, pardon me, brings them up with this increase to seventeen thousand dollars which I don't think is....is....too great."

Speaker Giorgi: "There being no further request for discussion. The question is shall the House concur to Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3, to House Bill 3036. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, 129 'ayes', 17 'nays', 2 voting 'present' and the House does concur to Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3 to House Bill 3036 and the Bill is declared passed. House Bill 3311, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "That's Ryan's Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Ryan. Representative Ryan on House Bill 3311. Out of the record. Representative Terzich in the room? Representative Bower on...Representative Bower. House Bill 3049."

Bower: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I ask the House to concur in Senate Amendments 1, 3, 4 and 5, to the budget of the Department of Veterans' Affairs. It makes a.....net reduction of one million, one hundred and sixty-three thousand dollars for a total appropriation of nineteen million, eight hundred and thirty-six thousand dollars."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is there any discussion? There being no request for discussion, the motion is does the House concur with Senate Amendments 1, 3, 4 and 5 to House Bill 3049. All in favor signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 149 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 voting 'present' and the House does concur to 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, to House Bill....Senate Amendments 1, 3, 4 and 5, to House Bill 3049 and the Bill is declared passed. House Bill 3197, Representative DiPrima. Representative DiPrima on 3197."

DiPrima: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I wish to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3197. Senate Amendment #1 provides that state employees to become members of the United States Armed Forces Reserves or the Illinois State Militia Reserves after December 31, 1980. A grant of leaves of absence from state employment. The leaves of absence shall be granted if the individual is involved in any of the following military service activities. Basic training, special or advanced training regardless of location and whether or not it is voluntary. An act of duty including the annual fifteen day service requirement. I would appreciate your support in concurring with Amendment #1 to House Bill 3197."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any discussion? There being no request for discussion...Representative Pullen on the motion. Pullen."

Pullen: "I would like to ask the Sponsor a question."

Speaker Giorgi: "Continue."

Pullen: "What is your intent with Senate Amendment 2?"

DiPrima: "I'm going to oppose that."

Pullen: "You're going to oppose Senate Amendment 2?"

DiPrima: "Yeah. We're on 1 now, what are you going to 2 for?"

Pullen: "Because Senate Amendment 2 is the only one that makes

Senate Amendment 1 acceptable."

DiPrima: "Let me worry about that, we'll work that out."

Pullen: "No, I'm going to worry about it. I would like to speak to the motion."

Speaker Giorgi: "Continue, Miss Pullen."

Pullen: "The way Senate Amendment 1 is drafted, the State of Illinois would be paying a differential in wages to any state employee who goes on active duty. And if there were an alert that might be, for example, in the case of a war or some kind of incident that is protracted and state employees are called into active duty if they're in the reserves. They would be paid by the state, the difference between their state wage and the amount that they are paid by the United States Armed Services. This would be an extremely costly proposition to be writing into our law and I urge that the House defeat this motion."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative DiPrima to close....Representative Jaffe on the motion."

Jaffe: "Yea, Larry. You know, there is a difference between 2 and 3, if you're going to move to adopt 3 that's fine but I don't think you can just...you know, just leave it with 2. Are you going move to adopt 3?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Jaffe, there's only Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on the Calendar."

Jaffe: "I'm sorry, I mean..."

Speaker Giorgi: "He's moving to concur to Senate Amendment #1 and holding Senate Amendment #2 for nonconcurrency."

Jaffe: "Oh, all right. Senate Amendment #2 for nonconcurrency?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Yes."

Jaffe: "Well, under Senate Amendment #1, as I understand it, it means that if someone were to get drafted, who is a state employee and be away in the service for four years then the state would have to still pay his salary. Isn't that

correct, Larry?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative DiPrima to answer Jaffes' question."

DiPrima: "Give me that again, I didn't hear it."

Jaffe: "If say we had a draft, Larry, and all of a sudden a state employee was to be drafted for four years. The state would have to pick up that individual's salary for four years, is that correct?"

DiPrima: "No, just for two weeks."

Jaffe: "No, I think that Senate Amendment #2 limits it to two weeks. But Senate Amendment #1 has it forever. I don't see how you can accept Senate Amendment #1 without accepting Senate Amendment #2. If you accept Senate Amendment #2, that's fine but Senate Amendment #1 means that if someone was drafted for four years, we pay them. Under Senate Amendment #2 it limits it to fifteen days."

DiPrima: "Let me save your breath, will you. Let me do this...do this now. Just do as I ask you to do and we're going to resolve this in conference. That's what my objective is, to get this in conference, we're going to add something else to this.....let's quit all....and vote for the Bill."

Jaffe: "Well, wait a second. What else are you going to add to it. I think it's all right...."

DiPrima: "You're going to vote against it."

Speaker Giorgi: "Continue, Mr. Jaffe."

Jaffe: "No, I think what the Sponsor is saying, is saying, you know, we're going to do something else with this particular Bill because we've got another deal cooking. I think if we're going to adopt Senate Amendment #1 and 2 that's fine, it makes it alright. But to say we're going to adopt the silly Amendment, leave out, you know, we're going to adopt the good Amendment and leave....I mean if we're going to adopt the silly Amendment and leave out the good Amendment

so we can get it into a Conference Committee so there can be all sorts of deals played. I think we ought to vote down the entire thing."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative DiPrima to close."

DiPrima: "All right, I ask for a favorable Roll Call on this concurrence."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative DiPrima moves that the House concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3197. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Vinson wants to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Well how many votes do I need? How many? I would like to poll the absentees, Mr...."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Stearney. Shall we dump that Roll Call."

DiPrima: "Alright, listen. I'll noncon...."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kelly to...or what reason do you arise? Representative Kelly."

Kelly: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I had my light on and I wanted to explain my vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "Continue."

Kelly: "I want to speak favorably to Representative DiPrima's motion to concur with the Amendments. It seems to me that this would be an expense, as it was pointed out earlier of an increased nature. But at the same time, it seems to me that we have a real problem in this area of having qualified persons enter our, not only the Federal but the..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kelly..."

Kelly: "National Guard."

Speaker Giorgi: "Kelly, excuse me. I think Representative

DiPrima wants to move now to nonconcur. Representative DiPrima."

DiPrima: "Yeah. Listen, let's cut the thing all out. Let's now...I nonconcur with #1, okay? And both, 1 and 2. Nonconcur with Amendment #1 and #2."

Speaker Giorgi: "Dump the Roll Call. He moves to nonconcur to Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3197. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and we nonconcur to Senate Amendment 1 and 2 to House Bill 3197."

Speaker Flinn: "House Bill 3272, Representative Marovitz. Representative Marovitz, could I get your attention please. House Bill 3272."

Marovitz: "First things first, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move that the House do concur with Senate Amendments 3, 4 and 5 to House Bill 3272."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that we...the House do concur in Senate Amendments 3, 4 and 5 on House Bill 3272. Any discussion? No discussion. All those in favor vote 'aye'....well, turn your light on if you wish to speak. Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "What do the Amendments do?"

Speaker Flinn: "Well, you ask him a question?"

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

Speaker Flinn: "Okay, he indicates he will."

Bowman: "One at a time. Amendment 1."

Marovitz: "I'll let DiPrima handle that explanation on that one. Larry, do you want to handle the do you want to handle the explanation on that? Amendment #3 deals with the fair plan and says that, what we're trying to do with Amendment #3 is discourage as many people as possible from going into the fair plan with a coverage in many instances it's more expensive and less comprehensive. And according to a

Tribune article that was recently published, an awful lot of people are being summarily funneled into the fair plan who would otherwise have the opportunity to get coverage on the voluntary market. And this says that....before they would go into the fair plan they would have to have three attempts to procure insurance with an evaluation on the voluntary market. Furthermore, it provides that applications to the fair plan...whoever the applicants of the fair plan is, is informed as to why he has been turned down. If in fact he has been turned down and whether or not he is accepted. And it provides him an opportunity for a re inspection within sixty days after the turn down, if in fact he has been turned down. And reasons for the denial incorporated into that. That is Amendment #3. Amendment #4 is consistent with the Bill which was passed by Representative Kane, which prohibits discrimination of handicapped and those with disabilities in life and health insurance. And Amendment #4 is consistent with a Bill that we passed in the House sponsored by Representative Sandquist and myself, which is the Privacy Act, the Privacy Protection Act which becomes the model Bill in the United States. It is supported by both consumers and the insurance industry, it's a product of two years work by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners. We will be the first state to do this, currently the insurance industry is one of the only industries not giving privacy protection to consumers and customers. This would give privacy protection. It is the Privacy Act and that is Senate Amendment #5. And I would ask for concurrence with Senate Amendments 3, 4 and 5."

Bowman: "Bravo. Thank you very much, Representative Marovitz."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? Representative Schuneman."

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

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

Schuneman: "Representative, if you recall when this Bill was on Third Reading or Second Reading on the House floor. I opposed one question of the Bill where I think the language included insurance coverages other than those that were in the fair plan. Has that...problem been resolved?"

Marovitz: "That is out of the Bill. It is totally out of the Bill."

Schuneman: "Okay, thank you very much."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Brummer. You did fine. Further discussion? If not the question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 3, 4 and 5 on House Bill 3272. All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 157 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments 3, 4 and 5 on House Bill 3272. House Bill 3127....before I call this, Mr. McCourt's Bill. We're running out of Bills to be concurred in, so if any of the House Members have any Bills they would like to move to concur in, come up and get on our list and we'll go on. This is the last one we have on our list so...under concurrence, House Bill 3127, Representative McCourt is recognized."

McCourt: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I recommend that we accept Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 3127. Amendment #1 allows a school district, K through 8th and...or high school district to raise their maximum educational tax rate from three dollars to three-fifty with a local referendum. And Amendment #2 corrects

some...clarifies the school bus reimbursements that the reference bureau saw that the way that it was written at one time, it allowed for a double reimbursement for unemployment insurance. So it's basically a housekeeping Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 3127 and under discussion, Representative Kane is recognized."

Kane: "Representative McCourt, the Chairman of the Education Committee isn't here. Do you know what his position is on this Bill?"

McCourt: "He's in....well, Representative Katz would like to answer that."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative....Representative Brummer was first but let me go around you, Representative Brummer. Representative Schneider, you're recognized. Maybe you can answer the question."

Schneider: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did talk to the parties interested, Representative Katz and McCourt. I still see the problem, however, it's one that we can wait to remedy until next year. That is bring the rates in to conformative so that my opposition to the, I think it's the second Amendment? Amendment #1? Was it 1? Okay, my opposition of #1, I withdraw on the assumption that we can correct it easily enough next term and I will offer that legislation myself, so I withdrew my opposition and would encourage that the Membership support the motion to concur in Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3127."

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "I note that Amendment #1 authorizes an increase in rates that can be levied. Is that....and it says with voter approval on our analysis. Is that with a referendum, a front door referendum provision?"

McCourt: "It requires a front door referendum. Right now the maximum rate is three dollars for education and it would allow a school district to have a referendum to raise it up to three dollars and fifty cents with a referendum. A front door referendum."

Bummer: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Katz. He canceled out. Representative McCourt to close."

McCourt: "I just recommend a favorable vote on Amendments #1 and 2."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 on House Bill 3127. 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."

McCourt: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "On this question there's 145 voting 'aye', none voting 'nay' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed and this House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3127. House Bill 3142, Representative Taylor on concurrence. 3241."

Taylor: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3241. The transfer of four hundred and forty-eight dollars in the contingent expense to personal service line item. There's no transfer in the appropriation, there's no new dollar amount changes. Mr. Speaker, I move for the adoption of Amendment....for the passage of House Bill 3241."

Speaker Flinn: "Any other discussion? If not, the Gentleman moves for the adoption of....for the concurrence of Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3241. 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's 130 voting 'aye', 15 voting 'nay'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3241. House Bill 1952, Representative Steele...take it out of the record. House Bill 3433, Representative Reed."

Reed: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3433. The Amendment provides for an effective date consistent with the date of decision by the U. S. Supreme Court in the case of Wisconsin vs. the State of Illinois. I move to concur with that Amendment #1."

Speaker Flinn: "The motion is to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3433. 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're 157 voting 'aye', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3433."

Reed: "Mr. Speaker, I now also move to concur on Senate Amendment #3 which was introduced by Senator Rock and provides appropriate language to allow the Division of Water Resources to enter into an agreement with other than the permittee. #2?"

Speaker Flinn: "#2 is the Amendment number."

Reed: "Amendment #2, then. The permittee being the City of Chicago, for the construction of four hundred slip marina located north Navy Pier and south of the water filtration plant."

Speaker Flinn: "Any discussion? If now, the question is....Representative Stearney."

Stearney: "The Lady yield?"

Speaker Flinn: "She indicates she will."

Stearney: "What was that mention about the creation of four hundred new slips north of Navy Pier."

Reed: "It is north of Navy Pier. This Amendment allows the Division of Water Resources to enter into an agreement with other than the permittee, who is the City of Chicago. For the construction of a four hundred slip marina north of Navy Pier and south of the water filtration plant."

Stearney: "Will this be outside the control of the Chicago Park District?"

Reed: "Yes, it will."

Stearney: "Well, who will operate and maintain this?"

Reed: "This project is to be a turn key facility by a private developer, to be returned in prime condition to the city after amortization of the seasonal fees estimated to be between ten and fifteen years."

Stearney: "Well, who will run it in the interim, before it's turned over to the city?"

Reed: "It will be run by the developer."

Stearney: "And who is that?"

Reed: "I don't happen to know, there's an ad hoc Committee, perhaps Representative Dawson can answer that question."

Stearney: "Wait. One other question, this facility that will be turned over to the City of Chicago rather than the Park District?"

Reed: "The arrangements as I understand it, are between the city and the developer, Representative Stearney. And the Navy Pier and the filtration plant both belong to the City of Chicago."

Stearney: "Well, my inquiry is, since the Chicago Park District now maintains and operates all the slips and facilities along Lake Michigan, why is this development going to be any different? That is, the City of Chicago itself, to

have control over the slips? I wonder about that."

Reed: "I suggest that you take it up with the city and Representative Dawson may well be able to answer that question."

Stearney: "Well, if Mr. Dawson is going to speak for the city so be it, I'll listen to it."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Dawson."

Dawson: "Ron, what this is, it's going to be a private business. And the land that they're going to put this in the water is going to be built in right now. It's actually dormant land on the lake front. It is the northside of Navy Plant and south side of the filtration plant. It's an empty slip right now and it's going to be a private concern and it's headed up by Harry Reise. And they're going to operate for ten years and turn it over to the City of Chicago."

Stearney: "Well, how will the slips be allocated in this ten year interim? Who is going to have control of that?"

Dawson: "They will for the ten years and they will have the lease privileges on that."

Stearney: "And they're going to be paying rent to the City of Chicago?"

Dawson: "Yes, they're going to turn it over to the City of Chicago after the ten year period."

Stearney: "And do you think this is a good venture? A good proposition, a good idea?"

Dawson: "Right now, that water and that area there is laying dormant. It's not used for anything at all, it's just an empty slip with no use at all for it."

Stearney: "And you favor this proposition?"

Dawson: "Yes, I do."

Stearney: "Well, if you do, Representative then I shall support it. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "I would like to ask the Sponsor a few questions."

Speaker Flinn: "She indicates she will yield."

Pullen: "Just to clarify. Who is it that owns this land? Is it the City of Chicago?"

Speaker Flinn: "Turn, Representative Reed on."

Reed: "It's my understanding, yes."

Pullen: "And this would allow the Department of Transportation of the State of Illinois to lease it for the purposes of constructing a marina?"

Reed: "No, no, Peggy. You've got it all wrong. The Division of Water Resources have to issue a permit for any structure that is built out into the lake. Public hearings have been held, ad hoc Committee has done considerable work on this. This merely allows the Division of Water Resources to enter into an agreement with the permittee, which is the City of Chicago. The City of Chicago then will enter into their own arrangement with the private developer."

Pullen: "According to the analysis before me, the effect of the Amendment would permit the Department of Transportation to lease this for purposes of constructing a floating marina, providing that a valid permit is issued. Which sounds to me as if the Department of Transportation is constructing a marina and then it will be turned over to someone else."

Reed: "That is absolutely not true. The Department...or the Division of Water Resources has nothing to do with this project other than granting the permit."

Pullen: "I hope you are right."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of Representative Reeds' motion for concurrence in Senate Amendment #2. Senate Amendment #2 quite simply allows the department to issue a permit for the purpose of which she previously enunciated and that is

to allow a private developer to construct a boat harbor, north of Navy Pier. This is a very important project for the City of Chicago, as you know in Chicago we're attempting to develop a new renaissance. This is part of that new renaissance in Chicago of developing an infra-structure that will be attractive not only on its water ways but also for commercial ventures. I think the Sponsor has clearly delineated the purpose of the Amendment and I rise in support of it and respectfully urge that the House concur with Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? Representative Reed to close."

Reed: "I would simply point out that there is no cost to the State of Illinois or to the City of Chicago. And I urge concurrence on this Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is shall the House adopt Senate Amendment....concur in Senate Amendment #2 on House Bill 32...3433. All those in favor vote 'aye' and those oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 122 vote 'aye', 32 voting 'nay', this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3433. On the Supplemental Calendar #1 appears a motion by Representative Telcser in regard to Senate Bill 1662. Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in order to facilitate the appropriations process in the closing days of the Session. I would like to move to take Senate Bill 1662 from this table and suspend Rule 35 (c) and (g), to permit the consideration and passage of Senate Bill 1662. We've talked to the Speaker and the Parliamentarian and I believe everything seems to be in order if we adopt....if

we...adopt my motion."

Speaker Flinn: "Any discussssion? Representative Brummer.
Brummer."

Brummer: "Where is it and what is it and is it on the Calendar?"

Telcser: "Yes, Senate Bill 1662 was on the Calendar when we
adjourned yesterday, the Bill was left behind. It is an
appropriation Bill which I would like to take from the
table, move back to Second to amend with some other
appropriations and then pass. It's the OCE for DOR."

Speaker Flinn: "Turn Brummer back on."

Brummer: "If I understand you, you not only want to take it from
the Table but you want to move it back to Second Reading
for Amendments?"

Telcser: "Correct."

Brummer: "What are the Amendments?"

Telcser: "I think, Representative Peters is going to offer the
Amendments and he could perhaps answer better than I."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Peters is recognized."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, Representative and Members of the Assembly.
Yesterday when we adjourned when we did, one of the Bills
that was left on the Calendar had a number of
appropriations. The appropriation to the Department of
Rehabilitative Services, the Department of Human Rights and
we have no...no Public Aid appropriation. The purpose of
what we are doing here has been discussed with the Speaker,
the Majority Leader, the Minority Leader, the Chairman of
the...both of the Appropriations Committee, Members of the
Black Caucus and they have all agreed to support this
motion, to bring it back, to add on public aid so that this
House goes out with some consensus in terms of what we
intend to do on those particular appropriations.
Otherwise, we've got a problem that might keep us here til,
like July 2."

Brummer: "You indicated there was some consensus with some very important people, the only problem is that some of us don't sit in that category and we don't know what that consensus is."

Peters: "Representative, you'll have the full opportunity to vote against the Bill if you want. All we're asking is to give people who are interested in public aid and increases for public aid and a public aid appropriation, the opportunity to get on the record in voting for it. This House will not have that opportunity and it's important to a lot of people in their districts to do it."

Brummer: "Is Mental Health part of the package...."

Peters: "Public Aid is the only consideration going to be given on this Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative John Dunn."

Dunn, J.: "Yes, if Public Aid is to be amended into this budget then what will happen to the other agencies that are in limbo right now. Mental Health, for example and if that is to be tacked on in Conference Committee on to something why can't Public Aid be tacked on to some Bill."

Peters: "Representative, I'm trying to facilitate things. If you want to vote against the motion it's alright with me. Just vote against it. I want to get out of here and I think the sense of the House is to get out of here. And I've talked to all the leaders that I can, if there are more leaders in this House than on the list, please give me a list and I'll talk to them too."

Speaker, Flinn: "Representative Reilly. Representative Reilly cancel. Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker...."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, just a minute, the Sponsor wanted to say something. Representative Telcser, we've sort of avoided you."

Telcser: "I'm sorry. If the last two Speakers object, then, Mr. Speaker, I move to take Senate Bill 1662 from the Table and suspend the Rules 35 (c) and (g), to permit consideration of passage and this Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. Representative Braun, on the motion. Discuss the motion."

Braun: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not certain which motion we're talking about. I hope it's not Mr. Telcser's motion. This matter...I had....we had discussed before it came back on this Bill with the Members in caucus downstairs. This represents, I think the most responsible attempt by the Republican Leadership to address the whole question of the Public Aid budget. We could stay with this budget and deal with it on Conference and throw it up in the air and have six people make the decisions for us. But, in this way we have the budget before us, we have an opportunity now to put it on a Bill and get it out of here. With regard to the increase, all of you remember that we started out asking for a 9% increase in Public Aid. That has been...that has....that is not in this budget, this only provides for 5% which is significantly less than we've given the teachers, pensioners and just about everybody else in the various agencies. It seems to me that 5% is a reasonable level, it's a rational level and the way we're going about this is a rational approach. I would heartily encourage the Members of the Democratic side of the aisle with whom this issue has been discussed in Conference time and time again, that procedurally the Republican Leadership has given us an opportunity to handle this in a rational way and I would encourage your support."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Bullock."

Bullock: "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 say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the main question is put. And we ask the Sponsor, Representative Telcser to close. Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I would simply appreciate a favorable Roll Call so we can move forward with this process."

Speaker Flinn: "The motion is that the rules be....we suspend Rules 35 (c), permit the consideration....and (g), and permit the consideration of and the passage of Senate Bill 1662. And take from the Table, that's what the motion does. All those in favor vote 'aye', those oppose vote 'no'. Takes 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 151 voting 'aye' and none voting 'nay' and the motion carries. Representative Telcser is recognized."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, do I have leave to take this Bill back to the Order of Second for a purpose of an Amendment?"

Speaker Flinn: "Does the Gentleman have to leave to take it back to Second. There is objection. Representative Day....well, why don't you come down here...the motion was 157 'ayes', you can come down here. There is objection, so the Gentleman moves...."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, I move. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman moves that this....leave to.....we've asked for leave. He moves to leave...to return the Bill from Second Reading for a purpose of an Amendment. All in favor of that motion vote 'aye', those oppose vote 'no'. This takes 89 this time. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 143 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and the motion passes...carries. The Bill is returned to Second Reading. Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #8, Reilly. Amends Senate Bill 1662 as amended."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "I withdraw Amendment #8."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #8. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #9, Peters. Amends House Bill.....Amendment #8 to Senate Bill 1662."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, I withdraw Amendment #9. In an explanation so the Members don't get too excited. What is happening is, 8 and 9 are coming in to one Amendment so, it satisfies people who thought that games were attempting to be played and were not. We want to facilitate things and do them right so we're withdrawing..."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #9. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #10, Reilly - Peters. Amends Senate Bill 1662 as amended."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Reilly. Representative Mulcahey, for what purpose do you arise?"

Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, have these Amendments been distributed?"

Speaker Flinn: "Yes, they are. Representative Reilly."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #10, let me first just tell you what it does and then kind of describe how we got here and why I think it's a good package. It grants a 5% cost of living increase effective January 1, that cost in the neighborhood of twenty-four and a half million dollars. It adds money for the Cuban line item which hopefully will be all Federal money, thought I cannot in all honesty guarantee that, twelve million dollars. It adds 13.2...excuse me twenty-six million dollars in those line items dealing with the general case loads AFDC and

general assistance. This is because of the simple fact that due to the recession the case loads in those areas are already well above what was projected. For years the department by the way, has been criticized for over projecting, in this case they've under projected and we've put that in. We have cut 2.8 million dollars out of personal services which was an agreement that we had reached in the House earlier, there is some money to complete the MMIS system and some additional funds for the....in the donated funds line item. If you will recall when we debated public aid previously, there was a 9% cost of living increase that would cost some like eighty million dollars. Many of us felt that was too high and subsequently the Bill was defeated. We've negotiated and I really should say that, Representative Braun and Representative Peters and others have negotiated, I think in good faith...the problem with Public Aid always is, that there're kind of two ways you've got to go once in terms of passing the Bill. To those who want a bigger cost of living increase, I would say, I think Representative Braun has said and perhaps will repeat. I think this is by all means the best and a responsible approach in the only way...the only vehicle there is for the House as a whole to speak its will on this subject. For those of you who may not want a cost of living increase at all, you want this Bill to go into a Conference Committee without the House having spoken on it and you'll be very very lucky if you get away with this kind of....this kind of recommendation. It seems to me that all sides negotiated this in good faith, I would just add personally one more thought. Those of you who want to go home on Monday, ought to vote for this, those of you who want to be here all next week ought to vote against it. Because this is one of those kind of

issues on which, unfortunately for a lot of reasons, we could end up getting hung up if we don't put this program together as it stands. I think this is a reasonable compromise between those who wanted a bigger increase and those who didn't want any. I think this is a reasonable position both on the part of the administration and on the part of those who are very concerned about welfare recipients, as well we should be. And I would urge a favorable Roll Call on the Amendment."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Dunn. John Dunn."

Dunn, J.: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Dunn, J.: "When would the 5% cost of living increase become effective for Public Aid recipients under the division of this Amendment?"

Reilly: "January 1."

Dunn, J.: "January 1, what year?"

Reilly: "This coming January 1, 1981."

Dunn, J.: "And the 9% cost of living that was in the Bill previously became effective July 1, 1980, did it not?"

Reilly: "Yes."

Dunn, J.: "So that, what you have changed is to reduce the cost of living for the welfare recipients not only from 9% to 5% but to delay the increase for an additional six months."

Reilly: "Yes. And in the meantime...."

Dunn, J.: "And in the meantime there is an election, is that what you were going to say?"

Reilly: "No. I was going to say, in the meantime between the time that we voted that Bill down overwhelmingly in the House, the Senate twice has turned down a figure somewhere in between where we were then and this figure. So, again this is the best we can get."

Dunn, J.: "Now, my next question is, what did you say the

increased appropriation for the welfare recipient case load is?"

Reilly: "It totals twenty-six. It's 12.6 for general assistance and about a little over thirteen for the....AFDC."

Dunn, J.: "And how much of that total of twenty-six million will be taken from general revenue funds?"

Reilly: "Half."

Dunn, J.: "And where are we going to find thirteen million dollars of general revenue funds to make available for this purpose? Has the Governor agreed to this and if so, where do we get the money?"

Reilly: "Yes. It is my understanding that the administration is supporting this, obviously we would not probably at this point be supporting it if they weren't. The answer is, that you know, there's somethings in a recession year like this that you've got to spend money on. We've all know and the point has been made many times on the floor that we could go somewhat beyond the original estimates because of the revenue picture and because of the money that we have. What we've been trying to say to you on all these other Bills is, because of some of the emergency things like this that we must end up doing that we can't spend too much of so-called surplus on other things. And so, the administration does support this."

Dunn, J.: "This thirteen million was not in the Governor's....the twenty-six million is not in the Governor's budget, was it?"

Reilly: "Not originally."

Dunn, J.: "And if it was not in the Governor's budget, we've been hearing all Spring that anything not in the Governor's budget is something that we can't afford and the matter of how badly the needs....how great the need is or how great the priority, we simply can't afford to do it. Now

how...how come all at once now the...two days before we are scheduled to adjourn, we can find thirteen million dollars. There are a number of other budgets that your are floating around that would like to be able to take advantage of thirteen million dollars. Where does this come from, is there something else being decreased or is this new money that was found just in the last twenty-four hours?"

Reilly: "Well, all I can say is at least for me, have not heard that we can't spend anymore than the Governor's budget. What you've heard from me is that if we sp... we can't spend the same extra dollars four or five times. I've not heard you defending the Governor's budget earlier. If you now want to, why, well we can fit another chair in over on this side if that's..."

Dunn, J.: "That's correct, I have not defended the Governor's budget and I am not doing so now, but I am suspicious that if we take thirteen million dollars in the form of an increase here, it will be taken away in the form of a decrease some place else. That's what I am suspicious about..."

Reilly: "It will not."

Dunn, J.: "And there are a lot of budgets still on the Calendar that are of great interest to a number of us all over the State of Illinois including the Highway Budget, including the Educational Budget, including the Mental Health Budget and if this...if Public Aid is to be a winner we want to know who the losers are and if we don't know who the losers are I don't see how we can vote for this Bill at this time."

Reilly: "Alright, there is....this is not tied to other things in the sense you're suggesting. We're not going to make the kind of cuts you're talking about somewhere else and this is the case where everybody is the winner."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Chapman. Eugenia Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I agree with Mr. Reilly and hope that we will adopt Amendment #10. As Mr. Reilly pointed out, this represents the Public Aid Budget as it came out of the Appropriations II Committee with one exception. Rather than providing for a 9% cost of living increase it only provides for a 5% cost of living increase. And this will not occur until January 1, 1981. I am disappointed at the results but I think that our course is clear on the basis of the Senate action as well as the action by this House. I believe the responsible thing to do is to vote 'yes', to accept a cost of living increase for Public Aid recipients as included in this budget. At least to get it into Conference Committee where we could discuss it further. For many many year we went without any cost of living increase for Public Aid recipients. And I'm happy to see that we have reached a point where I hope we will find that we do have agreement at least, that there should be a cost of living increase this year for Public Aid recipients. Please vote 'aye' on Amendment #10."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Conti."

Conti: "Previous question."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is shall the main question be put. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and Representative Reilly to close."

Reilly: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't know there's a great deal more that needs to be said. The House is taking a responsible action by not ending up with all of this in a Conference Committee. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is shall Amendment #10 be adopted to Senate Bill 1662. All those in favor vote 'aye', those

opposed vote 'no' and Representative Borchers is recognized to explain his vote. One minute."

Borchers: "I wanted to ask some questions. I was interested particularly in the refugee... refugee social service program. How much is the director going to be? Is this a new... is this a new... program in the... in the service? There's a lot of things I wanted to ask in relation to that, but I won't have time to do it since I haven't had time to do it, I'm going to vote 'no' cause I don't know about how much responsibility... are these people Cuban, are they boat people? Who are refugees in Illinois? I think I have a right to know and I couldn't ask the question."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Bullock, one minute to explain his vote. He cancelled out. Representative Ewell, one minute...cancelled out. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 111 voting 'aye' and 36 voting 'no' and House Amendment #10 is adopted to Senate Bill 1662. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #11, Huff - Henry. Amends Senate Bill 1662...."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Huff."

Huff: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I can't help but marvel at the way the almighty moves. He do indeed move in mysterious ways. But out of deference to what I understand is our word and out of respect to one of our Members. So be it. I will move to table Amendment #11 to House...Senate Bill 1662."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? Oh, withdrawing. Okay. The Gentleman moves to withdraw....asks to withdraw. No objection, we withdraw Amendment #11 to Senate Bill 1662. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Flinn: "Third Reading. Representative Telcser is recognized. Third Reading of Senate Bill 1662, was part of the original motion it be on. Put it on Third Reading at this time."

Telcser: "And would the Clerk please read the Bill a third time."

Speaker Flinn: "Read the Bill a third time."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1662, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses to the Department of Rehabilitation Services. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Telcser."

Telcser: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 1662 was the OCE for the Department of Rehabilitative Services for the Department of Human Services and now for the Department of Public Aid. I think we're had a great deal of discussion and questions answered and I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Flinn: "Any discussion? If not, the question is shall Senate...Representative John Dunn."

Dunn, J.: "Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Don't we have to have leave of this Body to...."

Speaker Flinn: "We just did, we passed a motion and it did that. Just prior to the Amendment passing."

Dunn, J.: "That was a motion to move it to Second...one motion take it from the table another motion took it to Second."

Speaker Flinn: "The motion was, let me read the motion to you. The motion was, I move to take the Bill from the table and suspend the Rules 35 (c) and (g), to permit consideration and passage. That's what we're doing. Further discussion? If none, Representative John Dunn, for what purpose do you arise?"

Dunn, J.: "One other parliamentary inquiry. How many votes will this take for passage at this time?"

Speaker Flinn: "89. Same as any other Bill."

Dunn, J.: "Okay, I'm not a parliamentarian but..."

Speaker Flinn: "We have already suspended....we have suspended a rule, Sir, to permit us to vote today instead of tomorrow. Simply because it was called back and amended."

Dunn, J.: "Alright."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. The question is shall Senate Bill 1662 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....yes, Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, after you announce the vote if I might be recognized."

Speaker Flinn: "Yes. On this question there are 113 voting 'aye' and 39 voting 'nay' and Senate Bill 1662, having received the Constitutional Majority if hereby declared passed. Representative Peters."

Peters: "Mr. Speaker, in the questioning and, I think the House Members know that at times I do get a little bit excited and overly excited. And I would apologize to Representative Dunn and others who might have asked questions and I was short with. But this was an awful lot of work trying to put together and I thought I started seeing it all come unglued. And I would have regretted that very much, so, if I offended anybody I apologize and I thank you for the vote."

Speaker Flinn: "House Bill 821, Representative Wvvetter Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to nonconcur as to Senate Amendments 1 and 2, on 821."

Speaker Flinn: "Your motion was to do not concur?"

Younge: "Yes."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady has moved to do not concur....someone calling for the Speaker? Representative Leinenweber."

Leinenweber: "Well, I just wonder if we could know what we're doing. What is 1 and 2?"

Younger: "Senate Amendment 1 expanded the use of the Illinois Industrial Development Authority to permit the Authority to develop commercial businesses throughout the state. And to permit the Industrial Authority to make funds available in retaining existing jobs in addition to creating existing jobs. Or creating new jobs. Senate Amendment #2, added the language that the Illinois Industrial Development Authority could not issue bonds unless it first gave notice to a municipality in which the project is going to be located. And too, that the proper authorities of the municipality did not adopt a Resolution disapproving the project within forty-five days. I move to nonconcur."

Leinenweber: "What's the matter with the Senate Amendments that we're not concurring in?"

Younger: "Well, we need to discuss these matters further. And I move for that reason to nonconcur."

Leinenweber: "Wait a minute. I didn't understand again why we're....is there something flawed about them and if so, what is it? Maybe there're better than the original Bill."

Younger: "Well, the parties on both sides of the aisle need to discuss these Amendments further. And there has been an agreement to do so, and they will do so in Conference Committee and therefore, I move to nonconcur."

Speaker Flynn: "Any further discussion? If not, the Lady has moved to do not concur on Senate Amendments #1, 2, on House Bill 821. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this motion there's 93 voting 'aye' and 40 voting 'no' and the House does not concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2, to House

Bill 821. House Bill 3435, Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "The....I move to concur on Senate Amendment #1, it was just a change in language so that we would be in compliance with the Federal law."

Speaker Flinn: "Any discussion? The motion is, concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3435. 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 143 'ayes' and none voting 'nay' and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3435 and the Bill is declared passed. On the Order of Nonconcurrency, page 6, we're going to go down the line and see what we can do. Senate Bill 1728, House Amendments 1, 8 and 9. Where's Representative Watson at? Stand at ease for a minute, we're checking where he's at. Take that one out of the record. Senate Bill 1747. Representative Jane Barnes. Representative Barnes, get off the phone and on the floor. 1747. House Amendment #1, what do you wish to do with that? Representative Jane Barnes."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, I refuse to recede on Senate Bill 1747."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady has refused to recede....do you wish to also request a Conference Committee, I assume in your motion? The Lady moves to recede...refuse to recede and request a Conference Committee. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, Conference Committee will be appointed. Senate Bill 2000, Representative Telcser. Is Art, back there? There he is. We'll wait on you. Representative Telcser moves to refuse to recede and ask that a Conference Committee be appointed on House Amendments #1 and 2. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, Conference Committee will be appointed. Representative McBroom on 2001, Senate Bill 2001. I don't see McBroom

back there. Is he...in hearing distance? Take that one out of the record. On page 2, 2893, Representative Donovan."

Donovan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2893. That provides an authorization of money to expend it from the Agriculture Premium Fund as opposed to the General Revenue Fund for the soil surveys. So, we've made a switch and this gives the authorization to take the money from the Agriculture Premium Fund as opposed to the General Revenue Fund. I move for concurrence."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved to concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2893. Any discussion? No discussion. All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 141 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'nay', this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2893. How about Oblinger and Anderson, do they wish to call 2905 at this time? Out of the record. Representative Oblinger on a motion to immediately consider House Resolution 893. Representative Oblinger is recognized."

Oblinger: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the other day on Agreed Resolutions was Resolution 893. At the request of Representative Walsh, it was taken out of the Agreed Resolutions. At the beginning of last year, I introduced a Bill to help senior citizens on transportation, House Bill 1183. This Bill was put in the Transportation Committee, assigned to an Interim Study Committee and nothing happened. I waited to see what Mr. Kornowicz's Bill on transportation was going to be and at that point it only

had to do with mass transit. If you realize that south of Springfield except for the East St. Louis, Belleville area there are no mass transit districts. We want to work out some kind of a program that will take care of the seniors in that area. I've talked to Mr....Representative Garmisa, the Chairman of Transportation Committee, to Representative Winchester who is the Minority Spokesman and joining me on this are Representatives Ralph Dunn, James Rea and Bill Harris. I would like to make a motion that this be taken from the Speaker's Table, suspend whatever necessary rule and be given consideration at this time."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Is this on the Calendar?"

Oblinger: "Yes, it is."

Speaker Flinn: "The motion is on the Calendar, we're discussing the motion, not the Bill."

Oblinger: "Page 9, Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? Now, the Lady has moved to... pursuant to rule 41 (a), to suspend the rules and place upon the Speaker's Table, immediate consideration House Resolution 893. All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no' and it takes 107 votes."

Oblinger: "Come on, guys."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 137 voting 'aye' and 4 voting 'nay' and the motion pass...carries. On the Resolution, Representative Oblinger."

Oblinger: "The reason that we've requested this Resolution is because originally there was diversion from the motor fuel tax that covered senior transportation. As you know, last year we abolished diversion from the motor fuel tax, so we

want to work out some kind of a program that we can support here in the Legislature. And this is the reason for this Resolution. I would request your favorable Roll Call vote."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is...Representative Totten."

Totten: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise reluctantly to oppose the Lady's motion. Probably one of the worse creations, formula creations that we have is our downstate mass transit districts. What happens is the incentive is to operate at bigger deficits. Because the bigger the deficits the more subsidies they get. So, there is no incentives for efficiencies and now we want to expand that program to go further and further downstate. And I just think that we ought not to...we ought not to multiply a big mistake. Am I on the right subject?"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Oblinger."

Oblinger: "Representative Totten, the way it is now, even though you abolished the diversions last year and you haven't read the Transportation Bill. The contributions and reimbursement now come out of the operating expenses. We're trying to get away from the mass transit. We don't have them, we don't want it that way. We want something based on units of service, not through mass transit. It has nothing to do with mass transit. Geez!"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Mulcahey. Cancelled out. Any further discussion? If not, the question is shall House Resolution 893 be adopted. All those in favor vote 'aye', those oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 125 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'nay' and the Resolution is adopted. Also on the Order of Motions

appears....made by Representative Hoffman, appears Senate Joint Resolution 121. Representative Hoffman is recognized."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, S.J.R. 121 is a...sets up a temporary Committee consisting of the Chairman of School Problems Commission and the Chairman and Minority Spokesman of both the House and Senate Committees on Higher Education and Elementary and Secondary Education. To receive the recommendations concerning minimal competency testing programs from the Illinois State Board of Education for the purpose of review and to consider legislation to implement the two year findings of minimal competency study by the State Board of Education. And, therefore, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move pursuant to Rule 41 (a), immediate consideration of this Joint Resolution. I've cleared this with the Leadership on both sides of the aisle."

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? The Gentleman has moved to suspend Rule 41 (a), for purpose of immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 121. All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. It takes 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 123 voting 'aye', and 6 voting 'nay' and the rule is suspended. Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I now move for the adoption of S.J.R. 121 pursuant to my earlier discussion on the motion."

Speaker Flinn: "We will wait until our machine gets caught up here. Any further discussion? If not, the question is shall Senate Joint Resolution 121 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', those oppose vote 'nay'. Have all voted who

wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 123 voting 'aye' and 5 voting 'nay' and the Senate Joint Resolution #121 is declared passed. Representative Birchler is recognized, what's the number of yours, we can't find yours on the Calendar right here? Is it 89? S.J.R. 89, Representative Birchler is recognized."

Birchler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Joint Resolution 89, I've discussed it with Leadership on both sides of the aisle. There is no opposition expressed on either side of the aisle. And what it is, it's that synthetic fuel facility siting Resolution that has come over from the Senate. I ask for a favorable vote so that we can take immediate action on this Resolution."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. The Gentleman has moved to suspend Rule 41 (a), for immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 89 and our machine is stuck right now. Okay. All those in favor vote 'aye' and those opposed vote 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 120 voting 'aye' and none voting 'nay' and the rule is suspended and Representative Birchler is recognized on Senate...."

Birchler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What the Resolution is, is the development of a synthetic fuel industry in Illinois depends upon the ability of Illinois to attract projects. A key element of this process is the availability of suitable sites and the corporation of regulatory agencies and approval of site development. At present there's no formal siting policy or mechanism synthetic fuel facilities. What this Resolution does, it request a study by the I.E.R.C. of the I.N.R. of synthetic fuel facility siting in Illinois directing the development of comprehensive siting legislation. I have talked to

Leadership on both sides of the aisle and I have had no opposition to this Resolution."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is shall Senate Joint Resolution #89 be adopted. All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. The camera lights are off. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 123 voting 'aye' and 2 voting 'nay' and Senate Joint Resolution #89 is passed. On page 7, the Speaker's Table appears #...House Resolution #897. For what purpose does Representative Daniels arise?"

Daniels: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, every year at this time we have what we call the Big Banana Award, and this year we're very happy to award the Top Banana of the House to none other than our very favorite friend, Marcia Stepanek, of the UPI. So, then, Marcia, we give you the Big Banana Award. You are one of our special people, and we also want to point out that Clarence Neff is the Top Banana in contributing to the Banana Fund, which is an annual event every year towards the end of the Session. Thank you, Clarence."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Chapman on House...Yeah, just a minute Representative Chapman. Representative Conti for what purpose do you arise?"

Conti: "Well, Mr. Speaker on the more serious note, if I can have the attention of the House. In the next couple of days we'll be scrutinizing all the Appropriation Bills and has been brought to our attention, not once but at least a half a dozen times. Speaker Redmond will cooperate with what I have to say, that when it comes to any appropriations for the renovations of this state building I wish that the Members would give it serious consideration for the simple reason that in this building alone we are cited with sixty

violations in the fire code alone. There are many many violations throughout the building, we witnessed a terrible accident here just the other day when a brand new elevator, that was not supposed to be in service, had received several complaints prior to the accident that occurred. We now have two girls laying over at St. John's Hospital. So, in giving your serious consideration to these Appropriation Bills especially when it comes to the renovation of this building to please exercise some intelligence in voting and not to try to save, where we here are making the laws, pressing violations and insisting on getting rid of violations throughout the state. That we ourselves are in violation in this building."

Speaker Flinn: "Your remarks are very well taken, I think the Members should pay attention to what you had to say there. Representative Chapman on House Resolution 897."

Chapman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This is House Resolution 897 that was pulled out of the record a few days ago. It calls for a single state agency, the Department of Public Health to look at all the programs that we offer in our state that relate to adolescent pregnancy and to work with the...."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Chapman..."

Chapman: "And I wish to offer a...an Amendment, Sir."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay."

Chapman: "I would first like to offer an Amendment that results, I hope, the questions that arose when House Resolution 897 came out. I would like to read the full text of the Amendment. The Amendment says at the end of this Resolution: "Resolved: that nothing in this Resolution shall authorize or encourage abortion performance, counseling or referral services. This is a point raised by Representative Brummer and Representative Kelly, this is

the exact language that I worked out with Representative Brummer, he wrote the Amendment. There was never any intention that House Resolution 897, deal with the issue of abortion, we were interested in working with problems relating to parenthood in helping young parents. So, I am happy to offer this Amendment to House Resolution 897 and do move for its adoption."

Speaker Flinn: "Any discussion? If not, the question is shall....Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "I would like to ask the Sponsor a question, please."

Speaker Flinn: "She indicates that she will yield."

Pullen: "Does this Resolution substitute for a Bill...."

Speaker Flinn: "We're on the Amendment really, not the Resolution."

Pullen: "Alright. I'll let it go till we take the Resolution then. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "On the Amendment, the question is shall the House adopt Amendment #1 to House Resolution 897. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. On the Resolution as amended. Representative Chapman."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we now have before us House Resolution 897 as amended, to make it very clear that the Sponsors do not wish to treat the subject of abortion in this Resolution. And what the Resolution provides for is a task force to look at what state programs are presently being offered to coordinate them and to develop a plan for any needs that would exist in dealing with the problem of adolescent pregnancy and possibly I can respond to Representative Pullen's question, if I understand it. And that is, yes, House Resolution 897 does take the place of a Bill which passed in this House, which went over and was stopped in the Senate Rules Committee

because the Senate Rules Committee did not apparently, regard the fact that one out of five babies in our state is born to a child as an emergency. This has regarded it as an emergency, I hope you will join with me and vote 'yes' on House Resolution 897."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I hope that you were listening when the Sponsor did say that this Resolution replaces by Resolution what was attempted to be done by a Bill, which the Senate held in the Rules Committee. I don't know whether you think much of that practice, I don't. And I don't think that it is necessary to have a Resolution to establish the task force to look into this. I think the Executive Department is quite capable of looking into it through the directors of the various departments involved and certainly the problem, if it is one, has been brought to their attention very amply this spring. And I urge the defeat of this Resolution."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I respectfully disagree with Representative Pullen and encourage support of this Resolution. The Conference of Women Legislators which many of the women Representatives in this House are active members held hearings across the state on the subject of teenage pregnancy. One of the major things that we heard was that insufficient attention has been given to the problem. That many people didn't know there was a problem. And it was through our efforts that attention has been drawn to the enormity of this issue and it's importance with regard to the public health and welfare of the people of the State of Illinois. This Resolution is a modest attempt, I think, to continue our efforts and with legislative sanction.

So far we have been doing it as a group, an informal grouping of Legislators but we would like to have, and I would strongly encourage...have that this Legislature go on record as being in support of helping...in support of finding ways to address the crucial issue of teenage pregnancies in this state. It is a national epidemic, it is an epidemic particularly in the State of Illinois. You've seen all of the newspaper reports, we have taken what I think to be a responsible, conservative, consistent approach in addressing this problem. And we cannot wait for....I think, we cannot wait for some administrator to take the initiative when that initiative has not been taken so far. This Resolution calls for the Legislature to speak out with one voice, that we would like to have some attention drawn to...some investigation made in this area. And I encourage your support for House Resolution 897."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Brunner."

Brunner: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentlemen has moved the previous question. The question is shall the main question be put. All those in favor say 'aye' 'aye', those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the main question is put and the Sponsor Representative Chapman is recognized to close."

Chapman: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, the Governor has indicated his interest in this issue through his initiative relating to infant mortality. The state agencies support this Resolution and believe it will help them to address the problems pointed to by Representative Braun. I ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is shall House Resolution 897 be adopted. 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

111 voting 'aye', 32 voting 'nay' and House Resolution 897 is adopted. On the Order of Motions appears HR 898. Representative Borchers, what purpose do you arise?"

Borchers: "A question if I might."

Speaker Flinn: "Sure."

Borchers: "I don't know the procedure, but we have a contingency fund, I understand. And have any flowers been sent to those two secretaries, paid for by this House out of our contingency fund. Do you know whether they've received flowers from us as a group?"

Speaker Flinn: "Not to my knowledge, I don't know, we'll check on it."

Borchers: "I don't know what the rules are on a thing like this, but I would like to move if there is a rule applicable that we...perhaps seconded by a Democrat that we do authorize the Speaker of the House, if no flowers have been sent to these girls, to send some flowers and pay for it out of the contingency fund. Is this possible?"

Speaker Flinn: "Well let us check on it and we'll find out, if so..."

Borchers: "Alright."

Speaker Flinn: "The we'll recognize you for such a motion."

Borchers: "Okay."

Speaker Flinn: "Alright. 898, Representative Barnes. On a motion."

Barnes: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to discharge the Committee on Human Resources for further consideration and advance to the Order of the Speaker's Table House Resolution 898. And it also deals with part of the package that Eugenia Chapman was just discussing. The Council of Women Legislators spent all last summer holding different hearings throughout the State of Illinois. I don't know how many of you are aware of it

but Channel 5, has editorialized in favor of these particular Bills. It is a problem the state must start to address, we have met with Representative Kelly and we are offering all the Right To Life Amendments on all of these Resolutions. He is now in total agreement with the concept and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The....any further discussion? The question is shall House adopt....I understand that you might have an Amendment, somebody....we've got to discharge it first. The motion is to discharge the Human Resources Committee pursuant to Rule 66 (a), and place this Resolution on the Speaker's Table. All those in favor vote 'aye', those oppose vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 118 voting 'aye', 11 voting 'nay' and the Human Resources Committee is discharged and the Bill is on the Speaker's Table. The Lady is recognized for the House Resolution...purpose of an Amendment. She had an Amendment submitted. You want to turn the T.V. lights back on."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Barnes - Macdonald. Amends House Resolution 898 by inserting after the last resolved clause the following. Resolved that nothing in this Resolution shall be construed to authorize or encourage abortion performance counseling or referral services..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Barnes. Point of order, Representative Brummer, what's your point of order."

Brummer: "Yes, I think the last motion was to discharge Committee and place it on the Order of Speaker's Table. Can we amend it while it's on the Order of Speaker's Table or don't..."

Speaker Flinn: "We can do anything we want on Speaker's Table. We can amend it and pass it and everything else. That's where it goes anyway. There's no Second and Third Reading

for Resolutions."

Brummer: "Okay. Fine."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "I think that I kind of explained this Amendment when I was discussing the House Resolution before. This is an Agreed Amendment between Representative Kelly, Representative Macdonald and myself. And it takes care of fears that any abortion counseling, would be discussed at anytime with connection with this particular House Resolution."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Resolution 898. All those in favor say 'aye' 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have, the Amendment is adopted. Now, the Lady on the Resolution as amended. Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 898 urges that the Department of Public Aid and the Department of Children and Family Services give a high priority to the special needs of adolescent parents in their day care planning and programing. And I would like you to know that both directors of both the Departments of Public Aid and the Department of Children and Family Services have been consulted on this particular issue. The reason that we've gone to House Resolution is that the Council of Women's Legislators and the Directors of the Department has put a lot of time into this particular project and we just want to make sure that over the summer months that it is kept alive and working."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not. The question is shall House Resolution 898 be adopted. All those in favor vote 'aye', those oppose vote 'no'. Representative Conti."

Conti: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, those of you who have occasion to visit the great City of Peoria, we

have the congenial host of one of the finest hotels in that city, John Daley in the back of the room. And he said, there are special rates to Legislators who come up there, 10% more than the regular customers. The great City of Peoria, Continental Regency."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 113 'ayes', 12 'nays' and House Resolution 898 is adopted. 899, Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Pursuant to Rule 66 (a), I move to discharge Committee of Human Resources in further consideration and advance to Order of the Speaker's Table, House Resolution 899."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady has moved to suspend...pursuant to Rule 66 (a), to discharge the Committee on Human Resources and place on the Speaker's Table House Resolution 899. Any discussion? If not, the question is, all in favor...that is the question. All in favor vote 'aye' and 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 118 voting 'aye' and 7 voting 'nay' and the Committee is discharged. The Lady on the Resolution now...Rep....any Amendments?"

Macdonald: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have Amendment #1 which is the same Amendment...."

Speaker Flinn: "The Clerk will read the Amendment."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Macdonald - Barnes. Amends House Resolution 899 by inserting after the last resolved clause the following. Resolves that nothing in this Resolution shall be construed to authorize or encourage abortion performance, counseling or referral services and be it further."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady on the Amendment."

Macdonald: "Yes. It is very important that we put this Amendment on this Bill or this Resolution the same as we have on the others. To satisfy the Right to Life People. There is no intent with this feasibility study that we are recommending in this Resolution to in anyway have abortion counseling or have anything to do to encourage any activity in that direction."

Speaker Flinn: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Resolution 899. 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: "The Lady on the Resolution."

Macdonald: "Yes. This merely directs the Department of Public Health to conduct a feasibility study on the establishment of comprehensive health centers to see what centers are available and how we might in this state work with those centers to help these teenage children, under seventeen, to have counseling and with the problems that they encounter...with the enormous problems, I might say that they encounter with their pregnancies and in early parenthood after their children arrive. So, I would move the passage of this Resolution."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not. The question is shall House Resolution 899 be adopted. Representative Ropp. Ropp."

Ropp: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield? I've got a...I have a question I guess on several of these that we have talked about in the last few minutes. It always seems like we're trying to deal with a problem after this has occurred. And it doesn't seem like we have as big of problem with pregnancy because that's pretty easy to become.

pregnant apparently. It looks to me like we ought to be spending some time and effort or maybe you can tell me what the state has already doing in trying to prevent this problem from multiplying year after year after year. It seems like we're just putting kind of a bandaid over the problem if there is a problem and I think there is. I wish you could give me some explanation as to how maybe we can begin to reduce this problem by preventing the cause initially."

Macdonald: "Well, Representative Ropp, I think that that's what all three of these Resolutions hope to conclude after we report back and after the feasibility studies and after the other reporting is done. We certainly have through the hearings learned that there is indeed a problem. Not just in Illinois but this is a national problem of enormous scope. And I would agree with you that certainly something has to be done to eliminate the original problem. I think that belongs locally with parents, I think it belongs locally with civic organizations and with others and I do not believe personally that the state government has any business getting into sex education. Which I believe is basically what is needed. But I do think that after the problem of teenaged parenthood is with us, that we certainly have an obligation when no one else seems to be addressing it. There are...the courts are fully of cases, welfare roles are full of cases where these young children under seventeen are abandoned by their families, their central families and are left out on their own. I am dealing with two such cases as a result of our teenage pregnancy hearing in my district at this particular time. And I certainly feel that we should try to have a counseling, we should have a place where these young people can come and get the kind of advice and get the kind of

medical help that they need. Many of them are coming to hospitals without every having seen a doctor before when we know that these infants and children are of the highest risk of any births that there are. And they are coming into hospitals without every having seen a doctor before. These are the kinds of problems that the state and local governments will probably have to address themselves to. I have no answers as to what we have to do about sex education, I think that ought to lie with the Parent Teacher Associations with other civic organizations encouraging maybe parent counseling to help their children avoid these kinds of situations. But I do think that trying to provide centers to try and provide day care so that these children can finish their educations and be at least self supporting and be better parents for the children that they have borne is indeed appropriate and that's why we are trying through Resolution what we had already succeed in doing in passing Bills through this House and over to the Senate."

Ropp: "Well, certainly your intent is laudable."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well maybe I move...the synopsis for House Resolution 899, in my book, Representative Macdonald, says that all this does is encourage the Illinois Department of Public Health to try and reduce infant mortality. Am I correct, this doesn't have anything to do with day care centers or teenage pregnancy, does this? Or is the synopsis in error?"

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Macdonald. Turn Macdonald on, please."

Macdonald: "Yes, I have House Resolution 899 and that Resolution has to do with a feasibility study to be undertaken by the Department of Health. Now, Representative Barnes was the

Resolution that had to do with....day care centers. So, I think that you are looking at the wrong Resolution. The House Bill...there has..."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "Well, I don't want to belabor it but the synopsis says, this is a Resolution, we're on a Resolution aren't we?"

Macdonald: "We are."

Deuster: "And my Resolution is just encouraging the Department of Public Health to continue its efforts on the subject of infant mortality. Now, was this Amendment somewhere or..."

Macdonald: "No. There is a program currently going on where the director of the Department of Health is trying to reduce infant mortality and these Resolutions merely go along with that goal in mind. But this specific Resolution that I have offered, really, of course includes as a part of this intent the reduction of infant mortality but more than that, it specifically addresses centers that might be used in conjunction with trying to arrive at that conclusion."

Deuster: "Well, I just don't want to be supporting something that calls for government funded day care centers. Is that in this or not?"

Macdonald: "No, that was in the previous Resolution."

Deuster: "Alright. Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Hallock. Hallock."

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

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentlemen has moved the previous question. The question is shall the main question be put. All those in favor say 'aye' and those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the main question is put and the Sponsor, Representative Macdonald is recognized. Representative Macdonald."

Macdonald: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that it is extremely important and I regret that the Senate did not feel that

this problem was urgent enough to address itself after a whole year of study by the Conference of Women Legislators on these issues. These young people under seventeen desperately need our help and I think that all this Resolution is doing is, asking that the Department of Health look into the possibility of seeing whether or not we shall join with established centers or whether the state indeed ought to be obligated to establish such centers to help these young people with pregnancy problems and with nutrition and health services, adoption counseling and all of the other problems that there are with raising a family. So, I urge your support to this Resolution."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is shall House Resolution 899 be adopted. 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 117 voting 'aye', 11 voting 'no' and the Resolution is adopted. Under concurrence appears House Bill 3229, Representative Collins. It's for the Committee on Elections."

Collins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3229 is a rather large Bill dealing with the transition to the consolidated election schedule. I would move for concurrence in the Senate Amendments to House Bill 3229. Senate Amendment #11 is a lengthy one, largely technical, but there are some substantive things in here that I should point out to the Members and would answer any other questions that you may have. In Senate Amendment #11, at the request of the town of Cicero, their elections are moved from the odd years to the even years. At the request of Representative Mahar, this Amendment will provide the precincts, when practical, will lie in only one Legislative District. There...earlier today we passed the

appropriation and this is the authorization for the on-time, 10 dollar stipend for training election judges in consolidated elections. Again, conforming to earlier statutory provisions, the Senate Amendment #11 would provide procedures for election authorities to receive state share of the cost of judges...the pay raise that we passed last year for judges. Another item that was subject to debate in this House was the change to a six-year term for...term for community college trustees. Under Senate Amendment #11 the term would be left at four years with the option given to community college districts to provide for six-year terms by referendum. Also, in the...in this Amendment is the elimination of a maximum salary for commissioners and chief clerks of Boards of Election Commissioners and would permit the Chairman of the Chicago Board of Election Commissioners to hold outside employment. Another provision in the Amendment, it would require the rotation on the ballot for University of Illinois trustee candidates by Congressional Districts. Furthermore, under this Amendment, it would permit any objections that are filed to public policy or Constitutional Amendments, it would permit them to be filed either in Springfield or at the Chicago Board of Elections Office, and, furthermore, it would incorporate a good deal of the nursing home legislation that was handled by Representative Bowman earlier and would permit the nursing home applicants who are severely disabled to secure a voting ID card, so they wouldn't have to get a physician's affidavit every election. The ID card would be good for five years. Finally, it would strike some language on all of our political literature which would permit the printing on the literature of just the name of the Committee and the fact that it is registered with the proper election authority.

That would be Senate Amendment #11, and I would move for its adoption...for concurrence."

Speaker Flinn: "Any...?"

Collins: "I can take them all at once."

Speaker Flinn: "...discussion? Why don't you take them all at once. If there's any objection, we'll bust them apart."

Collins: "All right. If there's no objection, I would like to take them all on one Roll Call."

Speaker Flinn: "Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Representative Bowman. Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Bowman: "Representative Collins, I would like to ask a question for the purposes of making a legislative record on the interpretation of some language. There is, on pages 118, 119, 123, and 124, there is a phrase that...which refers to Saturday, Sunday, or Monday, and the word, 'or', can be used in the inclusive or exclusive sense. My question of you is this an inclusive or exclusive, 'or'?"

Collins: "Yes, it's exclusive. One of the days."

Bowman: "One of the three days, but no...?"

Collins: "One of the three days."

Bowman: "One of the three, but not more than one of the three?"

Collins: "But not all."

Bowman: "I see."

Collins: "Not more than one."

Bowman: "Thank you. That sounds like a very good provision, and I support that."

Collins: "Yes, I hope it's clear from the context, but from our dialog I'm sure it will be made clear."

Bowman: "I trust it will be. Thank you."

Collins: "All right. Now, Amendment #12 is another one that

caused some debate on the House floor, but...and I was one that objected to the so-called Rock Island scanner voting machine. The Amendment...Amendment#12 in the Senate and subsequent explanation by the Sponsors of this legislation have satisfied me, at least, that this is a viable apparatus and one that will be able to count, not only cumulative votings, will do it without error, and the Amendment...the Amendment straightens out one point where we had a problem as to filling in the election...or the box. It could be subject to identifying marks. Now, the only thing that is allowable is a shading in this area, so the scanner can pick it up, but any other mark would be, indeed, an identifying mark and would eliminate the ballot. So, I think that these objections that were raised by Representative Bluthardt, me, and others have been satisfactorily answered. At least, as I say, to my satisfaction, and I would move for the concurrence in Senate Amendment #12. Senate....Senate Amendment #13 was offered by Senator Martin in the Senate, and it would permit street and light districts to raise their tax limit to two percent from one percent but by referendum, and I would move for concurrence in that Amendment and, finally, Amendment #16 offered by Senator Philip and, as I remember, has been a Bill offered by Representative McBroom in the past, would require a minimum number of write-in votes for a write-in candidate to be nominated or elected as the case may be. The number of write-in votes would be at least equal to the number of petition signatures required for a candidate to qualify for nomination for that particular office. And, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask for concurrence in these Amendments to House Bill 3229."

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? Representative Sam Wolf.

Representative Sam Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Wolf: "Representative Collins, do I understand that you're moving for concurrence on all of these Amendments?"

Collins: "Yes, I am asking for them all to be concurred in one Roll Call unless there's objection."

Wolf: "Oh, alright. I would hope, Representative Collins, that you, as a Member of the Elections Committee, and I'm also on that Committee, I'd hope that we would consider in some of our future meetings that we consider including the appellate court judges in being required to run, at least, on a Congressional District basis. You know, many of these judges run in multi-counties. I think in the Fifth Judicial District the appellate court judges there are run in 37 counties, and I think some of the others in at least 20, 25, and 30. I think it creates a situation where sometimes we wind up with a candidate that possibly we would rather have someone else, and I would think that on subsequent legislation that appellate court judges would be included in the Congressional District requirement."

Collins: "Representative Wolf, I would agree with you, and I would like to explore it with you further, and, as a matter of fact, as you probably know, we have looked at that, have run into some technical difficulties, and hopefully we can work it out. But, I'd like to work with you in the future."

Wolf: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? If not, the gentleman has moved that the House concur in...oh, I'm sorry. Representative Deuster."

Deuster: "If the Sponsor would yield for a question? Representative Collins."

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will."

Deuster: "In the House, Amendment #5 was added to this legislation which solves a very curious problem up in Lake County with respect to the charter city of Lake Forest, and I was wondering whether you would comment on that. It is my understanding that the Senate may have deleted that important Amendment that was adopted here in the House, and if so, I'm inquiring what action you recommend that we take on that and whether that's included in some way in your motion."

Collins: "Representative Deuster, I apologize for going over that. I did not do it on purpose. Senate Amendment #11 does delete the exemption for charter municipalities from consolidated elections, and I would ask you at this time to join with me in concurrence in light of the fact that the Amendment to which you refer was offered in the Senate to the Bill and was defeated. So, it...the issue has been debated in both Houses, successfully in this House from your standpoint, and your Amendment was defeated in...in the Senate deliberations."

Deuster: "Well, do you think we ought to just roll over for the Senate or..."

Collins: "Well..."

Deuster: "It's a very important Amendment for those of us from Lake County, those of us who represent Lake Forest, and we would like to..."

Collins: "Well, you know..."

Deuster: "...try and work this out."

Collins: "Well, I might add there's more than just working out an exemption. The Amendment as was adopted, I am told, eliminated your charter districts from the entire Election Code. So, it's more than just a consolidated election schedule. We're talking about inclusion in the code. I

wouldn't recommend rolling over, but I would recommend accepting the inevitable and working...trying to work on your problems separately at a different time. I don't think...I don't think that there is anything to be gained by going back to Conference Committee at this point on an issue that has been debated at length in both Houses and soundly defeated in one."

Deuster: "Thank you."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendments #11, 12, 13, and 16. All those in favor vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 143 voting 'aye' and 9 voting 'nay'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed, and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 11, 12, 13, and 16. Representative Ryan, for what purpose do you rise?"

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, an inquiry of the Chair. I've had...I've got 88 Republicans here, and 87 of them have asked me what the program is for rest of the day."

Speaker Flinn: "Well, let me give you a run down as best I know. Next is under concurrence, is House Bill 3311, which is the Speaker's, and then I've got four Resolutions and that appears to be it. Not very much longer. It depends on how much debate of course."

Ryan: "That's the same answer I got from everybody else. You don't really know, is that what you're telling me?"

Speaker Flinn: "I don't know anymore than you do. I gave you...I gave you the numbers but I couldn't tell you how much time it consumes."

Ryan: "You don't have a time, is that right?"

Speaker Flinn: "I would guess within a half hour, maybe less. Under concurrence, Representative Epton."

Epton: "Mr. Speaker, as a point of personal privilege. May I inquire, Representative Ryan, Representative Ryan...over this way."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ryan, Representative Epton's..."

Epton: "Yes, I don't want to talk to you either but, you used a figure of how many people that had asked you a certain question. I want to assure this House that I haven't talked to Representative Ryan all day and have no intention of doing so. So, that those of you who want to accuse him of a misstatement of facts, I certainly will join you. Impeachment, I think is the proper procedure and I'll draw that Resolution up later. Thank you, Mr. Chairman....Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Under concurrences, House Bill 3311, the Speaker is recognized at Representative Pechous's station."

Speaker Redmond: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3311 was sponsored by the Minority Leader and myself, at the request of the Secretary of State. It has the approval of the Governor. It transfers two hundred and sixty-five thousand dollars from a previous appropriation for the erection of an exterior fire safety improvement in the State Capitol Building. That's unnecessary for that and we're asking that it be transferred so that it can be used for the purpose of design of a new library, new State Library Building. And I, therefore, move that the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3311."

Speaker Flinn: "Any discussion? If not, the question is shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3311. All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. Final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 142 voting 'aye', 10 voting 'nay' and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby

declared passed and the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3311. Resolutions. They have House Resolution 631, Representative Keane. Jim Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask the support of the House for House Resolution 631. House Resolution 631 urges the U.S. Congress to enact the Cigarette Safety Act...House...Bill 5504. Which establishes the safety standards to reduce the hazards and deaths resulting from cigarette fires. It is a fire prevention Bill that is presently existing in Congress, the Resolution, my Resolution and the Bill in Congress is supported by all the fire prevention agencies throughout the state. I would ask for a favorable consideration and I would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? If not, the question is....Representative Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a comment for the Sponsor. This came up before the Executive Committee and somebody made the remark, what had happened, that the original Sponsor of this is Congressman John J. Mokley of Massachusetts. And found that he could not get this thing passed in Congress because of the heavy tobacco lobbying. I would preface my remarks by saying that, I'm supporting this. But a question was asked of the Sponsor and I just thought I let the Sponsor know exactly where Congressman Molkey was coming from, Jim, and why he introduced this. Congressman Molkey, we decided, was not necessarily anti smoking but the reason he wanted self extinguishing cigarettes was because we checked out Congressman Molkeys' district and it so happens that he has one lighter company and four match companies in his district. And I think the reason he wants self extinguishing cigarettes is because people will go through more matches that way. Just sort of

explain it to you a little bit."

Keane: "It sounds logical, Representative."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "I would like to ask the Sponsor a few question."

Speaker Flinn: "He indicates he will yield."

Pullen: "Pursuant to what the Gentleman just said, I wonder whether you would describe to us a little bit more fully the legislation that is in Congress. How is it that this legislation is structured?"

Keane: "I would be happy to. The Cigarette Safety Act deals with a situation where a cigarette if left without anyone puffing on it, will burn for over twenty to twenty-five minutes. If it falls on a furniture, on bedding or on a rug, with that kind of burning time it is very likely, in fact almost certain that that material will catch on fire. The reason that cigarettes burn as long as they do, is that in the manufacture of cigarettes various elements are added not only to the cigarette paper to make the paper burn, but also in some cases there are additives put on the tobacco during the fertilization and or, curing process. The reason that the fire protection and fire prevention people are supporting this Bill is that, the cigarette...if it goes out without puffing, if it goes out in five minutes the great bulle of the accidents and deaths that have occurred from lit cigarettes falling, would be substantially reduced. At the present time we're talking about annually ninety-three thousand fires, twenty-one hundred deaths, thirty-nine hundred injuries and a total of three hundred twelve million dollars in losses nationally. If you would like me...any further explanation, I would be happy to try it."

Pullen: "Is it the case that the legislation in Congress that you are asking this House in representing the people of the

State of Illinois to endorse, bans the manufacture of cigarettes which burn for longer than five minutes?"

Keane: "Could you repeat that?"

Pullen: "Is it the case that the legislation in Congress which you are asking this House as representing the people of the State of Illinois to endorse, bans the manufacture of cigarettes which burn for longer than five minutes?"

Keane: "That's roughly correct."

Pullen: "That's the effect of the legislation in Congress, right?"

Keane: "That's right."

Pullen: "And you told me in Committee, as I recall, that a cigarette when it's self extinguishes in five minutes under the Federal legislation, could be relit with a match or a lighter or however, you light a cigarette, right?"

Keane: "The same as...if you will notice that cigars or pipes if left unattended, go out. It would be the same situation that we have with cigar smokers or pipe smokers."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, aside from the comments made by a previous speaker about the number of match companies and lighter companies in the district of the Congressman who introduced this Federal legislation. I would like you also to think about the ramifications of our endorsing legislation which interferes so severely in the private enterprise system that it would ban the manufacture of a cigarette that burns for longer than five minutes. Is that really what we're here for, or what Congress is elected for? I urge you to defeat this Resolution."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Vinson. Sam Vinson."

Vinson: "Even though it's a conflict of interest, I move the previous question."

Speaker Flinn: "Put your pipe out. The Gentleman has moved the

previous question. All....the question is shall the main question be put. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Sponsor is recognized, Representative Keane to close."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The....almost....as far as I'm concerned, or as far as I know, every association that deals with fire prevention is in support of the Cigarette Safety Act. The burn council which is based at the trauma center at San Francisco General Hospital, has pretty much been instrumental in spearheading the national campaign. I have been approached on this by fire prevention people from throughout the State of Illinois, they are all in support of it and I would ask for your favorable consideration, just to let Congress know that the people of Illinois are worried about the tremendous amount of death and property damage and injury that is caused by unlit cigarettes. Fires caused by unlit cigarettes falling on bedding and so forth. I would ask for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is shall the House adopt House Resolution 631. All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Representative Griesheimer to explain his vote. One minute, the timer is on."

Griesheimer: "Just quickly, Mr. Speaker. I was going to suggest to the Sponsor, if he knows my interest in the anti-smoking move in the State of Illinois, I would suggest he should have changed his Resolution to require all cigarettes be dipped in agent orange that way we'd be taking care of the smokers and the cigarettes and also the fire hazard at the same time."

Speaker Flinn: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 103 voting 'aye', 19 voting 'nay' and this Resolution is adopted. Under motions appears Senate Joint

Resolution 119, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would move pursuant to Rule 41 (a), to place that particular Resolution on the Speaker's Table for immediate consideration."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman moves to suspend Rule 41 (a), so that we might place this on the Speaker's Table for immediate consideration. Any discussion on the motion? Hearing no discussion, all those in favor of the motion vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. It takes 107 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 112 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'nay' and the rule is suspended and the Gentleman on the Resolution. Senate Joint Resolution 119, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members, Senate Joint Resolution 119 is an alternative to a piece of legislation which this House passed some time ago overwhelmingly, I believe with 143 votes. We put in the Senate a Bill which provided for Tax Study Commission to report back to us next year with regard to farm land assessment. And in conjunction to legislation we passed putting a cap on farm land assessments for one year. That being the coming assesment year. This particular Resolution replaces the Commission Bill which the Senate killed in its Rules Committee and provides instead, rather than having a Commission that we will have a ten member Joint House, Senate Study Committee on the farm assessment issue to report back to us next year. I would appreciate a favorable Roll Call on this, this is the last possible piece of legislation that can affect this necessary end if we are to take a close look at and hopefully clear up the farm assessment law so that it is fair to farmers and also fair to taxing districts in its application. I would

appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Flinn: "The Gentleman....any further discussion? Representative Schraeder. Schraeder."

Schraeder: "Was there a motion filed on this one? Or an Amendment?"

Speaker Flinn: "We just suspended Rule 41 (a), so we could hear it....there's no Amendments. This is a Senate Joint Resolution. Any further discussion? If not, the question is shall the House adopt Senate Joint Resolution 119. 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 131 voting 'aye', 8 voting 'nay' and House does adopt Senate Joint Resolution 119. Representative Bower is recognized on House Resolution 862. For a motion."

Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Harris and I are cosponsors of Resolution 862, pursuant to Rule 41 (a), I move to place the Resolution on the Speaker's Table for immediate consideration."

Speaker Flinn: "Okay. The Gentleman has moved that Rule 41 (a), be suspended so this Resolution may be placed upon the Speaker's Table for immediate consideration. Any discussion on the Motion? Hearing no....those in favor of the motion 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 129 voting 'aye'....Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "This Resolution deals with something that is very vital to the Illinois, the confiscation of oil money..."

Speaker Flinn: "This is on the motion, Sir. We're not considering the Resolution. 129 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'nay' and the rule is suspended and the Resolution is on

the Speaker's Table. The Gentleman is recognized on the Resolution."

Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Congress of the United States recently enacted the windfall profits, tax which was intended to place a tax on the excess profits of the major oil companies. Now whether or not you agree with the concept of that legislation, it had an effect far beyond what I'm certain was the intent of Congress. During the last several weeks, Representative Harris and I, have received a great deal of correspondence, telephone calls and personal communications with constituents in our legislative districts concerning the effect of the windfall profits, tax it's having on the small royalty interest owner. In Illinois there are over twenty-five thousand producing wells that have an average of two to three royalty interest owners for each well. The effect of the windfall profits, taxes is to have taken from one-third to nearly two-thirds of the amount of those small royalty checks as a tax. It was never the intent of Congress to this. It was...for many of the people who are the recipients of the royalty interest are old people, retired people, people who have been relying on their small checks from maybe twenty-five, fifty dollars to three or four hundred dollars to supplement their very limited income. It would be....is the intent of this Resolution to express the intent of the Illinois House of Representatives to the Congress of the United States that the small royalty interest owners should be exempt from the windfall profits tax. Let me add that there are....there is legislation pending in both the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States to do this. I would like to call upon Representative Harris to close at the appropriate time, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Any further discussion? Representative Robbins."

Robbins: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill says, if you....it's on oil royalties. It was the intent to place the tax on major importing companies that were making a large profit at the expense of the taxpayer. Instead the way the Bill ended up, if you had, as one fellow did, he got a check for fifty-nine cents and they twenty out of it, left him thirty-nine cents. And this is confiscation of property because there is no profit as such, there. It's a the sale of something that you own and through government regulation of price they put a new tax on, a new excise tax. This could apply to any business or anything that looks like it might make a little money. Another way for the government to tax and I would ask for a unanimous support of this Resolution."

Speaker Flinn: "Further discussion? Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question? Representative Bower, I don't have a copy of the Resolution in front of me. Could you enlighten us as to whether Congress is being memorialized to revise the law in terms of the dollar volume of holdings or the dollar volume of the income or is it simply a Resolution which would memorialize Congress to modify the law with respect to wells that were owned by single or perhaps dual interest."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Bower."

Bower: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Resolution is a pertinent part, merely says, it would urge the Congress of the United States to exempt owners of small oil royalty interest from paying the windfall profits tax. Do you understand what a royalty interest owner is? We're not talking about the oil companies, we're talking about the landowner who in leasing his land primarily, in return for doing that got an interest in the proceeds of that well."

Bowman: "Well, are there other ways of getting the royalty interest other than owning the land?"

Bower: "Well, he may own the mineral interest under the land."

Bowman: "Okay. Do you know if anyone whose last name is Hunt, happens to own such rights in the State of Illinois?"

Bower: "I would have no idea, but what we're talking about is the small oil royalty interest owners right now. As I say, the...in the Senate, Senator Dole has a legislation that is cosponsored by, I believe thirty Members in the United States Senate in Congress there's a Democratic Congressman that has legislation sponsored by over seventy Members of the U. S. House of Representatives."

Bowman: "How do you define, small, what is your intention with respect to the definition of the word 'small'. You're talking about the small royalty owner. I mean....I can certainly bleed as much as the next person for the small businessman, but I think I....we have a common understanding of what it means to be a small businessman. I'm not sure we have a common understanding about a small royalty owner."

Bower: "Representative Robbins just advised me that the Hunts own no royalty interest in Illinois."

Bowman: "Neither Nelson nor Bunker?"

Robbins: "They may own some drilling interest but they own no royalty interest. They don't fool with that small...."

Bowman: "Would Representative Bower, now ask...respond to the part of the question about, what's 'small' means?"

Bower: "What we were referring to were the people who own very limited interest and are receiving checks probably under a thousand dollars from this wells."

Bowman: "Well, Representative Bower and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I could speak briefly to this I won't protract the question and answer period anymore. The number one

hundred thousand dollars or any other similar number, apparently does not appear in the Resolution. And I would urge the House to reject this very sloppy attempt to memorialize Congress on this particular issue. If they're asserting that an individual landowner or owner of mineral rights is before us is a small royalty owner. I think that they probably have another think coming. H. L. Hunt, who died recently is a multi-billionaire. He didn't....he was not a corporation, he had a privately owned operation...."

Flinn: "Would you bring your remarks to a close, please."

Bowman: "I am. I just want to point out to the House that small individual ownership doesn't necessarily imply small...especially in the oil industry. And I think that we would be ill advised to adopt this Resolution."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Sam Wolf."

Wolf, Sam: "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 say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Gentleman, Representative....Representative Harris is recognized to close. For a short closing."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I....I don't know where H. L. Hunt came in to this, we're talking about the small owner that we're taking away the incentive from the two to five barrel oil wells that are being drilled in southern Illinois and part of the central Illinois. If you're going to take 36% of the royalties, they're not going to have any...two to five barrel wells. H. L. Hunt has nothing to do with this whatsoever. This is just, when you get a fifteen or twenty dollar check, we're trying to keep grandpa and grandma and Uncle and Aunt, they're not taking 36% of it away from them. This is a very important Resolution."

Speaker Flinn: "The question is shall the House adopt Resolution #872. All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wished? Representative Bullock is recognized to explain his vote. One minute, the timer is on..."

Bullock: "Mr. Speaker, I really wanted to ask the Sponsor of this Resolution a question before being cut off in debate. I was wondering if Representative Bower, are you in opposition to the wind fall profits tax?"

Speaker Flinn: "I think that's out of order. Explain your vote and that's about it. We've spent enough time on this. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there's 122 voting 'aye', 20 voting 'nay' and the House does adopt House Resolution 862. Representative Ryan, for what purpose do you arise?"

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, it's...it is now three o'clock on Saturday, the Senate has been gone, there're not coming back till four o'clock this afternoon we're standing in here and talking about memorializing Congress. While we all know that games are being played through the Education Bills. That's what's going on here. I think we either ought to move the Education Bills or adjourn and go on home. Now, let's get to the order of business that we're here to do, let's get the Education Bills called and get them out of here. And I would now call upon you, Mr. Speaker, to call on the Sponsor of the Education Bills, to move them out of here, get the real Speaker in the Chair, get muscle Madigan on the ball and let's get this place in operation again and quite fooling around."

Speaker Flinn: "What we're doing...let me explain what we're doing and..."

Ryan: "You don't have to explain to me, Mr. Speaker, I can see

we're wasting time so they can put their deals together on education. Let's get out of here or move the Bill."

Speaker Flinn: "Would you ask your Members to withdraw their requests to hear these Resolutions and I will guarantee you, I'll scratch them off."

Ryan: "Let's...let's request the people that sponsored the Education Bills to call them and then we'll go back to the Resolutions."

Speaker Flinn: "I'm sure they heard your request."

Ryan: "I'll call the DOT Bills, if you'll call the Education Bills, I'll call DOT right now. I'll do it. You want...Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Flinn: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "You go to House Bill 30...30...what is it? 84. The DOT Bill...wait a minute. 3038, House Bill 3038."

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

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I didn't have any idea that they were playing these kind of games here and I definitely want to ask that my Resolution, that's on that list be removed so we can do what the Minority Leader has suggested. And please do it immediately."

Speaker Redmond: "843 is out of the record. Representative Matijeovich."

Matijeovich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I know a long time ago today you said, when you're going to see the sense of the House when the mood is to adjourn, we're going to get out of here and I sense that from what the Minority Leader said. I want your, okay, before I do this but if it isn't okay, I move to adjourn too. Till whatever time you want tomorrow and I'll be here then."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, pretty soon we'll get to that. First we'll have House Bill 3038 on the Order of Concurrence."

Representative Ryan. Any other Member have a Bill?"

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, I want to move to nonconcur on that Bill, 3038."

Speaker Redmond: "All the Amendments?"

Ryan: "All the Amendments. Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3...."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan has moved to nonconcur in all the Senate Amendments. Those in favor indicate by saying 'aye' 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried and the House nonconcur in all of the Senate Amendments. Is there any other Member who has a Bill on the Order of Concurrence? Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "On the Calendar is House Bill 3084 and I would like to move to nonconcur in that and all the Amendments."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan has moved to nonconcur in all the Committee....all the Senate Amendments to House Bill 3084. Those in favor....Representative Brummer."

Brummer: "It has been the practice here to briefly explain the Amendments and the reason for nonconcurrence and the subject matter of the...of the....of the Bill. I would like to know what this deals with and the reason for the nonconcurrence."

Speaker Redmond: "Will you yield and respond, Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "I didn't hear the question, whatever he wants to know about."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, I don't think I'm the only one who wants to go home. That has not been the practice on the motion to nonconcur, we've just been saying 'aye' and letting it run. So, I would just soon vote with the Minority Leader on the motion to nonconcur."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Brummer is within his rights, in my judgment."

Brummer: "Yes, I had a motion to nonconcur yesterday and specifically, Representative Ryan asked me to do so. I think it's only fair that I ask him to do the same."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "Well, the basic reason to nonconcur is....there's two of them here. You have some Members over there that are interested in Amendment #5 and they want me to nonconcur in that Amendment, so I just figured we might as well nonconcur in all of them because it's probably going to go to Conference. You also have a very important Member on your side that is interested in Amendment #8 and 10. And one is to deal with some street that I can't pronounce on Route 53. And the other has to do with a quarry. Now....that's Senate Amendment #2. That's Senate Amendment #2, I'm talking about. That handles both of them. Do you have any further questions, Representative?"

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House nonconcur in all of the Senate Amendment to House Bill 3034. All those in favor say 'aye' 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the motion carried and the House nonconcur in all the Senate Amendments. Any other....Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "I've now shown good faith, Mr. Speaker and I request that we go the Education Bills and move those either to concur or nonconcur but let's get them and let's go."

Speaker Redmond: "Who is the Sponsor of the Education Bill?"

Ryan: "John Dunn, 3066."

Speaker Redmond: "Do you desire to call it, Representative Dunn? He's not on the floor. You want to call it, Representative Dunn? Representative Borchers."

Borchers: "I have discovered that we have ten to twelve thousand dollars in our emergency fund. We seldom use it except for death of our members. That's enough to give us all flowers

which we probably need. I still now would like to put in a motion... if it would... whatever rule it is, has to be... to be suspended, put in a motion that we send flowers to the two girls, secretaries of this House, who are in the hospital. We can certainly afford about thirty-five, forty bucks. So I, if someone... if that's within the rules or the prerogative, I would appreciate a second if that's possible and let's authorize the Speaker to do it. He can control the money."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Peters."

Peters: "Representative Borchers, we read your mind and we had a huge floral piece in your name, the bill will be at your house."

Speaker Redmond: "Are you going to send him the Bill, Representative Peters?"

Peters: "Right."

Speaker Redmond: "That's good. Any other Member have a Bill...yes."

Ryan: "Well, Mr. Speaker, your Members asked that I call the Transportation Bills before Education was called. I've done that. Let's move on to the Education Bills. There's three or four of them. If Dunn doesn't want to call his we've got some more."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Matijevich."

Ryan: "We've got 3067...."

Matijevich: "Point of order. We said that you call yours before education, you have, tomorrow we're going to call education. We have lived up to our part of the bargain. You called yours first, ours will come next."

Speaker Redmond: "Any other Member have a Bill. I don't want to go to Resolutions now. The troops are getting restless. Representative Ryan has been pestering me every three minutes as to when we're going to go home. And I know he

doesn't want to stay very much longer. Representative Stuffle. Representative Ryan. Representative Simms, please sit down."

Ryan: "Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to correct what you just said. I have not been pestering you to go home. I've been trying to find out what kind of a schedule you're going to keep and of course I've been trying to find that out for four years."

Speaker Redmond: "Well, you'll have..."

Ryan: "Now, I want to say...."

Speaker Redmond: "Starting next Session, why, you can try it all over again."

Ryan: "I want to stay here and work, Mr. Speaker and I want to move on to the Education Bills. That's the most important thing we've got on this budget...on this Calendar and we've got to move those Bills out of here right now."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Either the program has changed or something because yesterday the Republicans, not necessarily, Representative Ryan but a number of others came over here to pester us to hold those Bills. So, I don't know what's going on today but, I don't think you should allude to the Democrats being unwilling to call Education Budgets."

Speaker Redmond: "It's moon madness. Change of votes. Representative Ryan."

Ryan: "I object to the changing of any vote today."

Speaker Redmond: "Representative Ryan objects to the changing of any vote today, he is within his...it requires unanimous consent. Anything further, Mr. Clerk? I understand then that from the silence out there, that no Sponsor desires to have a Bill called either on concurrence, nonconcurrence or Conference Committee Reports. And there's 180

days....while I'll get to you tomorrow. 180 days til Christmas. Representative Madigan. Three o'clock. Any messages from the Senate or anything, Jack?"

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker...."

Speaker Redmond: "Wait a minute. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, does Mr. Ryan have anymore Bills to call?"

Speaker Redmond: "No. We're off that order now. Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Does the Clerk require any time?"

Speaker Redmond: "No."

Madigan: "I move that we adjourn till 3 P.M., tomorrow afternoon."

Speaker Redmond: "The question is on the Gentleman's motion that the House stands adjourned until 3 o'clock tomorrow afternoon. Those in favor say 'aye' 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, motion carried and the House will stand adjourned. Have a good week-end."

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 28, 1980

HB-0821	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	129
HB-1009	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	17
HB-1505	CONFERENCE	PAGE	42
HB-2227	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	31
HB-2710	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	100
HB-2723	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	70
HB-2823	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	15
HB-2893	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	132
HB-3001	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	42
HB-3014	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	44
HB-3024	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	45
HB-3027	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	45
HB-3036	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	101
HB-3038	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	169
HB-3047	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	25
HB-3049	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	102
HB-3084	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	170
HB-3127	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	109
HB-3143	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	16
HB-3180	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	23
HB-3197	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	103
HB-3201	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	47
HB-3208	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	24
HB-3229	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	150
HB-3241	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	111
HB-3272	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	107
HB-3301	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	48
HB-3311	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	157
HB-3320	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	50
HB-3385	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	69
HB-3433	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	112
HB-3435	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	131
HB-3487	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	14
HB-3577	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	15
HB-3614	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	51
SB-1457	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	100
SB-1662	2ND READING	PAGE	120
	3RD READING	PAGE	128
	MOTIONS	PAGE	116
SB-1747	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	131
SB-2000	NON-CONCUR	PAGE	131
IR-0631	3RD READING	PAGE	158
HR-0862	3RD READING	PAGE	164

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 28, 1980

	MOTIONS	PAGE	163
HR-0893	3RD READING	PAGE	133
	MOTIONS	PAGE	132
HR-0897	2ND READING	PAGE	137
	2ND READING	PAGE	139
HR-0898	2ND READING	PAGE	143
	3RD READING	PAGE	144
	MOTIONS	PAGE	142
HR-0899	2ND READING	PAGE	145
	3RD READING	PAGE	146
	MOTIONS	PAGE	145
HR-0943	1ST READING	PAGE	7
SJR-0089	3RD READING	PAGE	136
	MOTIONS	PAGE	136
SJR-0119	3RD READING	PAGE	162
	MOTIONS	PAGE	161
SJR-0121	3RD READING	PAGE	135
	MOTIONS	PAGE	135

LEGISLATIVE INFORMATION SYSTEM

DAILY TRANSCRIPT INDEX
JUNE 28, 1980

PAGE 3

SUBJECT MATTER

SPEAKER REDMOND - HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REVEREND KRUEGER - PRAYER	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	6
ATTENDANCE ROLL CALL	PAGE	23
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	174
